



1972

## Alcohol Education: An Exploratory Study Of Teacher Opinions And Drinking Practices

Paul Douglas Wyatt  
*University of the Pacific*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop\\_etds](https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds)

 Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Wyatt, Paul Douglas. (1972). *Alcohol Education: An Exploratory Study Of Teacher Opinions And Drinking Practices*. University of the Pacific, Dissertation. [https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop\\_etds/3089](https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds/3089)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of the Pacific Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [mgibney@pacific.edu](mailto:mgibney@pacific.edu).

ALCOHOL EDUCATION: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF TEACHER  
OPINIONS AND DRINKING PRACTICES

A Dissertation

Presented to  
the Faculty of the Graduate School  
University of the Pacific

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Education

by

Paul Douglas Wyatt

November 1972

© Copyright by Paul Douglas Wyatt, 1972

This dissertation, written and submitted by

PAUL DOUGLAS WYATT

is approved for recommendation to the Committee  
on Graduate Studies, University of the Pacific

Dean of the School or Department Chairman:

J. Marc Gontz

Dissertation Committee:

K. Preston Gleason Chairman

Dan Cahalan

Wm. C. Fleming, Jr.

Howell V. Rummel

Edward Pehlman

Dated 20 November, 1972

Abstract of Dissertation

ALCOHOL EDUCATION: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF TEACHER  
OPINIONS AND DRINKING PRACTICES

Paul Douglas Wyatt

The Problem: As the teacher's role in preventing problems related to alcohol abuse becomes more important, it is incumbent upon educators and alcoholists to explore the opinions and views which teachers bring with them into the class on alcohol education. Specifically, what views and opinions do high school teachers have toward alcohol education and how do these views relate to their drinking practices and their social-demographic variables?

Methodology: The study was based on a survey of 475 randomly selected full-time high school teachers and an additional 121 teachers who were currently teaching alcohol education. The total sample of 596 secondary teachers was from twenty-three high schools located in six school districts of three geographical areas in California (Southern California, San Francisco Bay, and the Central Valley).

A twenty-minute, self-administered, pre-coded questionnaire was developed by the researcher. In addition to social-demographic questions, questions about alcohol education, and questions regarding the respondents' drinking practices, four different models of alcohol education were operationally defined and investigated.

The method of analysis involved using the chi-square test of independence (level of significance equal to .05) to determine statistical differences between alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators and between male teachers and female teachers on selected variables. In addition, standard survey research techniques were used in the analysis of the remaining data. This included the examination of single distributions of all variables and the selected cross-tabulation of these variables with categories of one or more independent variables.

Findings and Conclusions: Of the sample of 596 teachers, 550 or 92 percent returned completed questionnaires. It was concluded that alcohol educators did not differ significantly from non-alcohol educators regarding their: (1) frequency of preference for the Values Clarification Model of alcohol education, (2) their reasons for drinking, (3) their knowledge of friends or relatives with drinking problems, and (4) the frequency with which they attribute alcoholism to moral weakness.

Alcohol educators differed significantly from non-alcohol educators regarding the frequency of having Low-None Drinking Patterns. Alcohol educators less often had Low-None Drinking Patterns than did non-alcohol educators.

Male high school teachers of this sample drank alcoholic beverages (any amount and large amounts) significantly more often than female teachers.

There were no significant differences between male and female teachers concerning their views on teenage drinking (age fifteen to seventeen years).

High school teachers in this sample most often preferred to use the Objective Facts Approach toward alcohol education and least preferred the Temperance Approach.

Teachers in this sample generally did not feel younger teenagers (aged fifteen to seventeen) should be allowed to drink alcoholic beverages but a majority felt that drinking should be legalized for youth aged eighteen or older.

Most of the teachers were moderate or light drinkers and only a small percentage were abstainers.

Alcohol education efforts in the high school were felt to be of value and were supported by most of the teachers. Teachers generally felt that alcohol education and drug education should be combined.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Special gratitude is due many persons who provided assistance, encouragement, and support for the study. Professors Cahalan, Gleason, Pohlman, Runion, and Theimer, members of the dissertation committee, gave many hours of guidance and direction.

Loran D. Archer, Director of the California State Office of Alcohol Program Management, George E. Staub, Consultant to the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, and Donald A. McCune, Director of the Drug Task Force for the California State Department of Education are especially acknowledged for their generous efforts in developing and maintaining support for the research study.

Expert assistance in survey methodology and data analysis were provided by Walter Clark, Robin Room, and other staff members of the Social Research Group at the University of California, Berkeley. Data processing assistance was provided by the staff at the Institute for Research in Social Behavior, Berkeley, California.

The administration and faculties of the participating school districts and high schools are acknowledged for their interest and cooperation. Manuscript preparation and general secretarial assistance were provided by Carol Ayres.

The suggestions, prodding, editing, diversions, and concern of Carol Wyatt throughout this effort are warmly appreciated.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPROVAL SHEET . . . . .	iii
ABSTRACT . . . . .	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	v
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	ix
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
The Problem . . . . .	5
The Rationale . . . . .	6
Aims and Hypotheses . . . . .	12
Assumptions and Theoretical Framework . . . . .	14
Definitions of Terms . . . . .	18
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	24
Opinions About Alcohol Education . . . . .	24
Summary of Research . . . . .	40
Four Perspectives on Alcohol Education in the Schools . . . . .	40
The Temperance (Abstinence) Approach . . . . .	41
The Objective Facts Approach . . . . .	44
The Responsible Drinking Approach . . . . .	48
The Values Clarification Approach . . . . .	55
Summary of Literature . . . . .	63
Correlates of Drinking Practices . . . . .	63
Sex and Age . . . . .	65
Social Status . . . . .	66
Occupation . . . . .	66
Education . . . . .	67
Marital Status . . . . .	67
Region of Country . . . . .	68
Degree of Urbanization . . . . .	68
Race . . . . .	69

Ancestors . . . . .	69
Children in the Home. . . . .	70
Income. . . . .	70
Religion. . . . .	70
Summary of Findings . . . . .	71
Summary of Chapter II. . . . .	72
III, METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY. . . . .	74
Sample and Sampling Method . . . . .	74
The Instrument . . . . .	76
Administration of the Instrument . . . . .	78
Method of Analysis . . . . .	81
IV. RESULTS OF THE STUDY. . . . .	84
Characteristics of the Teacher Sample. . . . .	85
Testing of the Hypotheses. . . . .	95
Comparison of Alcohol Educators and Non-Alcohol Educators by Selected Variables. . . . .	95
Comparison of Male and Female Educators on Two Selected Variables. . . . .	112
Teacher Support for Various Models of Alcohol Education. . . . .	115
Teacher Drinking Practices and Views About Drinking . . . . .	122
Teacher Opinions on Various Questions About Alcohol Education. . . . .	137
Cross-Tabulations of Teacher Charac- teristics and Preferences for Alcohol Education Models . . . . .	146
Summary of Chapter IV. . . . .	164



V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .	166
Summary of Principal Findings. . . . .	169
Conclusions and Discussion . . . . .	179
Recommendations for Further Study. . . . .	183
APPENDIX A. SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE. . . . .	188
APPENDIX B. SAMPLE LETTERS. . . . .	202
APPENDIX C. TABLES 61 AND 62. . . . .	205
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	207

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Classification of Drinkers by Frequency and Quantity . . . . .	21
2. Comparison of Cahalan's and Harris' Findings by Drinker Category, In Percent . . . . .	64
3. Reasons for Non-Completion of Questionnaire . . . . .	84
4. Ages of Teachers by Sex . . . . .	86
5. Marital Status of Teachers. . . . .	87
6. Teachers With Children. . . . .	88
7. Number and Percentages of Teachers in Various Racial Groups. . . . .	89
8. Number and Percentage of Teachers Affiliating With Various Religions . . . . .	90
9. The Number and Percentage of Teachers Whose Ancestors Come from Various Countries or Areas . . . . .	91
10. The Number of Years in Which Teachers Have Taught School by Sex. . . . .	92
11. Numbers and Percentages of Teachers in the Major Teaching Areas by Sex. . . . .	93
12. Number and Percentage of Male and Female Alcohol Educators and Non-Alcohol Educators. . . . .	94
13. Preference for Alcohol Education Models by Type of Educator and Sex, In Percent. . . . .	97
14. Preference for Alcohol Education Models by Recency of Teaching About Alcohol, In Percent. . . . .	97
15. Preference for the Values Clarification Model by Type of Educator and Sex, In Percent . . . . .	99

Table	Page
16. Preference for the Values Clarification Model by Recency of Teaching About Alcohol, In Percent. . . . .	99
17. Percentage of Alcohol Educators and Non-Alcohol Educators by Drinker Category and Sex. . . . .	101
18. Percentage of Alcohol Educators and Non-Alcohol Educators by Drinking Pattern and Sex. . . . .	102
19. Reasons for Drinking by Alcohol Educators and Non-Alcohol Educators and Sex, In Percent. . . . .	104
20. Alcohol Educator and Non-Alcohol Educator by Friend with a Serious Drinking Problem and by Sex, In Percent. . . . .	107
21. Relative with a Serious Drinking Problem by Alcohol Educator and Non-Alcohol Educator and by Sex, In Percent . . . . .	108
22. Friend with a Serious Drinking Problem by Recency of Teaching About Alcohol and by Sex, In Percent. . . . .	109
23. Relative with a Serious Drinking Problem by Recency of Teaching About Alcohol and by Sex, In Percent . . . . .	110
24. Causes of Alcoholism by Alcohol Educator and Non-Alcohol Educator and by Sex, In Percent. . . . .	111
25. Preference for the Moral Weakness Cause of Alcoholism by Alcohol Educator and Non-Alcohol Educator and by Sex, In Percent. . . . .	112
26. Drinking Patterns by Male and Female Teachers, In Percent. . . . .	113
27. Views on Teenage Drinking by Male and Female Teachers, In Percent . . . . .	114
28. Amount of Teacher Agreement with the Temperance Approach Toward Alcohol Education. . . . .	116
29. Amount of Teacher Agreement with the Responsible Drinking Model of Alcohol Education. . . . .	117
30. Amount of Teacher Agreement with the Objective Facts Model of Alcohol Education . . . . .	119

Table	Page
31. Amount of Teacher Agreement with the Values Clarification Model of Alcohol Education . . . .	120
32. Rank Order of Teacher Preference for the Four Models of Alcohol Education. . . . .	121
33. Teacher Views on Teenage Drinking . . . . .	123
34. Teachers' Opinions About Legalizing Drinking for Eighteen Year Olds . . . . .	124
35. Teacher Views on Intoxication . . . . .	125
36. The Amount Which Teachers Feel Free to Drink in Various Situations . . . . .	127
37. Teacher Ambivalence Toward Drinking . . . . .	128
38. Frequency of Drinking Any Amount of Alcoholic Beverages Among Teachers . . . . .	130
39. Frequency of Drinking Five or More Drinks Among Teachers . . . . .	131
40. Selected Reasons Teachers Give for Drinking . . . .	132
41. Teachers Who Have Friends or Relatives With Serious Drinking Problems. . . . .	134
42. Teacher Views on Alcoholism Statements. . . . .	135
43. The Classification of Teachers Into Five Drinker Categories . . . . .	136
44. Number and Percentage of Teachers Who State that Alcohol Education Should be Part of the High School Curriculum. . . . .	138
45. Number and Percentage of Teachers Who Are or Would Be Uncomfortable About Teaching a Unit on Alcohol Education. . . . .	139
46. Teacher Opinion on Which Course Should Include a Major Section on Alcohol Education . . . . .	140
47. The Grade Levels in Which High School Teachers Feel Alcohol Education Should be Included. . . .	141

Table		Page
48.	The Number of Classroom Hours Per Year Which Teachers Feel Should be Spent on Alcohol Education. . . . .	142
49.	Teachers' Opinion About Combining Alcohol Education with Education About Other Drugs . . .	143
50.	Difficulty of Finding Materials on Alcohol Education by Alcohol Educators and Non-Alcohol Educators. . . . .	144
51.	Teacher Responses to Value Statements About Alcohol Education. . . . .	145
52.	Preference for Alcohol Education Models by Age and Sex, In Percent. . . . .	148
53.	Preference of Teachers for Alcohol Education Models by Marital Status and Sex, In percent .	150
54.	Preference of Teachers for Each Alcohol Education Model by Respondents With Children and Sex, In Percent. . . . .	152
55.	Preference of Teachers for Each Alcohol Education Model by Drinking Category and Sex, In Percent. . . . .	154
56.	Preference of Teachers for Each Alcohol Education Model by Respondents who Have a Friend with a Drinking Problem, In Percent . . . . .	156
57.	Preference of Teachers for Each Alcohol Education Model by Respondents who Have a Relative With a Drinking Problem, In Percent . . . . .	157
58.	Preference of Teachers for Each Alcohol Education Model by Respondents' Views on Teenage Drinking, In Percent . . . . .	159
59.	Preference of Teachers for Each Alcohol Education Model by Causes of Alcoholism and Sex, In Percent. . . . .	161
60.	Preference of Teachers for Each Alcohol Education Model by Religious Category and Sex, In Percent. . . . .	163

Table	Page
61. Alcohol Education Models Which the Teachers Perceive the School Boards Not Supporting. . . .	206
62. Alcohol Education Models Which the Teachers Perceive the Students' Parents Not Supporting. .	206

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

As society has become more industrial and less agricultural, more urban and less rural, more computerized and less personal, the number and complexity of its problems have greatly increased. Today the school and the community are faced with almost overwhelming social, economic, and health problems. One of the most serious of these is alcoholism. Estimates made in 1971 indicate that about five percent of the adult population in the United States manifest the behaviors of alcohol abuse and alcoholism. Of the more than ninety-five million drinkers in the Nation, nearly nine million men and women are alcohol abusers and alcoholic individuals.<sup>1</sup> The alcoholism problem in California has been described by Governor Reagan:

Alcoholism, as a disease, is defined in terms of individuals who are excessive drinkers. Their dependence on alcohol has attained such a degree as to interfere with their physical and mental health, interpersonal relations, and social, economic, and vocational functioning. In addition to the impact upon the health of the individual,

---

<sup>1</sup>U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, First Special Report to the U. S. Government on Alcohol and Health (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971), p. vi.

alcoholism also contributes to many other problems including family discord, poverty, violence, abuse and neglect of children, unemployment, welfare dependence and highway accidents.

In California, about nine million adults, almost three-fourths of the adult population, drink alcoholic beverages. The majority drink in moderation, but it is estimated that over one million Californians are alcoholics.

Deaths due to alcoholism are the fourth leading cause of death during the economically productive years from 35 to 64. Recent studies indicate that drinking drivers are involved in 39 percent of highway traffic fatalities in California and in 20 percent of the injury accidents. In terms of cost to the taxpayer, public drunkenness accounts for approximately 50 percent of all misdemeanor bookings into city and county jails in California. The estimated annual cost to business, industry and government in California for undetected and untreated alcoholics on their payrolls is estimated to be over \$400 million.<sup>2</sup>

The rate of alcoholism in California is continuing to rise according to figures released by the State Department of Rehabilitation.<sup>3</sup> In 1965, for instance, there were an estimated 8,780 alcoholics per 100,000 adults. Five years later the rate had increased by 720 to 9,500 alcoholics per 100,000 adults. Alcoholism authorities such as Plaut<sup>4</sup> and

---

<sup>2</sup>Ronald Reagan, State of California Governor's Program Budget for 1972-73 (Sacramento, California: State Printing Office, 1972), p. 718.

<sup>3</sup>Mary Brubaker, Estimated Number of Alcoholics in California, Memorandum Number FSS 72-2-12, California State Department of Rehabilitation, 1972. (Mimeographed.)

<sup>4</sup>Thomas F. A. Plaut, Alcohol Problems: A Report to the Nation by the Cooperative Commission on the Study of Alcoholism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), Part 3.



and Cross<sup>5</sup> have stressed the importance of preventing alcoholism if we are to begin to alleviate this public and mental health problem.

According to Chafetz, there are three types of alcoholism prevention: primary, secondary, and tertiary.<sup>6</sup> Secondary and tertiary prevention are defined, respectively, as early intervention of pathological drinking and as treatment to avoid further complications of the illness. Both of these types involve remediation of drinking problems at some stage after they have begun. Thus for the most part, these types of prevention are the responsibility of treatment and rehabilitation agencies. Primary prevention, however, is designed to prevent the onset of alcoholism and is, therefore, principally the responsibility of those community agencies who have the opportunity to reach people before they have drinking problems. High among such agencies are the public school systems with their elementary, secondary, college, and adult levels. According to McCarthy, for many people the classroom is the only opportunity for an unbiased consideration of the question about alcohol.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Jay N. Cross, Guide to the Community Control of Alcoholism (New York: American Public Health Association, Inc., 1968), p. 92.

<sup>6</sup> Morris E. Chafetz and Harold W. Demone, Alcoholism and Society (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), Part 4.

<sup>7</sup> Raymond G. McCarthy, ed., Alcohol Education for Classroom and Community (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1964), p. 8.

The philosophical basis for the school taking an active position in curing social ills is well documented by such writers as Brameld,<sup>8</sup> Glenn,<sup>9</sup> and Rogers.<sup>10</sup> Of these three authorities, Glenn and Rogers tend to focus on the mental health of the individual students. Brameld, on the other hand, is convinced that the schools are part of the social ills and that only through their reconstruction (and the reconstruction of other institutions) will our society and culture be improved. As California schools accept this reconstructionist position in the area of preventing alcohol problems and as federal and state funds become available for doing so, the public school teachers are finding that their responsibilities have greatly increased. Many are being asked to handle alcohol education curriculum which is both controversial and complex. To assist these teachers state-wide teacher training and consultation is needed.

However, before effective training and consultation can take place, it is necessary to know more about teacher

---

<sup>8</sup>Theodore Brameld, "A Cross Cutting Approach to Curriculum, The Moving Wheel," Phi Delta Kappa, 51:346-348, March, 1970.

<sup>9</sup>Vernon L. Glenn, "The School's Contribution to Mental Health," Discussion Papers, Volume II, Number 9, Arkansas State Rehabilitation Research and Training Center, Fayetteville Arkansas University, Fayetteville.

<sup>10</sup>Carl Rogers, Carl Rogers on Encounter Groups (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc., 1970).

views and opinions regarding alcohol education. Specifically, this involves gaining knowledge in several areas: 1) the amount of teacher support for different models of alcohol education; 2) the drinking practices of teachers; 3) the opinions teachers have about teenage drinking; 4) the answers teachers give to questions about where, what levels, and how many classroom hours should be devoted to alcohol education; and 5) the amount of interest teachers have in teaching about alcohol. Also, as preparation for teacher training in alcohol education, it would be helpful to note differences between teachers who have taught alcohol education and those who have not. Are these differences significant? Do the opinions of the alcohol educators appear to be more enlightened than the non-alcohol educators? Obtaining answers to these and other related questions served as one of the objectives of this study.

### The Problem

As indicated, teachers have a role in preventing problems of alcohol abuse. As this role becomes more important it behooves educators and alcoholologists to look at the opinions and views which teachers bring with them into the class on alcohol education. Specifically, what views and opinions do high school teachers have toward alcohol education and how do these views relate to their drinking practices and their social-demographic variables?

## The Rationale

Support for investigating teacher attitudes and opinions on alcohol education and their correlates with drinking practices and social-demographic variables was the literature which indicates that the teacher, his attitudes, and his opinions can have a positive or negative affect on student mental health -- a factor which may influence current or subsequent student drinking patterns. A second area of support came directly from the alcohol education literature which suggests the importance of attitudes, opinions, and drinking practices of those educators who teach about alcohol. The third supporting area was the literature which exists on adult drinking practices. This literature provided the present study with direction as well as the opportunity for external reliability checks. Lastly, this investigation found considerable practical support from recent legislation and policy decisions made at the federal and state levels.

The literature, especially in the areas of school guidance and teacher training, suggests that the teacher has an influence on the student's mental health and that he must assume the responsibility which goes along with this

influence.<sup>11</sup> Rogers<sup>12,13</sup> and Glasser<sup>14</sup> have devoted much of their recent writings to recognizing and describing the teacher/student relationship that facilitates mutual cognitive and affective development. Other writers such as Arbuckle,<sup>15</sup> Downing,<sup>16</sup> Johnston, et al.,<sup>17</sup> and Peters and Shertzer<sup>18</sup> have suggested that the teacher is an important part of the guidance team. He is responsible for creating not only a positive mental health learning situation, but

---

<sup>11</sup>The writer recognizes the diversity of classifications which may come under the heading of "student mental health." The reader interested in an elaboration of the problems associated with classifying mental health (or mental illness) is referred to Hathaway's discussion in the Foreword of An MMPI Handbook by W. G. Dahlstrom and G. S. Welsh (Minneapolis, Minnesota: The University of Minnesota Press, 1960).

<sup>12</sup>Carl Rogers, Freedom to Learn (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1969).

<sup>13</sup>Carl Rogers, Carl Rogers on Encounter Groups, (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc., 1970), pp. 41-48.

<sup>14</sup>William Glasser, Schools Without Failure (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc., 1969).

<sup>15</sup>Dugald S. Arbuckle, Pupil Personnel Services in American Schools (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1962), Chapter 4.

<sup>16</sup>Lester N. Downing, Guidance and Counseling Services: An Introduction (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1968), pp. 52-54.

<sup>17</sup>Edgar G. Johnston, Mildred Peters, and William Evraiff, The Role of the Teacher in Guidance (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1959).

<sup>18</sup>Herman J. Peters and Bruce Shertzer, Guidance: Program Development and Management (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969), pp. 146-148.

also for taking a conscious role in helping the student with his school-related problems. The importance of the teacher in influencing student mental health has been investigated by the Association for Student Teaching. In 1967, the Association devoted its Forty-Sixth Yearbook to mental health and teacher education. Peck and Richek, writing in this volume, review a large number of studies which, although not conclusive, indicate that teacher personality and mental health have a measurable influence on student personality and mental health.<sup>19</sup> Sears and Hilgard<sup>20</sup> found that interaction among teachers and pupils can be classified as affective, evaluative, and cognitive, and that each of these interaction types influences the pupil. Miller has found that recognition of the teacher's influence on the student is supported in practice as well as theory. Out of a sample of thirty teacher training institutions, twenty-five were sufficiently concerned about the effects of teacher personality on students to make use of a

---

<sup>19</sup>Robert F. Peck and Herbert Richek, "Teacher Education for Mental Health: A Review of Recent Studies," Mental Health and Teacher Education, Forty-Sixth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, Inc., 1967), pp. 217-235.

<sup>20</sup>Pauline S. Sears and Ernest R. Hilgard, "The Teacher's Role in the Motivation of the Learner," Theories of Learning and Motivation, Sixty-Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), p. 209.

personality evaluation and screening program.<sup>21</sup> The above research indicates that teachers' attitudes and characteristics have an influence on their students and thus supports the present research which was designed to study such attitudes and characteristics.

The present investigation found a second area of support from the literature on alcohol education. In this literature, it is suggested that teacher characteristics such as attitudes, values, opinions, and drinking practices are important determinants of success in the alcohol education classroom.<sup>22,23,24</sup> Dimas,<sup>25</sup> in his summary of alcohol education, emphatically states that the teacher is the most important person in school alcohol education programs and that he, therefore, has a responsibility to develop proper

---

<sup>21</sup>Lebern N. Miller, "Evaluating Teacher Personality Before Student Teaching Begins," Journal of Educational Research (Madison, Wisconsin: Dembar Educational Research Services, Inc., 1961), 56:382-384.

<sup>22</sup>Doris Sands, "The College Teacher," Alcohol Education, Conference Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 62.

<sup>23</sup>Frances Todd, "The Teacher," Alcohol Education, Conference Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 39.

<sup>24</sup>W. Kenneth Ferrier, "Alcohol Education in the Public School Curriculum," Alcohol Education for Classroom and Community, ed. by Raymond G. McCarthy (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1964), p. 64.

<sup>25</sup>George D. Dimas, Alcohol Education in Schools (Portland: Alcohol and Drug Section, Mental Health Division, Board of Control, 1967).

attitudes about this subject. Russell also would support the present investigation of teacher alcohol education views and opinions toward alcohol education when he says, "The teacher's basic personal point of view tends to affect his or her teaching . . . ."26

Several important national and local surveys of drinking practices provided a third foundation for the present study. Most notable of these are Cahalan's "Drinking Practices Study,"27 Mulford's "Drinking in Iowa,"28 Jessor's "Tri-Ethnic Community Study,"29 and Harris' "American Attitudes Toward Alcohol and Alcoholics Study."30 These studies carried out on national and local general populations have provided much of the rationale used in instrument construction and data analysis. Most important

---

<sup>26</sup>Robert D. Russell, "Teacher Education," Alcohol Education, Conference Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 53.

<sup>27</sup>Don Cahalan, Problem Drinkers (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970), p. xii.

<sup>28</sup>H. A. Mulford and N. E. Miller, "Drinking in Iowa, II," The extent of drinking and selected socio-cultural categories, Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol (1960), 21:26-39.

<sup>29</sup>Richard Jessor, Theodore D. Graves, Robert C. Hanson, and Shirley L. Jessor, Society, Personality, and Deviant Behavior (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1968).

<sup>30</sup>Louis Harris and Associates, American Attitudes Toward Alcohol and Alcoholics, A survey of public opinion prepared for the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (Study Number 2138, December, 1971).



has been their contribution to knowledge concerning drinking patterns and attitudes about alcohol. One of the principal findings of these studies is that the frequency and quantity with which one drinks often goes together with certain attitudes and views toward drinking (or not drinking) and toward alcoholism.

Lastly, considerable practical support for this investigation was derived from the implementation of recent federal and state legislation. Most prominent of these is the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970, (PL 91-616).<sup>31</sup> Under this law the prevention of alcoholism was given a high priority by the federal government. Their willingness to financially support alcohol education programs encouraged the California Office of Alcoholism to allocate \$85,000 to the State Department of Education. According to the California State Plan on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, these funds will be used to "develop and implement a statewide alcohol education project to increase emphasis on prevention of alcohol abuse and alcoholism."<sup>32</sup> Other important

---

<sup>31</sup>Public Law 91-616, 91st Congress, S. 3835, Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970.

<sup>32</sup>State of California, Human Relations Agency, California State Plan for Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation (Sacramento: State Printing Office, 1972), p. 47.

legislation dealing with alcohol education in the schools includes the McAteer Alcoholism Act-1969<sup>33</sup> and The Drug Education Act of 1971.<sup>34</sup> Each of these supports and expands the use of the schools and hence the teachers in preventing alcohol abuse and alcoholism.

### Aims and Hypotheses

The present study was designed to meet the following four principal objectives:

1. To test the following hypotheses:

General Hypothesis 1. Secondary teachers who have taught an identifiable unit on alcohol education (alcohol educators) will have different views from those teachers who have never taught alcohol education (non-alcohol educators).

Specific Hypothesis 1a. Alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators will differ in their choice of the

---

<sup>33</sup>Welfare and Institutions Code, Chapter 8, McAteer Alcoholism Act (1969).

<sup>34</sup>California Education Code, Article 5, Chapter 3 of Division 7 (Commencing with Section 8751), The Drug Education Act of 1971.

"Values Clarification Model"<sup>35</sup> of alcohol education.

Specific Hypothesis 1b. Alcohol educators will differ from non-alcohol educators regarding the frequency of having Low-None Drinking Patterns.

Specific Hypothesis 1c. Alcohol educators will less often find it somewhat or very important to drink when tense, to relax, or to forget worries than will non-alcohol educators.

Specific Hypothesis 1d. Alcohol educators will more often than non-alcohol educators have knowledge of a friend or a relative who has a serious drinking problem.

Specific Hypothesis 1e. Alcohol educators will differ from non-alcohol educators regarding how often they attribute alcoholism to moral weakness.

---

<sup>35</sup>The "Values Clarification Model" is operationally defined by Model D of the Drinking Practices and Alcohol Education Questionnaire found in Appendix A. See also Chapter II for a discussion on the Values Clarification Approach toward alcohol education.

General Hypothesis 2. Female teachers will differ from male teachers in their drinking patterns and views on teenage drinking.

Specific Hypothesis 2a. Female teachers will have Low-None Drinking Patterns more often than will male teachers.

Specific Hypothesis 2b. Male and female teachers will differ on how conservative they are about teenage drinking.

2. To ascertain the amount of secondary teacher support for each of the four types of school alcohol education models;
3. To explore various questions about or related to alcohol education in the schools; and
4. To explore relationships among the secondary teacher's: 1) choice of alcohol education models; 2) drinking practices; and 3) social-demographic variables.

#### Assumptions and Theoretical Framework

The major efforts of this study were: First, to investigate the previously stated hypotheses; second, to describe teacher opinions toward alcohol education; third,

to describe the drinking practices of teachers; and fourth, to provide an exploratory analysis of the interrelationships of these variables with selected social-demographic characteristics. The following assumptions and theoretical framework are related to the hypotheses of the study.

The first general hypothesis suggests that alcohol educators will differ from non-alcohol educators in their choice of alcohol education models, their drinking patterns, their knowledge of a friend or relative with a drinking problem, and their opinions about what causes alcoholism. Those who teach an identifiable unit on alcohol education will be likely to have more exposure to accurate information which will affect their drinking opinions, values, and behavior than will non-alcohol educators. This increased exposure will have resulted in part from the effects of the State Department of Education. During the last Fiscal Year (1971-72) the Drug Task Force of that Department presented thirty-four training sessions on drug (alcohol) education. Forty-Four percent of the total 1,070 elementary, secondary, and unified school districts in California were exposed to the training.<sup>36</sup> Each of these four-day training sessions presented to the participants the "values" approach toward alcohol education.

---

<sup>36</sup>Evaluation of the California Drug Education Training Program 1970-71, Unpublished Report, Drug Education Task Force, California State Department of Education, p. 2.

Approximately 1,600 educators interested in drug and alcohol education learned about this relatively new approach. At the same time as this extensive training was taking place, alcohol (and drug) educators were encouraged by state consultants to read recently published books which emphasized the "values" approach to teaching and education.<sup>37,38,39,40</sup>

Thus it was hypothesized that the net result of this widespread emphasis will be that alcohol educators are more likely than non-alcohol educators to choose a "values clarification" model of alcohol education. It was further anticipated that exposure to such materials and workshops have also affected drinking opinions and behavior so that alcohol educators will differ in how much they drink, the reasons they give for drinking, their awareness of people who have drinking problems, and their opinions about what causes alcoholism.

---

<sup>37</sup>W. Ray Rucker, V. Clyde Arnsperger, and Arthur J. Brodbeck, Human Values in Education (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, Inc., 1969).

<sup>38</sup>V. Clyde Arnsperger, James A. Brill, and W. Ray Rucker, Human Values Series (Austin, Texas: Steck-Vaughn Company, 1969).

<sup>39</sup>V. Clyde Arnsperger, W. Ray Rucker, and Mary E. Preas, Personality in Social Process (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, Inc., 1969).

<sup>40</sup>Louis E. Raths, Merrill Harmin, and Sidney B. Simon, Values and Teaching: Working With Values in the Classroom (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1966).

The second general hypothesis suggests that the sex of the teacher will make a difference in the amounts and frequency of alcoholic beverage consumption. Support for this hypothesis was derived from general population surveys completed by Cahalan, et al.,<sup>41</sup> Jessor,<sup>42</sup> and Harris<sup>43</sup> which indicate that as a total group men drink more than women. It was also hypothesized that sex will be a factor in teachers' views on teenage drinking. Cahalan's national survey<sup>44</sup> indicated a much greater percentage of females find "nothing good" about drinking than do males (40 percent to 28 percent male). Jessor<sup>45</sup> found in his community survey that adult males are significantly more permissive than females are in their attitudes toward deviance. Both of these studies indicated that females tend to be more conservative than males in their attitudes toward drinking and related activities.

---

<sup>41</sup>Don Cahalan, Ira H. Cisin, and Helen M. Crossley, American Drinking Practices (New Brunswick: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies, 1969), pp. 21-22.

<sup>42</sup>Richard Jessor, Theodore D. Graves, Robert C. Hanson, and Shirley L. Jessor, Society, Personality and Deviant Behavior (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1968), p. 182.

<sup>43</sup>Louis Harris and Associates, American Attitudes Toward Alcohol and Alcoholics, a survey of public opinion prepared for the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (Study Number 2138, December, 1971), p. 3.

<sup>44</sup>Don Cahalan, Ibid., p. 134.

<sup>45</sup>Richard Jessor, Ibid., p. 318.

Below are four general assumptions which underlie the stated hypotheses:

Assumption 1. Alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators have answered the Drinking Practices and Alcohol Education Questionnaire with the same degree of honesty and lack of bias.

Assumption 2. The control sample selected for Hypotheses 1a thru 1e was representative of high school teachers working in mid-size to large-size school districts in California.

Assumption 3. The teacher who is teaching alcohol education is in part doing so because of his interest in the field.

Assumption 4. The oversample of 121 alcohol educators did not bias the outcomes of Hypotheses 2a and 2b.

#### Definitions of Terms

ABSTAINER. One who has never had an alcoholic beverage, or who has alcoholic beverages less than once a year.<sup>46</sup> The term "abstainer" is not necessarily

---

<sup>46</sup>Don Cahalan, Ira H. Cisin, and Helen M. Crossley, American Drinking Practices (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies, 1969), p. 14.



equated with people who do not drink on moral grounds. It includes those who do not drink because: they do not like the taste, it makes them ill, it is not readily available, etc.

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE. Any beverage which contains ethyl alcohol (ethanol  $\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH}$ ). Alcoholic beverages are commonly classified into three divisions: wine, beer, and distilled spirits. Since a glass of wine, a can of beer, and a highball or other mixed drink contain approximately the same amount of ethyl alcohol, they will, for purposes of this study, be considered to have equal strength and effect.

ALCOHOLISM. "Alcoholics are those excessive drinkers whose dependence upon alcohol has attained such a degree that it shows a noticeable mental disturbance or an interference with their bodily and mental health, their interpersonal relations, and their smooth social and economic functioning; or who show the prodromal signs of such developments."<sup>47</sup> Although alcoholics are sometimes differentiated

---

<sup>47</sup>World Health Organization, Expert Committee on Mental Health, Alcoholism Subcommittee, Second Report, W.H.O. Technical Report Series, Number 48, August, 1962.

from "problem drinkers,"<sup>48</sup> for purposes of the present study they will be used interchangeably.

APPROACHES TOWARD ALCOHOL EDUCATION. Four approaches toward alcohol education are studied: Temperance, Objective Facts, Responsible Drinking, and Values Clarification. Each of these has been described and operationally defined in Chapter II.

ATTITUDE. "An enduring system of positive or negative evaluation, emotional feelings, and pro or con action tendencies with respect to a social object."<sup>49</sup>

DRINKER. One who partakes of alcoholic beverages at least once a year.<sup>50</sup> Table 1 classifies drinkers into five categories according to the frequency of using any alcoholic beverage and according to the frequency of drinking large quantities of alcoholic beverages (five or more drinks per occasion).

---

<sup>48</sup>Don Cahalan, Problem Drinkers (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970), pp. 1-17.

<sup>49</sup>David Krech, Richard S. Crutchfield, and Egerton L. Ballachey, Individual in Society (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962), p. 177.

<sup>50</sup>Don Cahalan, Ira H. Cisin, and Helen M. Crossley, American Drinking Practices (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies, 1969), p. 14.

TABLE 1  
CLASSIFICATION OF DRINKERS BY  
FREQUENCY AND QUANTITY

Category	Frequency	Quantity <sup>a</sup>
Heavy Drinkers	A. Three or more times a day	Heavy, Moderate, Light
	B. Twice a day	Heavy, Moderate, Light
	C. Every day or nearly every day	Heavy, Moderate
	D. Three or four times a week	Heavy, Moderate
	E. Once or twice a week	Heavy
	F. Two or three times a month	Heavy
Moderate Drinkers	A. Every day or nearly every day	Light
	B. Three or four times a week	Light
	C. Once or twice a week	Heavy, Moderate
	D. Two or three times a month	Heavy, Moderate
	E. About once a month	Heavy
Light Drinkers	A. Once or twice a week	Light
	B. Two or three times a month	Light
	C. About once a month	Moderate, Light
Infrequent Drinkers	Drink less than once a month but at least once a year.	
Abstainers	Drink no alcoholic beverages as often as once a year (see definition for "abstainer").	

<sup>a</sup>Quantity refers to the number of times the individual drinks five or more drinks. Heavy quantity is defined as drinking five or more drinks more often than "once in a while"; Moderate quantity is defined as drinking five or more drinks "once in a while"; and Light quantity is defined as drinking five or more drinks "almost never."

DRY. One who is opposed to drinking or to the promotion of the use of alcoholic beverages.<sup>51</sup> This is contrasted to the label "wet" which is given to one who promotes or advocates or would permit the use of alcoholic beverages.

HIGH-MODERATE DRINKING PATTERN. Heavy or moderate drinking as defined in Table 1.

LOW-NONE DRINKING PATTERN. Light, infrequent, or abstinent drinking as defined in Table 1.

OPINIONS. "A conclusion or knowledge held with confidence, but falling short of positive knowledge."<sup>52</sup> "Opinions," "views," and "judgments" are used interchangeably.

PROTESTANT RELIGIOUS CATEGORIES. Protestant Denominations have been divided into three categories according to the proportion of abstainers in each group. These are: 1) Low Abstinence Protestants -- Episcopalians, Presbyterians, other liberals (Quaker, Unitarian, Universalists, and Community Church); 2) Medium Abstinence Protestants -- Lutheran, Protestant (no denomination) Methodists (United

---

<sup>51</sup>Mark Keller and John R. Seeley. The Alcohol Language (Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 1958), p. 21.

<sup>52</sup>Funk and Wagnalls, Funk and Wagnalls Standard College Dictionary (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Publishing Company, Inc., 1968), p. 947.

Church of Christ, Congregationalists, Disciples of Christ, First Christian Church); and 3) High Abstinence Protestants -- Baptists, all other denominations and fundamentalists sects (Mormon, Christian Scientist, Church of God, Church of New Jerusalem, Unity, Nazarene, Seventh Day Adventists, Jehovah's Witnesses, Moravian, Menmonite, Amish, Sanctified Advent, Christian, Pentacostal).<sup>53</sup>

TEMPERANCE. Although temperance by strict definition means moderation,<sup>54</sup> it is commonly associated with the Temperance Movement as described by Ferrier.<sup>55</sup> In this Movement, temperance became associated with total abstinence. When used in the present study, temperance will be defined as total abstinence.

---

<sup>53</sup>Ann M. Seifert, Religious Affiliation and Belief in the Epidemiology of Problem Drinking, University of California, Berkeley: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, 1972). pp. 50-55.

<sup>54</sup>Funk and Wagnalls, Funk and Wagnalls Standard College Dictionary (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Publishing Company, Inc., 1968), p. 1378.

<sup>55</sup>W. Kenneth Ferrier, "Alcohol Education in the Public School Curriculum," Alcohol Education for Classroom and Community, ed. by Raymond G. McCarthy, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1964), p. 52.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The present investigation of teacher opinions about alcohol education and the interrelations of the opinions with teacher drinking practices and teacher social-demographic variables, suggests the review of three areas of literature. These are: 1) the literature on opinions about alcohol education; 2) the literature on four perspectives toward teaching about alcohol -- Temperance, Responsible Drinking, Objective Facts, and Values Clarification; and 3) the literature on the correlates of drinking practices. Each of these areas is presented in a section of this chapter.

#### Opinions About Alcohol Education

Although numerous expository articles and books have been written about alcohol education in the schools, research on the subject appears less plentiful. In 1966, Maddox stated that a review of research relating to alcohol education led him to the straight-forward conclusion: "There has been very little research on who has been saying what.

about alcohol to whom, how and with what effect."<sup>1</sup> He gave three reasons for this lack of research: 1) the emotional nature or controversialness of the subject; 2) the difficulty of evaluating alcohol education programs; and 3) the fact that public education in this country "voluntarily does very little pioneering on the frontier of social change."<sup>2</sup>

Although not designed to support or refute these reasons, the present investigation should increase knowledge about current (1972) teacher opinions about the controversialness as well as the value of alcohol education. Since teachers are the conveyors of alcohol education, knowing their attitudes and views is important for planning future alcohol education research.

Of the research which has been completed, Russell suggested that "the most extensive and intensive continuing research program directly related to alcohol has been directed by Windham and Globetti in Mississippi."<sup>3</sup> This section is limited to the relevant studies of the Mississippi Demonstration Project and to other research studies which investigate

---

<sup>1</sup>George L. Maddox, "Alcohol Education: Clues for Research," Alcohol Education, Conference Proceedings (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1966), p. 20.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., pp. 20-21.

<sup>3</sup>Robert D. Russell, "Education About Alcohol for Real American Youth," Journal of Alcohol Education, Volume 14, Number 3, (Spring, 1966), p. 18.

the attitudes or views of various populations toward alcohol education in the schools. Important expository writings on the subject will be reviewed in the next section which discusses four approaches to teaching about alcohol.

One of the earlier studies released by the Mississippi Demonstration Project was completed by Pomeroy and Windham and entitled: Attitudes of Selected Adult Groups Toward Alcohol Education.<sup>4</sup> Designed to determine the factors that would contribute to or retard the implementation of an alcohol education program, Pomeroy's study selected 115 adults on the basis of their possible involvement in an alcohol education program. Five adult groups from two Mississippi communities were represented: clergy, school teachers, school administrators, school board members, and public health personnel. The sample size for each group was not given. However, since there were only 115 participants, it can be assumed that no group was very large. Each group was administered a general open-ended schedule which contained questions concerning the background of the respondent, whether or not he used beverage alcohol, his knowledge of alcohol and alcoholism, his attitudes toward the alcoholic, and the needs which he perceived in the area of alcoholism and

---

<sup>4</sup>Grace S. Pomeroy and Gerald O. Windham, Attitudes of Selected Adult Groups Toward Alcohol Education (State College, Mississippi: Mississippi State University, Sociology and Anthropology Report Number 4, August, 1966).



alcohol education. Through personal interviews, each of the five groups was then given a supplementary open-ended schedule designed specifically for that group. The supplementary schedule was developed to determine the respondent's involvement in alcohol education and his perception of current problems and future needs.

The results of his first general study were not analyzed by sub-groups except in a general narrative form. However, concerning the responses of the entire 115 participants, several findings are pertinent to the present investigation of teacher opinions about alcohol education:

1. The majority responded that alcoholism was caused by a combination of psychological factors. About one-fourth thought it was caused by moral weakness and another fourth attributed it to "social incompetence."
2. Regarding the school's role in alcohol education, 47 percent thought the school should "teach the effects of the use of alcohol -- physical, social, psychological, and moral." Forty-four percent felt that the "facts about alcohol" should be presented.
3. Over half of the respondents (55 percent) felt alcohol education should be combined with the regular curriculum. Twenty-four percent thought

it should be introduced as a new course and about 18 percent felt it should be a combination of planned programs and/or outstanding speakers.<sup>5</sup>

From the narrative describing the results of the supplemental schedule for teachers, several findings are extracted:

1. Three-quarters of the teachers favored including alcohol education in the science curriculum and one-quarter recommended incorporating it within physical education.
2. Opinion about how much time in each course should be allocated to alcohol education was divided between one-two week period and five-six week units.
3. Two-fifths of the teachers felt that alcohol education should begin in the seventh grade.
4. A majority of those surveyed did not consider that there were adequate resource materials available in their schools.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Grace S. Pomeroy and Gerald O. Windham, Attitudes of Selected Adult Groups Toward Alcohol Education (State College, Mississippi: Mississippi State University, Sociology and Anthropology Report Number 4, August, 1966).

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., pp. 12-13.

It is suggested that each of these findings has relevance to a study of teacher opinions about alcohol education. However, because of the small Southern sample and rather vaguely reported results; the ability to generalize from this study, especially to gain knowledge about the opinions of California teachers, appears to be limited.

In the spring and summer of 1966, the Mississippi Demonstration Project also gathered data from two Mississippi communities, Tupelo and Clarksdale.<sup>7</sup> Globetti, as principal investigator, and his staff have completed numerous reports and articles from this information.<sup>8</sup> Of these, the most comprehensive and perhaps the most relevant for purposes of this literature review is Globetti, Pomeroy, and Bennett's Attitudes Toward Alcohol Education.<sup>9</sup> A review of this study follows.

---

<sup>7</sup>Grace S. Pomeroy and Gerald Globetti, The Mississippi Story, Demonstration Project in Alcohol Education (State College, Mississippi: Mississippi State University, Administrative Report Number 1, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, July, 1968), p. 22.

<sup>8</sup>The author is aware of at least fourteen reports issued by the Project and over thirty articles published in journals and workshop proceedings between 1966 and 1969.

<sup>9</sup>Gerald Globetti, Grace S. Pomeroy, and Walter Bennett, Attitudes Toward Alcohol Education (State College, Mississippi: Mississippi State University, Sociology and Anthropology Report Number 14, August, 1969), pp. 1-33.

A simple random sample consisting of 452 household heads or homemakers was taken from the 1965 city directories of the two Mississippi communities. Of this number, 319 (71 percent) were contacted by personal visitation and interviewed using a pre-tested schedule composed of both closed and open-ended questions. The purpose of this study was to delineate some of the social and cultural factors associated with a favorable attitude toward alcohol education. To operationalize the degree of favorability toward alcohol education, seven dichotomously scored items were combined into an index. These items measured attitudes about public information and school programs on alcohol education, the financial support of such programs, and the possible effects these programs may have.<sup>10</sup> The authors controlled the factors of community of residence and social affiliation in order to determine their influence on the original relationships.

Of particular relevance to the present study on teacher opinions about alcohol education are Globetti's findings regarding the social and demographic variables associated with favorability toward alcohol education. The investigations of organizational structures and

---

<sup>10</sup>Gerald Globetti, Grace S. Pomeroy, and Walter Bennett, Attitudes Toward Alcohol Education (State College, Mississippi: Mississippi State University, Sociology and Anthropology Report Number 14, August, 1969), p. 12.

knowledge concerning alcohol and alcoholism are not as relevant and, therefore, will not be reviewed here. The social-demographic factors of age, sex, education, race, and social-demographic status are discussed below.

#### Age

Although differences were not statistically significant, the percentages of favorability toward alcohol education tended to decrease with age.<sup>11</sup>

#### Sex

No difference between males and females regarding the degree of favorability toward alcohol education were found.<sup>12</sup>

#### Education

Education of the respondents was divided into three categories based on the number of years of formal schooling completed: Primary (zero to eight years), Secondary (nine

---

<sup>11</sup>Gerald Globetti, Grace S. Pomeroy, and Walter Bennett, Attitudes Toward Alcohol Education (State College, Mississippi: Mississippi State University, Sociology and Anthropology Report Number 14, August, 1969), pp. 20-21.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 16.

to twelve years), and College (thirteen years and over). Percentages of high favorability toward alcohol education for the three categories were respectively, 61 percent, 82 percent, and 94 percent. The chi-square test of differences was significant at the .001 level. It was concluded that increased levels of formal education are associated with a high degree of favorability toward alcohol education.<sup>13</sup>

#### Race

Globetti found considerable differences between the respondents of the Black and White races with respect to favorability toward alcohol education. Eighty-four percent of the White respondents favored alcohol education compared to 66 percent of the Black. These differences, however, appeared to be a function of the educational levels and socio-economic groups and not of race.<sup>14</sup>

#### Socio-Economic Status

Using education level and the Warner Meeker-Ellis Revised Scale of Occupational Ranking, an index of socio-

---

<sup>13</sup>Gerald Globetti, Grace S. Pomeroy, and Walter Bennett, Attitudes Toward Alcohol Education (State College, Mississippi: Mississippi State University, Sociology and Anthropology Report Number 14, August, 1969), p. 15.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., pp. 19-20.

economic status was developed. By dichotomizing the socio-economic status into high and low categories, it was found that 68 percent of the low status respondents had a high degree of favorability toward alcohol education. This was compared to 89 percent of the high status respondents. Differences between the high and low status groups as measured by the chi-square test of differences were significant at the .001 level.

Of the five social-demographic variables studied by Globetti, age and sex have the most relevance for the present investigation. The findings on the other variables, despite their statistical significance, are less important because of the homogeneity of the teacher sample (primarily White, middle class, and having a high educational level).

From Globetti's findings on age and sex, it was anticipated for the present study that differences between male and female teachers and older and younger teachers would not be significant with respect to their views on alcohol education. However, as mentioned with regard to the Pomeroy and Windham study, caution must be exercised in generalizing the findings of a random sample from two Mississippi communities to that of an urban California teacher population.

---

<sup>15</sup>Gerald Globetti, Grace S. Pomeroy, and Walter Bennett, Attitudes Toward Alcohol Education (State College, Mississippi: Mississippi State University, Sociology and Anthropology Report Number 14, August, 1969), pp. 19-20.

To find out if teachers were prepared to take on the responsibility of modifying excessive drinking habits, Muñoz and Parada conducted a survey covering a representative sample of teachers in primary, secondary, and technical-professional schools as well as in higher education in Greater Santiago, Chile.<sup>16</sup> The random sample was stratified and included 7 percent of all teachers in that area. The relevant findings of this study are summarized as follows:

1. Teacher information about problems of alcohol. Concerning knowledge about excessive drinking, alcoholism and treatment, 62 percent of the teachers did not have any information on the subject, 32 percent had very little, and only 6 percent has some knowledge.<sup>17</sup>
2. Teachers' attitudes towards excessive drinking. Muñoz and Parada reported that the form of drinking most acceptable by the teachers was moderate, with some acceptance of excessive drinking. The study indicated that the attitude of "tolerance towards excessive drinking" was not related to sex, subject matter taught,

---

<sup>16</sup>Luis C. Muñoz and Aída Parada, "Teaching About Alcoholism in Schools," Alcohol and Alcoholism, ed. by Robert E. Popham (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970), pp. 360-367.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., pp. 362-363.



or degree of information about alcoholism. Regarding this lack of relationship, Muñoz pointed out that mere information may not promote a change in attitudes regarding excessive drinking.<sup>18</sup>

3. Teachers' acceptance of erroneous beliefs.

Several questions were asked teachers on erroneous beliefs about alcohol. Fifty-seven percent of the teachers rejected erroneous beliefs, while 43 percent accepted them.<sup>19</sup> This investigator feels that several of the six questions presented would be highly debated by some experts. For instance, one "erroneous" belief is "give alcohol to children so they can learn to drink." Chafetz would argue that this may not be an "erroneous" belief since in some countries where this is a common practice, the frequency of alcoholism is less than in countries which do not accept this practice.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup>Luis C. Muñoz and Aída Parada, "Teaching About Alcoholism in Schools," Alcohol and Alcoholism, ed. by Robert E. Popham (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970), p. 363.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 363.

<sup>20</sup>Morris Chafetz, "The Prevention of Alcoholism," International Journal of Psychiatry, Volume 9 (1970-1971), pp. 329.

4. Teacher's willingness to participate in a prevention program. Only 28 percent of the teachers indicated they would be willing to personally participate in a preventive program. Willingness to participate was not linked either to sex or subject matter.<sup>21</sup>

Although Muñoz suggested the importance of preventing "excessive drinking" and not the preventing of "all drinking," his report did not differentiate between the two. This is a serious oversight since one is not sure when social drinking leaves off and "excessive drinking" begins. Also without a clear differentiation, the prevention program becomes one of preventing all use of alcohol, i.e., prohibition. This may in part account for the apparently low interest of the Chilean teachers becoming involved in the alcoholism prevention program as described by Muñoz.

The Muñoz and Parada study is the only known study which has been designed solely for purposes of investigating teacher knowledge and attitudes about alcohol. Its scope, however, is limited. No exploration of different approaches toward alcohol education was presented. Also, it is unlikely that the attitudes and behaviors of the Chilean teachers are

---

<sup>21</sup>Luis C. Muñoz and Aída Parada, "Teaching About Alcoholism in Schools," Alcohol and Alcoholism, ed. by Robert E. Popham (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970), p. 363.

representative of the California teacher population of the present investigation since they are from a different culture and region of the world.

Perhaps the study which has the most relevance to the present investigation was conducted by Harris and Associates in December, 1971.<sup>22</sup> In the introduction to their report they stated:

In the long roster of American health problems perhaps none is more pervasive than the use and abuse of alcohol. But because it is so often hidden from public view, much remains to be known about the scope of the problem, and about the attitudes of most citizens toward alcohol and alcoholism.<sup>23</sup>

To find out how the general population felt about alcohol and alcoholism, 2,131 Americans aged eighteen and over were talked to by field interviewers. The instrument used was an hour-long questionnaire designed with the assistance of project officers from the National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.

The subjects were selected from across the nation on a random area probability basis. A special oversample was also conducted among 385 Blacks, in order to assure an adequate basis for studying any attitudinal variations

---

<sup>22</sup>Louis Harris and Associates, American Attitudes Toward Alcohol and Alcoholics, a survey of public opinion prepared for the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (Washington, D.C.: Study Number 2138, December, 1971), pp. 1-202.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 1.

relating to this race. The findings of the study were presented in simple tabulated form and divided into five parts. In this section, Part 3, "Awareness and Attitudes Toward Alcohol Education" will be reviewed.<sup>24</sup> Other findings of the Harris study will be reviewed later under the heading, "Correlates of Drinking Practices."

Harris and Associates found strong public endorsement for alcohol education programs at the high school level. Eighty-nine percent of the respondents approved of such courses, and only 8 percent were opposed. The younger, more affluent, better educated, single, light or moderate drinker, and those living in cities or suburbs provided the most support for such programs.<sup>25</sup>

In answering questions about what should be taught in alcohol education courses, most people (54 percent) felt that the goal of such courses should be "to give the medical facts and avoid moral judgments." Another 22 percent felt that they should "teach moderate or social drinking," while only 20 percent said that the goal of alcohol education should be to teach people not to drink at all. Harris stated:

---

<sup>24</sup>Louis Harris and Associates, American Attitudes Toward Alcohol and Alcoholics, a survey of public opinion prepared for the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (Washington, D.C.: Study Number 2138, December, 1971), p. 98b.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid.

Predictably, more members of those groups that tend to oppose drinking--Southerners, the elderly, those with low income and little education, abstainers, Blacks, and those dwelling in towns and rural areas--all feel that the aim of such instruction should be to teach people not to drink. However, in no case does that attitude constitute a majority opinion.<sup>26</sup>

In response to the question, "When should young people start to drink?" some 40 percent of the public felt young people should never begin. Among those who felt it was safe and proper for young people to begin drinking, 31 percent said that a young man should wait until age twenty-one or over, but 14 percent went as low as sixteen to eighteen, and another 10 percent selected nineteen to twenty. The figures for young women were not different than those for young men. With regard to young people (eighteen years or less) drinking at home under parental supervision, 46 percent felt it was a good idea, but another 48 percent said it was not. Again the young, affluent, educated, drinkers, and residents of both coastal regions were more permissive than others on these matters.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup>Louis Harris and Associates, American Attitudes Toward Alcohol and Alcoholism, a survey of public opinion prepared for the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (Washington, D.C.: Study Number 2138, December, 1971), p. 99.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., p. 112.

## Summary of Research

The research on opinions about alcohol education in the schools is limited in amount and applicability. Of the four studies reviewed, two were conducted in Mississippi (one of these studied only a general population sample), one was carried out in Chile, and the fourth was a nation-wide study of the general public. None of these studies broadly investigated teacher opinions about alcohol education in the schools. Despite the fact that teachers have been asked to teach about alcohol since 1882,<sup>28</sup> there are no known studies which attempt to explore teacher opinions of what and how this should be done. It would appear that the review of research related to opinions about alcohol education indicates the existing gap in knowledge and thus supports the present investigation.

### Four Perspectives on Alcohol Education in the Schools

To provide a background for the present investigation, the literature on four perspectives of alcohol education is presented. The four perspectives are: The Temperance (Abstinence) Approach, the Objective Facts Approach, the Responsible Drinking Approach, and the Values Clarification

---

<sup>28</sup>W. Kenneth Ferrier, "Alcohol Education in the Public School Curriculum," Alcohol Education for Classroom and Community, ed. by Raymond G. McCarthy (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1964), p. 64.

Approach. Although not necessarily all-inclusive, these four approaches seem to represent the major positions in modern alcohol education. In addition to the review of the literature, each perspective has been operationally defined.

#### The Temperance (Abstinence) Approach

The history of alcohol education in the schools is closely related to the development of the Alcohol Temperance Movement. Ferrier,<sup>29</sup> Bacon,<sup>30</sup> Kelly,<sup>31</sup> and Gusfield,<sup>32</sup> among others, have discussed this development in detail. In his writing about the history of alcohol education, Ferrier said that early American temperance leaders believed that "the education of the young would be of more consequence in achieving sobriety than would an attempt to reform the inebriate."

---

<sup>29</sup>W. Kenneth Ferrier, "Alcohol Education in the Public School Curriculum," Alcohol Education for Classroom and Community, ed. by Raymond G. McCarthy (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1964), pp. 51-56.

<sup>30</sup>Seldon D. Bacon, "The Classic Temperance Movement of the USA: Impact Today in Attitudes, Action, and Research" British Journal of Addiction, Volume LXII, pp. 7-11.

<sup>31</sup>Norbert L. Kelly, Alcohol Education for Classroom and Community, ed. by Raymond G. McCarthy (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1964), pp. 11-31.

<sup>32</sup>Joseph L. Gusfield, "Status Conflicts and the Changing Ideologies of the American Temperance Movement," Culture and Drinking Patterns, ed. by David J. Pittman and Charles R. Snyder (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962), pp. 101-120.

The founding of the Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) in 1874 strengthened the temperance leaders' desire to educate the young. The objectives of the WCTU to teach all children with information, not mere exhortation, shows this emphasis on education against the evils of alcohol.<sup>33</sup> In the period between 1874 and 1920, the WCTU developed graded lessons, leaflets, posters, and other literature for use within the schools. Essay and drawing contests for youth were initiated to prevent the evils of drinking. Several hundred thousand pupils participated in these contests annually.<sup>34</sup>

Today the WCTU is still actively promoting abstinence in the schools.<sup>35</sup> According to A Syllabus in Alcohol Education,<sup>36</sup> the objectives of alcohol education are to enhance personal health and to present scientific facts that will "provide an influence which will spread from the classroom to the home, and which will discourage the serving

---

<sup>34</sup>W. Kenneth Ferrier, "Alcohol Education in the Public School Curriculum," Alcohol Education for Classroom and Community, ed. by Raymond G. McCarthy (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1964), p. 53.

<sup>35</sup>In response to his request for temperance materials used in the schools, this investigator received different packets for the primary, intermediate, and high school levels. In addition, special packets were received for high school science courses, health courses, English courses, social studies courses, and driver education courses.

<sup>36</sup>Bertha Rachel Palmer, A Syllabus in Alcohol Education (Evanston, Illinois: The Signal Press, 1962).



of beer, wine, or mixed alcoholic drinks." Student activities such as comparing the actions of water and diluted alcohol on growing plants or gold fish to show how "alcohol interferes with the life functions" are encouraged. It appears that these experiments are designed to scare youth into avoiding alcohol. One pamphlet distributed by the WCTU, called "Why Hurt Yourself." openly discusses the importance of fearing alcohol:

There are times when it takes great courage to be afraid. Fear is a safety guard set in each of us for our protection. Fear alcohol! Fear it because using it threatens the clarity of your mind and the control of your body. Make no mistake about this. It does NOT make you quick, alert, accurate.<sup>37</sup>

Other writers who support this approach toward alcohol education include: Allen,<sup>38</sup> Hamlin,<sup>39</sup> and Seliger.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup>Angelo Patri, Why Hurt Yourself? (Evanston, Illinois: The Signal Press).

<sup>38</sup>Helen M. Allen, Some Hints for Public School Teachers: Vital Reasons for Teaching the Effects of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Narcotics in the Classroom (Evanston, Illinois: The Signal Press).

<sup>39</sup>Howard E. Hamlin, Alcohol Talks to Youth (Evanston, Illinois: School and College Service, 1969).

<sup>40</sup>Robert V. Seliger and Lloyd M. Shupe, Alcohol at the Wheel (Evanston, Illinois: School and College Service, 1967).

For purposes of this investigation, the Temperance Approach toward alcohol education is operationally defined as follows:

Alcohol education consists of imparting information about the nature of ethyl alcohol, its uses outside the body, the scientific facts of its effects upon the mind and upon the body tissues when inside the body, and the desirability of enjoying the fullness of life without alcohol's deceptive influences. Alcohol education should create in the pupils a desire to prevent effects from drink and to help change prevailing sentiment as to the use of ethyl alcohol as a beverage. The first effect of a drink is deceptive, the temptations to drink are many, and alcohol is habit forming. Therefore, the attitude to "refuse the first drink" and "to stop now while you can" should be developed. Experience today shows that many of our most talented people are hurt, others suffer severely, while many are completely ruined by the use of alcohol. These people were deceived, as children will be if they are not taught the facts about alcohol in school.<sup>41</sup>

#### The Objective Facts Approach

The Objective Facts Approach toward alcohol education appears to have developed from a general unhappiness with the temperance instruction and materials used in the schools. The development of this new approach has been identified with the establishment of the Yale Center of Alcohol Studies in 1940, seven years after the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment. With the efforts of this Center,

---

<sup>41</sup>See Appendix A, Drinking Practices and Alcohol Education Questionnaire, Model A.

a "more objective approach, based on new physiological knowledge and modern methods of instruction, was developed."<sup>42</sup> Globetti, et al, in 1969, referred to this approach as the "modern alcohol education movement." He stated:

Unlike the educational emphasis of the prohibition model, this approach maintains a neutral stand neither pleading for nor against the practice of drinking. Rather, it endeavors to present dispassionately the growing body of data about alcohol in order to assist all citizens to formulate for themselves acceptable standards of conduct regarding alcohol use. In this way, it is hoped that the problems arising out of the misuse and abuse of beverage alcohol will be reduced.<sup>43</sup>

This method of alcohol education allows the youth to make his decisions about drinking on knowledge rather than on outside pressures and the advice of friends.<sup>44</sup> Todd comments on this in her book, Teaching About Alcohol.

Effective alcohol education should enable each teenager to form his own set of judgments, attitudes, and behavior concerning alcohol by combining two influences: first the values of his home, church, and community; and second, scientifically valid, non-judgmental information.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup>W. Kenneth Ferrier, "Alcohol Education in the Public School Curriculum," Alcohol Education for Classroom and Community, ed. by Raymond G. McCarthy (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1964), p. 58.

<sup>43</sup>Gerald Globetti, Grace S. Pomeroy, and Walter Bennett, Attitudes Toward Alcohol Education (Mississippi State University: State College, Mississippi, 1969).

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., p. 58.

<sup>45</sup>Frances Todd, Teaching About Alcohol (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1964).

A review of several curriculum guides indicates the type of facts that Todd, Ferrier, and others have recommended. These facts can be classified as: 1) the chemistry of alcoholic beverages; 2) the physiological effects of alcohol on the human body; 3) the history of alcohol use; 4) why people drink or do not drink; 5) alcoholism -- causes, treatment, and rehabilitation; 6) alcohol legislation; and 7) the effects of alcohol on youth. Dimas,<sup>46</sup> McCarthy,<sup>47</sup> and others<sup>48,49</sup> offer suggestions on classifying facts about alcohol.

Although the stated aim of presenting these facts is to allow the student to make a "better" judgment about the use of alcohol, it should be noted that quite often the underlying goal is to present facts which persuade him to abstain. Sometimes this is done subtly by focusing on alcoholism, traffic deaths, etc.; other times it is more direct. Todd's four goals for alcohol education illustrate this:

---

<sup>46</sup>George C. Dimas, Alcohol Education in Oregon Schools: A Topic Outline and Resource Unit for Teachers (Portland: Alcohol and Drug Section, Mental Health Division, Board of Control, 1968), pp. 10-11.

<sup>47</sup>Raymond G. McCarthy, Facts About Alcohol (Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1951), p. 3.

<sup>48</sup>Health: An Instructional Guide for Senior High School (Los Angeles: Los Angeles City Schools, Division of Instructional Services, Publication Number SC-617, 1966), pp. 162-193.

<sup>49</sup>A Preliminary Guide to Health and Family Life Education: Grades k-12 (San Francisco: San Francisco Unified School District, 1968), pp. 229-234.

1. Each pupil should understand why it is desirable that he abstain from drinking until he reaches legal age.

2. Each student should develop sound criteria upon which to make his own decision whether to drink or not when he reaches legal age.

3. Each student should develop a critical understanding of the personal, inter-personal, family, and community problems related to drunkenness.

4. Each student should develop a critical understanding of the personal, inter-personal, family, and community problems related to alcoholism.<sup>50</sup>

The Objective Facts Approach toward alcohol education, for purposes of this investigation, has been operationally defined as follows:

The goal of alcohol education is to provide factual information, without judgment, on several topics related to the use and abuse of alcoholic beverages. Presentations should include materials on the nature of alcoholic beverages, such as their chemistry and production; consumption rates and drinking patterns of various cultures; and metabolism of alcohol in the body. In addition, information regarding both the "positive" and "negative" effects of alcoholic beverages should be provided. Differentiations should be made among social drinking, problem drinking, and alcoholism. Common problems associated with misuse of alcoholic beverages, such as traffic accidents, body damage, and economic losses should be presented. Special emphasis should be given to the disease concept of alcoholism. Identification is made of the current treatment programs for the various aspects of alcoholism, including Alcoholics Anonymous, outpatient and inpatient programs, and recovery houses.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup>Frances Todd, Teaching About Alcohol (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1964), pp. 18-19.

<sup>51</sup>See Appendix A, Drinking Practices and Alcohol Education Questionnaire, Model C.

## The Responsible Drinking Approach

The evolvement of the Responsible Drinking Approach toward alcohol education gained impetus in the late 1950's with an article by Ullman.<sup>52</sup> Expressing dissatisfaction with the physiological and psychological interpretations of the causes of alcoholism, Ullman suggested looking at the socio-cultural backgrounds of drinking to isolate those factors associated with high or low rates of alcoholism. Drawing on his own and previous research, he tentatively concluded that members of high alcoholism groups, as are the Irish-Americans, have conflicting attitudes toward drinking. This inner conflict, or "ambivalence"<sup>53</sup> results from drinking customs which are not integrated with the rest of the culture. He stated:

. . . in any group or society in which the drinking customs, values, and sanctions -- together with the attitudes of all segments of the group or society -- are well established, known to and agreed upon by all, and are consistent with the rest of the culture, the rate of alcoholism will be low. However, under conditions in which the individual drinker does not know what is expected or when the expectation in one situation differs from that in another, it can be assured that he will have ambivalent feelings

---

<sup>52</sup>Albert D. Ullman, "Sociocultural Backgrounds of Alcoholism," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science Understanding Alcoholism, Volume Number 315 (January, 1958), pp. 48-54.

<sup>53</sup>For classification of the term "ambivalence" the reader is referred to Paul Verden, "The Concept of Ambivalence with Reference to Alcohol Use and Misuse in American Culture," International Journal of Social Psychiatry, Volume 14, Number 4 (Autumn, 1968), pp. 252-259.

about drinking. This, ambivalence is the psychological product of unintegrated drinking customs.<sup>54</sup>

The integrative drinking customs suggested by Ullman are illustrated by the Italians and Italian-Americans, the Orthodox Jews, and the Chinese. Each group starts to use alcohol in childhood, they drink with relatively great frequency, they exhibit little or no drunkenness (except the Chinese who may frequently exhibit drunkenness with celebrations), they drink in clear-cut situations with no immoral connotations; and "everyone feels the same way about drinking, and there is no clash with other elements of the culture."<sup>55</sup>

In listing the characteristics of unintegrated drinking customs, Ullman reported studies by Bales<sup>56</sup> and Glad<sup>57</sup> which compare drinking by Jewish-Americans with Irish-Americans. Generally, it was found that unlike the Jewish drinker, the Irish-American "drinks to get drunk." Other unintegrative characteristics of this group offered

---

<sup>54</sup>Albert D. Ullman, "Sociocultural Backgrounds of Alcoholism," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science Understanding Alcoholism, Volume Number 315 (January, 1958), p. 50.

<sup>55</sup>Ibid., p. 51.

<sup>56</sup>Robert F. Bales, "Cultural Differences in Rates of Alcoholism," Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Volume 6 (March, 1946), pp. 480-499.

<sup>57</sup>Donald D. Glad, "Attitudes and Experiences of American-Jewish and American-Irish Male Youth as Related to Differences in Adult Rates of Inebriety," Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Volume 8 (December, 1947), pp. 406-472.

by Ullman were: 1) the Irish-American takes his first drink under unfamiliar circumstances, outside the home, and in the presence of companions who associate heavy drinking with "manliness"; 2) the Irish-American has more frequent contact with alcoholism due to its higher prevalence among his friends and family. This must result in formal and informal sanctions against drinking. "The person who violates these sanctions must enter the drinking situation with high ambivalence."<sup>58</sup>

Although he cautioned that the amount of information in the field is inadequate for validating this theory of causes of alcoholism, Ullman's study, nonetheless, appears to serve as the foundation for the Responsible Drinking Approach to alcohol education. Morris Chafetz, M.D., the present Director of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, is perhaps the leading proponent of this approach. For the past decade he has been discussing the importance of integrative or responsible drinking for those

---

<sup>58</sup>Albert D. Ullman, "Sociocultural Backgrounds of Alcoholism," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science Understanding Alcoholism, Volume 315 (January, 1958), p. 53.



who use or will use alcoholic beverages.<sup>59,60,61,62,63,64,65</sup>  
In these writings, his philosophy of alcoholism prevention has been well described. The following summary is from his article in the International Journal of Psychiatry:

This preventative approach aims to inculcate societies with responsible drinking behavior and to interlard alcohol use with all ordinary social behavior by teaching young people how to drink with responsibility, without ill effects, and for benefit only. This learning experience for those who will choose to drink and those who will not provides factual information about alcohol use during hygiene instruction at school and college levels. This instruction emphasizes the differing

---

<sup>59</sup>Morris E. Chafetz and Harold W. Demone, Alcoholism and Society (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 175-191.

<sup>60</sup>Morris E. Chafetz, Liquor: The Servant of Man (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1965).

<sup>61</sup>Morris E. Chafetz, "Alcoholism Prevention and Reality," Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Volume 28, Number 2 (June, 1967), pp. 345-348.

<sup>62</sup>Morris E. Chafetz, Howard T. Blane, and Marjorie Hill, Frontiers of Alcoholism (New York: Science House, 1970), pp. 257-267.

<sup>63</sup>Morris E. Chafetz, "The Prevention of Alcoholism," The International Journal of Psychiatry, Volume 9 (1970-71), pp. 329-348.

<sup>64</sup>U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, First Special Report to the U. S. Government on Alcohol and Health (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971), p. 4.

<sup>65</sup>Morris E. Chafetz, "Problems of Reaching Youth," Speech presented at the Session on Alcohol and the Adolescent, 14th Annual American Medical Association -- American School Health Association Session on School Health, Hilton Hotel, San Francisco, California, June 18, 1972, (Mimeographed).

effects between drinking rapidly versus sipping slowly; consuming liquor with food in the stomach versus drinking on an empty stomach; drinking under tense circumstances alone or drinking while relaxed, with people and communicating; how intoxication is sickness and is unhealthy behavior. By providing on a voluntary basis group experiences with alcohol under supervision, young people may familiarize themselves with their own responses to alcohol under variable conditions and learn how to avoid disastrous, unhealthy episodes. Finally, I would make alcohol available to all so that the attraction provided by that which is forbidden will be removed.<sup>66</sup>

Thomas Plaut, reflecting the opinions of the Cooperative Commission on the Study of Alcoholism suggested four goals for prevention which adhere to Ullman's and Chafetz's suggestions:

1. Reduce the emotionalism associated with alcoholic beverages.
2. Clarify and emphasize the distinction between acceptable drinking and unacceptable drinking.
3. Discourage drinking for its own sake, and encourage the integration of drinking with other activities.
4. Assist young people to adapt themselves realistically to a predominantly "drinking" society.<sup>67</sup>

Rupert Wilkinson, also an advocate of the Responsible Drinking Approach toward alcohol education, suggested that classroom education on alcohol should: 1) inform and

---

<sup>66</sup>Morris E. Chafetz, "The Prevention of Alcoholism," The International Journal of Psychiatry, Volume 9 (1970-71), p. 348.

<sup>67</sup>Thomas F. A. Plaut, Alcohol Problems: A Report to the Nation by the Cooperative Commission of the Study of Alcoholism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), pp. 136-152.

debate rather than preach; 2) present moderation in drinking rather than drinking per se as a sign of maturity; and 3) suggest that the host and party-goer respect the abstainer. He also parenthetically suggested that the present system of alcohol education in many American schools may do more harm than good. "A few words by 'Coach' about unhealthy aspects of alcohol can inspire ridicule."<sup>68</sup> On the subject of moderate drinking, he made the following suggestions:

That drinking moderately is nearly always more enjoyable than getting heavily drunk.

That getting drunk is not a sign of maturity, but quite the opposite, and that a person who does so usually makes more of a fool of himself than he realizes.

That people who frequently get drunk should not be ridiculed; such people may have psychological disorders which require professional help.

That a responsible host who serves alcoholic drinks also serves non-alcoholic drinks, as well as some kind of food; and that even when a friend just stops by for a drink, the host should always have suitable food (crackers, nuts, etc.) on hand to go with it.

That making the abstaining guest feel an outsider is inconsiderate and ignorant.

That parents who drink, and expect their children to drink when they grow up, should let their children taste alcohol at an early age; and that they should convey the idea that alcohol is one of the pleasant things of life: it can be abused, but there is no magic about it.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup>Rupert Wilkinson, The Prevention of Drinking Problems (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), p. 105.

<sup>69</sup>Ibid., pp. 120-121.

Other writers who completely or partially support this approach are Russell,<sup>70</sup> Robinson,<sup>71</sup> and Unterberger.<sup>72</sup>

The operational definition of this approach, developed for the present investigation, serves as a summary of what is meant by the Responsible Drinking Approach toward alcohol education:

Alcohol Education should provide theoretical information about alcohol and its use with emphasis on the benefits as well as the disadvantages of alcohol. Since 70 percent of the students do drink or will drink, they should be told how to drink responsibly. They should be taught how different the response will be when drink is consumed with food and while sitting in a relaxed atmosphere, in contrast to drinking without food and standing in tense circumstances; how the use of alcohol provides meaningful experience when partaking with another, while a drink alone is as uncommunicative as talking to oneself; and how intoxication is sickness and not strength. An undesirable characteristic of American drinking patterns is the social pressure to drink or to drink more. This should be reduced with complete social acceptance of the 30 percent of the population who choose to abstain or who drink very little.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup>Robert D. Russell, "Education About Alcohol... For Real American Youth," Journal of Alcohol Education, Volume 14, Number 3 (Spring, 1969).

<sup>71</sup>Robert R. Robinson, "The Prospect of Adequate Education About Alcohol and Alcoholism," Journal of Alcohol Education, Volume 14, Number 2 (Winter, 1969).

<sup>72</sup>Hilma Unterberger and Lena Di Cicco, "Alcohol Education Re-Evaluated," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary Schools, Volume 52, Number 326 (March, 1968).

<sup>73</sup>See Appendix A, Drinking Practices and Alcohol Education Questionnaire, Model B.

## The Values Clarification Approach

Although the field of education has always been concerned with the values of society and individuals, only recently has there existed a wide-spread interest in clarifying values as a method for helping youth make decisions which will enhance them rather than harm them.<sup>74</sup> Much of this current interest in "values" and "valuing" appears to stem from the writings of Raths, Harmin, and Simon. In discussing value clarification techniques they said:

The evidence already in shows that the reported procedures have helped many students change patterns of behavior that were characterized by apathy, drift, conformity, and underachievement. In different words, many students have been helped to become more purposeful, more enthusiastic, more positive, and more aware of what is worth striving for. This, of course, is the kind of behavior teachers and parents have wanted to promote for some time but, until recently, clear procedures based on adequate theory have not been available.<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup>It should be noted that unlike the other three approaches toward alcohol education, this approach was not originally developed for the purpose of preventing alcoholism. Rather, it seems to have grown out of a general desire to help youth develop meaning, purpose, and direction in their lives through the assessment of needs and the clarification of values.

<sup>75</sup>Louis E. Raths, Merrill Harmin, Sidney B. Simon, Values and Teaching: Working With Values in the Classroom (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1966), p. 12.

Their writings have indicated that they are not concerned with the particular value which emerges from a person's experience, as they are with the processes that he uses to obtain his values.

They reserved the term "value" for those individual beliefs, attitudes, activities, or feelings that satisfy the following criteria:

1. Choosing freely. Values must be freely selected if they are to be really valued by the individual.
2. Choosing from among alternatives. Only when a choice is possible, when there is more than one alternative from which to choose, do we say a value can result.
3. Choosing after thoughtful consideration of the consequences of each alternative.
4. Prizing and cherishing. In our definition, values flow from choices that we are glad to make. We prize and cherish the guides to life that we call values.
5. Affirming. We are willing to publically affirm our values.
6. Acting upon choices. . . . for a value to be present, life itself must be affected. Nothing can be a value that does not, in fact, give direction to actual living.
7. Repeating. Where something reaches the stage of a value, it is very likely to reappear on a number of occasions in the life of the person who holds it. Values tend to have a persistency, tend to make a pattern in a life.<sup>76</sup>

In summarizing their theory Raths, Harmin, and Simon suggested that it is the teacher's responsibility to help students use these processes to "raise to the value

---

<sup>76</sup>Louis E. Raths, Merrill Harmin, Sidney B. Simon, Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1966), pp. 28-29.

level the beliefs, feelings, interests, and activities children bring with them."<sup>77</sup>

A second major theory of values was adopted by Ray Rucker, et al,<sup>78</sup> from the values framework of the noted political scientist, Harold D. Lasswell.<sup>79</sup> Essentially they have developed their theory of values in education on a five-point philosophy which may be stated as follows:

1. The overriding objective of the school is the realization of human worth and dignity in theory and in fact.

2. The school which is oriented toward human dignity is one in which human values are widely spread and shared.

3. In such a school the formation of mature personalities whose value demands and capabilities are compatible with this ideal is essential.

4. Hence, the long-range goal of the school is to provide opportunities for as many human beings as possible to achieve their highest potentials.

5. Thus, the school must provide an environment in which the individual can seek human values for himself, but with minimum damage to the freedom of choice and value assets of others.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup>Louis E. Raths, Merrill Harmin, Sidney B. Simon, Values and Teaching: Working With Values in the Classroom (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1966), pp. 28-29.

<sup>78</sup>Ray Rucker, V. Clyde Arnsperger, and Arthur J. Brodbeck, Human Values in Education (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, Inc., 1969), p. 6.

<sup>79</sup>For a brief discussion of his values see: Harold Dwight Lasswell, Power and Personality (New York: W. W. Norton Company, Inc., 1948), pp. 16-19.

<sup>80</sup>V. Clyde Arnsperger, James A. Brill, and W. Ray Rucker, Values To Learn (Teacher's Edition)--The Human Values Series (Austin, Texas: Steck-Vaughn Company, 1967), p. 1.

In this theory of values, there is little concern for differentiating values from drives, needs, wants, attitudes, interests, etc. The distinction among these terms were labeled by Rucker as "technical" and "often confusing." He defined "value" as follows:

A value is simply a preferred event. To describe a value, therefore, we have not only to say what is distinctive about the pattern that embodies it but, as part of that, what it is being preferred to in terms of alternatives. In short, if we are to describe a value pattern operation in any practice, we have systematically to utilize all the value categories to find which one or more of these is receiving high emphasis in the event being scrutinized. We are engaged in describing "preferences" and not mere "physical pushes and pulls" when dealing with values.<sup>81</sup>

In contrast to Raths, et al, the proponents of this theory seemed to be more interested in "categorizing values" than in the "process of valuing." They have developed and defined Lasswell's eight value categories as follows:

Affection refers to the degree of love and friendship of persons in primary and secondary relationships.

Respect refers to the degree of recognition given to persons in their capacity as human beings.

Skill refers to the degree of development of talent.

Enlightenment may be identified as the knowledge necessary to make important decisions.

Power refers to the degree to which a person participates in the process of making important decisions.

---

<sup>81</sup>W. Ray Rucker, V. Clyde Arnspiger, and Arthur J. Brodbeck, Human Values in Education (Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1969), pp. 88-91.



Wealth refers to the degree to which individuals have access to goods and services.

Well-being refers to the degree of one's mental and physical health.

Rectitude refers to the degree or moral practices and ethical standards.<sup>82</sup>

An adaption of the Rucker Theory of Human Values in Education to the prevention of drug abuse (including the abuse of alcohol) was developed by Herbert O. Brayer and Zeller W. Cleary.<sup>83</sup> They suggested the underlying causes of drug abuse include: curiosity; peer group pressure; insecurity--desire for affection, identity, low self-esteem; boredom--lack of excitement, zest and challenge in contrast with study, work, routine; affluence and permissiveness; escape--from problems of home, school and society; rebellion against authority; failure, absence of standards and ethics--lack of models; and mental and physical problems. According to Brayer each of these "causes" has to do with the affective domain, personal feelings and reactions, and has little to do with "facts" about drugs. Since all the behavior results from "deprivations or enhancements" in one or more of the eight "basic needs and wants" (affection, respect, well-being etc.), the misuse of alcohol or drugs must also result from

---

<sup>82</sup>v. Clyde Arnsperger, James A. Brill, and W. Ray Rucker, Values to Learn (Teacher's Edition)--The Human Values Series (Austin, Texas: Steck-Vaughn Company, 1967), pp. 2-4.

<sup>83</sup>Herbert O. Brayer and Zeller W. Cleary, Values in the Family: A Workshop Guide for Parents (San Diego: Pennant Press, 1972).

these "needs." To illustrate this Brayer took each of the underlying causes of drug abuse and listed the anticipated gains and possible losses using the eight value categories. For example:

Underlying causes of drug abuse--Peer Group Pressure.  
Anticipated Gains: Power, Respect, and even Affection.  
Possible Losses: Rectitude, Respect, and Power.<sup>84</sup>

An important off-shoot of this theory of values has been that the "causes" of drug abuse are the same as the causes for all other behaviors that get young people into trouble. Brayer's rationale was that if you cannot satisfy your basic needs in normal ways, you will use an alternative method even if it is not acceptable to others.<sup>85</sup>

To help prevent drug abuse or alcohol abuse or any other behavioral problem in youth, Brayer further suggested that teachers "must both understand the needs of the student and assist him to develop coping behaviors which he accepts as more effective for handling the 'need or want' that could lead to dangerous, high-risk, or anti-social behavior."<sup>86</sup> The teacher gives this assistance through

---

<sup>84</sup>Herbert O. Brayer and Zeller W. Cleary, Values in the Family: A Workshop Guide for Parents (San Diego: Pennant Press, 1972), p. xxiii.

<sup>85</sup>Ibid., p. xii.

<sup>86</sup>Herbert O. Brayer, "Valuing Approach to Drug Abuse Prevention Education," Santa Ana, California: Center for Drug Education, Orange County Department of Education (Mimeographed), p. 2.

what Brayer referred to as "value education" and "value centered curriculum." These are described as:

Value Education: to educate for values is to provide the student with value alternatives to analyze and explore for himself. (Valuing.) It also suggests providing the students with abilities--skill--or strategies for conducting value analysis in their own lives. Both of these facets are process oriented. If there is any "end" value, it is the existence of unique and personal value clarification on the part of each individual student.

Value Centered Curriculum: where classroom activities and daily interaction of participants are planned by both teachers and students in terms of a value-oriented approach to all areas of study and play. Values are individually identified and shared at all times. Damage to, or deprivation of, individual values is recognized, clarified, and minimized. Responsibility is encouraged through active participation by students in planning and conducting classroom activities. Ordinary needs and objectives of all classroom participants are shared and each is respected.<sup>87</sup>

In summary, the Values Clarification Approach to alcohol education has recently developed from an awareness that students were failing to make decisions that would enhance their lives. The rational clarification of values by teachers and parents is designed to help students weigh the "benefits" and "risks" of certain behaviors in terms of meeting their needs. As in other approaches toward preventing

---

<sup>87</sup>Herbert O. Brayer, "Valuing Approach to Drug Abuse Prevention Education," Santa Ana, California: Center for Drug Education, Orange County Department of Education (Mimeographed), p. 2.

alcoholism, this one is not without criticism. The prestigious Ford Foundation Drug Abuse Survey Project reported, "But no one knows how students come to hold certain values, or why some values are more prevalent than others. This may explain the adamant refusal of many schools to consider adoption of the value-clarifying curriculum until more concrete data are made available."<sup>88</sup>

For purposes of this investigation, the value clarification technique is operationally defined as follows:

Alcohol education should provide a small amount of cognitive information on the nature of alcohol and its effects. Emphasis, however, is not on information, but on a joining of information with the student's feeling and experiences. Each student is seen as a person who has values, needs, and emotions which play an important part in his behavior. An attempt is made through open-ended discussions (inquiry type teaching) to provide the student with value alternatives to analyze and explore for himself. This value education suggests providing the student with abilities, skills, and strategies for conducting value analysis in their own lives. To reduce the misuse of alcoholic beverages, the educator must understand the needs of the student and assist him to develop coping behaviors which are not self-destructive. This development of constructive coping behavior is a joint effort of the students and the educator.<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>88</sup>The Drug Abuse Survey Project, Dealing with Drug Abuse: A Report to the Ford Foundation (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972), p. 159.

<sup>89</sup>See Appendix A, Drinking Practices and Alcohol Education Questionnaire, Model D.

## Summary of Literature

Four major approaches toward alcohol education in the schools were identified, described, and operationally defined in this section. These were: The Temperance Approach, The Objective Facts Approach, The Responsible Drinking Approach, and The Values Clarification Approach. As was seen, the first three approaches, Temperance, Objective Facts, and Responsible Drinking, emphasized presenting cognitive information as a deterrent to alcohol abuse. The Values Clarification Approach, however, focused on attitudes and needs or what was described as the "underlying causes" of alcohol abuse. The writings presented in this section were used to develop the operational definitions of the four Models.

### Correlates of Drinking Practices

The present investigation considers the drinking practices of teachers as one of the independent variables that may affect which model of alcohol education they will prefer. This suggests a review of two important drinking practice studies which have been reported within the last three years: Don Cahalan's American Drinking Practices<sup>90</sup> and Louis Harris' American Attitudes Toward Alcohol and

---

<sup>90</sup>Don Cahalan, Ira H. Cisin, and Helen M. Crossley, American Drinking Practices (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies, 1969).

Alcoholics.<sup>91</sup> Subjects for each of these surveys were selected from across the nation on a random probability basis with the Harris study interviewing 2,131 respondents, eighteen years or older, and Cahalan interviewing 2,746 respondents, twenty-one years or older.<sup>92</sup> In addition, the Harris study conducted a special oversample among 385 Blacks, "in order to assure an adequate basis for studying any attitudinal variation relating to race." Both studies created similar, five category, drinker typologies based on quantity and frequency of drinking. Table 2 presents this typology and the findings related to it.

TABLE 2  
COMPARISON OF CAHALAN'S AND HARRIS' FINDINGS  
BY DRINKER CATEGORY, IN PERCENT

Drinker Category	Cahalan's Study (N = 2,746)	Harris' Study (N = 2,131)
Heavy	14	12
Moderate	11	13
Light	28	28
Infrequent	10	15
Abstainer	37	32
Total	100%	100%

<sup>91</sup>Louis Harris and Associates, American Attitudes Toward Alcohol and Alcoholics, a survey of public opinion for the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (Washington, D.C.: Study Number 2138, December, 1971), p.1.

<sup>92</sup>This difference in lower age levels probably reflects the lowering of the legal adult age from twenty-one to eighteen, which took place in 1971.

The relationships of basic social demographic variables to alcohol usage as reported by these two studies are presented next.

### Sex and Age

Generally men tended to drink more often and heavier than women.<sup>93,94</sup> Cahalan reported that only 23 percent of the males abstained compared to 40 percent of the females. Of the males that drank alcoholic beverages, 28 percent were heavy drinkers compared to only 8 percent among the female drinkers.<sup>95</sup>

Older people tended to drink less than those aged fifty or less.<sup>96,97</sup> The largest difference occurred between younger males and older females. Only 12 percent of the males between thirty and thirty-four abstained while 60 percent of the females above sixty-five abstained.<sup>98</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup>Louis Harris and Associates, American Attitudes Toward Alcohol and Alcoholics, a survey of public opinions for the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (Washington, D. C.: Study Number 2138, December, 1971), p. 3.

<sup>94</sup>Don Cahalan, Ira H. Cisin, and Helen M. Crossley, American Drinking Practices (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies, 1969), pp. 21-22.

<sup>95</sup>Don Cahalan, Ibid., pp. 21-22.

<sup>96</sup>Louis Harris, Ibid., p. 3.

<sup>97</sup>Don Cahalan, Ibid., pp. 21-22.

<sup>98</sup>Don Cahalan, Ibid., pp. 21-22.

## Social Status

Using the Hollingshead Index of Social Position (ISP),<sup>99</sup> Cahalan suggested that ". . . those of highest status are much more likely to be drinkers (i.e., non-abstainers) and, if drinkers, somewhat less likely to be heavy drinkers than are those of lower status."<sup>100</sup> Cahalan also found that differences in the proportions of men and women drinkers were generally smaller in the upper ISP group than in the lower.

## Occupation

Harris differentiated executives, white collar and blue collar workers and found that the greatest percentage of abstainers were among the blue collar workers and the least number belonged to the executive group.<sup>101</sup> Cahalan, looking at various occupations found that the largest proportion of abstainers was found among the farm-owner group. The largest proportion of drinkers (non-abstainers) were in

---

<sup>99</sup>A. B. Hollingshead, Two Factor Index of Social Position (New Haven: Mimeographed, 1957).

<sup>100</sup>Don Cahalan, Ira H. Cisin, and Helen M. Crossley, American Drinking Practices (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies, 1969), p. 26.

<sup>101</sup>Louis Harris and Associates, American Attitudes Toward Alcohol and Alcoholics, a survey of public opinions for the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (Washington, D.C.: Study Number 2138, December, 1971), p. 3.



the professional, semi-professional and technical roles, and managerial groups.<sup>102</sup>

### Education

The greatest number of abstainers were among those with an education of eighth grade or less (60 percent); those with some college, or college graduates were least likely to abstain (27 percent).<sup>103</sup> Women college graduates were much more likely than other women to be drinkers, but they were much less likely to be heavy drinkers if they drank.<sup>104</sup>

### Marital Status

Cahalan reported that the single and the divorced or separated had a higher proportion of heavy drinkers on the average than the married or widowed. By controlling for age, sex, and social position, he found that ". . . the connection between heavy drinking and being single or divorced or separated holds true to a marked degree only in men and women of lower socio-economic status under age forty-five."<sup>105</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup>Don Cahalan, Ira H. Cisin, and Helen M. Crossley, American Drinking Practices (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies, 1969), pp. 29-30.

<sup>103</sup>Louis Harris and Associates, American Attitudes Toward Alcohol and Alcoholics, a survey of public opinions for the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (Washington, D.C.: Study Number 2138, December, 1971), p. 3.

<sup>104</sup>Don Cahalan, Ibid., p. 31. <sup>105</sup>Don Cahalan, Ibid., p. 32.

## Region of Country

The Harris survey suggested that the percentage of abstainers varied among the South (52 percent), Midwest (35 percent), West (31 percent), and the East (27 percent).<sup>106</sup> Cahalan explained the lower than average proportion of persons drinking in the South: "The South is relatively less urban and less well-to-do than the other regions . . . . Another factor is religion: the more conservative Protestant denominations (which frown upon alcohol) are more prevalent in the South than elsewhere."<sup>107</sup>

## Degree of Urbanization

Generally the more urban the area the higher the proportion of heavy drinkers. However, the suburbs rather than the cities had the least number of abstainers.<sup>108</sup> Cahalan suggested that the same general patterns of differences in the incidence of drinking by degree of urbanization held for both men and women.<sup>109</sup>

---

<sup>106</sup>Louis Harris and Associates, American Attitudes Toward Alcohol and Alcoholics, a survey of public opinions for the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (Washington, D.C.: Study Number 2138, December, 1971), p. 3.

<sup>107</sup>Don Cahalan, Ira H. Cisin, and Helen M. Crossley, American Drinking Practices (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies, 1969), pp. 37-38.

<sup>108</sup>Louis Harris, Ibid., p. 3.

<sup>109</sup>Don Cahalan, Ibid., p. 41.

## Race

Harris reported that although Blacks abstained more than Whites (44 percent to 37 percent), those that did drink did so more heavily (21 percent heavy Black drinkers to 13 percent heavy White drinkers).<sup>110</sup> Cahalan's findings indicated that most of these differences were due to the different drinking rates of Black women opposed to White women: "Negro women differed from White women both in their much higher proportions of abstainers and in their higher rate of heavy drinkers."<sup>111</sup>

## Ancestors

Those respondents identifying themselves as primarily Italian in origin had the highest proportion of drinkers (91 percent). Those of Russian, Polish, or Baltic origin were next (86 percent). Of all national affiliations, the highest proportion of abstainers were found in the Scotch-Irish (50 percent) and in the Scotch and English (40 percent).<sup>112</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup>Louis Harris and Associates, American Attitudes Toward Alcohol and Alcoholics, a survey of public opinions for the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (Washington, D.C.: Study Number 2138, December, 1971), p. 3.

<sup>111</sup>Don Cahalan, Ira H. Cisin, and Helen M. Crossley, American Drinking Practices (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies, 1969), p. 48.

<sup>112</sup>Don Cahalan, Ibid., p. 188.

### Children in the Home

Cahalan did not find significant differences between the drinking practices of adults with children in the home and adults without children in the home. However, he did find that ". . . a slightly higher proportion of the women with children at home proved to be heavy drinkers than of women who were married but had no children at home."<sup>113</sup>

### Income

The proportion of people who drank increased as their family income rose (within the limits: "less than \$5,000" and "more than \$15,000"). Harris reported 86 percent of those making more than \$15,000 drank alcoholic beverages while only 48 percent of those making less than \$5,000 did.<sup>114</sup>

### Religion

Of any of the religious groups the least likely to abstain were the Jews and the Episcopalians (less than

---

<sup>113</sup>Don Cahalan, Ira H. Cisin, and Helen M. Crossley, American Drinking Practices (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies, 1969), p. 33.

<sup>114</sup>Louis Harris and Associates, American Attitudes Toward Alcohol and Alcoholics, a survey of public opinions for the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (Washington, D.C.: Study Number 2138, December, 1971), p. 3.

10 percent each). Conservative Protestant denominations had a relatively high proportion of abstainers (48 percent) and relatively few heavy drinkers (7 percent). Catholics had above average proportions of drinkers (83 percent) and heavy drinkers (19 percent).<sup>115</sup>

#### Summary of Findings

The social demographic correlates of drinking recently reported by Cahalan and Harris have been reviewed in this section. It is noted that neither of these studies specifically studied the drinking practices of teachers; nor did they correlate drinker categories (heavy, moderate, light, etc.) with the teachers' alcohol education model preference. However, the findings of Cahalan and of Harris provide an excellent foundation for investigating the relationship of teacher drinking practices and their selection of alcohol education models. Additionally, their findings will be of value as a referant for the teachers' drinking practices to be briefly described in Chapter IV of the present study. It appears that the findings in this area of the literature support and enhance the present investigation.

---

<sup>115</sup> Don Cahalan, Ira H. Cisin, and Helen M. Crossley, American Drinking Practices (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies, 1969), p. 188.

Summary of Chapter II

Three areas of literature have been reviewed in this Chapter. First, studies which investigated general attitudes and opinions about alcohol education in the schools were reviewed. For the most part, these studies sampled the general population and, therefore, did not focus on teacher opinions. Where teachers were sampled, the characteristics of the geographical location (Mississippi, and Chile) seemed to disallow any generalizations about the teachers of California. Second, a description of the four perspectives toward alcohol education was presented. The perspectives reviewed included: 1) The Temperance Approach, 2) The Objective Facts Approach, 3) The Responsible Drinking Approach, and 4) The Values Clarification Approach. An operational definition of each of these perspectives was presented. Third, two important studies which correlated drinking practices with social-demographic variables were reviewed. These studies provided a background for understanding one of the important independent variables to be considered in the present investigation, namely, teacher drinking practices.

The review of these areas of literature supports the investigation of the Problem presented in Chapter I. No studies seem to exist which have attempted to investigate alcohol education from the perspective of teacher opinions and the correlation of these opinions with drinking practices

and social-demographic variables. However, studies and expository writings reviewed do provide the information necessary for giving direction and support to the present investigation.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

The present study was designed to investigate seven hypotheses related to alcohol education and to describe certain social-demographic variables of high school teachers, their opinions toward alcohol education, and their drinking practices. In this chapter the methodology for the study is given. Following are discussions of the sample, the instrumentation, and the method of analysis.

#### Sample and Sampling Method

The population from which the sample was drawn consisted of California high school teachers who are full-time instructors representing a complete range of subject matter taught. Counselors, department heads, part-time teachers, and administrators were not sampled. Two moderate to large size school districts from each of three geographical areas (Southern California, San Francisco Bay, and Central Valley) were selected. The selection of these districts was based on two criteria: district size and



district location. Moderate to large school districts are more likely to have a number of educators teaching units on alcohol education and thus afford a better opportunity for study than do smaller districts. Choosing districts that reflect geographic and regional patterns representative of most of the population of the State of California allows greater generalization of the findings. One school district respectfully declined to participate in the study stating, "Because of the possible misunderstanding which could result from our participation in the survey which you propose, we do not feel that it is in the best interests of this district to participate. . . ." A substitute district was then chosen in the same geographical area.

Out of the possible forty-six high schools in these six districts, twenty-two were randomly selected using tables of random numbers<sup>1</sup> with one additional school selected on the basis of its inner city location.<sup>2</sup> In the twenty-three high schools, there were a total of 1,681 full-time teachers. Of these, 121 were identified by the high school principals as

---

<sup>1</sup>Herbert Arkin and Raymond R. Colton, Tables for Statisticians (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1950), pp. 142-145.

<sup>2</sup>The writer plans a future study investigating differences between alcohol educators in city schools and alcohol educators in suburban schools. To ensure an adequate sample for this future study, he deviated from the random sampling to select an inner-city school.

educators who were teaching a unit on alcohol education. Each of these "alcohol educators" were included in the sample. Of the remaining 1,560 teachers who were not currently teaching alcohol education units, 475 were randomly selected. The combined sample of 121 alcohol educators and 475 non-alcohol educators yielded a total N of 596.

### The Instrument

The data were gathered by using a precoded, structured questionnaire which was developed by the investigator for the present study.<sup>3</sup> The questionnaire, entitled the Drinking Practices and Alcohol Education Questionnaire, (DPAEQ) is self-administering and has twenty-five major questions with eleven subquestions of from one to eight parts. The DPAEQ had seven major revisions, each one having been "tested" or tried out by teachers, counselors, and office personnel. The final revision was "pretested" by ten individuals each of whom followed the directions without error. The average completion time was seventeen minutes with a range from thirteen to twenty-two minutes.

The questionnaire has thirteen pages and asks questions which may be placed into three categories: social-demographic questions, questions about alcohol education, and

---

<sup>3</sup>The reader is referred to Appendix A, Drinking Practices and Alcohol Education Questionnaire.

drinking practices questions. With the exceptions of the questions relating to teaching (such as the number of years taught, major teaching area, etc.), the social-demographic questions are standard questions covering sex, age, marital status, children, race, religion, and ancestry. The questions on alcohol education can be separated into two parts: those relating to different models of alcohol education and those pertaining to the value and scope of alcohol education in the classroom. Each model of alcohol education is described in a paragraph of approximately 160 words. The alcohol education models represent and may be labeled as: 1) The Temperance Approach, 2) The Responsible Drinking Approach, 3) The Objective Facts Approach, and 4) The Values Clarification Approach.<sup>4</sup>

The models, as presented on the questionnaire, were constructed from the literature on or related to alcohol education.<sup>5</sup> In addition, on each model, experts who advocate or are very familiar with that model reviewed the paragraph and agreed that it represented their particular viewpoint. For example, the Temperance Model (Model A) was presented to the Northern California President of the Women's Christian Temperance Union who under objective conditions agreed that it was an accurate reflection of the temperance view toward alcohol education.

---

<sup>4</sup>The actual paragraphs describing the models may be found in Appendix A, Models A, B, C, and D.

<sup>5</sup>See Chapter II of the present study.

The third category of questions, those on drinking practices, are similar to and in some cases exactly those used by various national drinking practices studies developed by Cahalan and others.<sup>6</sup> These questions, having been identified as yielding pertinent and valuable information from a general population, are assumed to be suitable to the teacher population sampled in the present study. One of the most serious problems of self-administered questionnaires is the possible misunderstanding of the directions for the questions asked. This problem is not as important in the present study since the respondents are part of a highly literate group (high school teachers). It was felt that the "structuredness" of the questionnaire might become quite frustrating for some respondents. To help alleviate this possibility and to increase motivation a comments page was added. Other than noting what percentage of the respondents made use of this page, no effort was made to code or categorize the comments.

#### Administration of the Instrument

Although the Drinking Practices and Alcohol Education Questionnaire is designed to be self-administered, the packaging and delivery of it seemed of such importance that two major precautions were taken. There were: 1) orientation

---

<sup>6</sup>Don Cahalan, Ira H. Cisin, and Helen M. Crossley, American Drinking Practices (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies, 1969), pp. 231-253.

meetings were held with various levels of school officials to establish a clear understanding of the intent and purposes of the research study, and 2) procedures for distribution and collection of the Questionnaire were simplified as much as possible.

Regarding the first precaution, meetings were held in each of the geographical areas with the drug coordinator or the health consultant of the Office of the County Superintendent of Schools, with a designated representative of each of the six school districts (hereafter called the "District Liaison"),<sup>7</sup> and with principals of twenty-one of the twenty-three high schools involved in the study. The other two principals were given an orientation by phone. At each meeting, the school officials expressed a strong support for the study. The writer believes that discussions of topics concerning the usefulness of data, confidentiality and anonymity, and a general organization of the project were instrumental factors in gaining cooperation from these administrators.

The second precautionary action, which was to establish clear distribution and collection procedures, involved utilizing the existing school district and high school resources as well as extensive preparation at the investigator's

---

<sup>7</sup>Of the six District Liaison, two held positions as head of research, one was a drug education coordinator, one was a supervisor of health educators, one was the executive secretary for the teacher's association in the school district, and one was in charge of pupil personnel and guidance.

office. The following procedures were carried out for each of the six school districts:

1. A preliminary memorandum was sent to every teacher in the twenty-three schools stating that some of them would be asked to participate in the study by anonymously completing the questionnaire. The memorandum was sent by the District Liaison under the school district letterhead.<sup>8</sup>
2. The name of each participating teacher and his high school was typed on a large envelope that contained a Questionnaire and instructions, a pre-addressed postcard indicating a completed Questionnaire, and a return envelope (addressed to the District Liaison).<sup>9</sup>
3. The appropriate large envelopes were then either personally taken or mailed to the District Liaison, who in turn sent them through the inter-school mail system to the respective high schools. The mail clerk at the high school distributed them using the teacher's mail boxes.

---

<sup>8</sup>See Appendix B.

<sup>9</sup>See Appendix B.

4. Upon completing the anonymous Questionnaire, the teacher sealed it in the return envelope and returned it through the school mail system to the school district liaison. At the same time, the teacher mailed directly to the investigator the postcard which stated that he had filled out the Questionnaire.
5. Records were kept of those who had and had not returned postcards. Two weeks after the initial distribution, follow-up letters<sup>10</sup> and Questionnaire packets were sent to those who had not returned their postcards.
6. The entire distribution and collection of the Questionnaires, including the follow-up, was completed within the seven week period between mid-April and early June, 1972.

#### Method of Analysis

The data received from the Questionnaire were processed according to procedures outlined by Hyman.<sup>11</sup> Each Questionnaire was hand edited and coded. The editing and coding were reviewed by checkers. Where the checker did not

---

<sup>10</sup>See Appendix E.

<sup>11</sup>Herbert Hyman, Survey Design and Analysis (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, Publishers, 1955), pp. 381-388.

agree with the coder, the investigator was consulted. A random check of ten percent of the Questionnaires indicated a coding error percentage of less than .001. The Questionnaires were then key punched and verified.

Seven specific null hypotheses (Ho) were tested using the chi-square test of independence. These were:

- Ho (1) There is no difference between alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators regarding their preference for the Values Clarification Model of alcohol education.
- Ho (2) There is no difference between alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators regarding the frequency of having Low-None Drinking Patterns.
- Ho (3) There is no difference between alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators regarding how often they find it somewhat or very important to drink when tense, to relax, or to forget worries.
- Ho (4) There is no difference between alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators regarding their knowledge of a friend or relative who has a serious drinking problem.
- Ho (5) There is no difference between alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators



concerning how often they attribute alcoholism to moral weakness.

Ho (6) There is no difference between male and female teachers regarding the frequency of having Low-None Drinking Patterns.

Ho (7) There is no difference between male and female teachers concerning their views on teenage drinking.

For each of these hypotheses the .05 level of significance was used to determine differences.

In addition, standard survey research techniques were used in the analysis of other data obtained from the DPAEQ. Briefly, this involved the examination of single distributions of all variables and the cross-tabulation of these variables with categories of one or more independent variables. Chi-square tests of independence were generally used to guide the analysis.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The results of the study are presented in six major sections of this Chapter. These sections are entitled: 1) Characteristics of the Teacher Sample; 2) Testing of the Hypotheses; 3) Teacher Support for Various Models of Alcohol Education; 4) Teacher Drinking Practices and Their Views About Drinking; 5) Teacher Opinions on Various Questions About Alcohol Education; and 6) Cross-Tabulations of Teacher Characteristics and Preferences for Alcohol Education Models.

These results are based on data from 550 high school teachers (92 percent) who completed the Drinking Practices and Alcohol Education Questionnaire. Information from the remaining forty-six teachers was not received for various reasons which are given in Table 3.

TABLE 3  
REASONS FOR NON-COMPLETION OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Reasons for Non-Completion	Number	Percent
No longer teaching	1	.2
Questionnaire lost in editing process	1	.2
Questionnaire returned incomplete	7	1.2
Questionnaire not returned	37	6.2
Total	46	7.8

### Characteristics of the Teacher Sample

In this section the social and demographic characteristics of the respondents are given. Where it is felt to be of interest and/or analytical value, the characteristics were separated by sex. Teacher characteristics summarized include: age, sex, marital status, age of children, racial group, religious affiliation, ancestry, length of teaching career, teaching area, number of alcohol educators, and subjects in which educators teach alcohol education.

#### Age and Sex

The teachers as a group were relatively young. Table 4 indicates that about 44 percent were under thirty-five and only 17 percent were fifty or above. With the exception of the higher percentage of young female teachers in the twenty-five to twenty-nine age bracket and an almost comparable higher rate of men in the thirty-five to forty-four age bracket, males and females appeared similar in age. Most of the teachers (62 percent) were men while only about 38 percent were women. This predominance of males can be attributed in part to the fact that about 80 percent of the alcohol educators were men (see Table 12) and that all of the alcohol educators (from the twenty-three high schools) were included in the present study. However, even among the non-alcohol educators who were randomly drawn from the twenty-

three high schools there were 4 percent more male teachers than females.

TABLE 4  
AGES OF TEACHERS BY SEX

Years of Age	Sex of Teachers					
	Male		Female		Both Sexes	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
20 - 24	2	1	3	1	5	1
25 - 29	49	15	67	33	116	21
30 - 34	76	23	43	21	119	22
35 - 39	64	19	21	10	85	16
40 - 44	58	17	15	7	73	14
45 - 49	32	10	22	11	54	10
50 - 54	31	9	18	9	49	9
55 - 59	13	4	8	4	21	4
60 +	12	4	7	3	19	4
No Information	3	1	1	a	4	1
Total <sup>b</sup>	340	100	205	100	545	100 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Less than one percent

<sup>b</sup>Does not include five cases of no information on gender.

<sup>c</sup>Percentages may not add up to 100 as a result of rounding procedures.

#### Marital Status

Almost three out of every four teachers were married with male teachers more likely to be married than female teachers (84 percent to 58 percent). The proportion of single

females was more than one out of four compared to the proportion of single male teachers which was about one out of twelve. The data on marital status is found in Table 5.

TABLE 5  
MARITAL STATUS OF TEACHERS

Marital Status	Male		Female		All Teachers	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Married	286	84	118	58	404	74
Widowed	1	a	7	3	8	2
Divorced or Separated	28	8	25	12	53	10
Never Married	25	8	55	27	80	15
Total <sup>b</sup>	340	100	205	100	545	100 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Less than one percent.

<sup>b</sup>Does not include five cases of no information.

<sup>c</sup>Percentages may not add up to 100 as a result of rounding procedures.

#### Teachers with Children

The high percentage of unmarried female teachers (see Table 5) understandably increased the percentage of teachers who did not have children. Table 6 shows that one-third of all teachers did not have children. Most of those that did have children, had young ones which ranged up to the age of twelve.

TABLE 6  
TEACHERS WITH CHILDREN<sup>a</sup>

Item	Male		Female		All Teachers	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No children	73	21	110	54	183	34
Children 12 or under	192	56	49	24	241	44
Children 13 to 20	87	26	36	18	123	23
Children 21 or over	48	14	28	14	76	14

<sup>a</sup>Teachers may have several children which represent more than one age group; numbers and percentages are therefore not additive. Percentages are based on 340 male teachers, 205 female teachers, and 545 "All Teachers."

#### Racial Group

As can be seen in Table 7, the teachers sampled were primarily of the White racial group. The minority groups represented only about 8 percent of the respondents. Since these groups were of approximately the same economic class and the same educational level as their White colleagues, it is assumed that generally the sample of 550 teachers was culturally homogeneous.

TABLE 7  
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS  
IN VARIOUS RACIAL GROUPS

Racial Group	Number	Percentage
White	505	92
Mexican/American	10	2
Black	14	3
Oriental	4	1
Indian	3	1
Other	8	2
No Information	6	1
Total	550	100 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Percentages may not add up to 100 as a result of rounding procedures.

#### Religious Affiliation

Over half of the teachers were of the Protestant Religion with most of these representing the Baptist or Methodist denominations. About one out of every five teachers was a Catholic. Perhaps most surprising was the large percentage of teachers who stated they had no religious affiliation. Table 8 indicates that about one out of every six teachers did not have a religion.

TABLE 8  
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS AFFILIATING  
WITH VARIOUS RELIGIONS

Religion	Number	Percentage
Catholic	123	22
Jewish	7	1
Protestant (total)	293	53
Episcopalian	24	4
Presbyterian	49	9
Lutheran	22	4
Baptist, Methodist	81	15
Congregationalist	21	4
Other Liberal Protestants	10	2
Other Fundamental Protestants	10	2
All Other	22	4
Other Religions	16	3
No Religion	93	17
No Information	17	3
Total	550	100 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Percentages may not add up to 100 as a result of rounding procedures.

### Ancestry

The ancestry or the national identity of the respondents is given in Table 9. About 60 percent of the teachers stated that their ancestors came from Great Britain, Western Europe, or the United States or Canada. Very few people (twenty-five teachers) gave places other than Europe or the United States as the country of their origin.



TABLE 9

THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS  
WHOSE ANCESTORS COME FROM VARIOUS  
COUNTRIES OR AREAS

Country of Ancestors	Number	Percentage
United States or Canada	55	10
Central Europe	18	3
Western Europe	112	20
Scandinavia	45	8
Southern Europe	46	8
Ireland	39	7
Great Britian	161	29
Russia	6	1
Someplace other than Europe of the United States	19	4
No Information <sup>a</sup>	49	9
Total	550	100 <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>"No Information" includes a number of areas reported which lacked specificity and thus did not fit in the above classifications, e.g., "Europe."

<sup>b</sup>Percentages may not add up to 100 as a result of rounding procedures.

Length of Teaching Career

The data in Table 10 shows the number of years during which teachers had taught in school. As might be expected from the data in Table 4 (Age of Teachers by Sex) there were more female teachers just beginning their educational career than there were males. The highest percentage of teachers had been teaching for five to seven years (22 percent).

TABLE 10  
THE NUMBER OF YEARS IN WHICH TEACHERS HAVE  
TAUGHT SCHOOL BY SEX

Years Taught	Sex					
	Male		Female		Total Male and Female <sup>a</sup>	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	14	4	15	7	29	5
2 - 4	58	17	54	27	112	21
5 - 7	67	20	49	24	116	22
8 - 10	54	16	20	10	74	14
11 - 15	68	20	28	14	96	18
16 - 20	44	13	16	8	60	11
21 - 25	24	7	9	4	33	6
26 - 30	4	1	8	4	12	2
31 - 44	2	1	4	2	6	1
Total	335	100	203	100	538	100 <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Does not include five cases which did not give their sex and seven cases which did not give information on the number of years for which they have taught.

<sup>b</sup>Percentages may not add up to 100 as a result of rounding procedures.

#### Teaching Area

Physical Education, Language Arts, and History, each mandated by State law, were the most prevalent major teaching areas as indicated by Table 11. Other well represented areas were the Physical Sciences and Industrial Arts or Homemaking.

TABLE 11  
 NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF TEACHERS IN  
 THE MAJOR TEACHING AREAS BY SEX

Teaching Area	Sex					
	Male		Female		Total Male and Females <sup>a</sup>	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Art	6	2	4	2	10	2
Business, Economics	16	5	13	6	29	7
Driver Education	12	4	1	1	13	3
Foreign Language	12	4	17	8	29	7
Health Education, State Requirements	12	4	4	2	16	4
History, Social Studies, Civics	54	16	16	8	70	16
Industrial Arts, Homemaking	32	10	13	6	45	10
Language Arts, Literature	31	9	64	31	95	21
Mathematics	35	11	8	4	43	10
Music	8	2	1	1	9	2
Physical Education	64	19	40	20	104	23
Psychology, Guidance	4	1	2	1	6	1
Sciences - Biological	9	3	1	1	10	2
Sciences - Physical	32	10	11	5	43	10
Speech	4	1	4	2	8	2
Special Education	2	1	5	3	7	2
Other						
No Information						
Total <sup>a</sup>	340	100	205	100	445	100 <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Does not include five cases where information about gender was not given.

<sup>b</sup>Percentages may not add up to 100 as a result of rounding procedures.

### Number of Alcohol Educators

All of the known alcohol educators in the twenty-three high schools studied were included in the sample. Of these, 207 responded: 165 (80 percent) males and 42 (20 percent) females (see Table 12). The 207 alcohol educators represented 38 percent of the respondents with the remaining 62 percent having been non-alcohol educators.

TABLE 12

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF MALE AND FEMALE ALCOHOL EDUCATORS AND NON-ALCOHOL EDUCATORS

Educators	Male		Female		Total <sup>a</sup>	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Alcohol Educators	165	80	42	20	207	100
Non-Alcohol Educators	172	51	163	49	337	100

<sup>a</sup>Does not include six cases of no information.

### Testing of the Hypotheses

As part of the present descriptive study of teacher views toward alcohol education, seven hypotheses were developed. In the next two subsections each of these are presented in formal statistical terms as suggested by Runyan and Haber,<sup>1</sup> and followed by a tabular presentation of the results. All hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance using the chi-square test of independence. The first five hypotheses are concerned with predicting differences between alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators on selected variables. Hypotheses six and seven were designed to measure differences between male and female educators with regard to two selected variables.

#### Comparison of Alcohol Educators and Non-Alcohol Educators by Selected Variables

It was hypothesized in Chapter I that alcohol educators would differ from non-alcohol educators with regard to: 1) their preference for the Values Clarification Approach toward alcohol education; 2) their drinking patterns; 3) their reasons for drinking; 4) their having a friend or relative with a drinking problem; and 5) their views on what

---

<sup>1</sup>Richard P. Runyan and Audrey Haber, Fundamentals of Behavioral Statistics (Menlo Park, California: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1967), p. 207.

causes alcoholism. This subsection presents the findings relevant to these hypotheses.

Preference for the Values Clarification Model-

Hypothesis One. In statistical terms Hypothesis One is described as follows:

- A. Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ): There is no difference between alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators regarding their preference for the Values Clarification Model of alcohol education.
- B. Alternative Hypothesis ( $H_1$ ): Alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators will differ in their choice of the Values Clarification Model of alcohol Education (two-tailed).

In Table 13 and Table 14 several findings related to this hypothesis are reported. Table 13 shows that generally alcohol educators more than non-alcohol educators favored the Objective Facts Model. The other Models, however, received more support from the non-alcohol educators.

Since almost half of the respondents who taught alcohol education did so more than a year ago, differences between alcohol educators who are currently teaching about alcohol and those who had taught it in the past were measured. Table 14 indicates that the differences between current and past alcohol educators were small.

TABLE 13

PREFERENCE FOR ALCOHOL EDUCATION MODELS BY  
TYPE OF EDUCATOR AND SEX, IN PERCENT

Type of Educator	N	Temperance Model	Responsible Drinking Model	Objective Facts Model	Values Clarification Model
<u>Total Sample</u>	496	11	16	43	31
Alcohol Educator	184	10	12	48	30
Non-Alcohol Educator	312	12	18	40	31
<u>Men</u>					
Alcohol Educator	145	10	13	49	28
Non-Alcohol Educator	159	16	19	39	26
<u>Women</u>					
Alcohol Educator	39	8	8	44	41
Non-Alcohol Educator	153	7	16	41	36

TABLE 14

PREFERENCE FOR ALCOHOL EDUCATION MODELS BY RECENCY  
OF TEACHING ABOUT ALCOHOL, IN PERCENT

When Taught About Alcohol	N	Temperance Model	Responsible Drinking Model	Objective Facts Model	Values Clarification Model
<u>Total Sample</u>	184	10	11	49	30
Current Year	94	10	13	50	28
Previous Years	90	10	10	48	32

In Tables 15 and 16, the findings presented in Tables 13 and 14 were collapsed into a two by two format for the purpose of statistically testing Hypothesis One. In no case were differences found to be significant. The null hypothesis was accepted that there was no difference between alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators regarding their preference for the Values Clarification Model of alcohol education.



TABLE 15

PREFERENCE FOR THE VALUES CLARIFICATION MODEL BY  
TYPE OF EDUCATOR AND SEX, IN PERCENT

Type of Educator	N	Values Clarification Model	All Other Models
<u>Total Sample</u>	496	31	69
Alcohol Educator	184	30	70
Non-Alcohol Educator	312	31	69
	Chi square = .031	df = 1	p > .05
<u>Men</u>			
Alcohol Educator	145	28	72
Non-Alcohol Educator	159	26	74
	Chi square = .129	df = 1	p > .05
<u>Women</u>			
Alcohol Educator	39	41	59
Non Alcohol Educator	153	36	64
	Chi square = .166	df = 1	p > .05

TABLE 16

PREFERENCE FOR THE VALUES CLARIFICATION MODEL BY REGENCY  
OF TEACHING ABOUT ALCOHOL, IN PERCENT

When Taught About Alcohol	N	Values Clarification Model	All Other Models
<u>Total Sample</u>	184	30	70
Current Year	94	28	72
Previous Years	90	32	68
	Chi square = .264	df = 1	p > .05

Educator's Drinking Patterns - Hypothesis Two.

In statistical terms Hypothesis Two is described as follows:

- A. Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ): There is no difference between alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators regarding the frequency of having Low-None Patterns of Drinking.
- B. Alternative Hypothesis ( $H_2$ ): Alcohol educators will differ from non-alcohol educators regarding the frequency of having Low-None Drinking Patterns (two-tailed).

Tables 17 and 18 indicate the findings related to this hypothesis. From Table 17 it can be seen that about 88 percent of the teachers in this sample drink beverage alcohol with most of them drinking lightly (35 percent). Table 18 gives the results of dividing the five drinking categories into a High-Moderate Drinking Pattern and a Low-None Drinking Pattern. From this division, it is seen that alcohol educators in this sample were more frequently heavier drinkers than were the non-alcohol educators. Differences between these educators were significant and, therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. It is noted, however, that when sex was controlled, the differences between alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators were not statistically significant.

TABLE 17

PERCENTAGE OF ALCOHOL EDUCATORS AND NON-ALCOHOL  
EDUCATORS BY DRINKER CATEGORY AND SEX

	N	Heavy	Moderate	Light	Infrequent	Abstainer
<u>Total Sample</u>	538	16	31	35	7	12
Alcohol Educator	206	17	35	31	5	12
Non-Alcohol Educator	332	15	27	38	8	11
<u>Men</u>						
Alcohol Educator	164	17	40	29	3	10
Non-Alcohol Educator	171	20	27	33	6	14
<u>Women</u>						
Alcohol Educator	42	14	17	38	12	19
Non-Alcohol Educator	161	11	28	42	11	7

TABLE 18

PERCENTAGE OF ALCOHOL EDUCATORS AND NON-ALCOHOL  
EDUCATORS BY DRINKING PATTERN AND SEX

Educator	N	High-Moderate Drinking Pattern	Low-None Drinking Pattern
<u>Total Sample</u>	538	46	54
Alcohol			
Educator	206	52	48
Non-Alcohol			
Educator	332	43	57
	Chi square = 3.97	df = 1	p < .05
<u>Men</u>			
Alcohol			
Educator	164	57	43
Non-Alcohol			
Educator	171	47	53
	Chi square = 3.295	df = 1	p > .05
<u>Women</u>			
Alcohol			
Educator	42	31	69
Non-Alcohol			
Educator	161	39	61
	Chi square = .514	df = 1	p > .05

Reasons for Drinking - Hypothesis Three. In statistical terms Hypothesis Three is described as follows:

- A. Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ): There is no difference between alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators regarding how often they find it somewhat or very important to drink when tense, to relax, or to forget worries.
- B. Alternative Hypothesis ( $H_3$ ): Alcohol educators will less often find it somewhat or very important to drink when tense, to relax, or to forget worries than will non-alcohol educators (one-tailed).

Table 19 presents four common reasons for drinking and the frequencies that educators felt these reasons are very or somewhat important. The first reason is included for perspective, while Reasons 2, 3, and 4 relate directly to Hypothesis Three. For all reasons, alcohol educators in this sample stated that drinking is very or somewhat important less often than did non-alcohol educators. However, none of these differences were statistically significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis was affirmed.

By separating the males and females it was observed that female alcohol educators statistically differed from female non-alcohol educators for Reason 1

TABLE 19

REASONS FOR DRINKING BY ALCOHOL  
EDUCATORS AND NON-ALCOHOL  
EDUCATORS AND SEX,  
IN PERCENT

Educator	N	Reason 1 Makes Social Occasions More Enjoyable	
		Very or Somewhat Important	Not At All Important
<u>Total Sample</u>	508	64	36
Alcohol Educator	195	63	37
Non-Alcohol Educator	313	65	35
		Chi square = .129	df = 1 p > .05
<u>Men</u>			
Alcohol Educator	157	66	34
Non-Alcohol Educator	159	62	38
		Chi square = .525	df = 1 p > .05
<u>Women</u>			
Alcohol Educator	38	47	53
Non-Alcohol Educator	154	68	32
		Chi square = 4.436	df = 1 p < .05

Reason 2 Helps to Relax

<u>Total Sample</u>	505	56	44
Alcohol Educator	192	53	47
Non-Alcohol Educator	313	58	42
		Chi square = .690	df = 1 p > .05
<u>Men</u>			
Alcohol Educator	155	57	43
Non-Alcohol Educator	160	58	42
		Chi square = .017	df = 1 p > .05
<u>Women</u>			
Alcohol Educator	37	41	59
Non-Alcohol Educator	153	58	42
		Chi square = 2.860	df = 1 p < .05

TABLE 19 CONTINUED

Educator	N	Reason 3 Need It When Tense	
		Very or Somewhat Important	Not At All Important
<u>Total Sample</u>	504	21	79
Alcohol Educator	192	17	83
Non-Alcohol Educator	312	23	77
		Chi square = 2.587	df = 1 p > .05
<u>Men</u>			
Alcohol Educator	155	16	84
Non-Alcohol Educator	159	25	75
		Chi square = 3.380	df = 1 p < .05
<u>Women</u>			
Alcohol Educator	37	19	81
Non-Alcohol Educator	153	21	79
		Chi square = .001	df = 1 p > .05

Reason 4 Helps to Forget Worries

<u>Total Sample</u>	505	10	90
Alcohol Educator	192	7	93
Non-Alcohol Educator	313	11	89
		Chi square = 1.337	df = 1 p > .05
<u>Men</u>			
Alcohol Educator	155	6	94
Non-Alcohol Educator	159	11	89
		Chi square = 1.269	df = 1 p > .05
<u>Women</u>			
Alcohol Educator	37	11	89
Non-Alcohol Educator	154	11	89
		Chi square = .000	df = 1 p > .05

(Makes Social Occasions More Enjoyable) and Reason 2 (Helps to Relax). There were no statistical differences between male alcohol educators and male non-alcohol educators except for Reason 3 (Helps to Forget Worries).

Friend or Relative With a Serious Drinking Problem - Hypothesis Four. In statistical terms Hypothesis Four is described as follows:

- A. Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ): There is no difference between alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators regarding their knowledge of a friend or relative who has a serious problem with drinking.
- B. Alternative Hypothesis ( $H_4$ ): Alcohol educators will more often than non-alcohol educators have knowledge of a friend or a relative who has a serious drinking problem (one-tailed).

Tables 20 and 21 indicate no significant differences between alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators with regard to having known a friend or a relative who has a serious drinking problem. The fourth null hypothesis was therefore accepted.



TABLE 20

ALCOHOL EDUCATOR AND NON-ALCOHOL EDUCATOR  
BY FRIEND WITH A SERIOUS DRINKING  
PROBLEM AND BY SEX, IN PERCENT

Educator	N	Friend With Drinking Problem	No Friend With Drinking Problem
<u>Total Sample</u>	539	58	42
Alcohol Educator	206	58	42
Non-Alcohol Educator	333	58	42
<u>Men</u>	Chi-square = .003      df = 1      p > .05		
Alcohol Educator	164	57	43
Non-Alcohol Educator	172	62	38
<u>Women</u>	Chi square = .473      df = 1      p > .05		
Alcohol Educator	42	60	40
Non-Alcohol Educator	161	53	47
Chi-square = .270      df = 1      p > .05			

TABLE 21

RELATIVE WITH A SERIOUS DRINKING PROBLEM  
BY ALCOHOL EDUCATOR AND NON-ALCOHOL  
EDUCATOR AND BY SEX, IN PERCENT

Educator	N	Relative With Drinking Problem	No Relative With Drinking Problem
<u>Total Sample</u>	542	49	51
Alcohol Educator	207	48	52
Non-Alcohol Educator	335	50	50
		Chi-square = .256	df = 1 p > .05
<u>Men</u>			
Alcohol Educator	165	49	51
Non-Alcohol Educator	172	54	46
		Chi-square = .835	df = 1 p > .05
<u>Women</u>			
Alcohol Educator	42	45	55
Non-Alcohol Educator	163	47	53
		Chi-square = .000	df = 1 p > .05

Table 22 indicates that there were no significant differences between educators currently teaching about alcohol and those who had taught it in the past regarding their knowledge of a friend with a serious drinking problem.

Table 23, however, indicates that significant differences did exist concerning knowledge of relatives with drinking problems.

TABLE 22

FRIEND WITH A SERIOUS DRINKING PROBLEM BY REGENCY  
OF TEACHING ABOUT ALCOHOL  
AND BY SEX, IN PERCENT

When Taught About Alcohol	N	Friend With Drinking Problem	No Friend With Drinking Problem
<u>Total Sample</u>	206	58	42
Current Year	106	59	41
Past Year	100	56	44
	Chi-square = .133	df = 1	p > .05
<u>Men</u>			
Current Year	91	58	42
Past Year	73	56	44
	Chi-square = .010	df = 1	p > .05
<u>Women</u>			
Current Year	15	67	33
Past Year	27	56	44
	Chi-square = .154	df = 1	p > .05

TABLE 23

RELATIVE WITH A SERIOUS DRINKING PROBLEM BY  
REGENCY OF TEACHING ABOUT ALCOHOL  
AND BY SEX, IN PERCENT

When Taught About Alcohol	N	Relative With Drinking Problem	No Relative With Drinking Problem
<u>Total Sample</u>	207	48	52
Current Year	106	55	45
Past Year	101	41	59
		Chi-square = 3.582	df = 1    p < .05
<u>Men</u>			
Current Year	91	55	45
Past Year	74	41	59
		Chi-square = 2.859	df = 1    p < .05
<u>Women</u>			
Current Year	15	54	46
Past Year	27	41	59
		Chi-square = .204	df = 1    p > .05

Views on What Causes Alcoholism - Hypothesis Five.

In statistical terms Hypothesis Five is described as follows:

- A. Null Hypothesis (H<sub>05</sub>): There is no difference between alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators concerning how often they attribute alcoholism to moral weakness.
- B. Alternative Hypothesis (H<sub>5</sub>): Alcohol educators will differ from non-alcohol educators regarding how often they attribute alcoholism to moral weakness (two-tailed).

Table 24 indicates the frequency with which educators in the sample agreed with each of the presented causes of alcoholism. No significant differences were found between alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators with regard to their preference for the moral weakness cause of alcoholism (Table 25). Therefore, the fifth null hypothesis was affirmed.

TABLE 24  
CAUSES OF ALCOHOLISM BY ALCOHOL EDUCATOR AND  
NON-ALCOHOL EDUCATOR AND BY SEX, IN PERCENT

Educator	N	Physical	Mental	Moral	Social
<u>Total Sample</u>	1068 <sup>a</sup>	32	43	15	10
Alcohol Educator	417	30	44	17	10
Non-Alcohol Educator	651	33	43	14	10
<u>Men</u>					
Alcohol Educator	332	30	46	19	8
Non-Alcohol Educator	324	30	44	16	10
<u>Women</u>					
Alcohol Educator	84	37	40	8	14
Non-Alcohol Educator	322	36	41	11	11

<sup>a</sup>Each of the 550 educators could agree with more than one cause of alcoholism.

TABLE 25

PREFERENCE FOR THE MORAL WEAKNESS CAUSE OF ALCOHOLISM BY ALCOHOL EDUCATOR AND NON-ALCOHOL EDUCATOR AND BY SEX, IN PERCENT

Educator	N	Moral Weakness Cause	All Other Causes
<u>Total Sample</u>	1068	15	85
Alcohol Educator	417	17	83
Non-Alcohol Educator	651	14	86
		Chi-square=1.624	df=1 p>.05
<u>Men</u>			
Alcohol Educator	332	19	81
Non-Alcohol Educator	324	16	84
		Chi-square=.610	df=1 p>.05
<u>Women</u>			
Alcohol Educator	83	8	92
Non-Alcohol Educator	322	11	89
		Chi-square=.309	df=1 p>.05

Comparison of Male and Female Educators on Two Selected Variables

It was also hypothesized in Chapter I that male and female educators would differ with regard to: 1) their patterns of drinking, and 2) their views on teenage drinking. This subsection formally presents these hypotheses and the findings related to them.

Male and Female Patterns of Drinking - Hypothesis

Six. In statistical terms Hypothesis Six is described as follows:

- A. Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ): There is no difference between male and female teachers regarding the frequency of having Low-None Drinking Patterns.
- B. Alternative Hypothesis ( $H_a$ ): Female teachers will have Low-None Drinking Patterns significantly more frequently than will male teachers (one-tailed).

Table 26 indicates that male educators were less likely to have Low-None Drinking Patterns than were female educators (48 percent to 63 percent). The differences between males and females were significant. The sixth null hypothesis was, therefore, rejected.

TABLE 26  
DRINKING PATTERNS BY MALE AND FEMALE  
TEACHERS, IN PERCENT

Educator	N	Low-None Drinking Pattern	High-Moderate Drinking Pattern
Total Sample	538	54	46
Male Teachers	335	48	52
Female Teachers	203	63	37
Chi-square = 10.82      df = 1      p < .01			

Male and Female Views on Teenage Drinking -

Hypothesis Seven. In statistical terms Hypothesis Seven is described as follows:

- A. Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ): There is no difference between male and female teachers concerning their views on teenage drinking.
- B. Alternative Hypothesis ( $H_1$ ): Female teachers will be significantly more conservative in their views on teenage drinking than will male teachers (one-tailed).

Table 27 indicates male and female educators' views on teenage drinking. Differences between males and females were not significant and, therefore, the null hypothesis was affirmed.

TABLE 27  
VIEWS ON TEENAGE DRINKING BY MALE AND  
FEMALE TEACHERS, IN PERCENT

Teachers	H	Teenage Drinking Permissible	No Teenage Drinking
Total Sample	527	39	61
Male Teachers	333	37	63
Female Teachers	194	42	58
Chi-square = 1.002    df = 1    p > .05			



Teacher's Support for Various Models of Alcohol Education

Teachers were asked to specify the extent of agreement they had for four different models of alcohol education (Temperance, Responsible Drinking, Objective Facts, and Values Clarification). Their responses to these questions indicate that teacher support for alcohol education varied according to the model which was being considered. Data which indicated this variability are presented in Tables 28 thru 31. By adding the categories of Strongly Agree and Moderately Agree for each model it is seen that the Objective Facts Model was supported by 89 percent of the teachers while only 40 percent of the teachers supported the Temperance Model. In between these two extremes were the Values Clarification Model and the Responsible Drinking Model, which received support from 66 percent and 62 percent, respectively, of the teachers.

Table 28, which presents the teachers' response to the Temperance philosophy of alcohol education, indicates that almost 14 percent of the teachers strongly agreed that students should be taught the deceptiveness and ruinous effects of alcohol. Although this model had the least support of the four models, it is noteworthy that there remained a large percentage (40 percent) of teachers who agreed (either strongly or moderately) with this updated version of temperance alcohol education.

TABLE 28

AMOUNT OF TEACHER AGREEMENT WITH THE TEMPERANCE  
APPROACH TOWARD ALCOHOL EDUCATION<sup>a</sup>

Amount of Agreement	Teachers	
	Number	Percentage
Strongly Agree	76	14
Moderately Agree	143	26
Don't Know	50	9
Moderately Disagree	167	30
Strongly Disagree	112	20
Total <sup>b</sup>	548	100 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>The Temperance Approach toward alcohol education has been operationally defined by Model A of the Drinking Practices and Alcohol Education Questionnaire (see Appendix A).

<sup>b</sup>Does not include two cases for which there was no information available.

<sup>c</sup>Percentages may not add up to 100 as a result of rounding procedures.

The Responsible Drinking Model was strongly supported by 20 percent of the teachers while an additional 42 percent moderately agreed with it (see Table 29 below). Unlike the Temperance Model which had more people disagreeing with it, this Model had 62 percent agreeing and 29 percent disagreeing. Although this controversial model<sup>2</sup> had a strong majority of teachers agreeing with it, it was also the Model

---

<sup>2</sup>Articles by Edwards and Mendelson in the International Journal of Psychiatry, Volume 9 (1970-71). pp. 354-358 and 368-371.

perceived by teachers as the most likely to be disliked by the students' parents and the districts' school boards.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, it was assumed that teachers tended to agree with the idea of teaching responsible drinking (which includes abstinence for those who choose it) but did not feel the community or the school board would allow it.

TABLE 29  
AMOUNT OF TEACHER AGREEMENT WITH THE  
RESPONSIBLE DRINKING MODEL  
OF ALCOHOL EDUCATION<sup>a</sup>

Amount Of Agreement	Teachers	
	Number	Percent
Strongly Agree	112	20
Moderately Agree	229	42
Don't Know	52	10
Moderately Disagree	87	16
Strongly Disagree	68	12
Total <sup>b</sup>	548	100 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>The Responsible Drinking Model of alcohol education has been operationally defined by Model B of the Drinking Practices and Alcohol Education Questionnaire (see Appendix A).

<sup>b</sup>Does not include two cases for which there was no information available.

<sup>c</sup>Percentages may not add up to 100 as a result of rounding procedures.

<sup>3</sup>See Tables 61 and 62 in Appendix C.

Of the four models of alcohol education, the Objective Facts Model received the greatest support. Table 30 indicates that about nine out of every ten teachers either strongly or moderately agreed with this approach. It appeared that in this sensitive area teachers were most comfortable in presenting facts which were not controversial such as the chemistry of alcohol, the number of traffic accidents, or the various types of treatment programs available to the alcoholic. It is not incongruous that the teachers responded to a later question by stating that their school board and the parents of their students would be least negative toward this approach.<sup>4</sup>

The Values Clarification Model of alcohol education was supported by 66 percent of the teachers sampled (see Table 31). Although the amount of agreement with this model was not as high as the Objective Facts Model, it was higher than the Responsible Drinking and Temperance Models. Only 17 percent of the teachers stated they could not agree with the philosophy of assisting students to explore effective ways of meeting their needs and clarifying their values.

---

<sup>4</sup>See Tables 61 and 62 in Appendix C.

TABLE 30  
AMOUNT OF TEACHER AGREEMENT WITH THE  
OBJECTIVE FACTS MODEL OF  
ALCOHOL EDUCATION<sup>a</sup>

Amount of Agreement	Teachers	
	Number	Percentage
Strongly Agree	280	51
Moderately Agree	211	39
Don't Know	26	5
Moderately Disagree	19	4
Strongly Disagree	11	2
Total <sup>b</sup>	547	100 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>The Objective Facts Model of alcohol education has been operationally defined by Model C of the Drinking Practices and Alcohol Education Questionnaire (see Appendix A).

<sup>b</sup>Does not include three cases for which there was no information available.

<sup>c</sup>Percentages may not add up to 100 as a result of rounding procedures.

TABLE 31.

AMOUNT OF TEACHER AGREEMENT WITH THE  
VALUES CLARIFICATION MODEL  
OF ALCOHOL EDUCATION<sup>a</sup>

Amount of Agreement	Teachers	
	Number	Percentage
Strongly Agree	194	35
Moderately Agree	168	31
Don't Know	90	16
Moderately Disagree	57	10
Strongly Disagree	38	7
Total <sup>b</sup>	547	100 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>The Values Clarification Model of alcohol education has been operationally defined by Model D of the Drinking Practices and Alcohol Education Questionnaire (see Appendix A).

<sup>b</sup>Does not include three cases for which there was no information available.

<sup>c</sup>Percentages may not add up to 100 as a result of rounding procedures.

In addition to allowing the teachers to state how much they philosophically agreed with each of the four Models, the Drinking Practices and Alcohol Education Questionnaire gave them the opportunity to rank the Models from their First Choice to their Fourth Choice. Table 32 reflects the results of the teachers' preferences. Forty-three percent of the respondents chose the Objective Facts Model as their first choice. About three out of ten teachers chose the Values

Clarification Model, while one out of six chose the Responsible Drinking Model and one out of ten chose the Temperance Approach. The chi-square test (Table 32) indicated that the respondents differed significantly in their preference for the four Models of alcohol education.

TABLE 32

RANK ORDER OF TEACHER PREFERENCE FOR THE FOUR MODELS OF ALCOHOL EDUCATION<sup>a</sup>

Model	Teachers' Preference	
	Number	Percentage
Objective Facts Model	214	43
Values Clarification Model	153	31
Responsible Drinking Model	78	16
Temperance Model	54	11
Total <sup>b</sup>	498	100 <sup>c</sup>

Chi-square = 128.13    df = 3    p < .001

<sup>a</sup>Teacher preference is defined as the teachers' response to the question, "If you were asked to teach alcohol education, which of the above models would be your first choice?"

<sup>b</sup>Does not include fifty-two cases for which there was no information available.

<sup>c</sup>Percentages may not add up to 100 as a result of rounding procedures.

## Teacher Drinking Practices and Views About Drinking

Presented in this section are the results of questions asked teachers about their views on drinking and about their own drinking practices. These results are organized under subsections entitled: "Teenage Drinking," "Frequency of Drinking (Any Amount)," "Frequency of Drinking (Larger Amounts)," "Reasons for Drinking," "Friends or Relatives with Drinking Problems," and "Statements About Alcoholism." A final subsection presents the frequencies and percentages of teachers who exhibit heavy drinking, moderate drinking, light drinking, infrequent drinking, and no drinking (abstinence). This typology was created through cross-tabulation of Table 38 and Table 39 according to definitions presented in Chapter I (Page 20).<sup>5</sup>

### Teenage Drinking

It might be expected that these teachers would be more conservative toward girls than boys when considering the appropriateness or inappropriateness of teenage drinking (fifteen to seventeen years old). This, however, was not

---

<sup>5</sup>Since these are relative definitions, the reader is cautioned against making generalizations about the typology. For instance, those teachers fitting into the "heavy drinking" category based on a population of teachers would not necessarily fit in a heavy drinking category based on a general population sample.



supported by the results given in Table 33 which indicate that teacher opinions about teenage male drinking and teenage female drinking were the same. Almost two out of three respondents felt that laws against teenage drinking should be more strictly enforced. Sixty-one percent of the teachers felt that teenagers should not be allowed to drink. Only 15 percent felt they should be allowed to drink with friends.

TABLE 33  
TEACHER VIEWS ON TEENAGE DRINKING

Statement About Drinking	Teacher Responses <sup>a</sup>			
	True for Male Teenagers		True for Female Teenagers	
	No.	%	No.	%
1. Teenagers (15-17 years old) should <u>not</u> be allowed to drink.	324	61	318	61
2. Teenagers (15-17 years old) should be allowed to get drunk once in a while.	62	12	59	12
3. Teenagers (15-17 years old) should be allowed to drink with friends the same age.	77	15	76	15
4. Laws against teenage drinking should be more strictly enforced.	340	65	333	65

<sup>a</sup>There were varying cases of no information for each of the Statements About Drinking: for Statements 1 thru 4 made about male teenagers, there were, respectively, 19, 23, 23, and 25 cases of no information; for Statements 1 thru 4 made about female teenagers, there were, respectively, 32, 36, 35, and 38 cases of no information.

However, for teenagers over the age of eighteen, most teachers in the sample felt they should have the right to drink. Table 34 indicates that 64 percent of the respondents felt drinking should be legal for eighteen year olds.

TABLE 34  
TEACHERS' OPINIONS ABOUT LEGALIZING DRINKING  
FOR EIGHTEEN YEAR OLDS

Statement	Teachers Answering "True"	
	Number	Percent
Drinking should be legal for eighteen year olds.	341	64

#### Views on Intoxication

Five statements about intoxication were given the teachers. Their responses are presented in Table 35. More than one out of three respondents felt that it is all right to get drunk once in a while (however, only 6 percent felt that it's all right to get drunk whenever one feels like it) and one out of four said they do enjoy getting drunk once in a while. In Table 35, 71 percent of the teachers said that they hate to see a person drunk, but of those same teachers, 57 percent said that their friends do not mind a person

becoming drunk as long as he doesn't disturb other people. Apparently these teachers viewed themselves as being less tolerant of drunkenness than were their friends.

TABLE 35  
TEACHER VIEWS ON INTOXICATION

Statement About Intoxication	Teacher Response			
	True		False	
	No.	%	No.	%
1. It's all right to get drunk whenever you feel like it.	34	6	504	94
2. It's all right to get drunk once in a while as long as it doesn't get to be a habit.	187	35	348	65
3. No matter how much I like a person, I hate to see him drunk.	382	71	159	29
4. I enjoy getting drunk once in a while.	137	26	400	74
5. Most of my friends don't mind a person getting drunk if he doesn't do things that disturb other people.	306	57	228	43

### Situational Drinking

Drinking, for the respondents, appeared to be more appropriate in some situations than others. Table 36 indicates that small parties, a married couple having dinner, or

a person at a bar with friends of the same sex, were situations in which teachers felt most free to drink. On the other hand, most teachers felt it is not appropriate to drink when playing with their small children or when they are about to drive an automobile. Very few teachers felt free to become drunk in any of the situations presented. However, almost four out of ten said it is "OK to be high" when at a bar with friends, and six out of ten felt free to have one or two drinks while having dinner with their spouses. It is noteworthy that only 2 percent of the teachers felt it is permissible to be high when about to drive and none of them felt it is all right to be drunk in that situation.

TABLE 36

THE AMOUNT WHICH TEACHERS FEEL FREE  
TO DRINK IN VARIOUS SITUATIONS

The Teacher's Drinking Situation	Amount of Drinking							
	No Drinking		One or two drinks but not enough to make one high		OK to be high but not drunk		Getting drunk is sometimes all right	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
. . . the host (hostess) of a small party or get together	72	13	286	52	178	33	11	2
. . . a father (mother) playing with his (her) small kids	331	61	201	37	12	2	2	a
. . . a husband (wife) having dinner with his wife (husband)	60	11	327	60	138	25	21	4
. . . a man (woman) out at a bar with some of his male (female) friends	51	9	260	48	205	38	30	6
. . . a man (woman) about to drive his (her) car	368	67	170	31	9	2	0	0

<sup>a</sup>Less than one percent.

As was briefly discussed in Chapter Two, several authorities attribute a portion of drinking problems to the ambivalence which people have toward consuming alcoholic beverages.<sup>6</sup> Although there is an appealing logic to their arguments, the research which directly supports this theory is minimal. Part of the difficulty appears to be a lack of an accepted definition for ambivalence toward drinking. This question and the teacher's response to it are presented in Table 37.

TABLE 37  
TEACHER AMBIVALENCE TOWARD DRINKING

Statement	Teachers Answering "True"	
	Number	Percentage
My own feelings about drinking are somewhat mixed.	193	36

Frequency of Drinking (Any Amount)

The frequency with which respondents drank any amount of alcoholic beverages is presented in Table 38. Most of the teachers (59 percent) drank between three or four times a week and two or three times a month. About 16 percent drank

---

<sup>6</sup>See Pages 48 to 50 in Chapter II.

more often than this and 14 percent drank less frequently. As a group, there were less abstainers among these teachers than had been found in general population studies. Only 11 percent of the teacher respondents stated they did not drink. This is considerably less than the 32 percent found by Cahalan<sup>7</sup> and the 37 percent reported by Harris.<sup>8</sup> It is doubtful, however, that the teaching occupation was the major determining variable. Harris suggests that the young adult, the better educated, men as a group, those living in cities or suburbs, and the more affluent are all less likely to abstain.<sup>9</sup> Each of these variables were typical of the teacher sample found in the present investigation.

#### Frequency of Drinking (Larger Amounts)

Table 39 shows the teachers' response to a question about drinking larger amounts of alcoholic beverages. Although there are numerous other variables which determine drinking effect, such as body weight, food in stomach, mood, etc., in most cases the consumption of five drinks in

---

<sup>7</sup>Don Cahalan, Ira H. Cisin, and Helen M. Crossley, American Drinking Practices (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies, 1969), p. 19.

<sup>8</sup>Louis Harris and Associates, American Attitudes Toward Alcohol and Alcoholics, a survey of public opinion prepared for the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (Study Number 2138, December, 1971), p. 2.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

a short period of time will be related to a "high" or slightly intoxicated state. Table 39 indicates that two-thirds of the teachers almost never had larger amounts of alcoholic beverages. About 9 percent did have at least five drinks more than "once in a while." Table 39 when cross-tabulated with Table 38 is used to create the Drinker Typology found on Page 136.

TABLE 38  
 FREQUENCY OF DRINKING ANY AMOUNT OF ALCOHOLIC  
 BEVERAGES AMONG TEACHERS

Frequency of Drinking (Any Amount)	Teacher Response	
	Number	Percentage
1. Three or more times a day	3	1
2. Two times a day	5	1
3. Once a day	31	6
4. Nearly every day	46	8
5. Three or four times a week	91	17
6. Once or twice a week	139	26
7. Two or three times a month	89	16
8. About once a month	39	7
9. Less than once a month, but at least once a year	40	7
10. Less than once a year	22	4
11. I used to drink, but do not now	18	3
12. I have never had any beverages containing alcohol	23	4
Total <sup>a</sup>	546	100 <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Does not include four cases for which there was no information available.

<sup>b</sup>Percentages may not add up to 100 as a result of rounding procedures.



TABLE 39

FREQUENCY OF DRINKING FIVE OR MORE DRINKS AMONG TEACHERS

Frequency of Drinking (Five or More)	Teacher Response	
	Number	Percentage
Nearly every time	1	a
More than half the time	16	3
Less than half the time	30	6
Once in a while	120	24
Almost never	335	67
Total	502	100 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Percentage less than .5 percent.

<sup>b</sup>Does not include forty-eight cases for which there was no information.

<sup>c</sup>Percentages may not add up to 100 as a result of rounding procedures.

Reasons for Drinking

The importance of studying reasons or motivation for drinking are cited by Riley, et al.<sup>10</sup> Table 40 gives reasons why teachers drink. As Riley found in his nationwide survey,<sup>11</sup> most of the respondents in the present investigation stated they drink for social reasons. Personal reasons such as "it helps me to relax" or "forget my worries" did not appear to be as important.

<sup>10</sup>John W. Riley, Jr., Charles F. Marden, and Marcia Lifshitz, "The Motivational Pattern of Drinking," Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Volume 9, Number 3, (December, 1948), pp. 353-362.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

TABLE 40  
SELECTED REASONS TEACHERS GIVE FOR DRINKING

Reason for Drinking	Importance of Reason					
	Very		Somewhat		Not at all	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. I drink because it makes social occasions more enjoyable.	59	12	268	52	186	36
2. I drink because it helps me to relax.	48	9	237	47	224	44
3. I drink because I need it when I am tense and nervous.	12	2	93	18	404	79
4. I drink because a drink helps me to forget my worries.	6	1	42	8	462	91

#### Friends or Relatives with Drinking Problems

The number and percentage of teachers who had friends or relatives with drinking problems was measured by asking the question, "Have you ever had a relative (or friend) with a serious drinking problem?" Table 41 shows that 50 percent of the teachers said they have a friend with a drinking problem and 58 percent said they have a relative with a drinking problem. These percents are somewhat higher than those found in other studies. Globetti found in surveys of members of two Mississippi communities that 17 to 28 percent had friends or relatives with

problems related to drinking.<sup>12,13,14</sup> Harris in his national survey found 37 percent of his sample have friends with problems.<sup>15</sup> This may in part be explained by the relatively young age of the teachers. Harris notes that in his survey "young people eighteen to twenty-nine and those thirty to forty-nine years of age are far more likely to know someone with a drinking problem (45 percent and 41 percent) than older people."<sup>16</sup> Eighty-two percent of the teachers in the present study fell into these two age groups.

---

<sup>12</sup>Gerald Globetti, "Attitudes Toward Education About Alcohol and Alcoholism Among Community Members in Clarksdale, Mississippi" (State College, Mississippi: Mississippi State University, 1967), p. 16.

<sup>13</sup>Gerald Globetti and Walter H. Bennett, "Attitudes Toward Alcohol Education Among Community Members in Tupelo, Mississippi" (State College, Mississippi: Mississippi State University, 1967), p. 15.

<sup>14</sup>Gerald Globetti, "Attitudes Toward Alcohol Education: A Comparative Study of Negro and White Community Members," (State College, Mississippi: Mississippi State University, August, 1967), p. 21.

<sup>15</sup>Louis Harris and Associates, American Attitudes Toward Alcohol and Alcoholics, a survey of public opinions prepared for the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (Study Number 2138, December, 1971), p. 18.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 20.

TABLE 41

TEACHERS WHO HAVE FRIENDS OR RELATIVES  
WITH SERIOUS DRINKING PROBLEMS

Person With Drinking Problem	Teachers	
	Number	Percentage
Friend with drinking problem	273	50
Relative with drinking problem	314	58

Statements About Alcoholism

The problem of who is an alcoholic or what is alcoholism was presented to the teachers in the Drinking Practices and Alcohol Education Questionnaire. As shown in Table 27, 85 percent or more of the teachers agreed that drinking more than a pint of whiskey a day makes a person an alcoholic, or that alcoholism is a mental condition, or a failure of adjustment to life's circumstances. Only a few teachers felt one is born with alcoholism. More than a fourth of the teachers felt that alcoholism is the result of moral weakness. For the most part, teachers strongly agreed with statements which link alcoholism to the individual's failure to adjust and generally rejected those statements which imply that alcoholism results from conditions outside of the individual's control.

TABLE 42

## TEACHER VIEWS ON ALCOHOLISM STATEMENTS

Statements	Teachers Responding "Yes" to Statement	
	Number	Percentage
1. A person who drinks at least a pint of whiskey a day should be considered an alcoholic.	452	85
2. Alcoholism is a mental condition or mental illness.	463	85
3. Alcoholism is a physical condition or illness of the body.	342	64
4. Alcoholism is a result of physical conditions or defects people are born with.	76	14
5. Alcoholism is a failure of adjustment to the circumstances of one's life.	462	86
6. Alcoholism is the result of social conditions outside the individual's control.	108	20
7. Alcoholism is a sign of moral weakness.	157	29

### Drinking Typology

By cross-tabulating the "Frequency of Drinking" categories of Table 38 and the "Frequency of Drinking Five or More Drinks" categories of Table 39 according to the definitions given for "Heavy, Moderate, Light, Infrequent, and No Drinking (Abstinence)," (Chapter I, Page 21), a drinking typology was developed. This typology will be used later in the cross-tabulations of teacher characteristics, drinking practices, and choices of alcohol education models. The number and percentages of teachers fitting into the various drinking categories are found in Table 43.

TABLE 43

THE CLASSIFICATION OF TEACHERS INTO FIVE DRINKER CATEGORIES

Drinker Category	Teacher	
	Number	Percentage
Heavy	87	16
Moderate	164	30
Light	192	36
Infrequent	37	7
Abstinent	63	12
Total <sup>b</sup>	541	100 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>The five drinker categories are defined in Chapter I, Page 21.

<sup>b</sup>Does not include nine cases of no information.

<sup>c</sup>Percentages may not add up to 100 as a result of rounding procedures.

Teacher Opinions on Various  
Questions About Alcohol Education

In planning alcohol education programs several basic administrative questions become important.<sup>17</sup> The Drinking Practices and Alcohol Education Questionnaire presented a number of such questions to teachers who were currently teaching a unit on alcohol education, to those who have taught it in the past, and to those who have never taught alcohol education. Occasionally, there were slight differences among the responses of these groups, but for the most part these were not significant. In Tables 44 through 51, the combined responses are presented.

As indicated by Table 44, 96 percent of the high school teachers felt that alcohol education should be included in the curriculum. The 1971 Harris nationwide survey found that 80 percent of the public endorsed high school courses on alcohol and drinking problems.<sup>18</sup> Globetti reported

---

<sup>17</sup>The investigator is aware of the possibility of expending too much effort on administrative questions and following Bacon's and Hochbaum's suggestions would caution the interested reader to focus on "what" he should be teaching before he concerns himself with the "how." See United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Alcohol Education Conference Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, March, 1966), p. 13 and p. 35.

<sup>18</sup>Louis Harris and Associates, American Attitudes Toward Alcohol and Alcoholics, a survey of public opinion prepared for the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (Study Number 2138, December, 1971), p. 98.

approximately the same percentage in his study of Clarksdale, Mississippi.<sup>19</sup> It is interesting to note that despite these teachers' awareness of crowded curricula, they appeared to support the inclusion of alcohol education somewhat more than the general public.

TABLE 44

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS WHO STATE THAT ALCOHOL EDUCATION SHOULD BE PART OF THE HIGH SCHOOL CURRICULUM

Alcohol Education Question	Teacher Response <sup>a</sup>			
	Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%
Should alcohol education be part of curriculum?	522	96	23	4

<sup>a</sup>Does not include five cases of no information.

Another indication of the high school teachers' support of alcohol education was their response to a question about teaching a unit on alcohol education. Table 45 implies that 83 percent of the respondents would not feel uncomfortable

<sup>19</sup>Gerald Globetti, "Attitudes Toward Education About Alcohol and Alcoholism Among Community Members in Clarksdale, Mississippi" (State College, Mississippi: Mississippi State University, 1967), p. 14.



teaching about alcohol. This is considerably higher than the findings of Muñoz and Parada in their study of Chilean teachers of Greater Santiago.<sup>20</sup> In this study, Muñoz found that only 28 percent said they would be willing to participate in an alcohol education program. Of course, the differences between the two findings is most likely attributable to the wording of the questions and perhaps to the cultural differences of the two groups of teachers.

TABLE 45

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS WHO ARE OR  
WOULD BE UNCOMFORTABLE ABOUT TEACHING  
A UNIT ON ALCOHOL EDUCATION

Statement	Teachers Answering "True"	
	Number	Percent
I would be uncomfortable about teaching a unit on alcohol education.	91	17

When asked which course should include a section on alcohol education, most respondents (58 percent) felt it belongs in a health course. About 17 percent felt it should

<sup>20</sup>Luis C, Muñoz and Aída Parada, "Teaching About Alcoholism in Schools," Alcohol and Alcoholism, edited by Robert E. Popham (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970), pp. 360-367.

be in some type of science course.<sup>21</sup> Table 46 shows the number and percentages of the teachers' responses.

TABLE 46

TEACHER OPINION ON WHICH COURSE SHOULD INCLUDE  
A MAJOR SECTION ON ALCOHOL EDUCATION

High School Course	Teacher Response	
	Number	Percent
Biological Science	26	6
Driver's Education	21	5
Health	258	58
Physical Education	5	1
Science - Other	50	11
Social Studies	54	12
State Requirements Course	23	5
Other (Psychology, Civics, etc.)	29	7
Total <sup>a</sup>	466	100 <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Does not include eighty-four cases of no information.

<sup>b</sup>Percentages may not add up to 100 as a result of rounding procedures.

<sup>21</sup>This is contrasted to a Mississippi study conducted in 1966 by Pomeroy and Windham, where three-quarters of the teachers favored including it in a science course. The remaining teachers favored incorporating it in Physical Education. See G. S. Pomeroy and G. O. Windham, "Attitudes of Selected Adult Groups Toward Alcohol Education" (State College, Mississippi: Mississippi State University, SO.-AN. Report Number 4, August, 1966), p. 12.

Tables 47 and 48 present data on the grade levels and the number of classroom hours which would be appropriate for teaching an alcohol education unit. Thirty-two percent of the teachers felt alcohol education should begin in the seventh grade. In the tenth grade, 63 percent felt alcohol education should be included. Although the teachers may have been biased by the fact that they teach at the high school level, most of them did not feel the elementary school is the best level to teach about alcohol. Table 48 shows that most high school teachers felt eight to twenty hours per year should be spent on alcohol education.

TABLE 47

THE GRADE LEVELS IN WHICH HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS FEEL ALCOHOL EDUCATION SHOULD BE INCLUDED

Grade Levels	Teacher Response	
	Number	Percentage
Kindergarten	2	a
First Grade	4	1
Second Grade	4	1
Third Grade	10	2
Fourth Grade	25	5
Fifth Grade	43	8
Sixth Grade	83	15
Seventh Grade	176	32
Eighth Grade	219	40
Ninth Grade	286	52
Tenth Grade	347	63
Eleventh Grade	256	47
Twelfth Grade	267	49
All Grades (K-12)	41	8

<sup>a</sup>Less than one percent.

TABLE 48

THE NUMBER OF CLASSROOM HOURS PER YEAR  
WHICH TEACHERS FEEL SHOULD BE  
SPENT ON ALCOHOL EDUCATION

Hours Per Year	Teacher Response	
	Number	Percentage
One	1	<sup>a</sup>
Two to Four	36	7
Five to Seven	84	17
Eight to Ten	141	28
Eleven to Twenty	138	27
Twenty-One to Thirty	69	14
More than Thirty Hours	41	8
Total <sup>b</sup>	510	100 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Less than one percent.

<sup>b</sup>Does not include forty cases of no information.

<sup>c</sup>Percentages may not add up to 100 as a result of rounding procedures.

A question which is often discussed, concerns the advantages and disadvantages of merging drug education and alcohol education.<sup>22</sup> Teachers were asked their opinion about this question. Table 49 indicates that almost nine out of ten felt alcohol education should be included with education about other drugs.

<sup>22</sup>Godfrey Hochbaum, "Learning and Behavior -- Alcohol Education for What?" Alcohol Education Conference Proceedings (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), p. 35.

TABLE 49

TEACHERS' OPINION ABOUT COMBINING ALCOHOL EDUCATION WITH EDUCATION ABOUT OTHER DRUGS

Statement	Teachers Answering "True"	
	Number	Percentage
Alcohol education should be combined with education about other drugs.	469	89

Some teachers seem quite concerned about not having adequate equipment or materials, especially in difficult subjects such as alcohol education. Hochbaum suggests that this concern may in part be related to improper or incomplete training.<sup>23</sup> To obtain a perspective on this aspect, teachers were asked if they were having or would have difficulty in finding good alcohol education materials. The results presented in Table 50 show that two-fifths of them were concerned about finding materials. A chi-square test of independence between the alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators revealed no true differences. One or two factors seemed to be operating. Either non-alcohol educators had

---

<sup>23</sup>Godfrey Hochbaum, "Learning and Behavior--Alcohol Education for What?" Alcohol Education Conference Proceedings (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), p. 35.

an awareness of the difficulty in obtaining alcohol education materials which was similar to those teaching the course, or more likely, there may have existed a feeling in about two-fifths of the teachers that materials of any kind are inadequate or not available. What is being measured by the question may not be the difficulty in finding alcohol education materials, but a general dissatisfaction with the quality of all materials. More research is needed in this area.

TABLE 50

DIFFICULTY OF FINDING MATERIALS ON ALCOHOL EDUCATION BY ALCOHOL EDUCATORS AND NON-ALCOHOL EDUCATORS

Statement About Materials	Teacher Response <sup>a</sup>					
	Alcohol Educators		Non-Alcohol Educators		All Educators	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
True, I have had (would have) difficulty in finding appropriate alcohol education materials.	77	38	120	41	197	40
False, I have not (would not have) difficulty in finding appropriate alcohol education materials.	128	62	171	59	299	60

Chi-square = 1.92      df = 1      p > .05

<sup>a</sup>Does not include fifty-three cases of no information.

Table 51 presents the responses to three questions regarding the value of alcohol education. About three-fourths of the teachers felt that alcohol education is of value to teenagers and just a little less felt it has an effect on later adult drinking patterns. However, when asked whether the requirement for alcohol education was an effective policy or just a symbolic gesture only 12 percent felt it was effective.

TABLE 51  
TEACHER RESPONSES TO VALUE STATEMENTS  
ABOUT ALCOHOL EDUCATION

Statement	Teacher Response <sup>a</sup>			
	True		False	
	No.	%	No.	%
1. In my experience, alcohol education has some good effects on teenage drinking.	355	74	128	26
2. In my experience, alcohol education in high school has some good effects on later adult drinking patterns.	325	71	136	29
3. State requirements for alcohol education have been more a symbolic gesture than an effective policy.	437	88	62	12

<sup>a</sup>For Statement 1, there were sixty-seven cases of no information; for Statement 2, there were eighty-nine cases of no information; and for Statement 3, there were fifty-one cases of no information.

Cross-Tabulations of Teacher Characteristics  
and Preferences For Alcohol Education Models

In this section the results of cross-tabulating teacher characteristics with their preference for alcohol education models are presented. The following variables are described: Age and Sex, Marital Status, Respondents With Children, Drinking Categories, Friends or Relatives With Drinking Problems, Views on Teenage Drinking, Causes of Alcoholism, and Religious Categories. For each of these variables sex is controlled allowing a more detailed analysis.

Age and Sex (Table 52)

Both male and female respondents most preferred the Objective Facts Model and least preferred the Temperance Model. Generally differences in preference between men and women occurred only with the Values Clarification Model (37 percent of the women supported it compared with 27 percent of the men) and with the Temperance Model (7 percent of the women supported it compared with 13 percent of the men).

The younger teachers, aged twenty-four to twenty-nine most preferred the Values Clarification Model while those in their forties gave the strongest support to the Objective Facts Model. Relative to the other age categories, the Responsible Drinking Model was supported by the young and least supported by those in their forties. For those aged



twenty-four to twenty-nine the Temperance Model was the least appealing. Although not strongly supported by any age group those respondents aged fifty or more would be the least offended if they had to use the Temperance Model. Differences among age groups of the total sample were statistically significant at the .01 level.

By controlling for sex and analyzing the various age groups it can be seen that most of the young respondents' support for the Values Clarification Model came from the young women; that middle-aged women accounted for much of the support for the Objective Facts Model; and that it was the men who accounted for the older teachers' relatively high preference for the Temperance Model (more than one out of four men aged fifty or more preferred the Temperance Model).

TABLE 52

PREFERENCE FOR ALCOHOL EDUCATION MODELS  
BY AGE AND SEX, IN PERCENT

Age and Sex	N	Temperance Model	Responsible Drinking Model	Objective Facts Model	Values Clarification Model
<u>Total Sample</u>	494	11	16	43	31
Men	302	13	16	44	27
Women	192	7	15	41	37
Age 24 - 29	109	4	21	33	42
30 - 39	185	12	17	43	28
40 - 49	119	8	11	50	30
50 +	81	19	14	44	24
		Chi-square = 25.42    df = 9    p < .01			
<u>Men</u>					
Age 24 - 29	42	5	31	36	29
30 - 39	125	13	17	43	27
40 - 49	84	7	11	48	35
50 +	51	26	14	47	14
		Chi-square = 24.40    df = 9    p < .01			
<u>Women</u>					
Age 24 - 29	67	3	15	31	51
30 - 39	60	10	17	43	30
40 - 49	35	11	11	57	20
50 +	30	7	13	40	40
		Chi-Square = 14.45    df = 9    p > .10			

### Marital Status (Table 53)

Most support for the Temperance Model came from those teachers who had never married and the least support from those teachers who were divorced or separated. Married respondents tended to choose the Responsible Drinking Model slightly more than those who were divorced and those who had never married. Both the Objective Facts and the Values Clarification Models received the most support from teachers who were divorced or separated. Married respondents were the least likely to prefer the Values Clarification Model, while least support for the Objective Facts Model came from those who had never married.

When sex was controlled it was shown that almost no women who were divorced or separated supported the Temperance Approach. One out of two, however did support the Objective Facts Model. Men who were divorced or separated preferred either the Values Clarification Approach or the Objective Facts Approach, and only a small percentage supported the Temperance or Responsible Drinking Models.

TABLE 53

PREFERENCE OF TEACHERS FOR ALCOHOL EDUCATION MODELS  
BY MARITAL STATUS AND SEX, IN PERCENT

Marital Status	N	Temperance Model	Responsible Drinking Model	Objective Facts Model	Values Clarification Model
<u>Total Sample</u> <sup>a</sup>	491	11	16	43	31
Married	371	11	17	43	29
Divorced or Separated	48	2	13	48	38
Never Married	72	14	11	40	35
<u>Men</u>					
Married	260	13	17	44	26
Divorced or Separated	24	4	4	46	46
Never Married	20	20	20	45	15
<u>Women</u>					
Married	111	5	16	41	37
Divorced or Separated	24	b	21	50	29
Never Married	52	12	7	39	42

<sup>a</sup>Does not include six people who said they were widowed.

<sup>b</sup>Too few cases to analyze.

### Respondents with Children (Table 54)

Respondents with teenage children were most comfortable using the Objective Facts Approach toward alcohol education and least likely to advocate the principles of moderate or responsible drinking. Although the differences were not great there was a slight increase in support for the Temperance Model as the teachers' children became older.<sup>24</sup> The opposite was true for the Values Clarification Model: teachers were more likely to support it when their children were young.

Analyzing differences between men with children and women with children, it was shown that more men supported the Temperance Approach than was true for women. Women with teenage children most frequently supported the Objective Facts Approach and least often preferred the Responsible Drinking Model.

---

<sup>24</sup>More in depth examination may reveal that it is the age of the teachers and not the age of the children which partially accounts for this situation.

TABLE 54

PREFERENCE OF TEACHERS FOR EACH ALCOHOL EDUCATION  
MODEL BY RESPONDENTS WITH CHILDREN  
AND SEX, IN PERCENT

Respondents With Children	N	Temperance Model	Responsible Drinking Model	Objective Facts Model	Values Clarification Model
<u>Total Sample</u>	571 <sup>a</sup>	11	16	43	31
No children	164	10	16	41	33
Children age $\leq$ 12	221	11	18	41	31
Children age 13 - 20	116	12	9	51	28
Children age 21 +	70	14	14	47	24
<u>Men</u>					
No children	63	11	21	46	22
Children age $\leq$ 12	173	12	17	41	30
Children age 13 - 20	82	15	9	46	31
Children age 21 +	44	23	14	52	11
<u>Women</u>					
No children	101	10	13	38	40
Children age $\leq$ 12	48	6	19	42	33
Children age 13 - 20	34	6	9	62	24
Children age 21 +	26	<sup>b</sup>	15	39	46

<sup>a</sup>Some respondents have children in more than one age category.

<sup>b</sup>Too few cases to analyze.

### Drinking Categories (Table 55)

As might be expected the less respondents drank the more frequently they supported the Temperance Model; and, for the most part, the more teachers drank the more likely they were to support the moderate or Responsible Drinking Model. With the exception of Heavy Drinkers, who most preferred the Values Clarification Model, all other categories of respondents most preferred the Objective Facts Approach. Differences among the five categories of drinkers were significant at the .001 level.

It appears that the strongest supporters of the Temperance Model of alcohol education were the women who abstained from drinking and the men who drank infrequently. Women who were heavy drinkers were most likely to prefer the Values Clarification Model, and least likely to use the Temperance Approach. Those teachers who drank moderately were most in favor of the Objective Facts Model and least supportive of the Temperance Approach.

TABLE 55

PREFERENCE OF TEACHERS FOR EACH ALCOHOL EDUCATION  
MODEL BY DRINKING CATEGORY AND SEX, IN PERCENT

Drinking Category	N	Temperance Model	Responsible Drinking Model	Objective Facts Model	Values Clarification Model
<u>Total Sample</u>	492	10	16	43	31
Heavy	74	3	20	37	41
Moderate	146	5	16	47	32
Light	176	10	17	44	28
Infrequent	34	18	12	38	32
Abstainer	62	29	8	40	23
	Chi-square = 41.1		df = 12	p < .001	
<u>Men</u>					
Heavy	52	4	19	40	37
Moderate	96	6	17	52	25
Light	99	14	18	43	24
Infrequent	14	36	7	21	36
Abstainer	41	27	12	39	22
	Chi-square = 26.98		df = 12	p < .01	
<u>Women</u>					
Heavy	22	a	23	27	50
Moderate	50	2	14	38	46
Light	77	5	17	44	34
Infrequent	20	5	15	50	30
Abstainer	21	33	a	43	24

<sup>a</sup>Too few cases to analyze.



Friends or Relatives With  
Drinking Problems (Tables 56 and 57)

Having a friend or a relative with a serious drinking problem did not appear to influence these teacher's preference for alcohol education models. Tables 56 and 57 indicate that in all cases differences were not significant (at the .10 level) between the respondents who have friends or relatives with serious drinking problems and those who do not.

TABLE 56

PREFERENCE OF TEACHERS FOR EACH ALCOHOL EDUCATION  
MODEL BY RESPONDENTS WHO HAVE A FRIEND WITH  
A DRINKING PROBLEM, IN PERCENT

Friend With A Drinking Problem	N	Temperance Model	Responsible Drinking Model	Objective Facts Model	Values Clarification Model
<u>Total Sample</u>	495	11	16	43	31
Have friend with drinking problem	296	10	17	42	30
Don't have friend with drinking problem	199	12	14	43	32
		Chi-square = .80	df = 3	p > .10	
<u>Men</u>					
Have friend with drinking problem	188	14	18	45	24
Don't have friend with drinking problem	116	12	15	41	32
		Chi-square = 2.40	df = 3	p > .10	
<u>Women</u>					
Have friend with drinking problem	108	5	16	38	42
Don't have friend with drinking problem	83	11	13	45	31
		Chi-square = 4.52	df = 3	p > .10	

TABLE 57

PREFERENCE OF TEACHERS FOR EACH ALGOHOL EDUCATION  
MODEL BY RESPONDENTS WHO HAVE A RELATIVE  
WITH A DRINKING PROBLEM, IN PERCENT

Relative With A Drinking Problem	N	Temperance Model	Responsible Drinking Model	Objective Facts Model	Values Clarification Model
<u>Total Sample</u>	497	11	16	43	31
Have relative with drinking problem	251	10	17	44	30
Don't have relative with drinking problem	246	12	14	42	31
		Chi-square = 1.56 df = 3		p > .10	
<u>Men</u>					
Have relative with drinking problem	161	11	17	44	28
Don't have relative with drinking problem	144	15	15	44	26
		Chi-square = 1.32 df = 3		p > .10	
<u>Women</u>					
Have relative with drinking problem	90	7	17	42	34
Don't have relative with drinking problem	102	8	13	40	39
		Chi-square = .94 df = 3		p > .10	

### Views on Teenage Drinking (Table 58)

Respondents who felt that it is permissible for teenagers (aged fifteen to seventeen) to drink were inclined to choose the Values Clarification and Objective Facts Models of alcohol education. Those who did not feel teenagers should drink were considerably more likely to support the Temperance Approach than were the respondents who felt it was permissible for teenagers to drink (14 percent to 6 percent). Differences between respondents of the total sample who felt teenage drinking was permissible and those who did not were significant at the .01 level.

Controlling for sex it was seen that almost no women (1 percent) who think teenage drinking is permissible preferred the Temperance Approach. Forty-three percent of the women who felt teenage drinking is permissible preferred the Values Clarification Model. This is somewhat higher than the percentage of men who chose the Values Clarification Approach and felt teenagers should be allowed to drink. The differences among male respondents and the differences among female respondents regarding their views on teenage drinking were significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 58

PREFERENCE OF TEACHERS FOR EACH ALCOHOL EDUCATION  
MODEL BY RESPONDENTS' VIEWS ON TEENAGE  
DRINKING, IN PERCENT

Teenage Drinking	N	Temperance Model	Responsible Drinking Model	Objective Facts Model	Values Clarification Model
<u>Total Sample</u>	484	11	15	43	31
Teenage drinking permissible	191	6	16	40	39
No teenage drinking	293	14	15	45	26
	Chi-square = 15.30		df = 3	p < .01	
<u>Men</u>					
Teenage drinking permissible	114	9	14	40	37
No teenage drinking	186	16	18	45	22
	Chi-square = 9.58		df = 3	p < .05	
<u>Women</u>					
Teenage drinking permissible	77	1	18	38	43
No teenage drinking	107	12	10	44	34
	Chi-square = 10.43		df = 3	p < .05	

Causes of Alcoholism (Table 59)

Comparing the four presented causes of alcoholism, those who felt alcoholism is the result of a moral weakness most frequently chose the Temperance Approach and least frequently chose the Values Clarification Approach. Those who felt alcoholism is attributable to social conditions frequently preferred the Values Clarification Approach and less frequently preferred the Temperance Model. Sex did not appear to differentiate the causes except that, of the men and women who chose the Temperance Model, women were less likely to attribute alcoholism to a moral cause (8 percent to 18 percent). Of the respondents who chose the Values Clarification Approach, the women were more likely to attribute alcoholism to a social cause than were male teachers (40 percent to 32 percent).

TABLE 59

PREFERENCE OF TEACHERS FOR EACH ALCOHOL EDUCATION  
MODEL BY CAUSES OF ALCOHOLISM AND SEX, IN PERCENT

Causes	N	Temperance Model	Responsible Drinking Model	Objective Facts Model	Values Clarification Model
<u>Total Sample</u>	974	11	16	43	31
Causes: Physical	315	9	15	44	33
Mental	419	11	16	43	31
Moral	142	15	18	44	23
Social	98	9	14	41	35
<u>Men</u>					
Causes: Physical	172	10	15	45	30
Mental	263	12	16	44	28
Moral	102	18	18	43	22
Social	53	9	17	42	32
<u>Women</u>					
Causes: Physical	143	7	14	42	37
Mental	156	8	15	40	37
Moral	40	8	20	45	28
Social	45	9	11	40	40

### Religious Categories (Table 60)

Generally teachers in each of the religious categories favored the Objective Facts Approach more than the other models. As might be expected the High Abstinent Protestants<sup>25</sup> approved of the Temperance Approach more than other religions. People of no religion were the least likely to approve of the Temperance Approach. The Responsible Drinking Model was most preferred by Catholics (20 percent) and least by the Low or Medium Abstinent Protestants (12 percent). Catholics frequently supported the Objective Facts Model (49 percent) while Baptists and other High Abstinent Protestants less often supported this Model. The Values Clarification Model received the most frequent approval from the people of no religion and the least frequent support from Catholics.

Both Low Abstinent Protestant women and women without a religious identification most often chose the Values Clarification Approach. This was not true for men who in every category most frequently preferred the Objective Facts Approach.

---

<sup>25</sup>The Protestant Denominations are divided into High, Medium, and Low Abstinent groups. See definitions on Pages 22 and 23.



TABLE 60

PREFERENCE OF TEACHERS FOR EACH ALCOHOL EDUCATION MODEL BY  
RELIGIOUS CATEGORY AND SEX, IN PERCENT

Religious Category	N	Temperance Model	Responsible Drinking Model	Objective Facts Model	Values Clarification Model
<u>Total Sample</u> <sup>a</sup>	420	11	16	43	30
Catholic	113	11	20	49	20
Low Abst. Prot. <sup>b</sup>	75	12	12	40	36
Medium Abst. Prot.	49	10	12	47	31
High Abst. Prot.	98	19	16	39	26
None	85	4	18	40	39
<u>Men</u>					
Catholic	79	13	20	49	18
Low Abst. Prot.	45	18	18	38	27
Medium Abst. Prot.	28	11	11	50	29
High Abst. Prot.	58	19	19	38	24
None	46	7	15	46	33
<u>Women</u>					
Catholic	34	6	21	47	27
Low Abst. Prot.	30	3	3	43	50
Medium Abst. Prot.	21	10	14	43	33
High Abst. Prot.	40	20	13	40	28
None	39	c	21	33	46

<sup>a</sup>Jews and other religions are excluded because of too few cases for analysis.

<sup>b</sup>Protestants have been divided into Low Abstinence, Medium Abstinence, and High Abstinence categories as developed by Seifert, 1972. See definition for Religious Categories, Page 21.

<sup>c</sup>Too few cases to analyze.

### Summary of Chapter IV

In the six sections of this Chapter, the findings of the survey of California teacher drinking practices and views toward alcohol education have been presented. Section one gives the basic social-demographic characteristics of the high school teacher sample such as age, sex, and marital status. The second section of this Chapter gives the results of testing seven hypotheses developed as the onset of the present investigation. The hypotheses were designed to predict differences on selected variables between alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators and between male educators and female educators.

In the third section, the support respondents gave for the four models of alcohol education (Temperance, Responsible Drinking, Objective Facts, and Values Clarification) are presented. The drinking patterns and views about drinking of the 550 teachers surveyed are given in section four. Included in this section are areas such as: views on teenage drinking, should drinking be legalized for eighteen year olds? frequency of drinking, reasons for drinking, and other related topics. Section five reports the findings on a number of pedagogical questions about alcohol education (what, when, and how should it be taught?).

The results of cross-tabulating teacher characteristics, including their drinking patterns, with their

preference for the four models of alcohol education are presented in section six. In this section nine variables are cross-tabulated with model preference.

A summary of the investigation and findings is presented in the next Chapter. Conclusions and recommendations for further study are suggested.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The present investigation was concerned with teachers' views toward alcohol education and the relation of these views to their drinking patterns and their social-demographic variables. The study was based on a survey of 475 randomly selected high school teachers and 121 teachers who were currently teaching alcohol education. The total sample of 596 teachers was from twenty-three high schools located in six school districts of three geographical areas (Central Valley, San Francisco Bay, and Southern California). Of those sampled 550 or 92 percent completed the self-administered Drinking Practices and Alcohol Education Questionnaire between April and June of 1972.

As part of this investigation, three areas of literature were reviewed. First, studies on general attitudes and opinions about alcohol education in the schools were discussed. For the most part, the samples of these studies were drawn from the general adult population or from localized teacher populations in Mississippi and Chile. Second, four perspectives of alcohol education were described: 1) The Temperance Approach, 2) The Objective Facts Approach, 3) The Responsible Drinking Approach, and

4) The Values Clarification Approach. An operational definition of each of these approaches was presented. Third, two important national studies which correlated drinking practices with social-demographic variables were reviewed. These studies provided a background for describing the variable of teacher drinking practices. As noted in Chapter II, the studies and expository writings reviewed provided direction and support for the present investigation.

In Chapter IV selected social-demographic characteristics of the teacher sample were presented. These included:

Age and Sex. The respondents as a group were relatively young: Forty-four percent were under age thirty-five and only 17 percent were aged fifty or above. There were considerably more male teachers than female teachers (62 percent to 38 percent).

Marital Status. Seventy-four percent of the teachers were married. A higher percentage of males than females were married (84 percent to 58 percent). Females more than males were likely to have never married (27 percent to 8 percent).

Teachers With Children. About a third of the respondents did not have children. Of those that did, most of them had children under age twelve.

Racial Group. The teachers sampled were primarily of the White race. Only about 8 percent of the respondents were from minority groups.

Religious Affiliation. Protestants comprised 53 percent of the sample, while Catholics made up 22 percent and those with no religion, 17 percent.

Ancestry. About 86 percent of the respondents' ancestors came from some place in Europe or the United States.

Length of Teaching Career. Teaching careers of the respondents ranged from one year to forty-five years, with the largest percentage teaching between five and seven years.

Teaching Area. The major teaching areas most represented were physical education, language arts, and history.

Number of Alcohol Educators. Of the respondents, 207 were current or past alcohol educators (38 percent) and 343 were non-alcohol educators (62 percent).

## Summary of Principal Findings

### 1. Testing the Hypotheses

#### Preference for the Values Clarification Model.

The first alternative hypothesis stated that alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators will differ in their choice of the Values Clarification Model of alcohol education. The results indicated that there were no significant differences between these groups of educators.

Educators' Drinking Patterns. A second alternative hypothesis stated that alcohol educators will differ from non-alcohol educators regarding the frequency of having Low-None Drinking Patterns. It was found that alcohol educators had Low-None Drinking Patterns less frequently than did non-alcohol educators (48 percent to 57 percent). The differences were significant and, therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. However, when sex was controlled, differences between alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators were not significant.

Reasons for Drinking. A third alternative hypothesis stated that alcohol educators will less often find it somewhat or very important to drink when tense, to relax, or to forget worries than will non-alcohol educators. It was found that for each of these reasons the differences were not statistically significant.

Friend or Relative With a Serious Drinking Problem. The fourth alternative hypothesis stated that alcohol educators will more often than non-alcohol educators have knowledge of a friend or a relative who has a serious drinking problem. The results indicated that the differences between these two groups of educators were not significant.

Views on What Causes Alcoholism. The fifth alternative hypothesis stated that alcohol educators will differ from non-alcohol educators regarding how often they attribute alcoholism to moral weakness. The findings indicated that the differences were not significant.

Male and Female Patterns of Drinking. The sixth alternative hypothesis stated that female teachers will have Low-None Drinking Patterns significantly more frequently than will male teachers. The results indicate that 63 percent of the female teachers compared to 48 percent of the male teachers had Low-None Drinking Patterns. These differences were statistically significant and, consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Male and Female Views on Teenage Drinking. The final alternative hypothesis stated that male and female teachers will differ on how conservative they are about teenage drinking. The findings indicated that the differences were not significant.



## 2. Teacher Support for Various Models of Alcohol Education

Operational definitions of the Temperance Model, the Responsible Drinking Model, the Objective Facts Model, and the Values Clarification Model were presented to the respondents. They were asked to read each paragraph for its whole or broad philosophy and then choose whether they: "strongly agree with it," "moderately agree with it," "don't know if agree or disagree with it," "moderately disagree with it," or "strongly disagree with it."

It was found that 89 percent of the teachers agreed with the Objective Facts Model (either strongly or moderately); 66 percent agreed with the Values Clarification Model; 62 percent agreed with the Responsible Drinking Model; and 40 percent agreed with the Temperance Model. In addition to allowing the teachers to state how much they philosophically agreed with each of the four Models, they were given the opportunity to choose which Model they would prefer to use if they were asked to teach alcohol education. The results indicated that there were significant differences regarding the respondents' preference for the four models. Most respondents preferred the Objective Facts Model while the Temperance Model was least preferred.

### 3. Teacher Drinking Practices and Views About Alcohol

Teenage Drinking. A majority of the respondents felt teenagers (fifteen to seventeen years old) should not be allowed to drink and that laws against teenage drinking should be more strictly enforced. However, regarding teenagers aged eighteen or more, most respondents (64 percent) felt they should have the right to drink.

Views on Intoxication. About a third of the teachers felt it is all right to get drunk once in a while as long as it does not get to be a habit. A number of them said they personally enjoy getting drunk once in a while. Seventy-one percent of the respondents said they do not like to see a person drunk but only 43 percent indicated that their friends mind a person's getting drunk.

Situational Drinking. Situations in which respondents said they feel most free to drink were small parties, a married couple having dinner, or a person at a bar with friends of the same sex. Most respondents felt it was not appropriate to drink when playing with their children or when they were about to drive a car.

Ambivalence Toward Drinking. A number of respondents indicated that they were not sure whether drinking is good or bad. Thirty-six percent said their "feelings about drinking are somewhat mixed." Ullman and Chafetz would probably suggest that this finding supports their general

contention that Americans tend to be ambivalent about their drinking.<sup>1</sup>

Frequency of Drinking. It was found that more of the respondents in this sample drank alcoholic beverages (89 percent) than has been reported elsewhere.<sup>2</sup> According to Harris this should be expected since the present sample has a large majority of males, is relatively young, resides in urban areas, is highly educated, and is generally affluent.

Drinking Typology. In applying the drinking typology developed for this investigation it was found that most of the respondents were moderate or light drinkers.

Reasons for Drinking. Most respondents stated that they drank to make social occasions more enjoyable (64 percent). Personal reasons such as "I need it when I am tense and nervous" or "to forget worries" were not as important (20 percent and 9 percent, respectively).

Friends or Relatives with Drinking Problems. Fifty percent of the teachers said they have a friend with a drinking problem and 58 percent said they have a relative with such a problem. These findings are considerably higher than those reported by Harris and by

---

<sup>1</sup>Supra, pp. 48-50.

<sup>2</sup>Supra, p. 64.

Globetti.<sup>3</sup> The differences may be related to the relatively young sample of the present study since Cahalan has reported that younger age groups (twenty-one to thirty-nine) tend to have more alcohol related problems (and thus are more likely to have friends and relatives with drinking problems).<sup>4</sup>

Statements About Alcoholism. Eighty-five percent or more of the teachers felt that drinking more than a pint of whiskey a day makes a person an alcoholic or that alcoholism is a mental condition or a failure of adjustment to life's circumstances. Only a few respondents felt one is born with alcoholism (14 percent), while 29 percent felt it is a sign of moral weakness.

#### 4. Teacher Opinions on Various Questions About Alcohol Education

Ten pedagogical questions related to alcohol education were asked. The teachers' responses to these questions were as follows:

1. Ninety-six percent felt alcohol education should be part of the high school curriculum.
2. About 17 percent would have felt uncomfortable teaching a unit on alcohol education.

---

<sup>3</sup>Supra, pp. 132 and 133.

<sup>4</sup>Donald Cahalan, Problem Drinkers (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1970), p. 119.

3. A majority (58 percent) felt alcohol education should be part of a health course.
4. Generally a large percentage of the teachers favored teaching alcohol education in the seventh to twelfth grades. The highest percentage felt it should be provided in the tenth grade.
5. A majority (55 percent) felt eight to twenty hours per year should be spent on alcohol education.
6. Almost nine out of ten respondents (89 percent) felt alcohol education should be combined with education about other drugs.
7. Forty percent of the respondents were having or would have had difficulty in finding appropriate alcohol education materials.
8. Seventy-four percent felt that alcohol education has some good effects on teenage drinking.
9. Seventy-one percent felt that alcohol education in high school has some good effects on later adult drinking patterns.
10. Eighty-eight percent of the teachers agreed that State requirements for alcohol education have been more a symbolic gesture than an effective policy.

5. Cross-Tabulations of Teacher Characteristics and Preferences for Alcohol Education Models

Age and Sex. Statistically significant differences were found among the different age groups of the sample. Generally both male and female respondents preferred the Objective Facts Model and least preferred the Temperance Model. Noticeable differences between men's and women's preferences occurred with the Values Clarification Model (37 percent of the women supported it compared to 27 percent of the men). A relatively large percentage of young teachers (especially females) in the sample preferred the Values Clarification Approach.

Marital Status. Men who were divorced or separated and women who never married tended to support the Values Clarification Model. The respondents as a group who were divorced or separated seldom supported the Temperance Model.

Respondents With Children. Female respondents with teenage children most frequently supported the Objective Facts Model, while women with grown children preferred the Values Clarification Model. Male respondents with grown children rarely chose the Values Clarification Model; however, they often supported the Objective Facts Model.

Drinking Categories. Overall differences among the five categories of drinking were significant. Specifically, however, the drinking practices of the teachers did not appear to affect their preference for the Objective Facts Model, but did affect their preference for other models. The less respondents drank, the more often they supported the Temperance Model and; generally the more they drank, the more often they supported the Responsible Drinking Model and the Values Clarification Model.

The infrequent male drinkers seemed to prefer the Temperance Model more often than the infrequent women drinkers (36 percent to 5 percent). The same infrequent male drinkers supported the Objective Facts Model more often than the infrequent female drinkers (21 percent to 5 percent). The Values Clarification Approach received proportionately more favor from Heavy or Moderate female drinkers (50 and 46 percent) than from Heavy or Moderate male drinkers (37 percent and 25 percent).

Friends or Relatives With Drinking Problem.

Since differences were not significant it does not appear that having a friend or a relative with a serious drinking problem influenced the teachers' preferences for the alcohol education models.

Views on Teenage Drinking. Overall differences between respondents who felt teenage drinking was permissible

and those who did not were significant. The respondents who felt teenage drinking was permissible were more inclined to choose the Values Clarification Approach than were those who did not want teenagers (age fifteen to seventeen) to drink. As might be expected those who favored no teenage drinking more frequently chose the Temperance Model than those who felt teenage drinking was permissible.

Causes of Alcoholism. Comparing the four presented causes of alcoholism (physical, mental, moral, and social) those who felt alcoholism was due to a moral weakness were most likely to choose the Temperance Model and least likely to prefer the Values Clarification Model. The Values Clarification Model received the most frequent support from those who felt alcoholism was attributable to social causes.

Religious Categories. The Temperance Model was frequently supported by High Abstinent Protestants and less often supported by those with no religion. Of all the religious categories, those with no religion supported the Values Clarification Approach the most frequently and those of the Catholic religion the least. Fifty percent of the female, Low Abstinent Protestants supported the Values Clarification Model compared to only 27 percent of the males from the same religions.



## Conclusions and Discussion

1. Alcohol educators did not differ significantly from non-alcohol educators regarding their: (1) frequency of preference for the Values Clarification Model of alcohol education, (2) their reasons for drinking, (3) their knowledge of friends or relatives with drinking problems, and (4) the frequency with which they attribute alcoholism to moral weakness. Each of these variables relates to the teachers' knowledge, attitudes, or practices regarding alcohol and alcohol education. The lack of significant differences regarding these four variables may reveal practices about the selection and training processes of alcohol educators in this sample. Although the findings cannot be considered conclusive, there is no indication that teacher attitudes and drinking practices were considered in their selection to teach about alcohol. Nor do the results suggest that the alcohol educators were receiving any training that differentiated them from other educators.

2. Alcohol educators in this sample differed significantly from non-alcohol educators regarding the frequency of having Low-None Drinking Patterns. Alcohol educators less often had Low-None Drinking Patterns than did non-alcohol educators. This conclusion strongly suggests that alcohol educators are not chosen to teach about alcohol because of their abstinence orientation. One explanation

for their higher frequency of Heavy-Moderate Drinking Patterns is that they are reacting to the "holier than thou temperance attitude" that was once associated with teaching about alcohol. This would be analagous to the "preacher's kid" who had to prove that he was not a saint.

3. Male high school teachers of this sample drank alcoholic beverages (any amount and large amounts) significantly more often than female teachers. This conclusion implies that it is still more acceptable for men to drink alcoholic beverages than women. Cahalan suggests, however, that this situation may be fading since the proportion of women who drink is increasing especially among the upper social levels and in the areas of high urbanization.<sup>5</sup>

4. There were no significant differences between male and female teachers concerning their views on teenage drinking (age fifteen to seventeen years). It appears that the variables of earning approximately the same salaries, attaining a similar education level, and living in the same urban areas negate or equalize any sex differences with regard to how conservative or liberal one is about teenage drinking. The reference to Cahalan's finding cited in conclusion (3) seems to also have relevance here.

---

<sup>5</sup>Don Cahalan, Ira H. Cisin, and Helen M. Crossley, American Drinking Practices (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies, 1969), p. 199.

5. As might be expected from the social-demographic characteristics of the high school teachers in this sample, most of them were moderate or light drinkers and only a small percentage were abstainers. Harris has reported that the young adult, the better educated, men as a group, those living in cities or suburbs, and the more affluent are all less likely to abstain. Since each of these variables characterize the respondents of the present investigation, the small percentage of abstainers appears to be partially explained.

6. Teachers in this sample generally did not feel younger teenagers (aged fifteen to seventeen) should be allowed to drink alcoholic beverages, but a majority felt that drinking should be legalized for youth aged eighteen or older. Most of the teachers apparently do not agree with the philosophy of inculcating children with a little sherry as a method of preventing alcoholism.<sup>6</sup> However, the recent granting of adult status to eighteen year olds seems to bring the California law of "no drinking until twenty-one years of age" into question. The teachers in this sample may be seeing the incongruity of holding eighteen year olds accountable as adults for some activities but not others.

---

<sup>6</sup>For a brief discussion of this philosophy, the reader is referred to Morris Chafetz, International Journal Of Psychiatry (1970-71), pp. 336-337.

7. High school teachers in this sample most often preferred to use the Objective Facts Approach toward alcohol education and least preferred the Temperance Approach. At least two factors appear to be influencing the teachers' preference for the Objective Facts Approach over the Values Clarification, Responsible Drinking, and Temperance Approaches toward alcohol education. First, presenting "factual" information whether it's relevant or not, is "safer" than taking a stand "for" or "against" something (exemplified by the Responsible Drinking and Temperance Approaches, respectively). High school teachers appear to be continuously caught in the predicament of having to please numerous parents, school board members, and principals many of whom have divergent views. When faced with the curriculum problem of "what do you do in an alcohol education class?" it is professionally less hazardous to present facts such as the "chemistry of alcohol" than it would be to facilitate an open-ended discussion about drinking.

Second, high school teachers for the most part have been trained to teach in the cognitive area. Only recently with the writings of Glasser, Rogers, and Brameld does it appear that public school teachers have been encouraged to deal in the affective domain. It is suggested that as teachers learn to integrate both domains of teaching,

their students will be better able to handle life by making decisions which are enhancing to themselves and society. The gaining of this ability seems to be especially relevant to those teachers who have been asked to play a part in preventing one of societies greatest problems, alcoholism.

8. Alcohol education efforts in the high school were felt to be of value and were supported by most of the teachers. They generally felt that alcohol education and drug education should be combined. Since the respondents had different opinions as to what the preferable model of alcohol education was, it can be assumed that when a high proportion said they think alcohol education is of value they were referring to "their own" definition or model of alcohol education. It might be expected that if one of the models of alcohol education had been specified, there would have been less general support. This may be one of the reasons why there is an apparent tendency not to describe in detail what happens in alcohol education classes.

#### Recommendations for Further Study

The survey presented in this thesis was designed to explore California high school teachers' drinking practices and opinions about various aspects of alcohol education. It was felt that the study had developed knowledge in several previously unexplored areas of this complex field.

However, as new information was gained, several questions and problems beyond the scope of the present investigation became apparent. These are discussed below as recommendations for further research.

#### People Who Teach Alcohol Education

Very few differences were noted between alcohol educators and non-alcohol educators. It is suggested that survey research be designed to explore the selection processes for alcohol educators. Are "Spanish teachers with reduced class enrollments" as likely to be candidates for teaching about alcohol as are trained health educators? What draws teachers into this field? What kind of and how much training do alcohol educators receive? What do measures of individual personality reveal about those in this field? How do principals and students rate alcohol educators? Answers to these and other related questions would be helpful in understanding the lack of differences between alcohol and non-alcohol educators on variables such as reasons for drinking and views on causes of alcoholism.

### Other School Personnel and Community Leaders

Although the teacher is perhaps the most important person in the presentation of alcohol education, other school personnel and community leaders have vital inputs into what is done in the classroom. For this reason it is suggested that surveys similar to the present one be conducted with school board members, city and county officials, and principals and other school personnel. From these surveys a profile of local leaders' views about alcohol education in the schools could be developed. Such profiles would be helpful in determining which type of alcohol education approach would most likely be successful in that community.

### Cultural, Economic, and Environmental Influences

The largely White, urban population of teachers studied in this investigation provided little enlightenment on cultural, economic, and environmental influences on views about alcohol education. It is suggested that effects of these variables need to be explored prior to developing alcohol education programs in other than White, middle class schools.

## Prediction and Explanation

The outcomes of various cross-tabulations of independent and dependent variables presented in this study suggest that more extensive statistical analysis would be helpful in predicting and explaining teacher views on alcohol education. Techniques for multivariate analysis presented by Hyman<sup>7</sup> are recommended for this more in depth analysis.

## Evaluative Studies

The present investigation has shown that alcohol educators differ on their preferences for the four models of alcohol education. As a highly important next step, it would seem necessary to determine if these differing views are associated with different student behaviors. Several questions need to be answered such as: "What are the drinking practices of students six months, one year, two years, and three years after they have been taught a temperance approach (or one of the other approaches) toward alcohol education?" "How do these findings compare to the follow-up results on other alcohol education approaches?" If education about alcohol is presented in schools to help

---

<sup>7</sup>Herbert Hyman, Survey Design and Analysis (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, Publishers, 1955).



prevent alcohol abuse, then it appears that seeking answers to these questions would be paramount for program development and the efficient utilization of limited resources.

APPENDIX A

THE DRINKING PRACTICES AND ALCOHOL  
EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE

DRINKING PRACTICES AND ALCOHOL EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS: Please answer the questions as frankly as you can. We are interested in your answers, so please don't talk about the questions with anyone else until you have finished. Use either pencil or pen to complete the questionnaire.

Please answer all the questions. Unless other instructions are given, check only one answer box for each question or part of a question.

1. For how many school years have you taught? (INCLUDE THIS YEAR) \_\_\_\_\_ (7-8)  
Years

2. What is your major teaching area now? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE SUCH AS SCIENCE, MUSIC, ETC.) \_\_\_\_\_ What is your minor teaching area? \_\_\_\_\_ (11-12)

3. Have you ever taught a course that included an identifiable section on alcohol education?  Yes 1  No IF YES, as part of what course? (CHECK AS MANY AS APPLY)

- |      |   |      |  |
|------|---|------|--|
| (14) | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Science | (18) | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> History                     |
| (15) | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Civics             | (19) | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> Physical Education          |
| (16) | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Driver Training    | (20) | 8 <input type="checkbox"/> "State Requirements Course" |
| (17) | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Health Education   | (21) | 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Other, which? _____         |

When did you last do this? (CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BOX)

- |      |  |   |
|------|--|---|
| (22) | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Current school year | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 10-12 years ago        |
|      | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 1-3 years ago       | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 13-15 years ago        |
|      | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4-6 years ago       | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> More than 15 years ago |
|      | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 7-9 years ago       |   |

QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR OWN PERSONAL VIEWS

4. A recent study indicates that on the average about 75 to 85 percent of high school students experiment with drinking alcoholic beverages. Keeping this in mind, please answer the following questions for both male teenagers (PLACE ANSWERS ON THE LEFT) and female teenagers (PLACE ANSWERS ON THE RIGHT).

MALE  
TEENAGERS

FEMALE  
TEENAGERS

TRUE FALSE

TRUE FALSE

- |    |                            |                            |   |                            |                            |      |
|----|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|------|
| 37 | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | A. Teenagers (15-17 years old) should <u>not</u> be allowed to drink.   | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | (28) |
| 41 | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | B. Teenagers (15-17 years old) should be allowed to get drunk once in a while.                                | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | (29) |
| 51 | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | C. Teenagers (15-17 years old) should be allowed to drink with friends the same age.                          | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | (30) |
| 61 | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | D. Teenagers (15-17 years old) should be allowed to experiment with drinking only under parental supervision. | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | (31) |
| 71 | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | E. Laws against teenage drinking should be more strictly enforced.  | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | (32) |

5. Questions about your views on drinking and intoxication . . .

TRUE FALSE

- |    |                            |                            |  |
|----|----------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| 37 | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | A. It's all right to get drunk whenever you feel like it.  |
| 41 | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | B. It's all right to get drunk once in a while as long as it doesn't get to be a habit.                    |
| 51 | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | C. No matter how much I like a person, I hate to see him drunk.  |
| 61 | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | D. I enjoy getting drunk once in a while.  |
| 71 | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | E. Most of my friends don't mind a person getting drunk if he doesn't do things that disturb other people. |

6. Listed below are some situations that people sometimes find themselves in. For each one check how much a person in that situation should feel free to drink. Please try to answer as if you yourself were in that position.

	<i>No drinking</i>	<i>1 or 2 drinks but not enough to make one high</i>	<i>OK to be high, but not drunk</i>	<i>Getting drunk is sometimes all right</i>	
	↓	↓	↓	↓	
	How much drinking is all right for <u>you</u> as . . .				
A. . . . the host (hostess) of a small party or get together	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	(38)
B. . . . a father (mother) playing with his (her) small kids	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	(39)
C. . . . a husband (wife) having dinner with his wife (husband)	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	(40)
D. . . . a man (woman) out at a bar with some of his male (female) friends	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	(41)
E. . . . a man (woman) about to drive his (her) car	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	(42)

7. How often do you have any beverages containing alcohol (wine, beer, whiskey, liquor, gin, rum, etc.)?

- 01  Three or more times a day
- 02  Two times a day
- 03  Once a day
- 04  Nearly every day
- 05  Three or four times a week
- 06  Once or twice a week
- 07  Two or three times a month
- 08  About once a month
- 09  Less than once a month, but at least once a year
- 10  Less than once a year
- 20  I used to drink, but do not now
- 30  I have never had any beverages containing alcohol (SKIP TO QUESTION 10)

8. How important would you say that each of the following is to you as a reason for drinking? (IF YOU USED TO DRINK BUT DO NOT NOW, ANSWER THE QUESTIONS AS YOU WOULD HAVE WHEN YOU DID DRINK)

CHECK ONE FOR EACH REASON

	<u>Very Important</u>	<u>Somewhat Important</u>	<u>Not at all Important</u>	
A. I drink because it makes social occasions more enjoyable.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	(45)
B. I drink because it helps me to relax.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	(46)
C. I drink because I need it when I am tense and nervous.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	(47)
D. I drink because a drink helps me to forget my worries.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	(48)

9. When you drink, how often do you have five or more drinks?

- 1  Nearly every time
- 2  More than half the time
- 3  Less than half the time
- 4  Once in a while
- 5  Almost never

10. Have you ever had a relative with a serious drinking problem? 1  Yes 2  No

11. Have you ever had a friend with a serious drinking problem? 1  Yes 2  No

12. People feel differently about the problems that may arise from the use of alcohol. What do you think about each of the following? (FOR EACH QUESTION CHECK THE ANSWER WHICH SEEMS THE BETTER CHOICE)

A. A person who drinks at least a pint of whiskey a day should be considered an alcoholic.

1  Yes

2  No

B. Alcoholism is a mental condition or mental illness.

1  Yes

2  No

C. Alcoholism is a physical condition or illness of the body.

1  Yes

2  No

D. Alcoholism is a result of physical conditions or defects people are born with.

1  Yes

2  No

E. Alcoholism is a failure of adjustment to the circumstances of one's life.

1  Yes

2  No

F. Alcoholism is the result of social conditions outside the individual's control.

1  Yes

2  No

G. Alcoholism is a sign of moral weakness.

1  Yes

2  No

VIEWS ABOUT ALCOHOL EDUCATION

13. INSTRUCTIONS: Four paragraphs about Alcohol Education are presented below. Each paragraph represents a different approach to alcohol education. Read each paragraph for its whole or broad philosophy and then answer the questions which follow.

Model "A"

Alcohol Education consists of imparting information about the nature of ethyl alcohol, its uses outside the body, the scientific facts of its effects upon the mind and upon the body tissues when inside the body, and the desirability of enjoying the fullness of life without alcohol's deceptive influences. Alcohol Education should create in the pupils a desire to prevent effects from drink and to help change prevailing sentiment as to the use of ethyl alcohol as a beverage. The first effect of a drink is deceptive, the temptations to drink are many, and alcohol is habit forming. Therefore, the attitude to "refuse the first drink" and "to stop now while you can" should be developed. Experience today shows that many of our most talented people are hurt, others suffer severely, while many are completely ruined by the use of alcohol. These people were deceived, as children will be if they are not taught the facts about alcohol in school.

A. Regarding this model:

- (7) 1  I strongly agree with it.  
2  I moderately agree with it.  
3  I don't know if I agree or disagree with it.  
4  I moderately disagree with it.  
5  I strongly disagree with it.

Model "B"

Alcohol Education should provide theoretical information about alcohol and its use with emphasis on the benefits as well as the disadvantages of alcohol. Since 70 percent of the students do drink or will drink, they should be told how to drink responsibly. They should be taught how different the response will be when a drink is sipped slowly rather than gulped; how different the response will be when drink is consumed with food and while sitting in a relaxed atmosphere, in contrast to drinking without food and standing in tense circumstances; how the use of alcohol provides meaningful experience when partaking with another, while a drink alone is as uncommunicative as talking to oneself; and how intoxication is sickness and not strength. An undesirable

(Continued)



characteristic of American drinking patterns is the social pressure to drink or to drink more. This should be reduced with complete social acceptance of the 30 percent of the population who choose to abstain or who drink very little.

B. Regarding this model:

- (8) 1  I strongly agree with it.  
2  I moderately agree with it.  
3  I don't know if I agree or disagree with it.  
4  I moderately disagree with it.  
5  I strongly disagree with it.

Model "C"

The goal of alcohol education is to provide factual information, without judgment, on several topics related to the use and abuse of alcoholic beverages. Presentations should include materials on the nature of alcoholic beverages, such as their chemistry and production; consumption rates and drinking patterns of various cultures; and metabolism of alcohol in the body. In addition, information regarding both the "positive" and "negative" effects of alcoholic beverages should be provided. Differentiations should be made among social drinking, problem drinking, and alcoholism. Common problems associated with misuse of alcoholic beverages, such as traffic accidents, body damage, and economic losses should be presented. Special emphasis should be given to the disease concept of alcoholism. Identification is made of the current treatment programs for the various aspects of alcoholism, including Alcoholics Anonymous, outpatient and inpatient programs, and recovery houses.

C. Regarding this model:

- (9) 1  I strongly agree with it.  
2  I moderately agree with it.  
3  I don't know if I agree or disagree with it.  
4  I moderately disagree with it.  
5  I strongly disagree with it.

Model "D"

Alcohol Education should provide a small amount of cognitive information on the nature of alcohol and its effects. Emphasis, however, is not on information, but on a joining of information with the student's feeling and experiences. Each student is seen as a person who has values, needs, and emotions which play an important part in his behavior. An attempt is made through open-ended discussions (inquiry type teaching) to provide the student with value alternatives to analyze and explore for himself. This value education suggests providing the student with abilities, skills, and strategies for conducting value analysis in their own lives. To reduce the misuse of

(Continued)

alcoholic beverages, the educator must understand the needs of the student and assist him to develop coping behaviors which are not self-destructive. This development of constructive coping behavior is a joint effort of the students and the educator.

D. Regarding this model:

- (10) 1  I strongly agree with it.  
2  I moderately agree with it.  
3  I don't know if I agree or disagree with it.  
4  I moderately disagree with it.  
5  I strongly disagree with it.

14. Below are a few more questions about the models. Please answer as best you can.

A. If you were asked to teach alcohol education, which of the above models would be your first choice? Second? Third? Fourth?

- (11) 1st choice: Model \_\_\_\_\_
- (12) 2nd choice: Model \_\_\_\_\_
- (13) 3rd choice: Model \_\_\_\_\_
- (14) 4th choice: Model \_\_\_\_\_

(ENTER MODEL LETTERS  
"A", "B", "C", OR "D")

B. What would be the order of preference of your Department Head? Your Principal? If you have absolutely no idea, check the box below.

Your Department Head's

- (15) 1st choice: Model \_\_\_\_\_
- (16) 2nd choice: Model \_\_\_\_\_
- (17) 3rd choice: Model \_\_\_\_\_
- (18) 4th choice: Model \_\_\_\_\_

I have no idea

Your Principal's

- (19) 1st choice: Model \_\_\_\_\_
- (20) 2nd choice: Model \_\_\_\_\_
- (21) 3rd choice: Model \_\_\_\_\_
- (22) 4th choice: Model \_\_\_\_\_

I have no idea

C. Check the model(s) below which you think the school board would not support. If you think the school board would support all models, check the box to the right.

- (23) 2  Model "A"
- (24) 3  Model "B"
- (25) 4  Model "C"
- (26) 5  Model "D"

(27) 1  Would support all models

D. Check the model(s) that you think the parents of the students would not support. If you think the parents would support all models, check the box to the right.

- (28) 2  Model "A"
- (29) 3  Model "B"
- (30) 4  Model "C"
- (31) 5  Model "D"

(32) 1  Would support all models

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS CONCERN YOUR GENERAL VIEWS ABOUT ALCOHOL EDUCATION

15. Should alcohol education be included in the high school curriculum?

- (33) 1  Yes (ANSWER PART A ONLY)
- 2  No (ANSWER PART B ONLY)

**PART A** This section should be filled out by those who checked "Yes" above.

A. Alcohol education should be: (CHECK ONE)

- (34) 1  A major part of one course.
- 2  A small part of several courses.
- 3  A major part of one course and a minor part of several other courses.

B. If you were to select one course which would include a major section on alcohol education, which would it be? \_\_\_\_\_ (35-36)

C. Of grades K-12, which ones should include alcohol education? \_\_\_\_\_ (37-38)

D. How many actual classroom hours should be spent on alcohol education during the school year? (Total number for the whole year.)

- (39) 1  1 hour
- 2  2-4 hours
- 3  5-7 hours
- 4  8-10 hours
- 5  11-20 hours
- 6  21-30 hours
- 7  More than 30 hours

**PART B** Please check the reason(s) below which led you to say "No" on the question, "Should alcohol education be included in the high school curriculum?" (CHECK MORE THAN ONE IF APPROPRIATE)

I said "No" because:

- (40) 1  Alcohol education is a family responsibility.
- (41) 2  Alcohol education should be presented at an earlier level (e.g., elementary school).
- (42) 3  The curriculum is already too full.
- (43) 4  Other. (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

16. Here are some True/False questions about alcohol education.

A. In my experience, alcohol education has some good effects on teenage drinking.

- (44) 1  True  
2  False

B. In my experience, alcohol education in high school has some good effects on later adult drinking patterns.

- (45) 1  True  
2  False

C. Drinking should be legal for 18 year olds.

- (46) 1  True  
2  False

D. State requirements for alcohol education have been more a symbolic gesture than an effective policy.

- (47) 1  True  
2  False

E. I have had (would have) difficulty finding appropriate materials for an alcohol education course.

- (48) 1  True  
2  False

F. Alcohol education should be combined with education about other drugs.

- (49) 1  True  
2  False

G. My own feelings about drinking are somewhat mixed.

- (50) 1  True  
2  False

H. I would be (I am) uncomfortable about teaching a unit on alcohol education.

- (51) 1  True  
2  False

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

17. What is your sex? 1  Male 2  Female (52)

18. What year were you born? 19\_\_ (53~54) (55) \_\_\_\_\_

19. What is your marital status? 1  Married 3  Divorced or separated  
(56) 2  Widowed 4  Never married

20. Do you have children? (CHECK AS MANY AS APPLY)

(57) 1  No (58) Yes, I have 2  children 12 or under  
(59) 3  children 13 to 20  
(60) 4  children 21 or over

21. What is your ethnic group?

(61) 1  White 4  Oriental  
2  Mexican/American 5  Indian  
3  Black 6  Other, which? \_\_\_\_\_

22. What is your religion?

(62) 1  Catholic 4  Other, which? \_\_\_\_\_  
2  Jewish 5  None  
3  Protestant, which denomination? \_\_\_\_\_ (63) \_\_\_\_\_

23. Where was your father born?

(64) 1  U.S.  Other, which? \_\_\_\_\_

24. Where was your mother born?

(65) 1  U.S.  Other, which? \_\_\_\_\_

25. What country did most of your ancestors come from? \_\_\_\_\_

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION. THE NEXT PAGE HAS BEEN PROVIDED FOR THOSE WHO  
WOULD LIKE TO COMMENT ON ALCOHOL EDUCATION.

(66) \_\_\_\_\_  
(67~79:1)  
(80:2)

COMMENTS ON ALCOHOL EDUCATION

**APPENDIX B**

**SAMPLE LETTERS**



## DEPARTMENT OF REHABILITATION

STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

Spring, 1972

Dear Educator:

We are requesting your cooperation in filling out this questionnaire about opinions on drinking, drinking practices, and alcohol education. Some of the questions asked may be inappropriate for some people and others may seem quite personal. They are, however, important questions if we are to make advances in developing sound programs of Alcohol Education. It is for these reasons that we ask your cooperation.

The study in which you are about to participate is being carried out by the Alcohol Education Project of the State Department of Rehabilitation. Four hundred and fifty high school teachers from the Greater Sacramento, Santa Clara, and San Diego areas will be completing questionnaires. Many of you have never been or will never be involved in an alcohol education program. Nevertheless, we want to know your views and opinions, since it is our intention to study a sample of all high school teachers. If you have any questions concerning this survey or your part in it, please feel free to phone the Project Coordinator. His phone number is included below for your convenience.

We would like to assure you that we are not concerned with the answers of any individual, but with the answers of all individuals grouped together. We want this questionnaire to be completely anonymous: There is no need to put your name on it. We would, however, like to know those educators who have helped us. To do this we have given you a postcard to send us after you have turned in your completed questionnaire.

We appreciate your cooperation and have made arrangements for you to receive a copy of the "Project Report" which is scheduled to be completed before the school year ends.

Thank you for your participation and help.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Paul D. Wyatt".

Paul D. Wyatt  
Coordinator  
Alcohol Education Project  
(916) 445-7882

DEPARTMENT OF REHABILITATION

1000 STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814

## TWO-WEEK FOLLOW-UP LETTER

It concerns me that as of yet I have not received a postcard from you telling me that you filled out the Alcohol Education Questionnaire. Your honest views and opinions are needed since on July 1, 1972, we will begin planning alcohol education workshops, curriculum aids, and consultation programs for school personnel. If we know how you as a teacher feel about alcohol education, we will be able to make these programs more effective and meaningful.

I certainly appreciate your cooperation, especially during this busy time of the school year. For your convenience, I have attached another questionnaire and return envelope addressed to

Sincerely yours,

Paul D. Wyatt  
Coordinator  
Alcohol Education Project

PDW:ca

Attachment

APPENDIX C

TABLES 61 AND 62

TABLE 61

ALCOHOL EDUCATION MODELS WHICH THE  
TEACHERS PERCEIVE THE SCHOOL  
BOARDS NOT SUPPORTING

Model	Number Not Supporting	Percent Not Supporting
Temperance	108	19.6
Responsible Drinking	127	23.1
Objective Facts	56	10.2
Values Clarification	124	22.5

TABLE 62

ALCOHOL EDUCATION MODELS WHICH THE  
TEACHERS PERCEIVE THE STUDENTS'  
PARENTS NOT SUPPORTING

Model	Number Not Supporting	Percent Not Supporting
Temperance	94	17.1
Responsible Drinking	135	24.5
Objective Facts	38	6.9
Values Clarification	125	22.7

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

### A. Journals and Yearbooks

Bacon, Seldon D. "The Classic Temperance Movement of the USA: Impact Today in Attitudes, Action and Research," British Journal of Addiction, Volume LXII, 7-11.

Bales, Robert F. "Cultural Differences in Rates of Alcoholism," Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Volume 6 (March, 1946), 480-499.

Brameld, Theodore. "A Cross Cutting Approach to the Curriculum, The Moving Wheel," Phi Delta Kappa, 51:346-348, March, 1970.

Chafetz, Morris E. "The Prevention of Alcoholism," International Journal of Psychiatry, Volume 9 (1970-71), 329-398.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Alcoholism Prevention and Reality," Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Volume 28, Number 2 (June, 1967), 345-348.

Edwards, Griffith. "A Doubtful Prognosis," International Journal of Psychiatry, Volume 9 (1970-71), 354-358.

Glad, D. D. "Attitudes and Experiences of American-Jewish and American-Irish Male Youth as Related to Differences in Adult Rates of Inebriety," Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Volume 8 (December, 1947), 406-472.

Mendelson, Jack H. "Another Doubtful Prognosis," International Journal of Psychiatry, Volume 9, (1970-71), 368-371.

Miller, Lebern N. "Evaluating Teaching Personality Before Student Teaching Begins," Journal of Educational Research, 56:382-384.

Mulford, H. A. and Miller, N. E. "Drinking in Iowa II," Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 21:26-39, 1960.

- Peck, Robert F. and Richeck, Herbert. "Teacher Edition for Mental Health: A Review of Recent Studies," Mental Health and Teacher Education, Forty-Sixth Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, Inc., 1967.
- Riley, John W., Jr.; Marden, Charles F.; and Lifshitz, Marcia. "The Motivational Pattern of Drinking," Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Volume 9, Number 3 (December, 1948), 353-362.
- Robinson, Robert R. "The Prospect of Adequate Education About Alcohol and Alcoholism," Journal of Alcohol Education, Volume 14, Number 2 (Winter, 1969).
- Russell, Robert D. "Education About Alcohol for Real American Youth," Journal of Alcohol Education, Volume 14, Number 3 (Spring, 1966), 18.
- Sears, Pauline S. and Hilgard, Ernest R. "The Teacher's Role in the Motivation of the Learner," Theories of Learning and Motivation, Sixty-Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Ullman, Albert D. "Sociocultural Backgrounds of Alcoholism," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science Understanding Alcoholism, Volume 315 (January, 1958), 48-54.
- Unterberger, Hilma and Di Cicco, Lena. "Alcohol Education Re-Evaluated," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary Schools, Volume 52, Number 326 (March, 1968).
- Verden, Paul. "The Concept of Ambivalence with Reference to Alcohol Use and Misuse in American Culture," International Journal of Social Psychiatry, Volume 14, Number 4 (Autumn, 1968), 252-259.

## 2. Learned Societies and Governmental Publications

- California Education Code, Article 5, Chapter 3 of Division 7 (Commencing with Section 9751). The Drug Education Act of 1971.
- Dimas, George D. Alcohol Education in Oregon Schools: A Topic Outline and Resource Unit for Teachers. Portland: Alcohol and Drug Section, Mental Health Division, Board of Control, 1968.

- Dinas, George D. Alcohol Education in Schools. Portland: Alcohol and Drug Section, Mental Health Division, Board of Control, 1967.
- Glenn, Vernon L. "The School's Contribution to Mental Health," Discussion Papers. Volume II, Number 9, Arkansas State Rehabilitation Research and Training Center, Fayetteville, Arkansas University, Fayetteville.
- Globetti, Gerald. "Attitudes Toward Alcohol Education: A Comparative Study of Negro and White Community Members." State College, Mississippi: Mississippi State University, August, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Attitudes Toward Education About Alcohol and Alcoholism Among Community Members in Clarksdale, Mississippi." State College, Mississippi: Mississippi State University, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Bennett, Walter H. "Attitudes Toward Alcohol Education Among Community Members in Tupelo, Mississippi." State College, Mississippi: Mississippi State University, August, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_ ; Pomeroy, Grace S.; and Bennett, Walter. "Attitudes Toward Alcohol Education." State College, Mississippi: Mississippi State University, Sociology and Anthropology Report Number 14, August, 1969.
- Health: An Instructional Guide for Senior High School. Los Angeles: Los Angeles City Schools, Division of Instructional Services, Publication Number SC-617, 1966.
- Hochbaum, Godfrey. "Learning and Behavior--Alcohol Education for What?" Alcohol Education Conference Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1966.
- Maddox, George L. "Alcohol Education: Clues for Research," Alcohol Education Conference Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1966.
- Pomeroy, Grace S. and Windham, Gerald O. Attitudes of Selected Adult Groups Toward Alcohol Education. State College, Mississippi: Mississippi State University, Sociology and Anthropology Report Number 4, August, 1966.



- Pomeroy, Grace S. and Windham, Gerald O. The Mississippi Story. State College, Mississippi: Mississippi State University, Administrative Report Number 1, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, July, 1968.
- San Francisco Unified School District. A Preliminary Guide to Health and Family Life Education: Grades K-12. San Francisco: San Francisco Unified School District, 1968.
- Reagan, Ronald. State of California Governor's Program Budget for 1972-73. Sacramento: State Printing Office, 1972.
- Russell, Robert D. "Teacher Education," Alcohol Education Conference Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.
- Sands, Doris. "The College Teacher," Alcohol Education Conference Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.
- State of California, Human Relations Agency. California State Plan for Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation. Sacramento: State Printing Office, 1972.
- Todd, Frances. "The Teacher," Alcohol Education Conference Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.
- U. S. Congress. Senate. Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970. Public Law 91-616, 91st Congress, S. 3835.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Alcohol Education Conference Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, March, 1966.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. First Special Report to the U. S. Government on Alcohol and Health. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.
- Welfare and Institutions Code. Chapter 8. McAteer Alcoholism Act (1969).

World Health Organization. Expert Committee On Mental Health, Alcoholism Subcommittee. Second Report. World Health Organization Technical Report Series, Number 48, August, 1952.

### 3. Published Materials

Allen, Helen M. Some Hints for Public School Teachers: Vital Reasons for Teaching the Effects of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Narcotics in the Classroom. Evanston, Illinois: The Signal Press.

Arbuckle, Dugald S. Pupil Personnel Services in American Schools. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1962.

Arkin, Herbert and Colton, Raymond R. Tables for Statisticians. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1950.

Arnspiger, V. Clyde; Rucker, W. Ray; and Preas, Mary E. Personality in Social Process. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, Inc., 1969.

\_\_\_\_\_; Brill, James A.; and Rucker, W. Ray. Values to Learn (Teacher's Edition)--The Human Values Series. Austin, Texas: Steck-Vaughn Company, 1967).

Brayer, Herbert O. and Cleary, Zeller W. Values in the Family: A Workshop Guide for Parents. San Diego: Pennant Press, 1972.

Cahalan, Don; Cisin, Ira H.; and Crossley, Helen M. American Drinking Practices. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers Center of Alcohol Studies, 1969.

\_\_\_\_\_. Problem Drinkers: A National Survey. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970.

Chafetz, Morris E. Liquor: The Servant of Man. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1965.

\_\_\_\_\_ and Demone, Harold W. Alcoholism and Society. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.

\_\_\_\_\_; Blane, Howard T.; and Hill, Marjorie. Frontiers of Alcoholism. New York: Science House, 1970.

Cross, Jay N. Guide to the Community Control of Alcoholism. New York: American Public Health Association, Inc., 1968.

Dahlström, W. G. and Welsh, G. S. An MMPI Handbook. Minneapolis, Minnesota: The University of Minnesota Press, 1960.

Downing, Lester N. Guidance and Counseling Services: An Introduction. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1968.

The Drug Abuse Survey Project. Dealing With Drug Abuse: A Report to the Ford Foundation. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972.

Ferrier, W. Kenneth. "Alcohol Education in the Public School Curriculum," Alcohol Education for Classroom and Community. Edited by Raymond G. McCarthy. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1964.

Funk and Wagnalls. Funk and Wagnalls Standard College Dictionary. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Publishing Company, Inc., 1968.

Glasser, William. Schools Without Failure. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Inc., 1969.

Gusfield, Joseph L. "Status Conflicts and the Changing Ideologies of the American Temperance Movement," Culture and Drinking Patterns. Edited by David J. Pittman and Charles R. Snyder. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.

Hamlin, Howard E. Alcohol Talks to Youth. Evanston; Illinois: School and College Service, 1969.

Harris, Louis and Associates. American Attitudes Toward Alcohol and Alcoholics. A survey of public opinion prepared for the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (Study Number 2138). December, 1971.

Hyman, Herbert. Survey Design and Analysis. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, Publishers, 1955.

Jessor, Richard; Graves, Theodore D.; Hanson, Robert C.; and Jessor, Shirley L. Society, Personality, and Deviant Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1968.

Johnston, Edgar G.; Peters, Mildred; and Evraiff, William. The Role of the Teacher in Guidance. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1959.

- Keller, Mark and Seeley, John R. The Alcohol Language. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 1958.
- Kelly, Norbert L. Alcohol Education for Classroom and Community. Edited by Raymond G. McCarthy. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1964.
- Krech, David; Crutchfield, Richard; and Ballachey, Egerton. Individual in Society. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962.
- Lasswell, Harold Dwight. Power and Personality. New York: W. W. Norton Company, Inc., 1948.
- McCarthy, Raymond G. Facts About Alcohol. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (ed). Alcohol Education for Classroom and Community. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.
- Muñoz, Luis C. and Parada, Aída. "Teaching About Alcoholism in Schools," Alcohol and Alcoholism. Edited by Robert F. Popham. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.
- Palmer, Bertha Rachel. A Syllabus in Alcohol Education. Evanston, Illinois: The Signal Press, 1962.
- Patri, Angelo. Why Hurt Yourself? Evanston, Illinois: The Signal Press.
- Peters, Herman J. and Shertzer, Bruce. Guidance: Program Development and Management. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969.
- Plaut, Thomas F. A. Alcohol Problems: A Report to the Nation by the Cooperative Commission on the Study of Alcoholism. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Raths, Louis E.; Harmin, Merrill; and Simon, Sidney B. Values and Teaching: Working With Values in the Classroom. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1966.
- Rogers, Carl. Carl Rogers on Encounter Groups. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc., 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Freedom to Learn. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1969.

Rucker, W. Ray; Arnspiger, V. Clyde; and Brodbeck, Arthur J. Human Values in Education. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Publishing Company, Inc., 1969.

Runyan, Richard P. and Haber, Audrey. Fundamentals of Behavioral Statistics. Menlo Park, California: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1967.

Seliger, Robert V. and Shupe, Lloyd M. Alcohol at the Wheel. Evanston, Illinois: School and College Service, 1967.

Todd, Frances. Teaching About Alcohol. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1964.

Wilkinson, Rupert. The Prevention of Drinking Problems. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.

#### 4. Unpublished Materials

Brayer, Herbert O. "Valuing Approach to Drug Abuse Prevention Education." Santa Ana, California: Center for Drug Education, Orange County Department of Education. (Mimeographed.)

Brubaker, Mary. Estimated Number of Alcoholics in California. Memorandum Number FSS 72-2-12. Sacramento: State Department of Rehabilitation, 1972. (Mimeographed.)

Chafetz, Morris E. "Problems of Reaching Youth." Speech presented at the Session on Alcohol and the Adolescent, 14th Annual American Medical Association Session on School Health, Hilton Hotel, San Francisco, California, June 18, 1972. (Mimeographed.)

Drug Education Task Force. Evaluation of the California Drug Education Training Program, 1970-71. Sacramento: California State Department of Education. (Mimeographed.)

Hollingshead, A. B. Two Factor Index of Social Position. New Haven, 1957. (Mimeographed.)

Seifert, Anne M. "Religious Affiliation and Belief in the Epidemiology of Problem Drinking." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1972.