

# A Study into Certain Aspects of Drug Education Programmes in Malaysian Schools

---

National Drug Research Centre  
in collaboration with  
the School of Educational Studies  
Universiti Sains Malaysia  
Minden, Pulau Pinang.

kas 9

---

This study was funded by the United Nations for Drug Abuse Control.

A STUDY INTO CERTAIN  
ASPECTS OF DRUG EDUCATION PROGRAMMES  
IN MALAYSIAN SCHOOLS

by

Dr. Peter Choo Piang Fong  
Profesor Madya (Dr.) Maznah Ismail  
Profesor Madya (Dr.) V. Navaratnam  
in collaboration with  
Profesor Madya (Dr.) Tunku Ismail Md. Jewa  
Azizah Ahmad  
Abdul Khalid Abdul Karim

National Drug Research Centre  
in collaboration with  
the School of Educational Studies  
Universiti Sains Malaysia  
Minden, Pulau Pinang.

April, 1983

---

This study was funded by the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse  
Control.

© Pusat Penyelidikan Dadah Kebangsaan Universiti Sains Malaysia 1983. All right reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the author.

CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgement	
A. Ringkasan Kajian	
1. Introduction .....	1
2. Methodology .....	5
2.1 Sample .....	5
2.2 Development of Questionnaire .....	6
2.3 Administration .....	7
2.4 Method of Analysis .....	7
3. Results .....	9
4. Printed Materials .....	10
4.1 Posters .....	10
4.2 Pamphlets .....	14
5. Films/Slides .....	20
5.1 List of Films Shown .....	22
6. Exhibitions and Talks .....	24
6.1 Exhibitions .....	24
6.2 Talks .....	27
7. Seminars/Workshops .....	30
8. Drug Education Programmes in Schools .....	35
8.1 Curriculum .....	35
8.2 Other Programmes/Comments .....	36
9. Suspected Cases of Drug Abusers in Schools .....	38
10. Summary and Conclusions .....	39
11. List of References .....	44
12. List of Appendices .....	45

ISBN - 967 - 9979 - 07 - 5

Printed in Pulau Pinang by Sinaran Bros. Sdn. Bhd.  
Published by the National Drug Research Centre,  
Universiti Sains Malaysia.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The research team wishes to thank the following persons.

1. Datuk Musa Hitam, Deputy Prime Minister and Chairman, Anti-Dadah Committee, National Security Council, for his interest and support.
2. Datuk (Dr.) Sulaiman Daud, Minister of Education for his continued support and interest.
3. Datuk Musa bin Mohamad, Vice-Chancellor, Universiti Sains Malaysia for his advice and interest.
4. Prof. (Dr.) G. di Gennaro, Executive Director, United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control for his constant support.
5. Tan Sri Datuk Murad b. Mohd. Noor, Director-General and Datuk Abdul Rahman Arshad, Deputy Director-General, for their advice and facilitating the execution of the study.
6. The Deputy Vice-Chancellors, Universiti Sains Malaysia for their interest and support.
7. The staff of the Division of Counselling Services, Ministry of Education, particularly Mr. Abdul Latiff b. Mohd. Ali for their constant assistance and understanding.
8. The technical and secretarial staff of the National Drug Research Centre for their assistance during the study and in the preparation of the report.
9. The headmasters and teachers of the participating schools for their collaboration and supportive co-operation.
10. The academic staff of the School of Educational Studies, Universiti Sains Malaysia, particularly Dr. Ghazali Othman, Ahmad Khamis, Fatimah Ali, Zurida Ismail, Kim Phaik Lah and Khatijah Khalid.

## RINGKASAN KAJIAN

1 Kajian penilaian yang dijalankan ini bertujuan melaporkan hasil tinjauan ke atas beberapa sekolah menengah mengenai jenis-jenis rancangan atau kegiatan yang terdapat di sekolah-sekolah menengah tentang sejauhmana dari perhitungan pihak sekolah rancangan-rancangan ini berkesan.

Rancangan penyelidikan ini merupakan bahagian pertama yang diatur mengenai pencegahan penyalahgunaan dadah melalui pendidikan.

Kajian ini merupakan usaha-kerjasama di antara Pusat Pengajian Ilmu Pendidikan dan Pusat Penyelidikan Dadah Kebangsaan, Universiti Sains Malaysia. Bahagian Pertama akan menilai rancangan-rancangan pencegahan dadah yang sedia ada di sekolah-sekolah menengah.

Pada Bahagian Kedua, hasil kajian-kajian daripada Bahagian Pertama ini akan dimajukan serta diuji rancangan-rancangan baru tentang kekesanannya bagi pelajar-pelajar sekolah menengah; dari segi pendekatan-pendekatan yang boleh digunakan, penggubalan program-program pencegahan yang sesuai dan psikologikal profail pelajar-pelajar sekolah.

Jelaslah bahawa kajian yang dilaporkan ini hanyalah sebahagian saja daripada rancangan penyelidikan yang menyeluruh.

## Kaedah Tinjauan

Sebanyak 250 buah sekolah menengah di Pulau Pinang, Perak, Perlis dan Kedah terlibat dalam kajian ini.

Pada pemilihan sekolah-sekolah menengah dan kawasan utara Semenanjung, ini adalah berdasarkan pendapat bahawa murid-murid pada peringkat menengahlah akan lebih mudah terpengaruh; kawasan utara ini berdekatan dengan sempadan Malayria-Thai di mana penyeludupan dadah berlaku dengan giatnya.

#### Sampel

Di antara 276 buah sekolah yang di 4 buah negeri tersebut, yang menerima Soalselidik, 250 buah (96.8%) telah menjawab dan menghantar balik maklumat yang dikehendaki.

Pengkelasan sekolah-sekolah ke dalam gred-gred adalah mengikut pengkelasan yang ditentukan oleh Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia. Klasifikasi sekolah-sekolah juga dibuat mengikut kawasan di mana sekolah-sekolah tersebut berada; iaitu yang terlibat dengan kegiatan dadah. Data-data ini dianalisisakan melalui komputer; ada terdapat beberapa soalan yang sengaja dibuat 'open-ended' yang mana jawapannya dimasukkan dalam bahagian-bahagian laporan ini.

#### Prosedur

Soalselidik yang mengandungi 32 soalan dihantar ke tiap-tiap sekolah. Kajian rintis dijalankan bagi menentukan kesesuaian soalan-soalan yang digunakan bagi mendapatkan maklumat berikut:

- i. Jenis bahan bercetak dan bukan bercetak mengenai pendidikan pencegahan dadah yang terdapat di sekolah-sekolah tersebut.

- ii. Pameran-pameran dan ceramah-ceramah yang dihadiri oleh murid-murid.
- iii. Seminar dan bengkel yang dihadiri oleh guru-guru atau gurubesar-gurubesar.
- iv. Matapelajaran yang pada pendapat guru mengandungi unsur-unsur pendidikan pencegahan dadah.
- v. Rancangan-rancangan atau kegiatan-kegiatan lain yang dijalankan di sekolah.
- vi. Maklumat-maklumat bilangan murid-murid yang dikesan sebagai penagih semenjak 1970.

Soalselidik ini adalah dalam Bahasa Malaysia.

#### Administrasi

Soalselidik dihantar dengan pos disertai surat penerangan mengenai tujuan penyelidikan ini. Sekolah-sekolah diberi nombor-nombor kod sahaja; dan gurubesar-gurubdsar diminta menjawab soalan-soalan yang dikemukakan.

#### Hasil

1. Bahan-bahan bercetak dan bukan bercetak yang diterima oleh sekolah-sekolah

- i) Bahan-bahan Bercetak

Jenis-jenis bahan bercetak yang kerap kali terdapat di sekolah-sekolah adalah poster dan risalah-risalah.

Poster

Sebagai yang ternyata dalam Jadual 2, kebanyakan sekolah mempunyai antara 1 hingga 5 jenis poster dan sekolah-sekolah gred A, B dan C mempunyai lebih dari 10 jenis. Sementara itu terdapat 14.6% dari sekolah-sekolah dalam sampel ini yang tidak mempunyai apa-apa jenis poster.

Jadual 2

Taburan Peratus Sekolah-Sekolah Yang Menerima Poster-Poster

Gred Sekolah (N=248)	Bilangan Jenis Poster					Jumlah
	1-2	3-5	6-10	10+	Tidak Ada	
	%	%	%	%	%	%
A = 87	15.3+ (43.7)*	10.1 (28.7)	3.2 (9.2)	1.6 (4.6)	4.9 (13.8)	100
B = 105	17.2 (40.9)	14.1 (33.3)	4.0 (11.4)	1.2 (2.9)	4.9 (11.4)	100
C = 38	6.9 (44.7)	4.0 (26.3)	0.4 (2.6)	0.4 (2.6)	3.6 (23.7)	100
D = 10	2.0 (50.0)	1.6 (40.0)	-	-	0.4 (10.0)	100
T = 8	2.0 (62.5)	0.4 (12.5)	-	-	0.8 (25.0)	100
Jumlah	43.5	30.2	8.5	3.2	14.6	

+ Peratus tanpa kurungan berdasarkan seluruh sampel.

\* Peratus dalam kurungan berdasarkan jumlah bagi tiap-tiap jenis sekolah. (Tanda yang sama, iaitu + dan \* diguna dalam Jadual-Jadual lain).

T = Tidak dapat diberi gred.

Sebahagian besar poster-poster ini didapati dari Persatuan Mencegah Salahguna Dadah Malaysia (PEMADAM) dan sekolah-sekolah sendiri. Badan-badan lain seperti Jabatan Penerangan, Pusat-Pusat Pemulihan Dadah serta juga kelab-kelab Rotery dan Lion ada juga mengeluarkan poster-poster.

Sekolah-sekolah juga diminta memberi pendapat sama ada secara umum, ramai murid-murid yang telah melihat poster-poster yang dipamerkan. Seperti yang ternyata dalam Jadual 3, 86.0% sekolah-sekolah menyatakan bahawa ramai juga murid-murid yang telah melihat poster-poster ini. Sementara itu 2.8% sekolah telah menyuarakan bahawa tidak seorang murid yang tertarik kepada poster-poster yang dipamerkan.

Jadual 3

Taburan Peratus Sekolah Mengenai Minat Murid Terhadap Poster-Poster

Bilangan Murid	Taburan Sekolah
	%
Ramai	34.6
Agak ramai	51.4
Tidak ramai	11.2
Tidak langsung	2.8
	100

Walaupun sebahagian besar sekolah-sekolah menyatakan bahawa ramai murid-murid tertarik kepada poster-poster yang dipamerkan, hanya 52.0% dari sekolah-sekolah ini yang berpendapat bahawa kebanyakan poster-poster adalah berkesan menyampai maklumat yang bertujuan untuk mencegah penggunaan dadah di kalangan murid-murid sekolah. Sementara itu 21.0% lagi menyuarakan bahawa kebanyakan poster-poster yang diterima adalah tidak begitu berkesan.

#### Risalah

Sekolah-sekolah juga mendapat berbagai risalah seperti yang ternyata dalam Jadual 4. Sebanyak 68.0% sekolah-sekolah biasa menerima 1-5 jenis risalah-risalah dan sekolah-sekolah gred A dan B biasa menerima lebih dari 10 jenis bahan ini. Dalam pada itu 25.5% dari sekolah-sekolah dalam sampel ini tidak biasa menerima apa-apa risalah. Ini termasuk sekolah-sekolah semua gred.

Jadual 4

Taburan Peratus Sekolah-sekolah Yang Menerima Risalah-Risalah

Gred Sekolah (N=247)	Bilangan Jenis Risalah					Jumlah
	1-2	3-5	6.10	10+	Tidak Ada	
	%	%	%	%	%	%
A = 86	15.4+ (44.2)*	7.7 (22.1)	1.6 (4.7)	0.8 (2.3)	9.3 (26.7)	100
B = 106	21.9 (50.9)	10.1 (23.6)	0.8 (1.9)	2.0 (4.7)	8.1 (18.9)	100
C = 38	5.3 (34.2)	3.6 (23.7)	1.6 (10.5)	-	4.9 (31.6)	100
D = 9	1.2 (33.3)	0.8 (22.2)	-	-	1.6 (44.4)	100
T = 8	0.8 (25.0)	0.8 (25.0)	-	-	1.6 (50.0)	100
Jumlah	44.5	23.1	4.0	2.8	25.5	

T = Tidak dapat diberi gred. (+ dan \* Rujuk Jadual 2).

Sekolah-sekolah juga mengatakan bahawa kebanyakan risalah-risalah yang diterima adalah dikeluarkan oleh PEMADAM. Badan-badan lain seperti Kementerian Pelajaran, Jabatan-Jabatan Pelajaran, Jabatan-Jabatan Pendrangan dan Kebajikan, Persatuan Pengguna-Pengguna Pulau Pinang dan Kelab Rotery dan Lion juga ada menghantar risalah-risalah ke sekolah-sekolah. Akhir sekali sebilangan kecil sekolah-sekolah telah berusaha mengeluarkan risalah-risalah sendiri.

Berhubung dengan soal mengenai kumpulan sasaran risalah-risalah ini, 37% sekolah menyatakan bahawa kandungan kebanyakan risalah-risalah yang terdapat di Sekolah adalah untuk guru, sementara 63% menyatakan bahawa kebanyakan risalah-risalah adalah untuk pembacaan murid-murid. Selanjutnya sekolah-sekolah juga menyatakan bahawa berbanding dengan peratus murid-murid (41.6%), peratus guru yang mungkin tidak berpeluang membaca risalah-risalah ini adalah 61.1%.

ii) Bahan-bahan Bukan Bercetak

Sekolah-sekolah juga ditanya mengenai bahan-bahan bukan bercetak yang biasa digunakan di sekolah. Jawapan kepada soalan ini menunjukkan bahawa bahan-bahan bukan bercetak yang kerap kali digunakan di sekolah-sekolah ialah filem atau slaid. Seperti yang terlihat dalam Jadual 5, peratus sekolah-sekolah yang biasa menayang filem atau slaid mengenai pencegahan penggunaan dadah adalah amat kecil sekali (10.6%). Sebilangan besar dari sekolah-sekolah (89.4%) tidak pernah menggunakan bahan-bahan ini dalam masa 5 tahun yang lepas.

Jadual 5

Taburan Peratus Sekolah-sekolah Yang Menayang Filem

Gred Sekolah (N=245)	Bilangan Tayangan					Jumlah
	1-2	3-5	6-10	10+	Tidak Pernah	
	%	%	%	%	%	%
A = 84	3.7+ (10.7)*	0.4 (1.2)	-	0.4 (1.2)	29.8 (86.9)	100
B = 105	4.1 (9.5)	-	0.4 (1.0)	-	38.4 (89.5)	100
C = 38	0.4 (2.6)	0.4 (2.6)	-	-	14.7 (94.7)	100
D = 10	0.8 (20.0)	-	-	-	3.3 (80.0)	100
T = 8	-	-	-	-	3.3 (100.0)	100
Jumlah	9.0	0.8	0.4	0.4	89.4	

T = Tidak dapat diberi gred. (+ dan \* Rujuk Jadual 2)

Di antara sebilangan kecil sekolah-sekolah yang pernah menayang filem, kebanyakan biasa menayang antara sekali hingga dua kali walaupun ada beberapa sekolah gred A dan gred B yang biasa menayang lebih dari 5 kali. Antara filem-filem yang ditayang di sekolah ialah:

- i. Drug Abuses
- ii. The Drug Bug
- iii. The Narcotic File

- iv. Smoking
- v. Alcoholism
- vi. The Switch Blade
- vii. Anti Drug Abuse
- viii. Three Experiences
- ix. Poisonous Honey

Selanjutnya sekolah-sekolah juga diminta nyatakan berapa kali murid-murid sekolah-sekolah ini berpeluang menonton tayangan filem yang dianjurkan oleh sekolah-sekolah lain atau badan-badan lain disepanjang 5 tahun yang lalu. 90.8% dari sekolah-sekolah menyatakan bahawa murid-muridnya tidak pernah berpeluang berbuat demikian. Di antara sebab-sebab yang diberi oleh sekolah mengenai hal ini ialah sekolah-sekolah tidak tahu bahawa sekolah-sekolah lain ada menayang filem mengenai pencegahan penggunaan dadah atau sekolah-sekolah lain itu terlalu jauh bagi murid-murid untuk pergi menonton filem.

Di antara peratus kecil sekolah-sekolah yang biasa menghantar murid-muridnya untuk menonton filem di sekolah lain, sekolah gred A dan gred B merupakan sekolah yang kerap memberi peluang ini kepada murid-muridnya sekurang-kurangnya antara sekali hingga dua kali; dan filem-filem yang ditonton di sekolah-sekolah lain ialah:

- i. Drug Abuse
- ii. Dangers of Smoking
- iii. Penagih Dadah

- iv. Sports and Drugs
- v. Anti Drug Abuse

2. Pameran-pameran dan Ceramah yang dihadiri oleh Murid-Murid Sekolah

Seperti yang terlihat dalam Jadual 6, 60.0% sekolah-sekolah dalam sampel kajian ini melaporkan bahawa di sepanjang 5 tahun yang lalu, murid-muridnya berpeluang menghadiri pameran-pameran yang mempunyai unsur-unsur pendidikan pencegahan dadah.

JADUAL 6

Taburan Peratus Sekolah-Sekolah Melaporkan Kehadiran Murid-Murid di Pameran Pencegahan Salahguna Dadah

Gred Sekolah (N=245)	Bilangan Kehadiran Murid-Murid di Pameran					Jumlah (%)
	1-2 (%)	3-5 (%)	6-10 (%)	10+ (%)	Tidak Pernah (%)	
A = 84	15.9+ (46.4)*	6.1 (17.9)	0.8 (2.4)	0.4 (1.2)	11.0 (32.1)	100
B = 105	20.4 (47.6)	5.3 (12.4)	0.8 (1.9)	0.4 (1.0)	15.9 (37.1)	100
C = 38	5.7 (36.8)	0.4 (2.6)	0.8 (5.3)	-	8.6 (55.3)	100
D = 10	1.6 (40.0)	-	-	-	2.4 (60.0)	100
T = 8	1.2 (37.5)	0.4 (12.5)	-	-	1.6 (50.0)	100
Jumlah	44.9	12.2	2.4	0.8	39.6	

T = Tidak dapat diberi gred. (+ dan \* Rujuk Jadual 2)

Dari peratus ini, sebahagian besar sekolah-sekolah menyatakan bahawa murid-muridnya berpeluang menghadiri antara sekali hingga dua kali pameran. Seterusnya sekolah-sekolah gred A dan gred B paling banyak melaporkan kehadiran murid-muridnya di pameran-pameran.

Badan-badan yang mengendalikan pameran-pameran ini termasuklah Jabatan-Jabatan Pelajaran, PEMADAM, Persatuan Pengguna-Pengguna Pulau Pinang, Jabatan Polis, sekolah-sekolah lain dan kelab Jaycees.

Berdasarkan jawapan-jawapan sekolah-sekolah didapati 72.5% sekolah-sekolah berpendapat bahawa pameran-pameran ini dapat memberi manfaat yang berkesan kepada murid dari segi menimbulkan kesedaran bahaya dadah. Sementara itu 26.2% sekolah berpendapat bahan pameran ini adalah tidak begitu berkesan, dan sebilangan kecil, iaitu 1.3%, percaya bahawa pameran-pameran ini adalah tidak berkesan langsung.

Berhubung dengan ceramah-ceramah untuk murid-murid, sebilangan besar sekolah-sekolah melaporkan biasa mengadakan kegiatan ini, (42.8%) sekurang-kurang antara sekali dan dua kali. Tetapi seperti yang terlihat dalam Jadual 7, banyak sekolah-sekolah yang tidak pernah mengadakan ceramah-ceramah (40.0%), terutama sekali sekolah-sekolah gred C dan gred D.

Jadual 7

Taburan Peratus Sekolah yang Mengadakan Ceramah-Ceramah untuk Murid-Murid

Gred Sekolah (N=245)	Bilangan Ceramah					Jumlah (%)
	1-2 (%)	3-5 (%)	6-10 (%)	10+ (%)	Tidak Pernah (%)	
A = 85	14.7+ (42.4)*	6.1 (17.6)	1.2 (3.5)	0.4 (1.2)	12.2 (35.3)	100
B = 105	20.4 (47.6)	6.1 (14.3)	1.2 (2.9)	0.4 (1.0)	14.7 (34.3)	100
C = 38	4.9 (31.6)	1.2 (7.9)	0.4 (2.6)	-	9.0 (57.9)	100
D = 10	1.2 (30.0)	-	-	-	9.0 (70.0)	100
T = 8	1.6 (57.2)	-	-	-	1.2 (42.8)	100
Jumlah	42.8	13.4	2.9	0.8	40.0	

T = Tidak dapat diberi gred. (+ dan \* Rujuk Jadual 2)

Selanjutnya sekolah-sekolah yang biasa menganjurkan ceramah-ceramah ini berpendapat bahawa ceramah-ceramah ini adalah berkesan bagi membangkitkan kesedaran murid-murid mengenai bahaya dadah.

### 3. Seminar-seminar dan bengkel pendidikan pencegahan dadah untuk guru-guru

Sekolah-sekolah telah melaporkan bahawa di sepanjang 5 tahun yang lalu berbagai seminar dan bengkel telah dianjurkan oleh badan-badan seperti PEMADAM, Kementerian/Jabatan-Jabatan Pelajaran/Kelab Rotary Jaycees dan Lions, Persatuan Pengguna-Pengguna, Pulau Pinang dan ABIM.

Namun demikian, seperti yang terlihat dalam Jadual 8, hanya 46.5% sahaja sekolah-sekolah dalam sampel kajian ini yang mela-

porkan biasa menghantar guru-gurunya untuk menghadiri seminar-seminar atau bengkel-bengkel ini dan kebanyakan guru-guru ini berpeluang menghadiri sekurang-kurangnya antara sekali hingga dua kali seminar-seminar atau bengkel-bengkel di sepanjang 5 tahun yang lalu.

Sebaliknya sebahagian besar sekolah-sekolah (53.5%) tidak pernah menghantar guru-guru ke mana-mana seminar atau bengkel pencegahan salahgunaan dadah.

Jadual 8

Taburan Peratus Sekolah Yang Menghantar Guru-Guru ke Seminar atau Bengkel

Gred Sekolah (N=245)	Bilangan Kehadiran Guru					Jumlah (%)
	1-2 (%)	3-5 (%)	6-10 (%)	10+ (%)	Tidak Pernah (%)	
A = 81	14.5+ (42.4)*	2.1 (17.6)	0.4 (3.5)	-	16.6 (49.4)	100
B = 104	16.2 (37.5)	2.1 (4.8)	0.4 (1.0)	-	24.5 (56.7)	100
C = 38	5.0 (31.6)	2.1 (13.2)	-	-	8.7 (55.3)	100
D = 10	2.5 (60.0)	-	-	-	1.7 (40.0)	100
T = 8	0.8 (25.0)	0.4 (12.5)	-	-	2.0 (62.5)	100
Jumlah	39.0	6.6	0.8	-	53.5	

T = Tidak dapat diberi gred. (+ dan \* Rujuk Jadual 2)

Selanjutnya bagi guru-guru yang biasa menghadiri seminar atau bengkel, kebanyakan mereka adalah guru bimbingan (42.8%). Selain dari itu terdapat juga guru besar (8.4%) dan guru biasa (6.8%) yang menghadiri seminar-seminar ini.

Kebanyakan guru-guru yang menghadiri seminar-seminar atau bengkel-bengkel ini berpendapat bahawa seminar-seminar atau bengkel-bengkel ini telah memberi munafaat kepada mereka (86.2%). Hanya sebilangan kecil sahaja yang berasa bahawa seminar-seminar atau bengkel-bengkel ini tidak memberi apa-apa faedah kepada mereka (0.9%).

4. Matapelajaran-matapelajaran yang mengandungi unsur-unsur pencegahan dadah

Sekolah-sekolah telah diminta meyenaraikan tiga matapelajaran sekolah yang dianggap amat penting, penting dan agak penting dari segi sama ada isi kandungannya mengandungi unsur-unsur pendidikan pencegahan dadah.

Jawapan-jawapan dari sekolah menunjukkan bahawa matapelajaran Sivik dianggap amat penting, matapelajaran Sains Kesihatan, penting dan matapelajaran Ugama, agak penting sebagai alat pengantar kepada pendidikan pencegahan dadah.

Sekolah-sekolah juga ditanya sama ada guru-guru yang mengajar matapelajaran-matapelajaran ini cuba mengguna bahan-bahan lain sebagai maklumat tambahan. 46.8% mengatakan guru-gurunya ada cuba menggunakan bahan tambahan, sementara 53.2% sekolah-sekolah melaporkan sebaliknya.

5. Usaha sekolah sendiri mengadakan rancangan-rancangan pendidikan pencegahan dadah

Dalam hal ini, didapati kebanyakan sekolah (71.7%) tidak pernah mengadakan rancangan sendiri mengenai pendidikan pencegahan dadah. Hanya 28.3% sekolah sahaja yang cuba mengadakan rancangan sendiri dan rancangan-rancangan ini termasuklah memberi bimbingan dan kaunseling kepada murid-murid; mengadakan pertandingan essei mengenai salahguna dadah dan melekatkan cabutan-cabutan dari surat khabar tentang bahaya dadah di papan kenyataan; mengadakan kegiatan-kegiatan luar seperti melawat pusat-pusat pemulihan dadah dan "camping".

Sekolah-sekolah ini juga melahirkan rasa puas hati dengan rancangan-rancangan yang dijalankan oleh mereka sendiri walaupun mereka mengakui bahawa keberkesanan rancangan-rancangan ini mungkin boleh ditingkatkan lagi kalau tidak kerana pengaruh-pengaruh asing yang di luar kawalan sekolah.

Bagi sekolah-sekolah yang tidak pernah mengadakan apa-apa rancangan pendidikan pencegahan dadah, sekolah-sekolah ini telah menyuarakan beberapa sebab tidak berbuat demikian. Antara sebab-sebab ini termasuklah rasa bimbang kalau-kalau rancangan-rancangan seperti ini akan membangkitkan lagi rasa ingin tahu murid-murid terhadap dadah. Masalah kewangan dan tidak masa juga disebut selain dari pendapat mereka bahawa rancangan-rancangan ini tidak perlu kerana sekolah tidak lagi menghadapi salahguna dadah dan lagi pun kempen-kempen yang sedia ada, seperti yang disiarkan oleh talivisyen sudah mencukupi.

Sementara itu beberapa sekolah lain telah melahirkan harapan agar badan-badan berkuasa yang tertentu mengadakan rancangan-rancangan pendidikan pencegahan dadah.

Perbincangan dan Penutup

Berdasarkan kepada jawapan-jawapan dari sekolah-sekolah dalam sampel kajian ini jelaslah bahawa pada umumnya sekolah-sekolah tidak ketinggalan melibatkan diri dalam rancangan-rancangan pendidikan pencegahan dadah. Misalnya, sekolah-sekolah telah menerima berbagai poster dan risalah dan telah mempamerkan bahan-bahan bercetak ini untuk tatapan sebilangan kecil sekolah-sekolah yang tidak mempunyai bahan-bahan media ini.

Berhubung dengan bahan-bahan bukan bercetak, seperti filem dan slaid, didapati amat sedikit sekali sekolah-sekolah yang menggunakan jenis media ini, dan seterusnya amat kecil sekali bilangan sekolah yang menghantarkan murid-muridnya ke sekolah-sekolah lain yang menayang filem-filem mengenai bahaya dadah. Ini mungkin membayangkan bahawa sekolah-sekolah tidak sedar adanya kemudahan-kemudahan ini ataupun menghadapi kesulitan mendapatkan kemudahan-kemudahan ini.

Walaupun murid-murid sekolah-sekolah tidak banyak peluang menonton filem-filem mengenai bahaya dadah, mereka berpeluang menghadiri pameran-pameran dan ceramah-ceramah mengenai perkara yang sama; dan guru-guru juga berpeluang menghadiri seminar-

seminar dan bengkel-bengkel pendidikan pencegahan dadah. Lebih separuh sekolah-sekolah dalam sampel ini melaporkan biasa mengambil bahagian dalam kegiatan-kegiatan ini. Dalam pada itu hampir separuh sekolah-sekolah belum lagi mengambil apa-apa langkah melibatkan diri dalam usaha yang sama.

Keadaan ini lebih ketara apabila diteliti jawapan-jawapan sekolah mengenai usaha sendiri mengadakan rancangan-rancangan pendidikan pencegahan dadah. Hampir 72% sekolah-sekolah belum berusaha sendiri. Ini menunjukkan bahawa sebahagian besar sekolah-sekolah amat bergantung kepada kurikulum sekolah yang seida ada ataupun kepada usaha-usaha badan-bada lain. Keadaan ini timbul misalnya tiada ada masa atau wang, dan mungkin juga tiada ada kepakaran untuk menyediakan rancangan-rancangan pendidikan dadah yang sesuai.

Pada amnya 'trend' menunjukkan bahawa sekolah-sekolah gred A dan gred B telah dapat mengambil bahagian yang aktif dalam rancangan pendidikan pencegahan dadah.

Setakat ini PEMADAM merupakan badan sukarela yang paling aktif membekalkan bahan-bahan serta juga mengadakan kegiatan-kegiatan yang melibatkan murid-murid dan guru-guru dalam pendidikan pencegahan dadah. Usaha-usaha yang serupa juga dibuat oleh badan-badan sukarela lain dan badan-badan kerajaan. Tetapi seperti yang disebutkan di awal kertaskerja ini kebanyakan usaha-usaha yang mempunyai tujuan murni ini belum dinilai dari segi sejauhmana ianya berkesan bagi mencapai matlamat-matlamat

mencegah dari merebaknya salahguna dadah di kalangan kaum remaja di bangku sekolah atau di luar sekolah. Hasil penilaian ke atas rancangan-rancangan ini adalah diperlukan supaya ianya dapat dijadikan garis panduan untuk rancangan-rancangan pendidikan pencegahan dadah selanjutnya.

1. INTRODUCTION

Studies conducted by the National Drug Research Centre have shown that 11.6% of 16,166 school children surveyed have had some experience with non-medical use of drugs and that a trend towards multiple drug use was becoming evident. Epidemiological studies conducted by the Centre also showed that 30% of the addicts started using drugs before reaching the age of 19 (Navaratnam & Spencer, 1981).

Clearly, the involvement of adolescents and young people in drug abuse has become increasingly serious. Early prevention efforts are therefore essential to prevent potential users from being influenced to experiment with drugs. In this respect several preventive measures have already been undertaken by the government as well as by various voluntary agencies (Iyer, 1979). However, there is a need for careful and systematic evaluation of drug educational materials and programmes that have already been introduced or are soon to be introduced to enable authorities concerned to make informed and well-balanced decisions for future actions (Second ASEAN Workshop, 1979).

Research on Drug Prevention Education at Universiti Sains Malaysia

A study on the drug prevention education programme is being undertaken collaboratively by the National Drug Research Centre and the School of Educational Studies in Universiti Sains Malaysia in an effort to provide a better foundation on which decisions on the choice of model and design for drug education programmes can be based. This is also in response to the directive of the Cabinet Committee on Anti

Dadah which has emphasised the relevance and importance of drug educa-

effective with Malaysian schoolchildren. All relevant

to these schools and the extent to which students had been exposed to them. The survey specifically focussed on the following aspects of the drug education programmes:

- (a) the kinds of printed and non-printed materials available in schools;
- (b) exhibitions and talks attended by school children;
- (c) seminars and workshops attended by teachers and headmasters;
- (d) school curricula.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

The survey was conducted at the secondary school level since it was considered that pupils at this age were more likely to be involved in the use of drugs. For the purpose of the survey all government secondary schools in the states of Perlis, Kedah, Perak and Penang were used. All secondary schools in these four states were chosen not only on grounds of accessibility but also because of their close proximity to the Malaysia/Thai border where drug smuggling is most active. This survey was carried out with the co-operation of the Ministry of Education and all the State Education departments concerned.

### 2.1 Sample

There were 276 government secondary schools in these four States and a total number of 250 schools (96.8%) responded and returned the questionnaire. These schools were categorised into different grades (A, B, C, D, T) as determined by the Ministry.<sup>1</sup> In order to make a comparative examination of the implementation of drug education in schools, it was found convenient to group the schools into the given grades as these would reflect the size of the schools in terms of the number of students, teachers and classes. The distribution of these schools according to these grades is shown in Table 1.

---

<sup>1</sup>These categories are based on the highest level of education provided (e.g. Form 6, Form 5 or Form 3), provided and also on the size of student enrolment.

Table 1

Distribution of Schools According to Grades

Grades of School	Number	Percentage
A	87	34.8
B	107	42.8
C	38	15.2
D	10	4.0
T	8	3.2
Total	250	100.0

The figures in this table indicate that over 77% of these schools are in categories A and B.

2.2 Development of Questionnaire

A pilot survey was conducted to determine the appropriateness of the questions. Modifications to the wording and some new questions were added. The items in the questionnaire asked for information and opinions regarding the types and degree of effectiveness of printed and non-printed materials, exhibitions and talks attended by students of the school, and seminars and workshops attended by headmasters/teachers. It also asked for information regarding the kind of drug education programmes in schools. Information regarding the number of students in each school who had been identified as misusing drugs since 1970 was also requested. The questionnaire was produced in Bahasa Malaysia (National Language) and is found in Appendix A.

2.3 Administration

The questionnaires were sent by post and a covering letter was attached to explain the purpose of the survey. For this survey the questionnaires carried codes of the schools as determined by the Ministry. Names of schools were not used. The Headmasters were requested to respond to the questionnaires, and in a number of instances, the questionnaires appeared to have been answered by other teachers such as the senior assistants and the guidance teachers.

2.4 Method of Analysis

A total number of 250 schools returned the questionnaires. The questionnaires were checked for any missing information and inconsistencies. The responses to the questionnaires were then coded. Analyses were carried out using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences.

Schools were also classified into 'high risk', 'medium-risk', and 'low risk' groups based on drug involvement of the districts in which the schools were located. Information for this classification was provided by the National Drug Research Centre which receives reports related to drugs from the relevant authorities such as the Customs, Police, Health and Welfare. The National Drug Research Centre (NDRC) functions as a national data bank on matters related to drugs in Malaysia.

The data was analysed and the results presented with respect to the grades of schools (A, B, C, D and T) and also the risk level of the

school (High, Medium and Low). Although most of the items were structured and analysed through the computer the information from a number of open-ended items was incorporated into the relevant sections of the report.

### 3. RESULTS

The results are presented under five main sections listed below:

- (a) Printed materials - Posters and Phamplets
- (b) Non-printed materials - Slides and Films
- (c) Exhibitions and Talks
- (d) Seminars and Workshops
- (e) Drug Education Programmes in Schools

The above sections represent the major aspects of the drug education programme that have been sampled in this survey. As indicated in the section on the specific purposes of the study, the availability and the effectiveness of each of the above aspects of the programme are presented.

4. PRINTED MATERIALS ON DRUG EDUCATION4.1 Posters

Table 2 presents the distribution of schools by grades regarding the availability of posters which is indicated by the number of types of posters received. In this table, two sets of figures and percentages are presented. The unbracketted figure indicates the percentage of the 248 schools which responded while the bracketted figure indicates the percentage of schools in the respective grades.

The table shows that just under 15% of the 248 schools had not received some posters. An interesting point is that only about 12% of these schools, mainly from grades A and B received more than five types of posters. This suggests that there is some relationship between the number of types of posters received and the size of the schools.

Table 2

Availability of Posters:  
Distribution of Schools by Grades

Grades (N=248)	No. of Types of Poster					Total
	1-2	3-5	6-10	10+	None	
	%	%	%	%	%	%
A = 87	15.3 (43.9)	10.11 (28.7)	3.2 (9.2)	1.6 (4.6)	4.9 (13.8)	100
B = 105	17.3 (40.9)	14.1 (33.3)	4.0 (11.4)	1.2 (2.9)	4.9 (11.4)	100
C = 38	6.9 (44.7)	4.0 (26.3)	0.4 (2.6)	0.4 (2.6)	3.6 (23.7)	100
D = 10	2.0 (50.0)	1.6 (40.0)	-	-	0.4 (10.0)	100
T = 8	2.0 (62.5)	0.4 (12.5)	-	-	0.8 (25.0)	100
Total	43.5	30.2	8.5	3.2	14.6	

Unbracketted figures are percentages based on sample (N).  
Bracketted figures are percentages based on the number of schools in each grade.

The same data is again analysed in terms of the risk level of the schools. The distribution of schools of risk level on the availability of posters is given in Table 3. In this table the columns from 6-10 and 10+ types of posters are combined for the purpose  $\chi^2$  test. The obtained  $\chi^2$  value of 9.69 is not significant at the 0.05 level. This means that there is no relationship between risk level and the number of types of poster received.

Table 3

Availability of Posters:  
Distribution of Schools by Risk Level

Levels of Risk (N=248)	Types of Posters				Total
	1-2	3-5	6+	None	
Low = 87	42	25	10	10	87
Medium = 82	26	26	13	17	82
High = 79	40	24	6	9	79
Total	108	75	29	36	248

Data was also collected regarding the producers of the posters received by schools. The relevant data is given in Table 4 which presents a list of producers together with the percentage of schools receiving posters from such sources. More than 63% of schools indicated that they received posters from PEMADAM, (The National Drug Prevention Association). It is interesting to note that 44% of schools produced their own posters while about 38% and 30% of schools received their posters from the State Department of Education and the Ministry of Education respectively. Nearly 23% of the schools received posters from other sources such as Ministry of Health, Department of Information, Department of Welfare, Drug Rehabilitation Centres, Rotary and Lions Clubs.

Table 4

List of Producers of Posters  
by Percentage of Schools Receiving Posters

Agencies	% of Schools
PEMADAM	63.6
Individual Schools	44.0
State Dept. of Education	37.6
Ministry of Education	29.6
Others	22.8

Two aspects of the effectiveness of the posters received are discussed here. The first aspect is concerned with the number of students which viewed the posters while the second is concerned with the number of posters considered effective by the Headmasters of schools.

Data for the first aspect is contained in Table 5 on the degree of exposure of posters to students. Eighty-six (86%) percent of the schools reported that quite a number of students had viewed the posters. Data for the second aspect of effectiveness of posters is given in Table 6. The effectiveness of posters is indicated by the number of posters considered effective by the schools. Over 21% of the schools felt that only a few or none of the posters were effective. On the other hand more than 15% of the schools felt that all posters were effective.

Table 5

types of pamphlets received by the schools. In this table, two sets of

indicated signs indicates

Table 7

Availability of Pamphlets:  
Distribution of Schools by Grades

Grades of Schools (N=247)	No. of Types of Pamphlets					Total
	1-2	3-5	6-10	10+	None	
	%	%	%	%	%	
A=86	15.4 (44.2)	7.7 (22.1)	1.6 (4.7)	0.8 (2.3)	9.3 (26.7)	100
B=106	21.9 (50.9)	10.1 (23.6)	0.8 (1.9)	2.0 (4.7)	8.1 (18.9)	100
C=38	5.3 (34.2)	3.6 (33.7)	1.6 (10.5)	-	4.9 (31.6)	100
D=9	1.2 (33.3)	0.8 (22.2)	-	-	1.6 (44.4)	100
T=8	0.8 (25.0)	0.8 (25.0)	-	-	1.6 (50.0)	100
Total	44.0	23.1	4.0	2.8	25.5	

Unbracketted figures are percentages based on table sample (N).  
Bracketted figures are percentages based on the number of schools in each grade.

Table 8 analyses the same data with respect to the risk level of the schools. In this table the actual number of schools are reported and  $x^2$  test shows that there is no difference in the response patterns for schools in different risk levels at the 0.05 level.

Table 8

Availability of Pamphlets:  
Distribution of Schools by Risk Level

Levels of Risk (N=247)	Types of Pamphlets				Total
	1-3	3-5	6+	None	
Low = 88	40	23	6	29	88
Medium = 81	34	19	7	21	81
High = 78	36	15	4	23	78
Total	110	57	17	63	247

$$x^2 = 2.4 (6 \text{ df}) \text{ N.S.}$$

An examination of the data presented in Table 9 regarding the list of producers of pamphlets received, shows that 51% of the pamphlets were produced by PEMADAM. In contrast to posters, only 16% of the schools produced their own pamphlets, and the State Department of Education/Ministry of Education tend to be relatively the more important producers of pamphlets. In general, the other producers of pamphlets are similar to those for posters except for the Consumers Association of Penang and the Central Narcotics Bureau.

Table 9

List of Producers of Pamphlets by  
Percentage of Schools Receiving Pamphlets

Agencies	% of Schools
PEMADAM	51.2
State Dept. of Education	37.6
Min. of Education	31.6
Individual School	16.0
Other	22.0

In order to assess the effectiveness of the pamphlets, the survey also collected data regarding the intended readers of the pamphlets.

The data shows that most of the pamphlets were intended for students while the remaining 37% were for teachers. Table 10 shows the extent to which the pamphlets were read by these two target groups. In general less than half of the schools reported that the pamphlets were read by the respective target groups. More specifically, 53% of the schools felt that students read few or none of the pamphlets while 68% of the schools reported that teachers read few or none of the pamphlets intended for them.

Table 10

Reading of Pamphlets by Teachers and Students:  
Percentage of Schools

Number Readings Pamphlets Read	Target Population	
	Students	Teachers
Many	12.7	7.4
Quite a number	34.7	24.8
Few	41.6	61.1
None	11.0	6.7
Total	100.0	100.0

5. FILMS/SLIDES

The schools in this sample were asked to report, for the preceding 5 years, how many times films and slides were shown in their schools. Table 11 shows the distribution of schools by grades which had shown films/slides to their students. The table shows that 89% of the 245 schools reported that no films/slides were shown in their schools. This finding is supported by the data contained in Table 12 which gives the distribution of schools which viewed films/slides shown by other school/agencies. As indicated in this table, 91% of the 229 schools reported that their students did not have the chance to review films/slides shown in other schools.

Table 11

Films/Slides Shown in Own Schools:  
Distribution of Schools by Grades

Grades of Schools	Number of Films/Slides Shown					Total
	1-2	3-5	6-10	10+	None	
	%	%	%	%	%	
A=84	3.7 (10.7)	0.4 (1.2)	-	0.4 (1.2)	29.8 (89.9)	100
B=105	4.1 (9.5)	-	0.4 (1.0)	-	38.4 (89.5)	100
C=38	0.4 (2.6)	0.4 (2.6)	-	-	14.7 (94.7)	100
D=10	0.8 (20.0)	-	-	-	3.3 (80.0)	100
T=8	-	-	-	-	3.2 (100.0)	100
Total	0.0	0.8	0.4	0.4	89.4	

Table 12

Films/Slides Shown by Other Schools/Agencies:  
Distribution of Schools by Grades

Grades of Schools (N=229)	No. of Times Films/Slides Shown					Total
	1-2	3-5	6-10	10+	None	
	%	%	%	%	%	
A=77	3.9 (11.7)	-	-	0.4 (1.3)	29.3 (87.0)	100
B=99	2.6 (6.1)	1.3 (3.0)	-	-	39.3 (90.9)	100
C=38	0.9 (5.3)	-	-	-	15.7 (94.7)	100
D=9	-	-	-	-	3.9 (100.0)	100
T=6	-	-	-	-	2.6 (100.0)	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>90.8</b>	<b>100</b>

### 5.1 List of Films Shown by Schools and Agencies

Below is a list of film-titles mentioned by the schools and this list is divided into Bahasa Malaysia (National Language) and English films. It should be pointed out that some of the titles may not be accurately reported by the Headmasters.

#### Bahasa Malaysia Films

- |  |                                       |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| . Bahaya Merokok                               | - The Dangers of Smoking              |
| . Jenis-jenis Dadah dan Alat<br>yang digunakan | - Types of Drugs and Utensils<br>Used |
| . Madu Beracun                                 | - Poisoned Honey                      |
| . Penagih Dadah                                | - The Drug Abuser                     |
| . Salahgunakan Dadah                           | - The Abuse of Drugs                  |

#### English Films

- . Alcoholism
- . Drug Abuses
- . Health Begins at Home
- . Narcotic - The Victim
- . Smoking
- . The Drug Bug
- . The Switch-Blade
- . The Three Experineces

6. EXHIBITION AND TALKS6.1 Exhibitions

In this survey data was collected regarding the number of times students in the respective schools had the opportunity to attend exhibitions on drug education in the last 5 years.

Table 13 presents the distribution of schools by grades and how often students attend exhibitions on drug education. The table indicates that about 40% of the schools surveyed did not have the opportunity to attend any of the exhibition while more than 57% reported that their students attended 1-5 exhibitions, during the last 5 years. The table also indicated that comparatively more grade A and B schools had the opportunity to attend exhibitions.

Table 13  
Exhibition on Drug Education:  
Distribution of Schools by Grades

Grades of School (N=245)	Frequency of Students' Attendance of Exhibitions					Total
	1-2	3-5	6-10	10+	None	
A=84	15.9 (46.4)	6.1 (17.9)	0.8 (2.4)	0.4 (1.2)	11.0 (32.1)	100
B=105	20.4 (47.6)	5.3 (12.4)	0.8 (1.9)	0.4 (1.0)	15.0 (37.1)	100
C=38	5.7 (36.8)	0.4 (2.6)	0.8 (5.3)	-	8.6 (55.3)	100
D=10	1.6 (40.0)	-	-	-	2.4 (60.0)	100
T=8	1.2 (37.5)	0.4 (12.5)	-	-	1.6 (50.0)	100
Total	44.9	12.2	2.4	0.8	39.6	

Table 14 presents distribution of schools by risk levels and the perceptions of the schools regarding the effectiveness of drug education exhibitions. The  $\chi^2$  value of 11.04 is significant at the 0.5 level. This means that there is a relationship between risk level and perception of effectiveness of exhibitions. It indicates that more schools in high risk level felt the exhibitions were effective when compared to medium and low-risk schools.

Table 14

Effectiveness of Exhibitions:  
Distribution of Schools by Risk Level

Levels of Risk N=149	Effectiveness of Exhibitions			Total
	Very Effective	Effective	Not too effective/ Not effective at all	
Low	3	27	13	43
Medium	3	27	21	51
High	4	44	7	55
Total	10	98	41	149

In this survey, data was also collected regarding the organisers of the drug education exhibitions. Table 15 shows a list of agencies which organised the exhibitions and the percentage of schools which mentioned these agencies. PEMADAM (The National Drug Prevention Association) appears to top the list of organisers. However a close investigation reveals that the State Education Departments which are responsible for the Education Expo, (here listed as an agency) have played a very important role in organising the exhibitions.

Table 15

List of agencies which organised exhibition:  
by percentage of schools attending exhibitions

Agencies	% of Schools
PEMADAM	21.2
State Education Department	19.2
Police Department	16.7
Education Expo	15.7
Lions Club	3.1
Rotary Club	2.5
State Information Department	2.5
Parent Teacher Association	2.5
Career Guidance Association	2.5
Other	14.1

6.2 Talks

Table 16 presents the distribution of schools by grades and the number of Talks on drug prevention organised by the schools. An examination of this table shows that the data for Talks is very similar to that for Exhibitions (Table 13). One of the reasons for this is that generally Talks and Exhibitions are associated activities.

Table 16

Talks on Drug Prevention Organised by Schools:  
Distribution of Schools by Grades

Grades of School (N=245)	Number of Talks					Total
	1-2	3-5	6-10	10+	None	
	%	%	%	%	%	
A=85	14.7 (42.4)	6.1 (17.6)	1.2 (3.5)	0.4 (1.2)	12.2 (35.3)	100
B=105	20.4 (47.6)	6.1 (14.3)	1.2 (2.9)	0.4 (1.0)	14.7 (34.3)	100
C=38	4.9 (31.6)	1.2 (7.9)	0.4 (2.6)	-	9.0 (57.9)	100
D=10	1.2 (30.0)	-	-	-	2.9 (70.0)	100
T=8	1.6 (57.2)	-	-	-	1.2 (42.8)	100
Total	42.8	13.4	2.9	0.8	40.0	

Table 17 shows the perception of the schools regarding the effectiveness of the Talks on drug prevention organised by the schools. The table shows that about 88% of the schools which responded indicated that Talks on drug prevention are effective while 12.2% indicated that they are not so effective.

Table 17

Effectiveness of Talks: Percentages of Schools

Degree of Effectiveness	% of Schools
Very effective	12.2
Effective	75.5
Not so effective	12.2
Not effective at all	-
	100.0

7. SEMINARS AND WORKSHOPS

Table 18 shows the distribution of schools by grades regarding the attendance of teachers at seminars/workshops on drug education during the last 5 years. The table indicates that 39% of the schools reported that teachers attended seminars/workshops once or twice only while 7% reported that teachers attended three times or more. The table also shows that more than 53% of these schools indicated that teachers did not attend seminars/workshops at all. An interesting point here is that only about 2% of the schools, mainly from grades A and B stated that teachers attended seminars/workshops on drug education more than 5 times.

Table 18

Seminars/Workshops on Drug Education:  
Distribution of Schools by Grades

Grades of School (N=241)	Frequency of Attendance					Total
	1-2	3-5	6-10	10+	None	
	%	%	%	%	%	%
A=81	14.5 (43.2)	2.1 (6.2)	0.4 (1.2)	-	16.6 (49.4)	100
B=104	16.2 (37.5)	2.1 (4.8)	0.4 (1.0)	-	24.5 (56.7)	100
C=38	5.0 (31.6)	2.1 (13.2)	-	-	8.7 (55.3)	100
D=80	2.5 (60.0)	-	-	-	1.7 (40.0)	100
T=8	0.8 (25.0)	0.4 (12.5)	-	-	2.0 (62.5)	100
Total	39.0	6.7	0.8	-	53.5	100

The same data is again analysed in terms of the risk level of the schools. As shown in Table 19, 38 of the high-risk schools reported that teachers attended seminars/workshops once or twice, 8 reported teachers attended more than 3 times, while 28 reported that teachers did not attend at all. The  $\chi^2$  value of 11.38 is significant at the 0.05 level and this means that there is a significant difference between the responses of the schools by risk level. An examination of the figures in Table 19 shows that relatively more high-risk schools attend seminars/workshops 1-2 times when compared with schools

in the medium and low-risk levels. This also means that relatively fewer of the high-risk schools did not send teachers to seminars/workshops.

Table 19

Seminars/Workshops on Drug Education:  
Distribution of Schools by Risk Levels

Levels of Risk (N=241)	No. of Times Teachers Attended Seminars/Workshops				Total
	1-2	3-5	6+	None	
	%	%	%	%	%
Low=85	20.8 (30.6)	1.7 (4.7)	0.4 (1.2)	22.4 (63.5)	100
Medium=82	12.4 (36.6)	2.1 (6.1)	-	19.5 (57.3)	100
High=74	15.8 (51.4)	2.9 (9.5)	0.4 (1.4)	11.6 (37.8)	100
Total	39.0	6.6	0.8	53.5	100

Additional data was also collected regarding the category of teachers who attended seminars/workshops over the last 5 years. The relevant data is given in Table 20 which shows that the main category teacher who attended seminars/workshops on drug education was guidance counsellors.

The main agencies that had organised seminars/workshops included the State Department of Education/Ministry of Education, the National Drug Prevention Association (PEMADAM) and the Lions and Rotary Clubs.

Table 20

Attendance in Seminars/Workshops:  
Categories of Teachers

Teachers of Different Categories	% of Schools
Principals	8.4
Guidance	42.8
Civics	1.6
Islamic Religious Instruction	0.8
Ordinary	6.8

In order to assess the effectiveness of seminars/workshops attended by teachers, two aspects are discussed here. The first aspect is concerned with the effectiveness of seminars/workshops by schools according to risk-level while the second is concerned with the degree of usefulness of seminars/workshops in the opinion of the schools.

Data for the first aspect of effectiveness is given in Table 21. Most of the schools (high to low) reported that the seminars/workshops were effective, and in this respect (of the total number of 79) 35 are from high-risk schools, 24 from medium-risk and 20 from low-risk schools.

Data for the second aspect is contained in Table 22, on the degrees of usefulness of seminars/workshops. Eighty-six (86%) percent of the schools felt that the seminars/workshops were useful while less than one (1%) percent felt they were not useful at all.

Table 21

Effectiveness of Seminars/Workshops:  
Distribution of Schools by Risk Level

Levels of Risk (N=116)	Degrees of Effectiveness				Total
	Very Effective	Effective	Not Too Effective	Not Effective At All	
	%	%	%	%	
Low=31	6.0 (22.6)	17.2 (64.5)	3.4 (12.9)	-	100
Medium=34	4.3 (14.7)	20.7 (70.6)	4.3 (14.7)	-	100
High=51	7.8 (17.6)	30.2 (68.6)	5.2 (11.8)	0.9	100
Total	18.1	68.1	12.9	0.9	100

Table 22

Degree of Usefulness of Seminars/Workshops on Drug Education:  
Distribution of Schools

Degree of Usefulness	% of Schools
Very useful	18.1
Useful	68.1
Not so useful	12.9
Not useful at all	0.9
Total	100.0

## 8. DRUG EDUCATION PROGRAMMES IN SCHOOLS

### 8.1 Curriculum

The schools were asked to list the three most important subjects which contained materials relevant to the prevention of drug abuse. From the responses of the schools (see Table 23) it was found that the subject Civics was rated as the most relevant subject, followed by Health Education and Islamic Religious Instruction. A total of 228 schools felt that Civics is among the three most relevant subjects in drug education while 138 and 103 schools included Health Education and Islamic Religious Instruction respectively among the three most relevant subjects. In addition to the number of schools, an additional analysis was made by assigning 3, 2, and 1 points in order of importance. On the basis of this, an average score of 2.48 was obtained for Civics while scores of 2.11 and 2.00 were obtained for Health Education and Islamic Religious Instruction respectively. These mean scores can be considered as the mean rating for the subject on a scale of 1 to 3.

Schools were also asked whether their teachers who taught the above subjects used other additional resources or materials. Forty-seven percent of the 235 schools which responded reported that their teachers had used other materials to supplement the drug education information contained in the above subjects.

Table 23

Relevance of Subjects for Drug Education

Subject	Ratings			Mean Ratings
	1	2	3	
Civics	135	68	25	2.48
Health Education	47	59	32	2.11
Islamic Religious Instruction	31	41	31	2.00
Human & Social Biology	4	7	9	1.75
Malay Language	9	20	40	1.55
Science	8	26	44	1.54
Other	3	9	21	1.45
History	0	4	9	1.31
Literature	0	0	1	1.00

Some 28 percent of the schools reported that they had implemented some drug education programmes of their own. These were mainly category A and B schools. Among the most popular programmes implemented by the schools were the presentation of information to students, for example, talks, display of newspaper clippings, poster and drawing contests and advice during school assemblies. In addition, counselling was also given to suspected cases of drug offenders. Visits to rehabilitation centres had also been arranged and students had also been encouraged to look at TV programmes.

### 8.2 Other Programmes/Comments

This section will discuss only the major comments. For details of specific comments please refer to Appendix B. Schools were asked to comment on the effectiveness of drug education programmes in their

schools. From the comments given, some principals did not make a distinction between their own programmes and programmes outside of the schools. In general, most schools did not have any special programmes for drug education. Three reasons were given for this. One of the most common reasons for not implementing any special drug education programme was the feeling that such programmes may tend to raise the level of curiosity of students and possibly leading them to experimentation. Secondly, some schools feel that since there were no cases of drug offenders in their schools, there was no need for any special programmes. Finally, a number of schools reported that they were advised to adopt a low-key approach to the problem of drug abuse.

Some 38 schools requested for special assistance from various agencies with regard to implementing a programme in their schools. Most of the requests were for the Ministry of Education to provide audio-visual materials, resource personnel, courses and additional counselling personnel. A number of schools felt the need to include more drug education into the school curriculum. Other agencies included the University of Science (USM), Ministry of Health and Information, Police Department and Village Development and Security Committee.

9. SUSPECTED CASES OF DRUG ABUSERS

The Headmaster was also asked to indicate the number of students who may be involved in the drugs over a period of 10 years. The relevant details are presented in Table 24. There appears to be some difficulty in recalling data for the early 1970s but the number of suspected cases tend to be increasing over this period. In addition to this, the majority of the drug abusers are males. Great care should be taken in interpreting this data as there is some evidence that the number of cases reported for each year may not all be new cases for that year.

10. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS10.1 Summary and Discussion

This study reports a survey on five main aspects or activities related to drug education in the 250 secondary schools in the states of Kedah, Penang, Perak and Perlis. The data was analysed with respect to two important variables, namely, categories of schools and the risk level of the school. The five main aspects covered in this survey are, printed materials such as posters and pamphlets, non-printed materials (slides and film), and talks, seminars and workshop, and finally the school curriculum. In addition the comments of the headmasters regarding the drug education programmes in their schools were also sought. It must be pointed out that the headmaster and/or his nominee (e.g. school counsellor) responded on behalf of the school. This limits the interpretability of the results since the opinions of both the teachers and the students were not sampled. Any generalization of the findings must keep this in mind.

The survey found that of the two types of printed materials slightly more schools in this sample tended to receive posters than pamphlets. In general, however, about 3/4 of the schools here received posters and pamphlets over the last five years. There was also a slight tendency for larger schools to receive more printed materials than the smaller schools. One of the reasons for this is that smaller schools tended to receive less attention either because of distance or for administrative reasons. The main producers of

printed materials are PEMADAM and the Ministry or State Departments of Education. However, individual schools were also important producers of printed materials especially posters. There is some difficulty in differentiating between the State Education Department and the Ministry of Education. It appears that, as a general rule, most materials were sent by the Ministry through the State Department, as such the listing of both the Ministry and the State Department as producers is hard to interpret. Other sources of posters included other government ministries/departments as well as a number of voluntary agencies. In the opinion of the headmaster, students were generally exposed to the posters, or had read the pamphlets. Most of the pamphlets were intended for students while only 37% of them were intended for teachers. The headmasters also reported that in his opinion, at least some of the posters were considered effective.

As far as the film/slides were concerned there were two important findings. The first is that most of the schools reported that no film/slides were viewed by students either in their own schools or in other schools during the last five years. The second finding which is related to the first one is that there were only four films/slides available for viewing by students.

Some forty percent of the schools reported that their students had no opportunity to attend exhibitions and/or talks during the last five years. This is especially true for the smaller schools. There was a general agreement among the headmasters that both exhibitions and talks were reasonably effective. However, more headmasters from

schools in high risk areas tended to consider exhibitions effective as compared to headmasters from medium and low risk schools. The major agencies which ran these exhibitions were PEMADAM, the Department of Education and the Police Department.

Fifty three percent of the schools reported that none of the teachers attended any seminars or Workshops during the last five years. Additional analysis showed that schools in high risk areas tended to have more opportunities to attend seminars/workshops when compared with schools from the medium and low risk areas. Most schools tended to send their guidance teachers to such seminars/workshops. A large number of headmasters considered seminars/workshops as relatively useful means of drug education.

The three most relevant subjects to drug education, in the opinion of the headmasters, were Civics, Health Education and Islamic Religious Instruction. This is interesting in view of the fact that Civics is a non-examinable course and it is probably because of this reason that topical issues like drug education find themselves into the course. The relevance of the other two subjects are easier to explain.

#### 10.2 Conclusions and Implications

The results of the survey indicated that the headmasters in general considered the existing facilities like posters, pamphlets, films, slides, exhibition, talks, seminars and workshops as relatively useful for drug education. There is a slight indication that the

larger schools tended to have more opportunities to participate in these activities than smaller schools and that schools in high risk areas were more receptive of these activities. This trend was not strong but is present for some of these activities.

In addition, the three school subjects considered most relevant to drug education are Civics, Health Education and Islamic Religious Instruction. Besides those subjects some teachers also used teaching materials for drug education. It should be pointed out that the actual drug education content in these subjects is very limited. This is reflected in the use of Civics, a non-examinable subject for the purpose of teaching drug education.

It was felt that an attempt should be made to provide a systematic drug education programme in the existing syllabus. The drug education programme suggested would help to prepare students to stay away from drugs while in school and especially after they leave school. There was evidence to suggest that most students tended to take drugs after leaving school. In view of this preventive measures should be planned for such students while they are still in school.

The above recommendation is made because the majority of the schools appeared to have no systematic drug education programmes. It is true that many should report that they have prepared posters, tried to identify drug users, have provided counselling to suspected drug users. But these activities are carried out on an ad hoc basis and do not constitute part of a systematic drug education programme. While

such an approach might be suitable previously it is necessary to reconsider it especially in relation to the current view of the drug problem as a national security problem. There is a strong indication that schools require considerable guidance and support in the planning and carrying out of any drug education programme.

As mentioned earlier an important and desirable feature of any drug education programme in schools is its preventive nature. For any programme to be truly preventive it should employ strategies aimed at helping students to develop correct attitudes and values towards drug and healthy living. Such attitudes and values will form the basis for students' decisions on the use of drugs when they leave school. Naturally for such a programme to be successful considerable additional research is necessary.

11. LIST OF REFERENCES

Navaratnam, V. with Spencer C.P.; Drug Abuse in East Asia,  
National Drug Research Centre (U.S.M.), Kuala Lumpur, Oxford  
University Press, 1981

Krishna Iyer, G.; Schools Division, Ministry of Education  
Circular, Kuala Lumpur, 1979

Report of Second ASEAN Preventive Drug Education  
Seminar-Workshop, Metro Manila, Philippines, 10-29 September  
1979.

12. LIST OF APPENDICES

A Questionnaire Form

B Comments by Headmasters

## Appendix A

PUSAT PENYELIDIKAN DADAH KEBANGSAAN  
dengan kerjasama  
PUSAT PENGAJIAN ILMU PENDIDIKAN

Kajian Tinjauan Mengenai Usaha-Usaha Pendidikan  
Mencegah Penggunaan Dadah di Sekolah-Sekolah

A. MAKLUMAT LATARBELAKANG SEKOLAH:

1. Bilangan murid-murid: Laki-laki \_\_\_\_\_ Perempuan \_\_\_\_\_  
Jumlah \_\_\_\_\_

B. 2. Bilangan Tingkatan:

R	1	2	3	4	5	6

3. Bilangan Guru: Laki-laki \_\_\_\_\_ Perempuan \_\_\_\_\_  
Jumlah \_\_\_\_\_

4. Gred Sekolah: \_\_\_\_\_

Soalan-soalan berikut bertujuan mendapatkan maklumat-maklumat mengenai kegiatan dan rancangan pencegahan salahguna dadah yang terdapat atau pernah dijalankan di sekolah tuan. Maklumat tentang kegiatan dan rancangan yang dijalankan dalam masa 5 tahun yang lalu sahaja perlu dinyatakan. Tolong tanda di tempat-tempat yang berkenan dengan jawapan yang setepat-tepat mungkin.

B. POSTER

5. Berapa jenis (bererti isi maklumat dalam poster) poster mengenai rancangan pencegahan penggunaan dadah yang pernah terdapat di sekolah tuan?

1 - 2 jenis

3 - 5 jenis

6 - 10 jenis

Lebih daripada 10 jenis

Tidak ada poster (terus ke Soalan D)

6. Kalau terdapat poster di sekolah tuan, siapakah yang menerbitkan poster-poster itu? Tanda 1 dalam kotak untuk menunjukkan dari siapa tuan mendapat poster yang banyak sekali; 2, banyak .....

PEMADAM

Jabatan Pelajaran

Kementerian Pelajaran

Sekolah sendiri

Lain-lain agensi (namakan)

7. Pada pandangan tuan, berapa ramaikan murid-murid sekolah tuan yang melihat poster-poster ini?

Ramai

Agak ramai

Tidak ramai

Tidak langsung

8. Umumnya pada pendapat tuan, beberapa banyakkah poster ini yang berkesan untuk menyampaikan maksudnya iaitu mencegah penggunaan dadah di kalangan murid sekolah?

Kesemua

Kebanyakan

Setengah

Sedikit

Tidak satu pun

C. RISALAH (PAMPHLETS)

9. Beberapa jenis (bererti isi maklumat dalam risalah) risalah (pamphlets) mengenai rancangan pencegah dadah yang pernah terdapat di sekolah tuan?

1 - 2 jenis

3 - 5 jenis

6 - 10 jenis

Lebih daripada 10 jenis

Tidak ada risalah (terus ke Bahagian D)

10. Kalau terdapat risalah (pamphlets) di sekolah tuan, siapakah yang menerbitkan risalah-risalah itu? Tandakan 1 dalam kotak untuk menunjukkan dari siapa tuan mendapat risalah yang banyak sekali, 2 banyak ... dan 5 yang sedikit sekali.

PEMADAM

Jabatan Pelajaran

Kementerian Pelajaran

Sekolah sendiri

Lain-lain agensi (namakan)

---



---

11. Untuk siapakah kebanyakan risalah-risalah ini?

Guru-guru (terus ke Soalan 12)

Murid-murid (terus ke Soalan 13)

12. Pada pandangan tuan berapa ramai guru-guru berpeluang membawa risalah-risalah ini?

Ramai

Agak ramai

Tidak ramai

Tidak langsung

13. Pada pandangan tuan, berapa ramai murid-murid yang berpeluang membaca risalah-risalah ini?

Ramai

Agak ramai

Tidak ramai

Tidak langsung

D. TAYANGAN FILEM (Reel and Slides) KHUSUS MENGENAI PENCEGAHAN DADAH

14. Dalam masa 5 tahun yang lalu, berapa kalikah filem-filem seperti ini ditayangkan di sekolah tuan?

1 - 2 kali

3 - 5 kali

6 - 10 kali

Lebih daripada 10 kali

Tidak pernah

15. Sila senaraikan tajuk-tajuk filem, yang telah ditayangkan.

---



---



---



---



---

16. Selain daripada itu, berapa kalikah murid sekolah tuan berpeluang menonton tayangan filem yang dianjurkan oleh sekolah-sekolah lain atau badan-badan lain?

<input type="checkbox"/>	1 - 2 kali
<input type="checkbox"/>	3 - 5 kali
<input type="checkbox"/>	5 - 10 kali
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lebih daripada 10 kali
<input type="checkbox"/>	Tidak pernah

17. Sila senaraikan tajuk-tajuk filem yang telah ditayangkan.

---



---



---



---



---

E. PAMIRAN/PERTUNJUKAN DI MANA BAHAN-BAHAN RANCANGAN PENCEGAHAN DADAH DIPAMIRKAN

18. Dalam masa 5 tahun yang lalu, berapa kalikah murid-murid sekolah tuan berpeluang menghadiri pamiran dan pertunjukkan di mana bahan-bahan tersebut dipamirkan?

<input type="checkbox"/>	1 - 2 kali
<input type="checkbox"/>	3 - 5 kali
<input type="checkbox"/>	5 - 10 kali
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lebih daripada 10 kali
<input type="checkbox"/>	Tidak pernah (terus ke Bahagian F)

19. Kalau pernah, badan-badan manakah yang mengendalikan pamiran/pertunjukkan ini?

---



---



---



---



---

20. Pada pendapat tuan adakah pameran yang pernah dihadiri oleh murid itu dapat memberi manfaat yang berkesan kepada murid dari segi menimbul kesedaran bahaya mengguna dadah?

Sangat berkesan

Berkesan

Tidak begitu berkesan

Tidak berkesan langsung

SEMINAR/BENGGEL MENGENAI RANCANGAN PENCEGAHAN DADAH

21. Dalam masa 5 tahun yang lalu beberapa kalikah guru sekolah tuan pernah menghadiri bengkel/seminar mengenai rancangan pencegahan dadah?

1 - 2 kali

3 - 5 kali

5 - 10 kali

Lebih daripada 10 kali

Tidak pernah (terus ke Bahagian G)

22. Guru manakah yang seringkali menghadiri bengkel/seminar ini?

Guru Besar

Guru bimbingan

Guru yang mengajar tatarakyat

Guru Agama

Guru-guru biasa lain

23. Pada amnya badan-badan manakah yang menganjurkan bengkel/seminar ini?

---



---



---



---



---

24. Kalau pernah menghadiri, pada pendapat tuan adakah rancangan itu memberi manfaat kepada rancangan pencegahan penggunaan dadah di sekolah tuan?

Sangat berguna

Berguna

Tidak begitu berguna

Tidak berguna langsung

G. CERAMAH KEPADA MURID-MURID SEKOLAH

25. Dalam masa 5 tahun yang lalu, adakah sekolah tuan pernah menganjurkan ceramah berkaitan dengan usaha mencegah penggunaan dadah di kalangan murid sekolah?

1 - 2 kali

3 - 5 kali

5 - 10 kali

Lebih daripada 10 kali

Tidak pernah (terus ke Bahagian H)

26. Pada pendapat tuan, adakah majlis ceramah itu berkesan dalam memberi kesedaran kepada murid sekolah tentang masalah pencegahan dadah?

Sangat berkesan

Agak berkesan

Tidak begitu berkesan

Tidak berkesan langsung

H. RANCANGAN PENCEGAHAN DADAH MELALUI KURIKULUM SEKOLAH

27. Senaraikan tiga matapelajaran yang tuan anggap mengandungi isi-isi yang bertujuan mencegah penggunaan dadah di kalangan murid-murid sekolah. Guna kotak 1 bagi menunjukkan matapelajaran yang penting sekali; kotak 2 bagi menunjukkan matapelajaran yang penting dan kotak 3 bagi menunjukkan matapelajaran yang tidak beberapa penting.

Amat penting \_\_\_\_\_

Penting \_\_\_\_\_

Agak penting \_\_\_\_\_

28. Adakah guru-guru yang mengajar matapelajaran di atas cuba mengguna bahan-bahan lain sebagai maklumat tambahan.

Ya

Tidak

I. KESELURUHAN

29. Selain daripada bahan-bahan dan kegiatan-kegiatan yang tersebut di atas adakah sekolah tuan mengadakan rancangan lain sendiri.

Ya

Tidak

30. Kalau ada, sebutkan rancangan-rancangan itu dan sejauhmana rancangan ini berkesan.

---



---



---



---



---

31. Bilangan murid-murid sekolah tuan yang mungkin telah terlibat dalam penagihan dadah.

Tahun (Bilangan)	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	Jumlah
Laki-Laki											
Perempuan											

32. Komen-komen tuan berkenaan rancangan mencegah penggunaan dadah di sekolah tuan sekarang ini.

---



---



---



---



---

APPENDIX BCOMMENTS BY HEADMASTER

The comments by Headmasters are grouped under 4 sections;

- (a) Drug Education
- (b) Drug Education as practised in schools
- (c) Support facilities needed by schools
- (d) Some suggestions for implementors

(a) Drug Education

It is noted that the headmasters of 30% of the schools surveyed did not make any comments at all. Of the rest that responded 17% objected to having any drug education programmes in their schools, while 12% did not think it necessary to have any programmes; some 15% requested various forms of aid to carry out a drug education programme in the schools.

Objections

1. Incidence of abuse had abated.
2. The Ministry of Education was cited as wanting the schools to take a low-key approach.
3. The time was inopportune to introduce the programme, as no cases of drug abuse occurred in schools.
4. Programme will evoke curiosity that will then lead to experimentation.
5. Misinterpretation of Government Circular to mean a total ban should be imposed on drug education in schools.
6. Too serious an approach will place undue importance of the subject: the children may respond by wanting to try drugs.
7. Not necessary to awaken interest in the subject as the children were innocently unaware of such problems.
8. No campaign is necessary, as a small group of children may be tempted to take the message as a challenge.

9. Keep the subject away from the children's consciousness.
10. In a 'risk-area', focussing on information about drugs is counter-productive.
11. Instruction in Islamic Religious Knowledge is given in depth in 'Islamic Schools' established by the Government, there is enough deterrent in the lessons given.
12. Drugs are freely available around the school area, programme's credibility is taken to task.
13. Drug education is not a separate subject in the curriculum, and therefore priority should not be given to it.
14. Too much of the negative aspects of drug abuse were stressed.

(b) Drug Education as Practised by Schools

1. Lectures by outside speakers were given.
2. Advice by Headmasters were carried out during school assemblies.
3. Resource persons were utilised to give talks to the pupils; from the Police Department, the Information Department, the Medical and Health Services, PEMADAM, Parent-Teacher Associations, and other agencies.
4. Spot-checks and school patrols were carried out from time to time.
5. Alternative activities through school-clubs were undertaken.
6. Posters, newspaper-cuttings were displayed prominently on notice-boards.
7. Pamphlets were issued to staff and pupils.
8. Drug education subjects were taught as integrated lessons through Civics, Health Education, Islamic Religious Instruction and other subjects.
9. Poster and drawing competitions were held.

10. Essay-writing in Language classes, incorporating 'Drug' as a topic.
11. A system of 'adopted-child' treatment was initiated.
12. Student Committees were formed.
13. Efforts by schools to instill moral-education, good parent-pupil relationship, and discipline were made.
14. Film-shows and exhibitions were held.
15. Field-trips to rehabilitation centres to see drug rehabilitation at first-hand were undertaken.

(c) Support Facilities Needed by Schools

1. Resource persons to give talks/lectures.
2. Guidelines on how to organise drug exhibitions on a mini-scale.
3. More posters, charts and films needed.
4. Apparatus such as film slide projectors for rural schools, required.
5. More teachers to be given in-service courses and more counsellors to be appointed.
6. Establish 'Drug Committee' in schools.
7. Agencies around school area, such as Police, Village Committees to report to school, whenever students were seen after-school hours to indulge in dadah activities.
8. More serious attention to be given to the problem by those concerned with drug abuse education.
9. Increase budget allocation for schools.
10. Supply the schools with effective drug-education programmes.

(d) Some suggestions for implementors

1. Make use of the experiences of former drug abusers to give talks to school children.
2. Prepare drug education materials that stress on the positive aspects of behaviour.

3. Establish a pool of qualified 'speakers' in every Department of Education.
4. Present an "incorrigible" human specimen of abased drug abuser as a practical example of the effects of drugs.
5. Produce more films (in colour), appropriate to the target groups.

Overview of Comments

Among the schools that looked positively toward the effects of the programme, the following points could be discerned:

1. Children and teachers benefit from the campaign as awareness of the drug problem was aroused.
2. School discipline was strengthened.
3. Co-operation with outside agencies were established.
4. The impact of the programme could have a salutary effect on the pupils in the future.