



U.S. Department
of Transportation
National Highway
Traffic Safety
Administration

DOT HS 807 667
Final Report

September 1990

Determine Feasible and Acceptable Age 21 Support Programs

The United States Government does not endorse products or manufactures. Trade or manufacturer's names appear only because they are considered essential to the object of this report.

1. Report No. DOT HS 807 667		2. Government Accession No.		3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle Determine Feasible and Acceptable Age 21 Support Programs				5. Report Date September 1990	
				6. Performing Organization Code	
				8. Performing Organization Report No.	
7. Author(s) Wayne M. Harding, Ed.M.; Robert Apsler, Ph.D.; Wendi A. Walsh, B.A.					
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Gemini Industries, Inc. 10 Tower Office Park Suite 212 Woburn, Massachusetts 01801				10. Work Unit No. (TRIS)	
				11. Contract or Grant No. DTNH22-89-C-07339	
				13. Type of Report and Period Covered Final Report September, 1989 -- September, 1990	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address U.S. Department of Transportation National Highway Traffic Safety Administration 400 Seventh Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20590				14. Sponsoring Agency Code	
15. Supplementary Notes					
16. Abstract <p>The objective of this project was to identify programs which are feasible, acceptable, and effective in deterring adolescent drinking. To begin the project, information was collected on 22 prevention programs using a wide range of approaches. Next, a panel of 8 experts in highway safety and related fields appraised 18 generic approaches for prevention of underaged drinking (descriptions were based on the review of existing programs). A smaller set of 11 approaches were also assessed by 52 youth ages 11 through 20 who met in six focus groups.</p> <p>Perhaps the most important finding was that, to a great extent, the experts and the youth agreed on which programs would be most effective. Included were (1) programs which punish youth who drink by suspending their driver's license or postponing the age at which they become eligible to receive a license, and (2) improvements in the design and distribution of driver licenses in order to reduce the use of fraudulent identification to obtain alcohol. The results of this project underscore the need for reliable evaluation data on prevention programs. Future research might focus on those programs that the experts and youth agree have the greatest potential for reducing underaged drinking.</p>					
17. Key Words youth drinking and driving DWI prevention			18. Distribution Statement Document is available to the public through the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161		
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified		20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified		21. No. of Pages	22. Price

This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The United States Government assumes no liability for the contents or use thereof.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY1

 Introduction1

 Methods1

 Findings -- Conclusions1

INTRODUCTION3

 Statement of the Problem3

 Objective of This Study3

 Organization of This Report3

METHODS5

 Overview5

 Types of Programs Targeted for Investigation5

 Stage 1 -- Collection of Information From Programs6

 Stage 2 -- Collection of Information from Experts7

 Stage 3 -- Collection of Information from Youth8

 Limitations of the Study8

FINDINGS11

 Safe Homes11

 Sting Operations on Alcohol Vendors16

 Increased Enforcement in Suspect Serving Establishments...18

 Increased Penalties and Enforcement for Laws Concerning
 Serving of Alcohol to Persons Under Age 21.....20

 License Restrictions for Youth Alcohol Offenders22

 Presentation of License in Juvenile Court25

 Alternative Sanctions for Alcohol Offenses27

 Server Training30

 Alternative Activities for Youth32

 Youth Group Training35

 Alcohol-Free Colleges/Universities37

 Policy Development for Colleges/Universities39

 Adult Public Information and Education41

 Alcohol-Free Youth Groups43

 Random Alcohol Testing45

 Changes in Design and Distribution of Driver Licenses47

 Increased Penalties for False Identification49

 Student Assistance Programs51

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

Although the imposition of age 21 minimum drinking age laws in all 50 states, and other measures have reduced alcohol consumption by minors, there is still a need for programs to strengthen the effectiveness of the prohibition against underage drinking. The purpose of this project was to identify feasible, acceptable, and effective approaches for deterring underage drinking.

Methods

The project was conducted in three stages. In stage one, descriptive information was collected on 22 prevention programs. Among the types of program studied were stricter enforcement of underage drinking laws, promotion of alcohol-free youth events, increased sanctions for selling alcohol to youth, and use of parent groups and youth groups (e.g., "Just Say No" clubs) to promote abstinence. This stage of the project revealed that very little was known about the appeal of these programs to youth or the general public, their feasibility, or their impact on adolescent drinking.

In stage two, 18 generic descriptions of prevention programs were created using information collected during stage one. Each of these descriptions was reviewed by eight experts in highway safety and related fields who appraised: the ease with which the programs could be implemented, their acceptability to youth and the general public, their effectiveness in promoting abstinence, and the ease with which youth could circumvent the program. They also offered suggestions as to how these programs might be improved.

In stage three, 52 youth ages 11 through 20 were asked to appraise generic descriptions of a subset of 11 types of prevention programs. This was done in six focus groups of eight to nine youth. Three groups consisted of youth 11 through 15 years of age; three of youth ages 16 through 20. The youth varied in social class, whether they drank alcohol without parental permission, and gender.

Findings -- Conclusions

Perhaps the most important finding of the project was that, to a large degree, the panel of experts and members of the youth focus groups agreed on which programs would be the most and least effective in preventing drinking. Among those judged to be the most effective were:

- o The loss of a license or a postponement of one's eligibility to receive a license for youth who commit alcohol-related offenses, such as possession of or attempt to purchase alcohol.
- o Changes in the design and distribution of driver licenses to help prohibit the use of false identification to obtain alcohol.
- o Increased penalties for the use of false identification to obtain alcohol.
- o The use of student assistance programs in schools to help identify and treat students with alcohol problems.

Other conclusions drawn from the study include the following:

- o In many cases, those programs that youth felt would be most effective in preventing alcohol use were not personally appealing to youth since these programs would make it harder for them to obtain alcohol.
- o The experts advised that youth be involved in planning prevention efforts. The value of this strategy is supported by the fact that youth in this study offered many useful suggestions for improving the programs that the expert panel overlooked.
- o The expert panelists agreed that all but a few of the programs would be acceptable to the general public.
- o There were no pronounced differences in the ways in which older and youth adolescents evaluated the programs. The greatest difference between these groups was a tendency for younger adolescents to be slightly more positive about programs that emphasize abstinence such as alcohol-free youth groups.
- o Both the experts and the youth agreed that adolescents can easily circumvent the programs reviewed.

The results of this project underscore the need for reliable evaluation data on prevention programs. Resources for such studies could be focused on those programs that the experts and youth agreed have the greatest potential for reducing underage drinking. Other recommendations for future research include: studies to identify additional approaches to prevent adolescent drinking; studies to identify effective programs which promote safer drinking; investigations to determine how adults, especially parents, feel about various prevention programs; and studies to consider the effectiveness of delivering several types of programs simultaneously.

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Several studies of state laws prohibiting alcohol use under age 21 indicate that they reduce alcohol-related crashes among youth. For example, between 1982 and 1987, during the period when many states adopted these laws, the proportion of teenaged drivers involved in fatal crashes who were drunk decreased 32% (from 28% to 19%) (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 1988). Despite such improvements, it is clear that many youth circumvent the law and drink. There is a need, therefore, to find new approaches and programs that can make age 21 laws even more effective.

Objective of This Study

The objective of this study was to identify programs that are feasible, acceptable to youth, and potentially effective in deterring underage drinking and driving.

Organization of This Report

This remainder of this report is divided into three major sections:

- o. The METHODS section briefly describes the procedures used to conduct the study: the types of programs studied, how the opinions of youth were obtained, etc.
- o The FINDINGS section presents what was learned about various types of programs by having them reviewed by a panel of experts and by youth.
- o The third section discusses the CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS drawn from the study, including which approaches appear to have the most potential for reducing adolescent drinking.

METHODS

Overview

The project was conducted in three stages.

In the first stage, descriptive information was collected on programs that reinforce abstinence from alcohol among adolescents. The objectives were to learn about the types of programs that might help deter teenage drinking and what was already known about their feasibility, acceptability, and effectiveness.

In stage two, a panel of eight experts in highway safety, prevention, and related fields were asked to evaluate approaches/programs designed to reduce or deter adolescent drinking. The panel evaluated the feasibility, acceptability, and effectiveness of the approaches.

In stage three, a subset of the approaches the panelist reviewed, was evaluated by 52 youth ages 11 through 20 in a series of six focus groups.

Types of Programs Targeted for Investigation

This project focused on programs that are primarily designed to promote or enforce abstinence from alcohol among youth under 21 years of age. We excluded youth programs that essentially accept that adolescents will drink, and that attempt to support responsible use or to prevent alcohol abuse (including driving while intoxicated). This guideline eliminated programs such as Safe Ride or designate driver programs for adolescents, which attempt to prevent drinking and driving by providing alternative transportation to intoxicated teenagers.

In cooperation with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), we decided to concentrate on eleven countermeasure areas:

1. Enforcement -- stricter enforcement of age 21 purchase requirements through a variety of methods, such as: using undercover agents (sting operations); increased monitoring by State Alcohol Beverage Control Boards; and targeting establishments for investigation which have a history of serving minors.
2. Driver Licensing -- improvements in license design, distribution, and possession, for example: better tamper-proof designs; improved control over the issuance of duplicate licenses which may then be used as false identification by underage drinkers; and license suspensions for use of a fake ID or possession of alcohol.

3. Courts/Prosecution/Screening -- approaches involving the courts, such as: screening adolescent offenders for alcohol problems so they can be placed in treatment programs aimed at helping them achieve abstinence from alcohol.
4. Alcohol Server Industry -- programs to promote self-regulation of underage drinking by the industry, e.g., server training to help eliminate serving underage patrons (how to ask for identification, spotting false identification, etc.); and payment of bounties to servers/doormen for "capturing" false "IDs".
5. Social Hosts, Events -- promotion of alcohol-free dances, parties, and other activities.
6. Parent Groups, Youth Groups, etc. -- this approach includes parents cooperating to promote supervision of teen parties and the creation of adolescent clubs/groups that promote abstinence such as "Just Say No" clubs.
7. High Schools and Colleges -- approaches involving education institutions include alliances of schools/colleges for the purpose of sharing and developing effective programs and practices to handle underage drinking, drinking and driving, etc.; restricting the use of alcohol on college campuses; and training in how to detect and refer student alcohol abusers.
8. Legislative Support -- legislative approaches include adopting more appropriate sanctions for selling to/serving underage youth and for manufacturing fraudulent licenses.
9. Work Force -- training for alcohol retailers to reduce sales to underage persons; prevention programs which target companies with large numbers of employees under 21 years of age.
10. Public Information and Education -- efforts might include programs which target youth with anti-drinking messages, and programs which target adults with messages concerning the importance of preventing underage drinking.

Stage 1 -- Collection of Information From Programs.

Initially, two methods used to identify programs that might be effective in preventing adolescent drinking: (1) a review of literature, and (2) telephone discussions with people we expected would know of support programs because of their work in prevention and highway safety. The 18 people contacted included Alcohol Highway Safety Specialists in all ten NHTSA regions, the national headquarters for citizen activist groups such as MADD,

NHTSA staff in Washington D.C., and spokespeople for Governor's Highway Safety Representatives and other relevant state agencies.

Starting with the information extracted from the literature and provided by knowledgeable people, we used a "snowball" approach to identify additional sources of information and programs.

Using these approaches we collected leads to over 50 programs, 22 of which were selected for further study. The two most important selection criteria were (1) that the program was reputed to be successful, and (2) that the set of programs represent a broad variety of approaches, including all ten of the countermeasure areas listed above. Detailed information on these programs was collected through telephone conversations with program spokespeople and/or review of written materials (e.g., brochures, client intake and assessment forms, annual reports) provided by the program or other sources. Topics explored included: the goals and rationale for the program; when, why, and how the program began; the population served; how the program operates; program costs; funding; and evidence of the program's appeal to youth and its effectiveness. Appendix A lists the programs studied along with information about how to contact them.

This investigation showed that none or only a very few of the programs studied could provide definitive information about their acceptability to youth, cost, impact on youth drinking or drinking and driving, or other critical variables (Harding et al., 1990). This lack of evidence underscored the need to obtain estimates of the programs' feasibility, acceptability, and effectiveness from experts and from youth in the next two stages of the project.

Stage 2 -- Collection of Information from Experts

Based on the information collected about specific programs in Stage 1, 18 generic descriptions of various prevention approaches were generated for evaluation by an expert panel (these descriptions appear below in the FINDINGS section). The eight panelists had a wide range of relevant experience in such fields as highway safety, enforcement, prevention programming, and server training. (Refer to Appendix B for a list of the experts with their credentials and contact information.) The descriptions were mailed to the experts who evaluated each of them in terms of ease of implementation, effectiveness, appeal to youth, appeal to the general public, and ease with which the program might be circumvented. Four point scales (e.g., very ineffective, fairly ineffective, fairly effective, very effective) were used to tap each of these dimensions. The panel was also asked to comment on these issues and to rank all the programs according to their overall effectiveness in preventing underage drinking. (See Appendix C for a sample set of questions which illustrate the scales and ranking procedure.)

Stage 3 -- Collection of Information from Youth

During Stage 3, youth ages 11 to 20 participated in focus groups to discuss the feasibility and effectiveness of prevention programs. The youth were recruited through an ad in a suburban newspaper and were screened via telephone by a research assistant. In order to facilitate recruitment and promote attendance, subjects were offered \$45 to participate.

The reason we chose the lower cutoff point of age eleven was that before this age few children have used alcohol within the past year, less than 25% of children 12-13 years of age, and still fewer, about 11%, have used alcohol within the past month (NIDA 1988). The ceiling of 20 years of age was selected because this is the last year that a youth is legally prohibited from drinking alcohol.

Six focus groups of eight to nine youth were conducted: three for youth ages 11 to 15; three for youth ages 16 to 20. When possible, we selected subjects so they would be diversified in terms of background characteristics: sex, age, drinkers versus non-drinkers, socio-economic status as reflected by their parents' occupations. Characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 1, page 9.

The groups were held in a community center affiliated with a local hospital, and were conducted by the principal investigator and a research assistant. All groups were audio taped and the researchers made notes during the discussion. Nothing was observed to suggest that these procedures interfered with the discussion.

Generic program descriptions were presented to the youth and they were asked to discuss their feasibility, acceptability, and effectiveness (see FINDINGS for these descriptions). Seven of the 18 programs that were presented to the expert panel were excluded from discussion by the youth focus groups (see FINDINGS) chiefly because these programs would operate regardless of their acceptability (e.g., server training). After all eleven programs had been discussed, the youth were asked to identify the three they felt would be most effective in preventing underage drinking and the three they felt would be least effective.

Limitations of the Study

This study was exploratory in nature and, for at least two reasons, caution must be exercised in generalizing the results. First, the programs for which detailed data were collected were not selected in a manner which would ensure that they represent the characteristics of all programs that attempt to promote abstinence among youth. Second, the expert panel and youth focus

TABLE 1: CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE FOCUS GROUPS

Characteristic	Groups for Ages 11-15 N = 27	Groups for Ages 16-20 N = 25	Total N = 52
SEX:			
Male	14	6	20
Female	13	19	32
MEAN AGE			
Total:	12.6	18	14.8
Range:	11 - 15	16 - 20	11 - 20
PARENTS' EMPLOY.			
Blue Collar			
Fathers:	4	5	9
Mothers:	2	2	4
Total:	6	7	13
White Collar			
Fathers:	9	8	17
Mothers:	19	16	35
Total:	28	24	52
Missing Data			
Fathers:	13	12	25
Mothers:	6	7	13
DRINK ALCOHOL WITHOUT PARENTS' PERMISSION			
Males:			
Don't Drink	6	0	6
Do Drink	8	6	14
Females:			
Don't Drink	12	1	13
Do Drink	1	18	19
Total:			
Don't Drink	18	1	19
Do Drink	9	24	33

groups were comprised of small non-randomly selected samples of subjects and, therefore, they may not be representative of the larger populations from which they were drawn.

FINDINGS

In this section of the report the program descriptions reviewed by the expert panel and the youth focus groups are presented (bold print) followed by the evaluations these sources provided and their recommendations for improving the approaches. The 18 programs and the pages on which they are discussed are:

1. Safe Homes	12
2. Sting Operations on Alcohol Vendors	16
3. Increased Enforcement in Suspect Serving Establishments	18
4. Increased Penalties and Enforcement for Laws Concerning Serving of Alcohol to Persons Under Age 21	20
5. License Restrictions for Youth Alcohol Offenders	22
6. Presentation of License in Juvenile Court	25
7. Alternative Sanctions for Alcohol Offenses	27
8. Server Training	30
9. Alternative Activities for Youth	32
10. Youth Group Training	35
11. Alcohol-Free Colleges/Universities	37
12. Policy Development for Colleges/Universities	39
13. Adult Public Information and Education	41
14. Alcohol-Free Youth Groups	43
15. Random Alcohol Testing	45
16. Changes in Design and Distribution of Driver Licenses	47
17. Increased Penalties for False Identification	49
18. Student Assistance Programs	51

1. SAFE HOMES

Program goal: Safe Homes programs are designed to help prevent teenage drinking at parties.

Major activities: Parents sign a pledge that says they will not allow teenagers under age 21 to drink alcoholic beverages in their home and that they will supervise teenage parties in their home. A list of parents who have signed the pledge is publicized so that parents and youth know which homes in the community are the Safe Homes. It is assumed that parents who participate will not allow their teenager to attend a party that is not in a Safe Home.

The expert panel's overall evaluation of this approach was unenthusiastic (see Table 2, page 13). With the exception of one panelist who ranked Safe Homes among the three programs most likely to prevent drinking, it was ranked no higher than eighth of 18 by the other panelists. Two of them ranked it among the three programs least likely to prevent adolescent drinking. (See Appendix C, page C-3 for more information about the ranking procedure.)

The panel's judgments about individual aspects of the program were more varied. Most (six of the eight) panelists characterized the program as "Fairly Easy" to implement (see Appendix C for details concerning this and other scales). They commented that the program would be inexpensive, does not require the involvement of professionals, and that the publicity required can be easily arranged through local newspapers. Two panelists who felt the program would be "Fairly Difficult" to implement mentioned that it might prove difficult to recruit enough parents to significantly impact teen drinking, and that the approach might not work well in large amorphous communities.

The panel was evenly split in its assessment of the program's effectiveness. Four panelists felt the program would be "Fairly Ineffective." Their arguments included the suggestion that parents who were already actively concerned about their children's alcohol use would be the most likely to participate, but these families are at the lowest risk for adolescent drinking/driving problems. Among the comments by the four panelists who thought that Safe Homes could be "Fairly Effective," was the thesis that this approach helps to reinforce important guidelines for adolescent and parental behavior and to establish community standards.

Six panelists believed the program would be "Fairly Unappealing" to youth; two indicated it would be "Fairly Appealing." Comments offered by panelists for both these positions included the idea that the approach was likely to be more appealing to non-drinkers

TABLE 2: EXPERTS' RANKING OF PROGRAMS BY OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS

Type of Program	Top (a) Three	Bottom Three
1. Safe Homes	1	2
2. Sting Operations	0	1
3. Increased Enforcement in Suspect Serving Establishments	0	1
4. Increased Penalties and Enforcement for Laws Concerning Serving of Alcohol To Persons Under Age 21	1	0
5. License Restrictions for Youth Alcohol Offenders	4	0
6. Presentation of License in Juvenile Court	1	4
7. Alternative Sanctions for Alcohol Offenses	1	1
8. Server Training	1	0
9. Alternative Activities For Youth	1	1
10. Youth Group Training	2	0
11. Alcohol-Free Colleges/Universities	0	2
12. Policy Development for Colleges	0	3
13. Adult Public Information and Education	1	1
14. Alcohol-Free Youth Groups	0	3
15. Random Alcohol Testing	1	4
16. Changes in Design and Distribution of Driver Licenses	5	0
17. Increased Penalties for False Identification	2	0
18. Student Assistance Programs	3	0

(a) Numerals in these columns represent the number of experts (of eight) who ranked each program among the three most likely ("Top Three") and three least likely ("Bottom Three") to prevent adolescent drinking.

and younger adolescents, and that its degree of appeal would depend on how attractive and successful alcohol-free parties could be made.

All the panelist felt Safe Homes would be "Fairly" or "Very Appealing" to the general public. Two reasons for these positive assessments were offered by several panelists. The first is that the program would be welcomed by many parents who want to feel they can affect their children's alcohol use. Second, panelists suggested that "the public likes anything that places responsibility on parents."

Seven of the panel members felt it was "Very" or "Fairly" likely that youth could circumvent the program. The panelists did not think it likely that teens who come to these parties would try to smuggle-in alcohol. The problem, they suggested, is rather that youth can simply choose to attend parties where alcohol is available (and hide this from their parents), that youth can and do drink in many other situations, and that youth could drink either before or after a Safe Homes party.

Among the suggestions panelist offered for enhancing a Safe Homes program were the following:

- o Create a method for renewing the pledge each year and for recruiting new parents into the program.
- o Emphasize to parents that alcohol-free parties must be especially attractive events.
- o Involve teens in planning and promoting the program.
- o Create meetings and other methods for communication among participating parents.
- o Encourage parents to verify that their children attend only Safe Homes parties. One method (more appropriate for younger children) would be to drive their children to and from the party.

Youth were less optimistic about the effectiveness of Safe Homes than panel members. In fact, Safe Homes was among the three programs that youth mentioned as being the least likely to prevent drinking. The moderators estimate that Safe Homes received more disapproval than any other option among both the younger (ages 11-15) and older (ages 16-20) group members. Among the reasons offered for this negative appraisal were:

- o Most adolescents will drink at other times and in other settings. Some teens also hold unsanctioned parties when their parents are away, which this program can't control. (Inter-

estingly, most youth agreed with the panel that adolescents would not try to bring alcohol to a Safe Homes party.)

- o Parties at which alcohol is served are more attractive to most youth, including most non-drinkers, than parent supervised alcohol-free parties. Safe Homes parties would be most attractive to youth who are adamantly anti-alcohol.
- o Many drinkers might attend a Safe Homes party if it promised to be a "good time" or there was no alternative party, but this would have no lasting affect on their drinking.
- o It is possible that teens attending such parties may be viewed as "nerds" by their peers. (One panelist also noted that without a wide base of participation Safe Homes could "fall victim to the 'nerd syndrome'".)

The extent to which youth disapproved of Safe Homes was also reflected in the fact that a majority of the younger subjects and most of the older indicated that they would be embarrassed if their parents became involved in such a program.

The focus group members conveyed their opinion that if Safe Homes are intended to protect youth from being influenced to drink by their peers that this protection is largely unnecessary. Both drinkers and non-drinkers felt that a teenager's choice not to drink was well-respected by drinkers. There were even a few comments to the effect that non-drinkers are appreciated because they can help control drunken behavior and can drive drinkers home.

What little sympathy existed for this approach came more from younger adolescents and, within this age group primarily from those who did not drink without parental permission.

2. STING OPERATIONS

Program goal: To enforce laws which prohibit the sale of alcohol to underage drinkers.

Major activities: Law enforcement officers posing as adolescents or adolescent volunteers working for law enforcement attempt to purchase alcohol from alcohol vendors. The vendors may be chosen randomly or chosen based on a "tip" that they sell to underage customers. A vendor is found in violation of the law if alcohol is sold to the "youth" without asking for proper identification or after the "youth" has admitted to being underage. These sting operations are well-publicized in order to deter youth and establishments licensed to sell alcohol from violating minimum age drinking laws.

The panel gave this approach mixed reviews. In evaluating its overall potential for preventing adolescent drinking, the panel ranked Sting Operations from fourth through sixteenth. The panel's ratings concerning ease of implementation also varied widely: two indicated it would be "Very Difficult" to implement, two "Fairly Difficult" and three "Fairly Easy." Comments included the following:

- o The program may not compete well with other community enforcement needs (e.g., street crime).
- o It requires continuing publicity and commitment by enforcement personnel.
- o It is costly to pay for enforcement personnel to implement the program.

The panelists also differed in their opinions about the effectiveness of sting operations: one selected "Very Effective," two "Fairly Ineffective," and five "Fairly Effective." One drawback expressed by several panel members was that the program effects may be short-lived unless it continues over a long period and can be accompanied by ongoing publicity. Another was that the approach would not curtail the supply of alcohol from other sources: older friends, parents, etc. The counter-argument to this point was that it still reduced the amount of alcohol available from one important source.

Panelists' ratings of the acceptability of Sting Operations to youth varied: one selected "Very Unappealing," four "Fairly Unappealing," two "Fairly Appealing," and one "Very Appealing." These ratings are somewhat deceptive, since the comments by panelists who felt the program would be appealing indicated their judgments were based on the view that the approach is not directed at youth and, therefore, would not concern them. It may

be misleading, therefore, to think of the positive ratings as signifying appeal -- indifference might be more accurate.

Panelists felt this approach would be appealing to the general public. All eight rated it as "Fairly" or "Very Appealing." Panel members believed that "most people are against the sale of alcohol to minors" and they pointed out that Sting Operations do "not ask for or impose new duties on anyone but the seller and enforcement personnel." At the same time, panelists acknowledged that alcohol vendors would probably oppose the program.

Another point of agreement among the eight panelists was that they felt it was "Very" or "Fairly Likely" that youth could circumvent this approach. Panelists indicated that youth might still try to purchase alcohol, since they were not threatened directly by the program. As mentioned above, they also thought that youth would turn to other sources for alcohol. Proposals for strengthening the program included:

- o Train vendors/bar owners in how to detect underage youth and false identification.
- o Place signs in alcohol outlets warning underage youth that relevant laws will be enforced.
- o Publicize the program in schools.
- o Enforce the program vigorously and publicize the names of the offenders.

This approach was not presented to the youth focus groups (see METHODS, page 8).

3. INCREASED ENFORCEMENT IN SUSPECT SERVING ESTABLISHMENTS

Program goal: To identify drinking establishments that are either serving youth or over-serving patrons.

Major activities: Individuals arrested for Driving While Intoxicated are asked in court to identify the last place they drank. When an establishment has been identified a predetermined number of times, it is subject to investigation by enforcement officials, usually the Alcohol Beverage Control Board. A letter is sent warning the establishment that they may be investigated. If the establishment continues to be identified, undercover agents may be sent to investigate serving to minors and other violations. This enforcement program is well-publicized to drinking establishments in order to deter them from serving alcohol to persons under 21 years of age.

The panelists evaluations' of Increased Enforcement for Suspect Bars were as equivocal as those they gave for Sting Operations. Their rankings of the program's potential for reducing adolescent drinking were scattered from sixth to seventeenth.

The ratings of the program's ease of implementation ranged from "Very Difficult" (one panelist) to "Very Easy" (one), with three panelists choosing both "Fairly Difficult" and "Fairly Easy." Most of the comments made pointed out that significant funding may be required to support Increased Enforcement because the program requires more staff "to track identified establishments and send in undercover agents to investigate."

Responses also varied on the question of program effectiveness: five panelists felt it would be "Fairly Ineffective" and three that it would be "Fairly Effective." Positive comments were that the program would encourage responsible serving practices and send a message to youth that laws affecting their alcohol use will be enforced. Negative comments predominated. The two most common were: (1) that "individuals arrested for DWI may not be truthful about where they were served"; and (2) that many youth, especially younger adolescents, do not obtain alcohol from alcohol vendors.

The panelists' estimates of the program's appeal to youth ranged across the scale: two chose "Very Appealing," three "Fairly Unappealing," one "Fairly Appealing," one "Very Appealing," and one indicated the question was not relevant. As was true for the ratings of Sting Operations, comments by the panelists who indicated the program was acceptable to youth indicated that their choice rests on the proposition that youth would not be directly affected by the program. It seems appropriate, then, to conclude that the panelists felt the program was either not appealing to youth or would not directly concern them.

All the panelists felt that the program would be "Fairly" or "Very Appealing" to the public. One member commented that "the 'killer bar' mentality makes for good press," others indicated that the public feels that drinking establishments should be held accountable for their contribution to drunk driving.

Panelists agreed that youth would be able to circumvent the program. Seven thought this was "Very" or "Fairly Likely." Reasons given for this view included the propositions that many youth drink in other settings and that some youth will be able to use convincing false identification to drink in establishments.

There were several recommendations made for improving this approach:

- o Offer server training to enhance staff abilities to identify underage persons and make training mandatory for establishments that are cited for serving people under 21 years of age.
- o Utilize the approach to identify other sources of alcohol: parties, private homes, etc., and investigate these as well.
- o Couple this approach with stricter and well-publicized penalties for the use of false identification.

This is another of the programs that was not presented to youth.

4. INCREASED PENALTIES AND ENFORCEMENT FOR LAWS CONCERNING SERVING OF ALCOHOL TO PERSONS UNDER AGE 21

Program goal: To reduce serving and selling of alcohol to minors by increasing the penalties imposed on vendors and by more rigorous enforcement of law.

Major activities: New legislation provides for stricter penalties for selling/serving alcohol to minors. For example, vendors may be required to pay higher fines. In addition, the laws are more rigorously enforced. For example, on-site monitoring of serving establishments is increased. Also, the increases in penalties and enforcement are publicized to alcohol vendors in and to youth.

This proposal also received a mixed evaluation from the panelists. They ranked it from first to fourteen in terms of its potential for preventing adolescent drinking.

Seven of the panel members agreed that greater penalties and enforcement for serving minors is "Fairly Difficult" (one selected "Very Difficult"). The two sources of this difficulty cited most often were: (1) problems in obtaining the funds to support vigorous enforcement and (2) problems in passing the needed legislation. With respect to the latter, several panelist believed that the "liquor industry" would actively oppose such legislation.

Five of the group indicated that this approach would be "Fairly Effective" in reducing/preventing underage drinking, while three indicated it would be "Fairly Ineffective." Those who were more optimistic indicated that this approach would "provide a strong disincentive to sell to minors" and would make it at least somewhat more difficult for adolescents to obtain alcohol. Panelist who were more negative advanced three basic arguments: (1) this approach will not impact young adolescents who usually do not obtain alcohol from licensed establishments, (2) it leaves open other sources of supply, and (3) it "blames the seller versus concentrating on the consumer."

Six panelists felt that increasing penalties and enforcement for serving minors would be "Fairly Unappealing" to youth. Again, comments by the remaining panelists who chose "Fairly Appealing" indicated that the approach "does not directly affect youth" and therefore, they would not oppose it.

As with the previous 3 approaches, panelists felt this one would also be either "Fairly" or "Very Appealing" to the public. The reasons offered included that (1) it "holds liquor license holders accountable," (2) that the public generally favors enforcement of the laws, and (3) that nothing is asked of the public.

One expert felt that if servers rigorously enforced the laws, it was "Fairly Unlikely" that youth would be able to circumvent this program. The others felt it was either "Very" or "Fairly Likely" that youth could circumvent the program either by using high quality fake identification, or simply by obtaining alcohol elsewhere (from older friends, parents, by having a stranger purchase alcohol for them, etc.).

To improve this approach the panel recommended such things as:

- o Publicize it to youth through the schools and other channels.
- o Couple it with stricter penalties for using fake identification and for purchasing alcohol for minors.
- o Include suspension of the privilege to sell alcohol as part of the punishment for vendors.
- o Require training of staff in establishments that violate the law.

Youth in the focus groups did not review this approach.

5. LICENSE RESTRICTIONS FOR YOUTH ALCOHOL OFFENDERS

Program goal: To discourage underage drinking by penalizing underage possession, purchase, etc. of alcohol with suspension or postponement of the driver's license.

Major activities: Legislation allows for the imposition of new penalties for alcohol offenses by underage youth (possession, use, attempt to purchase, possession of fake identification, etc.). For example, for a first offense, the law may allow suspension of the offender's driver's license for one year. If the offender does not have a license, eligibility to obtain a license may be delayed one year. In addition, the youth may be required to attend a driver education or alcohol education program. The new penalties may supplement existing ones (e.g., fines) and they are widely publicized in order to deter youth from alcohol offenses.

This option was one of the most highly rated by panelists. In estimating its overall effectiveness, all but one ranked it in the upper half of the programs (first through ninth), and four panelists ranked it among the top three programs.

When rating this approach for ease of implementation one panelist selected "Very Difficult, three selected "Fairly Difficult," and four "Fairly Easy." Concerns expressed by the panelists included the following:

- o This approach may overburden the juvenile court system.
- o Attempts to pass the needed legislation may encounter opposition from people concerned about teens who need their cars to work.
- o Maintaining appropriate records on teens who have not yet been licensed may be difficult.

Consistent with the overall favorable ranking, all panel members indicated that License Restrictions would be "Fairly" (four panelists) or "Very Effective" (four). A typical comment was: "Possession of a driver's license is a key motivator for most underage youth...the possibility of its loss or delay in getting it are good leverage for compliance." One caveat offered was that the approach would not work well in the inner city where many adolescents do not drive. Another was that the program would probably make adolescents more cautious about drinking (especially in exposed situations versus private parties), but would not cause them to forego alcohol.

Although two panelists estimated that youth would find this approach "Fairly Appealing," the remainder believed youth would

find it "Very" to "Fairly Unappealing." The latter group felt youth would object to the threat posed by this measure and would resent the fact that licensing actions were tied to drinking situations other than drunk driving.

This is the first approach for which the panelists' estimations of public approval were anything less than positive. Two panelists thought the approach would be "Fairly Unappealing," three "Fairly Appealing," and three "Very Appealing." The justification for the negative ratings was the expectation that many would object to tying licensing actions to behavior that is not directly related to driving.

Two panelists felt it was "Fairly Unlikely" that youth would circumvent the program; the rest felt this was "Fairly Likely." Several panelists explained that this issue would largely depend on how vigorously the approach was enforced and publicized.

These ideas were offered for improving the program:

- o Train alcohol vendors about the program.
- o Prohibit pleas to lesser offenses in order to avoid the punishment.
- o Educate law enforcement personnel about the need to enforce the law.
- o Promote consistent enforcement and public education about the law.

To a large degree, the panelists views about this program match those expressed in the focus groups. For example, like the panelists, both the younger and older adolescents felt this option would be one of the most effective methods for reducing adolescent drinking. Most youth, especially the older adolescents, indicated this would be the most effective of the programs. These positive evaluations were qualified in one major respect: like some of the panelists, most teens felt this approach would not prevent or stop drinking so much as it would cause adolescents to be more cautious about their drinking behavior and, perhaps, to reduce the frequency of their drinking. Although the law would be taken seriously, as one participant put it: "there are drug laws with harsh punishments, but lots of kids use drugs."

With very few exceptions, youth did not find the program appealing. It was clear that they did not want the program to be adopted because loss or postponement of their driver's license is a serious threat: "this will work because a license is very important to kids." As predicted by some of the panelists, many

teens, especially the older group, disapproved of this approach. They believed "it isn't fair" to suspend one's license for non-driving offenses.

When asked what other sanctions would be effective in preventing alcohol use, the teens mentioned jail and fines (provided some way could be found to deal with the inequality in fining both rich and poor the same amount). There was widespread agreement, however, that parental response was as immediate and powerful a threat as the legal penalties.

Many teens pointed out that "it is easy for kids to get away with drinking without getting caught...cops can't go to every party." Like the panel, the teens emphasized that this program would have to be diligently enforced to be effective. One related suggestion was to "make an example" of the first offenders in order to convey the sense that teens can be caught. Group members also recommended that this approach should include stricter punishment for people who supply alcohol to teens. In addition, they pointed out that this approach could be undermined if many adolescents continue to drive after their license is suspended. The implication was penalties for driving with a suspended license should be increased and the laws about this better enforced.

6. PRESENTATION OF LICENSE IN JUVENILE COURT

Program goal: To educate youthful, new drivers and their parents concerning the laws pertaining to underage drinking and driving while intoxicated. Ultimately, the goal is to deter drinking and driving and underage drinking.

Major activities: Juvenile judges issue driver's licenses to youth (under 18 years of age) in court. In the presence of the youth's parent(s), the judge indicates that driving is a privilege and that either the court or the parent can revoke that privilege if the youth does not obey the rules. The judge also explains the rationale for the minimum drinking age, the legal penalties for driving while intoxicated, and asks the parent(s) to discuss the problem of DWI with their child.

This proposal was rated lowly by many panelists. Although two panelist ranked the approach third and seventh in its potential for preventing adolescent drinking, the remaining members ranked it from thirteenth through eighteenth. Four ranked it among the worst three approaches.

Three of the experts thought the program would be "Fairly" or "Very Easy" to implement. The rest thought it would be difficult. Many panelists commented that the program would burden the court system. Another drawback discussed was the need to obtain support from juvenile judges and to train them to make effective presentations.

Most (six) of the panel indicated the program would be "Very" or "Fairly Ineffective." One panel member described it as "symbolic gesture" another wrote "a single lecture by a judge will have no real impact." Several panelists believe that the program might help stimulate dialogue between parents and children about drinking and this, in turn, might reduce teenage drinking.

Almost all the panel (seven) believed that the approach would be "Very" or "Fairly Unappealing" to youth: "I would expect them to find the whole procedure demeaning and unnecessary." On the other hand, as one panel member put it: "This is another place where appeal [to youth] is not required for success."

The ratings concerning the appeal this program would have for the public were spread evenly across the scale -- from "Very Unappealing" to "Very Appealing." Many panelists who doubted its appeal guessed that parents would not want to take the time to go to court.

Ratings were also distributed almost evenly across the scale concerning the likelihood of teens circumventing the program. On one side, some panelists indicated that youth who wanted a li-

cense would be compelled to participate and this might have a positive effect on them. On the other side, panelists emphasized that the question of drinking was still left up to the adolescent and that they could simply ignore the judge's and their parents' advice.

One panel member felt this approach could be improved by mandating discussions between youth and parents in groups led by trained facilitators. Other suggestions included:

- o Broaden the discussion to include false identification, laws about illegal possession of alcohol, etc.
- o As a more efficient alternative, have the judges make presentations in schools to groups of students.
- o Train the judges in order to improve the quality of their presentations.

Young adolescents in the focus groups were very negative in their overall assessment of this program's effectiveness; the older adolescents only slightly less negative. Examples of statements summing up participants' views were: "It's not very effective, it just ties things up in the courts," "It's just more of a hassle," "Just another lecture."

The groups considered whether the program might promote useful discussions between parents and youth. The dominant answer was that in most families such discussions take place anyway -- though parents are more likely to discuss drugs in general than alcohol specifically. When alcohol use is discussed, the parents also tend to focus on drinking and driving rather than the issue of abstinence versus use and this was true even for teens who did not yet drink. Discussion between younger adolescents and their parents emphasizes the need to avoid riding with intoxicated drivers, and warnings to the effect that if they do drink in the future, they must not drink and drive.

Some positive comments about the approach were made, but these had to do with its possible value in helping to reduce drinking and driving. There was some resentment and confusion about using this program to discuss minimum age drinking rather than to discuss laws more related to driving. These comments were similar to some made about the previous program involving the use license restrictions to sanction drinking offenses.

7. ALTERNATIVE SANCTIONS FOR ALCOHOL OFFENSES

Program goal: To provide individual attention, counseling, and treatment to youth under age 21 who commit an offense involving alcohol. The purpose is to prevent the offender from committing the same or a similar alcohol-related offense and from drinking again while they are underage.

Major activities: Youth who commit an offense involving alcohol such as disorderly conduct or malicious destruction may be referred to the program prior to arrest, before trial, or after trial as part of probation. The offenders receive counseling concerning alcohol use and related issues for one year. They may also be required to enter a treatment program such as Alcoholics Anonymous. Offenders who complete the program may have the original charges/penalties dropped or reduced. Youth who do not complete the program are returned to the court for punishment.

This approach did not produce strong reactions by the experts or by youth. The experts overall rankings of the program in terms of its potential to prevent drinking varied widely from second to sixteenth.

Their responses concerning the ease of implementing the program were also mixed: three panelists selected "Very" or "Fairly Difficult" on the scale, and five chose "Fairly Easy." Regardless of their rating, several panelists commented that there must be adequate funding and well trained professional counselors to carry out the program. Some panelists were concerned about the ability of the criminal justice system to track information on the offenders so that court orders could be enforced.

The group was divided on the question of program effectiveness: four chose "Fairly Ineffective" and four "Fairly Effective." In part, this difference had to do with how the question was interpreted. When the question was taken to refer to adolescents at large, the experts judged that the effect on youth would be small and indirect. When the question was taken to refer to adolescents who become involved in the program, the panelists responses were more positive. One panelist noted a problem underlying treatment approaches is that "there is little evidence of the effectiveness of treatment programs."

Three panelists thought the treatment approach would be unappealing to youth; five felt it would be "Fairly Appealing." A panelist who felt youth would not find the program appealing wrote: "Few offenders will be ready to take advantage of the positive aspects of counseling. Those who do not have a problem will get nothing out of it." Comments supporting the other position included:

- o "If it avoids a conviction and other sanctions, it should have appeal."
- o "Teens recognize that there are 'problem drinkers' among them and would endorse the idea of forcing them into counseling or treatment."

All the panel members thought Alternative Sanctions would be "Fairly" or "Very" appealing to the public. A representative comment from the panel was: "A positive helping intervention is likely to be well received."

All the panelists estimated that it was "Very" or "Fairly Likely" that youth would be able to circumvent the program. Several panelists mentioned that youth involved in treatment would be likely to circumvent the program. One mentioned that many individuals continue to drink while in treatment. Others suggested that some youth would agree to treatment only to avoid other punishment. Another comment was that "this is an after-the-fact program, and involves youth who have already obtained alcohol." Another panelist commented that the program would not constrain the drinking of youth in general.

Recommendations made by the panel included:

- o Recognize that some high-risk drinking by youth is not always "alcoholic drinking" and that treatment may not be appropriate. "Most offenders are not in need of treatment."
- o Screen teens very carefully in order to determine the need for treatment.
- o Add counseling/treatment to other sanctions (such as fines and license suspension), rather than using counseling as a total substitute for them.
- o Publicity about the program might help deter drinking.
- o Monitor the treatment process and prohibited behavior closely.

There was limited support for this approach among youth. Some members of the focus groups felt this "could be helpful for a real abuser," however, there was more concern than praise for the program and many of the concerns were similar to those expressed by the expert panel:

- o Most adolescents do not have drinking problems. "This is not appropriate for a first offense."
- o Teens may agree to participate in the program "because its the easy way out" and not take the counseling seriously.

- o "This is too easy a punishment" -- other sanctions should not be eliminated entirely."

8. SERVER TRAINING

Program goal: To reduce the purchase and consumption of alcohol by minors and to reduce alcohol-related accidents.

Major activities: An educational program is offered to vendors who sell alcohol or who serve alcoholic beverages. The vendors and their staffs are given information concerning: methods for recognizing underage drinkers and false identification, the legal penalties for selling/serving to persons under age 21, the high rates of alcohol-related crashes among youth, along with other information about responsible serving practices. The program may be self-taught from a pre-packaged curriculum or taught by trained instructors.

The panelists' overall rankings for this approach were in the middle range. Apart from one panelist who ranked Server Training first, the range was from sixth through fourteenth.

There was disagreement over how easy it would be to implement Server Training: three chose "Fairly Difficult," three "Fairly Easy," and two "Very Easy." Some panelists felt that implementation would be facilitated by the fact that server training curricula exist. Others stated that many establishments are eager to adopt this approach because they "see such training as a means of minimizing their legal liability."

Several factors were discussed that might complicate implementation:

- o The cost for implementing the program could be high depending on whether one uses professional trainers or a self-taught course, etc.
- o "Finding one program to fit all situations is difficult."
- o "Monitoring the quality for the training is difficult."

Seven of the panelists believed this program would be "Fairly Effective." Remarks included:

- o "Depends on the quality of training and incentives to implement the skills learned."
- o "If establishments policies are clear...and employees are supported to not serve minors, [server training] can be fairly effective."
- o "For those youth who purchase [alcohol] themselves either with or without false identification, there is a good possibility of reduced sales."

The one panelist who selected "Very Ineffective" mentioned "that only some establishments would adopt the approach and "even fewer will provide it often enough to keep up with high turnover or will provide refresher training." He also wondered what research evidence existed to show that server training is effective.

The panelists felt either that Server Training would be "Fairly Unappealing" to youth (four panelists), or that most youth would be unaffected "unless they are turned down or their IDs are confiscated."

All the panelists thought this program would be "Fairly" or "Very Appealing" to the public because it places responsibility on vendors and seems a "logical approach to get to the supply-side of the formula."

The experts differed on the question of how likely it is that youth would circumvent Server Training: one thought it "Very Likely," four "Fairly Likely," two "Fairly Unlikely," and one "Very Unlikely." Those who were pessimistic discussed the fact that youth have other sources of alcohol, including establishments that do not adopt server training. The optimists focused on the fact that, if properly implemented, server training would make it more difficult for adolescents to obtain alcohol.

Panelists offered the following advice about this approach:

- o Provide refresher courses for staff and methods for educating new staff.
- o Offer incentives to servers such as rewards for confiscating false identification.
- o Publicize the program at drinking sites in order to deter off adolescents.
- o Make training required versus optional.
- o Evaluate the training through testing of employees.
- o Improve working relationships between serving establishments and enforcement agencies.
- o Collect Information from youth about how they "beat the system," and use this to design better policies and procedures.

The youth focus groups did not review this approach.

9. ALTERNATIVE ACTIVITIES FOR YOUTH

Program goal: To encourage teenagers to refrain from using alcohol by promoting their participation in alcohol-free activities.

Major activities: Alcohol-free parties, dances, adventure retreats and other activities are planned by youth with adult support and guidance. Often, these activities are scheduled to take place when large numbers of youth participate in special events, such as proms or school graduations. Ordinarily, this type of program takes place in place in schools.

Most panelists' ranked this about in the middle in terms of its potential for reducing drinking, but there was diversity of opinion -- the rankings ranged from second to fifteenth.

There was also a good deal of diversity in estimating the ease with which this approach could be implemented. Three experts felt it would be "Very" or "Fairly Difficult" to implement. Reasons given for their views were:

- o Lack of sufficient funds to "really support" these activities.
- o A great deal of effort is required to provide ongoing alternatives.
- o Much "energy and creativity" is needed to create viable events/activities.

Five panelists indicated it would be "Fairly" or "Very Easy" to implement Alternative Activities. The main justification offered for their position was that "A lot of schools already do this" which demonstrates that the approach is workable and "they just need to expand the programs."

Most (six) of the panel felt the program would be "Fairly" or "Very Effective." They argued that interesting activities "may attract some persons who would otherwise go to drinking settings." One of the two panelists who felt this approach would not be effective stated: "The problem is not a lack of alternative activities, but a perception by youth of what is socially acceptable or even expected of them by their peers." A very common remark was that the program will not appeal to high-risk youth.

Most of the panel (six) believed the program would or could be "Fairly" or "Very Appealing" to youth. One of the experts who has worked on such projects felt that "larger numbers of underage youth are supporting alternative activities than in the past."

Two concerns were expressed: (1) that youth support would very much depend on the quality of the activities and, (2) as mentioned above, that the program would not appeal to most high-risk youth.

All the panelists thought the program would appeal to the public -- in fact seven of the eight chose "Very Appealing." One member wrote: "from the public's point of view there's nothing to object to." Another stated that "providing alternatives to drinking is an easy concept to 'sell' to the public."

Seven panelists estimated that youth would be "Very" or "Fairly Likely" to circumvent the program. Many of the "holes" that panelist identified were similar to those mentioned in their review of the Safe Homes program:

- o Youth can drink before or after the event.
- o A few adolescents may attempt to bring alcohol into the event.
- o Adolescents can opt to attend parties/events where alcohol is available.

Some of the panels' proposals for improving Alternative Activities were:

- o Involve youth in the planning, which will increase their investment in the program. One expert suggested trying to engage high-risk youth in planning events.
- o Adopt strict policies that deny entrance to anyone who is intoxicated or who attempts to bring alcohol to the event.
- o Strive to make the events interesting/entertaining.
- o In order to control alcohol use "off the premises," do not allow adolescents to leave and the re-enter the event.

Youth were fairly unenthusiastic about the approach, though not nearly as negative, overall, as they were about the similar Safe Homes approach. One comment that seems to sum up the prevailing attitude was: "Some kids would choose an alcohol-free party, some would chose a drinking party -- it's nice to have a choice."

In critiquing the program youth mentioned many of the same issues they discussed when reviewing safe homes:

- o Teens can drink before or after the event.
- o Teens can simply chose to attend events where drinking is more tolerated.

- o Alcohol-free parties will be most appealing to adolescents who do not drink.

They also added some new concerns. The main one was that alternative programs would lose their appeal over time. Also, in contrast to Safe Homes, many group members felt that teens would try to smuggle alcohol into these events.

Teens advised that Alternative Activities must be very special and interesting to attract many non-drinkers. Some said there was a danger that a "bad party will leave kids thinking alcohol-free is boring." Another piece of advice was to de-emphasize the alcohol-free aspect of the event and emphasize its entertainment values. They also recommended that such events be closely chaperoned by teachers or other authority figures. A few youth said that the presence of police helped maintain order and reduce drinking at gatherings.

10. YOUTH GROUP TRAINING

Program goal: To develop leadership skills among youth and train them to plan and implement alcohol prevention programs in their schools and communities.

Major activities: Programs usually take place over the summer in a residential retreat and may last a few days to a week. Through workshops and activities adolescents learn refusal skills, leadership skills, alcohol/drug education, fund-raising activities and techniques, methods for starting alcohol-free youth groups in their own communities, etc. Youth may be accompanied to the program by representatives of their schools or communities.

The panel ranked youth group training fairly high among the programs. The rankings ranged from first through tenth and two placed it among the "top three" programs (see Table 2, page 13).

Five panel members felt it would be "Fairly Difficult" to implement this approach. The chief concerns were that it would require "lots of preparation, staff, and money." Three panelists indicated this program would be "Fairly Easy" to implement, but two of these also expressed reservations about staffing and funds.

Seven of the panel estimated that the program would be "Fairly" or "Very Effective" in preventing underage drinking. They explained that "youth are generally responsive to their peers" and that the effectiveness would be greatest among those who actually attended the training. One panel member felt the program would be "Fairly Ineffective" when judged in terms of its broad impact: "It will probably have some effect on attendees, but not on communities."

Most (seven) of the panel also believed that youth would find the program "Fairly" (three) or "Very Appealing" (four): "there are youth who are looking for an activity/group to connect with that offers an alternative to alcohol and drugs." At the same time panelists acknowledged that the appeal may be limited to "responsible youth" and that the challenge would be to "recruit high-risk youth or persuade organizations to allow them to participate."

Again, all the panelist felt this program would appeal to parents. Five chose "Very Appealing."

There were differences of opinion concerning circumvention of the program. Three panelists believed it "Very" or "Fairly Likely" youth would circumvent the program; four felt it was "Fairly Unlikely," and one did not respond. An example of negative assess-

ment was: "those inclined to drink will continue to so and only a small number of youth can be reached." On the positive side, panelists maintained that at least in the short run, students who participate will be far less likely to use alcohol."

Advice as to how to improve this approach included:

- o Target high-risk youth -- adult children of alcoholics, those in trouble at school or with the legal system, etc.
- o Use older trained students to deliver educational program to younger students.
- o Involve adults in the training so the teens will have their help in implementing programs.
- o Train more people from fewer communities in order to maximize impact.
- o Provide retraining on a period basis.

Youth were far less supportive of this option than the panel. Younger adolescents were particularly negative, ranking it among the worst three programs overall. This was interesting since many older adolescents thought the program would be better for "younger kids."

The major points made in the groups were:

- o This approach is not attractive to the many teens who drink. It appeals more to "goody goodies." It would be more attractive if it emphasized responsible drinking instead of abstinence.
- o When abstinent youth try to teach others about alcohol use, many "kids will not listen to them."
- o It will be very difficult for trained teens to start a program in their school/community alone. They need help, including help from adults.
- o More people should be trained from a single community.
- o The training should be made interesting and recreational activities should be offered to encourage participation. Payment would also encourage participation.

11. ALCOHOL-FREE COLLEGES/UNIVERSITIES

Program goal: To provide an alcohol-free environment to students of the university community.

Major activities: As part of college or university policies and regulations, student possession or consumption of drugs/alcoholic beverages is prohibited on campus. Occasionally the policy may extend to non-student members of the college/university. The policy and penalties for violating it are publicized through the student handbook, school newspaper, etc.

The panels' overall evaluation of Alcohol-Free Colleges/Universities was low to average. The range in rankings was from fifth to eighteen (last), and two of the panelists ranked this option among the worst three (see Table 2, page 13).

There was some disagreement among panelists as to the ease with which this approach could be implemented, but most felt it would be difficult: three indicated it would be "Very Difficult," three "Fairly Difficult," one "Fairly Easy," and one "Very Easy." Panelists who felt this would be difficult made remarks such as:

- o This approach "invades privacy."
- o Since colleges have some students over age 21, prohibitionist policies are difficult to adopt and implement.
- o The approach requires careful monitoring and rigorous enforcement to be effective.

Estimates of the program's effectiveness were scattered: one panelist thought it would be "Very Ineffective," four "Fairly Ineffective," two "Fairly Effective," and one "Very Effective." Those who felt it would not be effective stated the following:

- o Students will obtain/consume alcohol elsewhere -- off campus for example.
- o Many will choose to drink and will be more careful about being detected.

Those who felt the program could be effective argued that this approach would limit access to alcohol to some degree.

Seven of the panelists thought students would find this policy objectionable and one panelist did not respond. Panelists wrote:

- o "Students view total prohibition as a violation of their legal rights."

- o "For kids who are going to college to party it's very unappealing. For serious students it's appealing."
- o Students over age 21 might be "especially resentful" of this policy.

Most (six) panelists estimated that the public would support this approach. The panel suggested that the public would find the approach appealing because it places the college/university in charge of drinking problems, a position that parents are not eager to occupy.

Seven of the panelists felt it was "Very Likely: youth would be able to circumvent the prohibition against alcohol. The problem, as one panelist put it, is that "on-campus drinking is only one aspect of student alcohol consumption." Students could attend off-campus parties or drink at off-campus bars and restaurants using fake identification (or real identification if they are over 21). They can also simply "learn to avoid getting caught." Panelists pointed out that this policy may increase the risk of alcohol-related accidents, if students drive off-campus to drink.

Among the suggestions panelists made for improving this policy were the following:

- o As an alternative to prohibition, create more controlled drinking environments on campus.
- o Consider penalizing "any student found guilty of any alcohol related offense whether on or off campus."
- o Backup the policy with consistent enforcement and publicity.

The youth focus groups did not review this approach.

12. POLICY DEVELOPMENT FOR COLLEGES/UNIVERSITIES

Program goal: To develop more effective methods for reducing underage drinking and alcohol abuse by sharing experiences among colleges and universities.

Major activities: Through newsletters, conferences, and other means college/university administrators and interested students are provided with information concerning alcohol laws and regulations. Meetings and publications also serve as forums to share information concerning college/university policies and prevention activities concerning alcohol use.

The panelists' overall ratings for this option were low. They ranked it from eleventh to eighteenth. It was also one of the approaches that was ranked most often as among the worst three.

Almost all (seven) of the panelists thought it would be "Fairly" or "Very Easy" to implement this type of program. They mentioned that this approach has been tried in several areas of the country, and they felt "it would not be difficult to find colleges that are willing to take on this type of networking." One panel member indicated that "existing publications and professional conferences can be utilized to address the issues."

The panel divided on the question of effectiveness. Four thought it would be "Very" or "Fairly Ineffective," two that it would be "Fairly Effective," and two did not complete the scale. The most commonly mentioned problem with the approach was that as a process it does not directly affect students. One member stated: "This is a good idea, but a weak countermeasure in and of itself." One of the abstaining panelists wrote: "program effectiveness would depend on the policies adopted."

Three panelists thought students would find this idea "Fairly Unappealing," two selected "Fairly Appealing," and two "Very Appealing" (one did not respond). Panelists didn't provide much justification for their positions. On one side of the issue, there was a pronouncement that "most students would be utterly indifferent." On the other side, there was an assertion that "students would very much like to be part of this process."

Seven panelists felt Policy Development would prove "fairly" or "Very Appealing" to the public because it asks nothing from them and promises to enforce the law.

Six of the panel believed that youth would circumvent this approach (two felt the question was irrelevant without specifying a policy). The dominant view was that youth would be essentially unaffected by the adoption of this procedure for policy making.

The proposals made for improving this program were:

- o Develop a consensus document with input from all the participants.**
- o Ensure that the policies are well publicized and enforced.**
- o Involve students, especially campus leaders, in the process.**

The youth focus groups did not review this approach.

13. ADULT PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION

Program goal: To promote compliance with underage drinking laws.

Major activities: Messages in electronic and print media discuss the importance of underage drinking laws. Topics addressed include negative effects of drinking on youth (e.g., alcohol-related crashes) and the penalties for alcohol vendors and other adults for providing alcohol to underage youth, and the server's potential legal liability for damages caused by intoxicated youth.

This was one of the least-favored approaches. In making an overall assessment, one panelist ranked this approach second, but the rest ranked it only from tenth through seventeenth.

Three of the experts felt this approach would prove difficult to implement, the rest thought it would be "Fairly Easy" or "Easy." Both camps expressed reservations about the costs involved in developing effective and sophisticated campaigns: "Public service announcements are OK, but paying for slick advertising will improve effectiveness."

The panelists' estimates of effectiveness were almost evenly distributed across the scale.

Four members believed this approach would be "Fairly Unappealing to youth. Although the publicity would not be directed at youth, some panelists thought adolescents would "resent the big brother approach." Another said that adolescents "Don't particularly like to hear about laws and negative consequences." The other half of the group thought the publicity would be "Fairly" or "Very Appealing" to youth.

All but one panel member indicated that this program would be "Fairly" or "Very Acceptable" to the general public; "the only resistance will come from those who do not believe in or support underage drinking laws." One panel member stated that "by seeing this on television the general public will be more apt to believe the issue is being addressed seriously."

The question about youth's ability to circumvent this approach was, quite correctly, treated as largely irrelevant by the panel.

There were a few suggestions for enhancing this approach:

- o Involve underage youth in the design and implementation of these messages."
- o Institute this program in conjunction with other approaches (like server training).

o Invest in quality publicity and heavy media coverage.
Youth did not review this approach.

14. ALCOHOL-FREE YOUTH GROUPS

Program goal: To encourage abstinence from alcohol and other drugs among adolescents.

Major activities: Adolescents sign a pledge that they will not use alcohol or illegal drugs. They become part of a large, national list of young people who have made this pledge (such as "Just Say No"). Members may wear T-shirts, buttons, etc. showing their involvement in the group.

This program received little support from the panel. Six of the panelists ranked it thirteenth or higher and three ranked among the worst three programs (see Table 2, page 13) for preventing adolescent drinking.

Seven panelists estimated that it would be "Fairly" or "Very Easy" to implement such a program. Their main concerns about implementation were: obtaining adequate publicity, maintaining excitement about the program over time, and developing appropriate materials.

Six panelists felt this approach would be "Fairly Ineffective" and two selected "Fairly Effective." The comments by all the panelists were of two types: (1) reservations about how well the program would work with older adolescents, and (2) concern that the program would attract primarily those adolescents who are at the lowest risk for abusing alcohol.

The ratings for appeal to youth were spread across "Very Unappealing," "Fairly Unappealing," and "Fairly Unappealing." Many panelists commented that the programs would appeal most to younger adolescents (pre- Junior High School).

The panelists felt that "Just Say No type programs probably have fairly broad appeal to the general public." All of them guessed it would be "Fairly" or "Very Appealing."

All the panelists also agreed that adolescents would be "Very" or "Fairly Likely" to circumvent this approach: "A pledge is only as good as the motivation to maintain it."

The panel recommended the following improvements to the program:

- o More information and skill training in how to refuse alcohol and resist peer pressure to drink.
- o Begin this approach at a very young age and reinforce it frequently.
- o Train those who sign the pledge how to recruit others into the program.

- o Provide alternative entertainment and other incentives for members of the group.
- o Emphasize a local affiliation rather than a national one.

Adolescents were not very supportive of Alcohol-free youth groups. As the panel predicted, younger adolescents were less negative about it than older adolescents. No younger adolescent ranked this approach among the worst, but a large proportion of older youth assigned it a very low rank. It was ranked among the among the three to four worst programs in terms of probable effectiveness.

Interestingly, although the younger adolescents were less negative about the approach, they had almost no positive comments to make about it. Many felt it would be more positively received by a still-younger age group -- children in elementary school.

Comments in the groups included:

- o This approach will be attractive only to youth who do not drink and who plan to remain abstinent.
- o Some adolescents may sign the pledge and continue to drink.
- o Many teens reported they would be embarrassed if a listing of those who had signed the pledge were made public.
- o The program might cause friction between drinkers and non-drinkers who pledge.
- o Endorsement of the program by celebrities might help encourage participation in the program.

Recommendations from the groups were:

- o Plan ongoing, entertaining events to keep the program attractive.
- o Introduce the program to very young children (elementary school-age). They will accept it and the program may have a lasting effect on them.

15. RANDOM ALCOHOL TESTING

Program goal: To prevent alcohol use by adolescent students, before or during school.

Major activities: A random sample of students is required to submit to urine sampling, breathtesting, or other screening test designed to detect alcohol consumption. When the test indicates that alcohol has been used, sanctions may include suspension from participation in athletic teams or other extra-curricular activities, suspension from school, etc. In addition, students may be required to enter an alcohol-abuse treatment program.

This approach was regarded as among the worst by the panelists (see Table 2, page 13). Six ranked it in the lower half of programs and four ranked it among the worst three programs.

All the panelists believed that it would be "Very Difficult" to implement this type of program. They offered two reasons for this: (1) high cost, and (2) legal and ethical issues -- (opposition to such an intrusive program).

Four panelists felt that Random Testing would be ineffective, primarily because it "would discourage alcohol consumption on schools days only." Two of the four panelists who thought Random Testing would be effective acknowledged that adolescents could drink at other times, but emphasized that this program would reduce alcohol consumption during and immediately prior to school.

All of the panelists thought that youth would find this approach unappealing; 6 six "Very Unappealing." Comments by the experts indicated they felt that both youth who drink and those who do not would find Random Testing "alienating and intrusive."

Six panelists thought that the general public would not find this approach appealing and condemned it as intrusive and unfair.

Responses to the question about the likelihood of youth circumventing the program were distributed across the scale. Some panelists commented that youth would evade the program by drinking on non-school days. Others felt that eliminating or greatly reducing intoxication at school was a laudable and achievable goal and provided an adequate rationale for the program.

There were no important suggestions from the expert panel for improving the approach. Members did, however, discuss some questions and concerns, such as:

- o What will be the negative consequences of suspending students who are caught?

- o Do the students who are caught necessarily need treatment?
How will they be screened?

Not surprisingly the adolescents also gave this approach low marks. They identified this approach as one of the three or four that would be least likely to prevent adolescent drinking. Older adolescents were more likely to hold this position.

Like the panelists, the focus group participants mentioned that this approach would not deter drinking on the weekends or at other times that testing would not reveal. They added that very few students drink in school.

There were many comments by youth that Random Testing was "unfair" and "violated" their rights. Some asked pointedly how teachers or administrators would react if they were also asked to submit to this screening.

Youth identified additional concerns about the program:

- o Suspension may not be a meaningful threat to a student who would drink in school.
- o The approach seems too focused on detecting and punishing drinkers. More thought should be given to why students would drink in school and how those with a drinking problem could be helped.
- o The program would have to devise appropriate punishment for people who refused to be tested.
- o Some students may shift from alcohol to other drugs to escape detection. To prevent this, the testing would have to be designed to detect all drugs.

16. CHANGES IN DESIGN AND DISTRIBUTION OF DRIVER LICENSES

Program goal: To prevent underage drivers from altering or falsifying their licenses to purchase alcohol and to facilitate identification of those under age 21 from their license.

Major activities: Special licenses are developed to help identify drivers under age 21. For example, licenses issued to minors may be colored differently, the date of birth may be made more salient and difficult to alter (by using raised letters), and/or "UNDER 21" may be stamped prominently on the license. A plastic laminate is used to help prevent altering of paper licenses. In addition, the distribution of licenses is monitored more closely. For example, more positive identification is required to obtain a original or duplicate (replacement) license.

This was a popular approach among panelists. They ranked it from first to eleventh; five placed it among the best three approaches for preventing adolescent drinking.

Some panelists raised questions about what the costs for this might be, but seven estimated that it would probably be "Fairly" or "Very Easy" to implement this program.

Most panelists felt the program would reduce adolescent drinking: six chose "Fairly Effective" and one "Very Effective." One panelist summed things up with: "It will make altering IDs more difficult and thus lower the supply." Two factors which the panel thought would detract from the program's effectiveness were: (1) it does not prevent the use of fake ID's (though it makes obtaining a good fake more difficult); and (2) teens can still obtain alcohol from other sources.

Six of the panelists indicated that this approach would not be appealing to youth because it would interfere with their supply of alcohol. The other two panelists abstained and explained that it did not seem to matter whether youth would approve of this approach -- it would be imposed on them.

As was so often the case, all the panelists believe that Changes in Driver License would be appealing to the general public. Seven indicated it would be "Very Appealing."

The panel was split on the question of how likely it was that youth could circumvent the program: five chose "Fairly Likely," and four "Fairly Unlikely." Despite these differences, comments by all the panelists were very similar. The two main points they made were: (1) youth will always be able to obtain alcohol, though this measure makes it more difficult; and (2) high quality fake IDs can be used to purchase alcohol.

Ideas for improving this approach included:

- o **Combine it with better enforcement of laws prohibiting sales to minors.**
- o **Construct the license from special paper or other material that will reveal attempts to tamper with it.**
- o **Couple this approach with more severe penalties for using false identification.**
- o **Educate alcohol vendors in how to detect false identification.**
- o **Require at least two ID's for the purchase of alcohol.**

Once again, the teens' assessment of this approach closely matched the experts opinions.

Focus group members, especially the older ones, objected to this program because it would make it more difficult to obtain alcohol. Nevertheless, both older and younger participants ranked this approach among the top three for preventing adolescent drinking.

The groups' main reservations about the program's effectiveness were:

- o **Youth can still obtain alcohol from friends and parents and by using false identification.**
- o **The program is not relevant for adolescents who are too young to try and purchase alcohol.**
- o **Program success depends on how vigorously alcohol vendors will comply with the laws.**

Youth explained that obtaining false identification is relatively easy. Many were able to name sources or knew people who were likely to know sources. One participant told of a person who sold fake licenses door to door in the dormitories of a large university.

17. INCREASED PENALTIES FOR FALSE IDENTIFICATION

Program goal: To discourage the production and use of false identification.

Major activities: Penalties are increased for manufacturing and selling false identification, for knowingly allowing another to use your license as identification, or for using false or revoked/suspended identification. This includes the imposition of mandatory minimum penalties (e.g., a \$500 fine for using false identification to obtain alcohol when underage). In addition, alcohol vendors are given the authority to confiscate any ID believed to be fraudulent or altered and return it to authorities. These policies would be highly publicized.

The panel also reacted favorably to this approach. Seven of them ranked it second through fifth among the programs.

Seven panelists indicated this policy would be "Fairly Easy" or "Easy" to implement. Although implementation would depend on passage of a law, which can always be difficult, in this case, the panel saw no obstacles. Some panelists warned that obtaining monies to support enforcement of the law might prove difficult.

All the panelists indicated that this approach would be "Fairly Effective" in reducing adolescent drinking. They felt it would "narrow further opportunities for using false IDs -- the only options left involve getting alcohol from friends, family, etc." Some concerns about effectiveness that panelists mentioned were the need for enforcement of this law, and the need for suitable tamper-proof identification.

Most panelists (six) felt youth would find this measure unappealing because it limits their access to alcohol. One panelist mentioned that the confiscation of IDs would be especially unpopular.

The panelists believed that the public would find this approach "Fairly" or "Very Appealing." One reason given was that it places "penalties where they belong, on the perpetrator," rather than the vendor. Others felt the public readily supports law enforcement measures because they ask nothing of them.

The panel suggested some strategies for increasing the effectiveness of this approach:

- o Promote rigorous enforcement of the law.
- o Provide rewards for confiscating fake IDs.
- o Combine this approach with the previous one: Changes in Design and Distribution of Driver Licenses.

- o One panelist felt the penalties would have to be greater than a \$500 fine.

Youth also thought this approach could be effective. They ranked it among the top 3-4 programs in this respect.

Two concerns they had about this approach were also mentioned during their discussion of the previous program: (1) the program would have to be enforced (by vendors among others), and (2) many teens obtain alcohol without making use of fake IDs. A concern they added about Increased Penalties for False Identification was that the penalty proposed was "too soft." Some teens suggested loss of one's drivers license would inspire more compliance with the law.

18. STUDENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Program goal: To encourage an alcohol-free environment in the schools and to offer counseling and referral services to students experiencing problems related to alcohol abuse.

Major activities: Modeled on employee assistance programs, these programs aim to identify youth with alcohol abuse problems either through peer-, teacher-, or self-referrals. A variety of counseling and referral options may be offered including peer counseling, in-school counseling by professional staff, support groups, or treatment services provided in the community. As with employee assistance programs, students can receive assistance without fear of negative consequences imposed by the school.

The panel evaluated Student Assistance Programs (SAPs) quite highly. The rankings ranged from first through thirteenth. Three panelists ranked this program among the three most likely to prevent/reduce adolescent drinking.

Half the panelists indicated this program would be "Very" or "Fairly Difficult" to implement; half that it would be "Fairly" or "Very Easy" to implement. The difference between these two camps reflected different suppositions about the effort and money that would be required to staff such a program and to provide adequate training and supervision.

Most (six) panel members believed the program would be "Fairly Effective" in preventing underage drinking. This assessment referred to the particular students who became involved in the program and not to youth in general. As one panelist stated: "Whether it is effective in reducing consumption by students in general is more doubtful."

All the panelists felt that students would find the program "Fairly" or "Very Appealing": "Kids want to be sure help is available to their friends if not themselves." One panelist argued that the programs' appeal would depend on guaranteeing student confidentiality and immunity from punishment.

All the panelists also felt the general public would find SAPs "Fairly" or "Very Appealing." The panel anticipated some resistance from parents who might feel the school was interfering in "family business" and parents who objected to the referral mechanism.

Seven panelists indicated that it was "Very" or "Fairly Likely" that youth could circumvent the program. They felt students under treatment would probably be closely monitored and so less inclined to use/abuse alcohol. Students not in the program would not be affected. One panelist wondered whether adolescents expe-

riencing problems would be likely to come to the attention of the program and how detection could be improved.

Little advice was offered as to how to strengthen the program:

- o The issues the program addressees should be broader, e.g., other drugs, teenage pregnancy, etc.,
- o Couple this approach with a primary prevention and wellness curriculum for all students.
- o Ensure an adequate well-trained staff.
- o Involve students in planning the program.
- o Inform/train teachers and administrators about the program goals and procedures.

Youth also rated SAPs highly (though not quite as highly as the experts). They believed that having this option available might be helpful to teens with serious problems.

Their main concern about the approach was that adolescents would not be willing to refer friends unless they were guaranteed anonymity. The only other concern voiced in the groups was whether the program would correctly distinguish between those teens with true "drinking problems" and teens who may drink, but do not have drinking problems. The participants felt that if this program or similar efforts attempted to prohibit drinking per se, adolescents would not cooperate with it.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Programs Most Likely To Prevent Underage Drinking

By and large, the panel of experts and the youth focus groups agreed in their assessments of which approaches would be the most effective in deterring underage drinking.

Types of programs which the experts were most likely to rank among the top three were:

- License Restrictions for Youth Alcohol Offenders
- Changes In Design and Distribution of Driver Licenses
- Student Assistance Programs

The programs ranked most highly by focus group participants were:

- License Restrictions for Youth Alcohol Offenders
- Changes In Design and Distribution of Driver Licenses
- Increased Penalties for False Identification

The similarities between the opinions of youth and of the experts is even greater than it appears based on these lists. Student Assistance Programs were also ranked very highly by youth and Increased Penalties for False Identification was ranked very highly by the expert panel.

Programs Least Likely To Prevent Underage Drinking

Programs the expert panel ranked as having the least potential for preventing underage drinking were:

- Presentation of License in Juvenile Court
- Policy Development For College/Universities
- Alcohol-Free Youth Groups
- Random Alcohol Testing

(Four programs rather than 3 are listed because there were ties in the rankings).

The programs that received the lowest ratings by youth were:

- Safe Homes
- Presentation of License in Juvenile Court
- Random Alcohol Testing

Again, the match between the choices made by youth and the experts is closer than the lists imply. First, Policy Development For College/Universities could not appear on the youth list because the focus groups were not asked to evaluate this approach.

Second, although Safe Homes does not appear on the experts' list, they rated it very poorly.

Implications for Program Development

The following are additional conclusions drawn from the expert panel and focus groups:

- o In many cases, programs that youth felt had potential for preventing drinking were also programs they would rather not see implemented since they would make it harder for them to drink. The implication for program planners is that a program which youth do not find appealing should not be overlooked as a potentially useful approach for preventing underage drinking.
- o The experts repeatedly advised that youth be involved in planning and assessing prevention programs. Although youth in this project tended to share many of the same views as the expert panel, this does not mean they would have nothing to offer as collaborators in program design. In fact, youth offered ideas about how to improve programs which the experts overlooked.
- o With very few exceptions, the experts felt that the general public would accept the programs reviewed here. Assuming this is correct, program planners should focus more on enhancing program effectiveness than appeasing public opinion.
- o There were no marked differences in the responses of older versus younger adolescents to the programs. In general, younger adolescents were inclined to be somewhat more positive in their evaluations of the approaches and more tolerant of programs that emphasized abstinence such as Alcohol-Free Youth Groups. This is not surprising since younger subjects were far less likely to drink without their parents' permission (see Table 1, page 9). This does not mean that program designer should ignore age, but it does suggest that adolescents in the age ranges represented in this study (11-20) may not respond very differently to prevention efforts.
- o Both the expert panel and youth felt that adolescents could circumvent the approaches reviewed. Although many recommendations which would help strengthen programs were made, it appears that determined youth can always manage to obtain alcohol and enforcement is unlikely to increase the perception of risk to the point where youth will abstain from alcohol altogether.

Recommendations for Future Research

The lack of hard data on the effectiveness of the programs we investigated, points to a need to conduct rigorous evaluations of programs to prevent underage drinking. The programs that were the highest rated by youth and by the panel of experts are logical candidates for such studies.

Research should also be done to identify additional approaches and programs that may prevent adolescent drinking. For example, our panelists suggested the following should be investigated:

- o Special patrols of areas in which youth drink as part of a program to increase enforcement of laws concerning underage possession of alcohol.
- o Rewards for vendors who comply with underage drinking laws, rewards for doormen and other servers for identifying underage drinkers.

Programs that enlist the support of parents should also be investigated. This recommendation is based on the fact that adolescents in the focus groups reported that their decisions about drinking are influenced as least as much by how they think their parents will react as by the law.

Given the relatively small and non-representative sample of adolescents used in this project, it would be useful to test the generalizability of the results on additional subjects from a broad range of social classes and with varied drinking behavior. Since some of the approaches apply specifically to college students their opinions about these approaches should be obtained -- this was not done in this study.

Another population that should be queried is adults, especially parents, in order to determine whether the panelists' estimates of their reactions to the programs were accurate.

From the outset, this project focused exclusively on programs to prevent drinking. Future research should consider the wide variety of programs that promote safer drinking among adolescents, such as designated driver and safe ride programs. Both the expert panel and youth from the focus groups emphasized the importance of considering these types of programs.

In the course of evaluating one type of program, members of the expert panel and focus groups often mentioned other programs they felt would complement and enhance the program's effectiveness. A long-term research goal is to investigate the effects of delivering various type of programs in combination. One logical grouping would be programs designed to influence the point of

sale/distribution of alcohol to minors. Programs which might be combined include: Sting Operations to detect underage serving/sales, Increased Enforcement in Suspect Serving Establishments, Increased Penalties and Enforcement for Laws Concerning Serving of Alcohol to Persons Under Age 21, Server Training, Changes in the Design and Distribution of Driver Licenses, and Increased Penalties for False Identification.

REFERENCES

Harding, W.M., Apsler, R.A., and Walsh, W.A. Preliminary report On Programs Investigated To "Determine Feasible And Acceptable Age 21 Support Programs." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, April, 1990.

National Institute on Drug Abuse, National Household Survey on drug Abuse: Main Findings 1985, Rockville, Maryland: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institute on drug Abuse, DHHS Pub. No. (ADM)88-1586, 1988.

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, National Center for Statistics & Analysis 1987 Fatality Facts, Washington, D.C.: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, October 1988.

APPENDIX A:
PROGRAMS FOR WHICH DETAILED INFORMATION WAS COLLECTED

Enforcement

Program Name: No name
Program Sponsors: Department of Business Regulation, Division of
Alcohol Beverages and Tobacco
Type of Organization (for profit, nonprofit,): nonprofit, state
Spokesperson's name: John Harris
Spokesperson's position: Deputy Director
Address: 725 S. Bronogh St., The Johns Building, Tallahassee
Florida 32399-1023
Telephone number: (904) 488-3227

Program Name: Operation Last Call
Program Sponsors: Massachusetts Alcohol Beverages Control
Commission
Type of Organization (for profit, nonprofit): state, nonprofit
Spokesperson's name: George McCarthy
Spokesperson's position: Director
Address: 100 Cambridge Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02202
Telephone number: (617) 727-3040

Program Name: Surveillance of Alcohol Vending Establishments
(SAVE)
Program Sponsors: Michigan State Police
Type of Organization (for profit, nonprofit): state, non-profit
Spokesperson's name: (contact for information) Randall J. Bolin
Spokesperson's position: Regional Program Manager
Address: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
18209 Dixie Highway, Suite A
Homewood, Illinois 60430-2294
Telephone number: (708)799-6270

Program Name: 21 Enforcement Program
Program Sponsors: New York State Liquor Authority
Type of Organization (for profit, nonprofit): state, nonprofit
Spokesperson's name:
Spokesperson's position:
Address: 250 Broadway Street, New York, New York 10007
Telephone number: (212) 587-4002
(also contact program evaluators: Anne T. McCartt,
Marc C. Hammer, and Anen M. Dowling at the Institute for
Traffic Safety Management and Research, Rockefeller College
of Public Affairs and Policy, State University of New York
at Albany, 260 Washington Avenue, New York 12210

Driver Licensing

Program Name: Drug Free Youth Act
Program Sponsors: Governor's Highway Safety Office
Type of Organization (for profit, nonprofit): nonprofit
Spokesperson's name: Mike Ellis (1), Jess Hail (2),
Sargent Kathy Greg (3)
Spokesperson's position: Governor's Rep (1), Legislative
draftsman (2), Sargent, state planning office (3)
Address: James K. Polk State Office Building, 505 Deaderick
Street, Suite 600, Nashville, Tennessee 37219
Telephone number: (615) 741-2589 (Mike Ellis), 741-1676
(Jess Hail), 251-5229 (Kathy Gregg)

Program Name: No name
Program Sponsors: Department of Motor Vehicles
Type of Organization (for profit, nonprofit): state, nonprofit
Spokesperson's name: Karen Ruby
Spokesperson's position: Manager, Driver Licensing
Address: 2300 West Broad Street, Richmond, Virginia 23269
Telephone number: (804) 367-0406

Courts, Prosecution, Licensing

Program Name: Newton Youth Alcohol Program
Program Sponsors: Newton Public Schools
Type of Organization (for profit, nonprofit): nonprofit
Spokesperson's name: Matt Greene
Spokesperson's position: Director
Address: 100 Walnut Street, Newtonville, Massachusetts 02160
Telephone number: (617) 969-4925

Alcohol Server Industry

Program Name: Responsible Vendor Program
Program Sponsors: Department of Business Regulation, Division of
Alcoholic Beverages and Tobacco
Type of Organization (for profit, nonprofit): state, nonprofit
Spokesperson's name: John Harris
Spokesperson's position: Deputy Director
Address: 725 S. Bronogh St., The Johns Building, Tallahassee,
Florida 32399-1023
Telephone number: (904) 488-3227

Program Name: No name
Program Sponsors: DeKalb County's District Attorney's Office
Type of Organization (for profit, nonprofit,): state, nonprofit
Spokesperson's name: Bob Wilson (1), Guy Thompson (2)
Spokesperson's position: District Attorney (1), Trainer from the Georgia Hospitality and Travel Association
Address: District Attorney's Office, 7th floor, DeKalb County Court House, Decatur, Georgia 30030
Telephone number: (404) 371-2561

Social Hosts, Events

Program Name: Project Graduation
Program Sponsors: Office of Driver and Safety Education, Vermont Department of Education
Type of Organization (for profit, nonprofit): state, nonprofit
Spokesperson's name: John Harvey
Spokesperson's position: Consultant, Driver and Safety Education/ Pupil Education
Address: State Office Building, Montpelier, Vermont 05602
Telephone number: (802) 828-3126

Parent Groups, Youth Groups

Program Name: Just Say No International
Program Sponsors: Pacific Institute For Research and Evaluation
Type of Organization (for profit, nonprofit): international (Canada), non-profit
Spokesperson's name: Rob Simmons
Spokesperson's position: Program Director
Address: 1777 North California Boulevard, Suite 210, Walnut Creek, California 94596
Telephone number: (415)939-6666

Program Name: Safe Homes
Program Sponsors: Birmingham-Bloomfield Families in Action
Type of Organization (for profit, nonprofit): nonprofit
Spokesperson's name: Patricia Stanton
Spokesperson's position: Counselor at Lahser High School, President of Birmingham-Bloomfield Families in Action
Address: P.O. Box 1088, Birmingham, Michigan 48012-1088
Telephone number: (313) 338-0311 morning, 338-6643 afternoon

Program Name: Students To Offset Peer Pressure (STOPP)
Program Sponsors: Alvirne High School
Type of Organization (for profit, nonprofit): nonprofit, public
Spokesperson's name: Peter Jean
Spokesperson's position: Health teacher, STOPP adviser
Address: P.O. Box 103, Hudson, New Hampshire 03051-0103
Telephone number: (603) 889-8163

Program Name: Texas War on Drugs (summer leadership camp)
Program Sponsors: Texas War on Drugs
Type of Organization (for profit, nonprofit): state, nonprofit
Spokesperson's name: Bobby Heard
Spokesperson's position: Youth Coordinator
Address: 11044 Research, Bldg. D, Suite 200, Austin, Texas 78759
Telephone number: (512) 346-7591

High Schools and Colleges

Program Name: Teens Are Concerned (TAC)
Program Sponsors: Crowley's Ridge Development Council and the
Arkansas Division on Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention
Type of Organization (for profit, nonprofit): nonprofit, com-
munity action agency
Spokesperson's name: Dorothy Newsome
Spokesperson's position: Early Intervention Program Coordinator
and TAC adviser
Address: P.O. Box 1497, Jonesboro, Arkansas 72403
Telephone number: (501) 933-0033

Program Name: BACCHUS (Boost Alcohol Consciousness Concerning
the Health of University Students)
Program Sponsors: BACCHUS of the US, Inc.
Type of Organization (for profit, nonprofit,): nonprofit
Spokesperson's name: Drew Hunter
Spokesperson's position: Executive Director
Address: P.O. Box 10430, Denver, Colorado
Telephone number: (303) 871-3068

Program Name: Interscholastic Athletic Eligibility-Drug Testing
Program Sponsors: Homewood-Flossmore High School
Type of Organization (for profit, nonprofit): nonprofit, public
school
Spokesperson's name: Ken Schultz
Spokesperson's position: Athletic Director
Address: Homewood-Flossmoor High School, 999 Kedzie Ave,
Flossmoor, Illinois 60422
Telephone number: (708) 799-3000

Program Sponsors: St. Olaf College
Type of Organization (for profit, nonprofit): private, for prof-
it, pastoral college
Spokesperson's name: Dean Dan Savinske
Spokesperson's position: Dean of Students
Address: Northfield, Minnesota 55057
Telephone number: (507) 663-2222 or 663-3023

Program Name: Peer Education
Program Sponsors: Newton Public Schools
Type of Organization (for profit, nonprofit): nonprofit, public schools
Spokesperson's name: Manya Harrison
Spokesperson's position: Health educator
Address: 100 Walnut St., Newtonville, Massachusetts 02160
Telephone number: (617) 552-7739

Program Name: Alternatives
Program Sponsors: Alcohol Beverage Control Board
Type of Organization (for profit, nonprofit): state, nonprofit
Spokesperson's name: Tom Weedon
Spokesperson's position: Public Information Director
Address: P.O. Box 27491, Richmond, Virginia 23261
Telephone number: (804) 367-0649

Legislative Support

Program Name: no name
Program Sponsors: Transportation Committee (Iowa Department of Transportation)
Type of Organization (for profit, nonprofit,): state, nonprofit
Spokesperson's name: Al Chrystal
Spokesperson's position:
Address: 800 Lincoln Way, Ames, Iowa 50010
Telephone number: (515) 239-1641

Work Force

Program Name: Come of Age
Program Sponsors: Southland Corporation (7-11 stores)
Type of Organization (for profit, nonprofit): private, for profit
Spokesperson's name: Rosemary Fischer
Spokesperson's position: Assistant, Public Affairs
Address: 7-Eleven Food Stores, Capitol Division 2599,
5300 Shawnee Road, Alexandria, Virginia 22312
Telephone number: (703) 642-0711

Public Information and Education

Program Name: CAMPAIGN 21
Program Sponsors: Department of Highway Safety and Liquor Control
Type of Organization (for profit, nonprofit): nonprofit
Spokesperson's name: Patty Haskins
Spokesperson's position: Assistant Chief, Communications
Address: 2323 West Fifth Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43266-0701.
Telephone number: (614) 644-2556

**APPENDIX B:
MEMBERS OF THE EXPERT PANEL**

William DeJong, Ph.D.
29 Rice Spring Lane
Wayland, Massachusetts 01778
(508) 358-0072

Dr. DeJong is currently a self-employed consultant in health communications. His clients include Abt Associates, Cambridge, MA; Educational Development Center, Newton, MA; The University of Massachusetts Medical Center, Boston, MA; and the Boston University School of Public Health. Dr. DeJong has been Deputy Director of the Harvard Alcohol Project, a national drunk-driving prevention media campaign; consultant to the national office of Mother's Against Drink Driving; and founder of Project DARE (in Massachusetts).

Drew Hunter
Executive Director
BACCHUS of the U.S., Inc.
P.O. Box 100430, Denver, Colorado 80210
(303) 871-3068

Mr. Hunter administers a program for over 400 college and university based peer education programs. He has developed training programs and campaigns to promote support of prevention activities by college and university administrators and students.

Karen Jacobus
Coordinator of Alcohol and Drug Education Program
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts
413 549-2671

Ms. Jacobus has 13 years experience in alcohol and drug prevention education. She has been an instructor for a DWI education program and Health Educator of the University of Massachusetts Regional Prevention Center. In her current position, Ms. Jacobus has conducted training programs for students and parents and school personnel, done community organizing, and worked with the media and other groups.

Michael Klitzner, Ph.D.
**Senior Research Scientist; Pacific Institute for Research
and Evaluation**
Adjunct Assistant Professor of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
George Washington University School of Medicine
Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation
7315 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 900 East
Bethesda, Maryland 20814
(301) 951-4233

Dr. Klitzner has coordinated several national evaluation of substance abuse and DWI prevention. He is author of numerous articles and chapters including a background paper on youth for the 1988 Surgeon General's Workshop on Drunk Driving. He has conducted research under grants from NIDA, NIAAA, and NHTSA.

John Lacey
Principal Scientist
Mid-America Research Institute
1106 Roosevelt Drive
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514
(919) 967-8789

Mr. Lacey has been a program manager for alcohol studies at the University of North Carolina Safety Research Center. He has been active in evaluating alcohol and highway safety programs for the last two decades.

James Peters
President,
Responsible Hospitality Institute
4340 Scotts Valley Drive
Suite I
Scotts Valley, California 95066

Mr. Peters is founder as well as President of the Responsible Hospitality Institute, a non-profit organization serving as a clearinghouse for information on dram shop liability and responsible beverage service programs. Mr. Peters has been a manager of various hospitality businesses and an alcoholism counselor.

James M. Schaefer
Associate Professor; Associate Director Addiction Studies Center
Department of Behavioral Sciences, Medical School
University of Minnesota,
Stadium Gate 27
611 Beacon St. SE
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
612 624-6861

Dr. Schaeffer has created numerous community-based prevention programs on drinking and driving. His research has included work on on patron drinking behavior and early signs of intoxication.

**Margaret G. Thayer
Team Services Consultant
Division of Alcohol and Drug Education Services
State House, Station 57
Augusta, Maine 04333
(207) 289-6500**

Ms. Thayer has served as a school nurse and emergency medical technician on a Rescue unit. She was the Maine State Coordinator for Project Graduation from 1983-86 and developed other highway safety programs and materials. In her current capacity, Ms. Thayer works with local school and community alcohol/drug prevention teams across the State of Maine.

**APPENDIX C:
QUESTIONS POSED TO THE EXPERT PANEL**

This appendix contains two sections. Pages A-1 and A-2 show the questions posed to the expert panel for each of the program descriptions they reviewed. The last last section on page A-3 shows the formt panelists used to rank the programs on overall effectiveness.

1. How easy is it to implement this type of program?

Very Difficult	Fairly Difficult	Fairly Easy	Very Easy
-------------------	---------------------	----------------	--------------

Comments (e.g., what makes it easy/difficult to implement):

2. How effective is this type of program likely to be in reducing/preventing underage drinking?

Very Ineffective	Fairly Ineffective	Fairly Effective	Very Effective
---------------------	-----------------------	---------------------	-------------------

Comments (e.g., what makes it effective/ineffective):

3. How appealing/acceptable is this approach likely to be for youth?

Very Unappealing	Fairly Unappealing	Fairly Appealing	Very Appealing
---------------------	-----------------------	---------------------	-------------------

Comments (e.g., why is it acceptable/unacceptable to youth; is it likely to be more/less appealing to some youth):

4. How appealing/acceptable is this type of program likely to be for the general public?

Very Unappealing	Fairly Unappealing	Fairly Appealing	Very Appealing
---------------------	-----------------------	---------------------	-------------------

Comments (e.g., why is it acceptable/unacceptable to the general public; is it likely to be more/less appealing to some groups):

5. How likely is it that youth would be able to circumvent this approach and proceed to drink/obtain alcohol?

Very
Likely

Fairly
Likely

Fairly
Unlikely

Very
Unlikely

Comments (e.g., how can youth circumvent the approach?):

6. What could be done, if anything, to reduce the likelihood that youth will be able to circumvent this approach?

7. What could be done to make this type of program more effective? Are there elements/features of the program that should be changed or added?

RANKING PROGRAMS

Look over the list of programs and think about how they compare to one another in terms of effectiveness. Please rank them in order of their potential to prevent underage drinking (e.g., 1 = greatest potential, 18 = least potential).

<u>Type of Program</u>	<u>Rank (1-18)</u>
1. SAFE HOMES (p.1)	

2. STING OPERATIONS (p.3)	

3. INCREASED ENFORCEMENT IN SUSPECT SERVING ESTABLISHMENTS (p.5)	

4. INCREASED PENALTIES AND ENFORCEMENT FOR LAWS CONCERNING SERVING OF ALCOHOL TO PERSONS UNDER AGE 21 (p.7)	

5. LICENSE RESTRICTIONS FOR YOUTH ALCOHOL OFFENDERS (p.9)	

6. PRESENTATION OF LICENSE IN JUVENILE COURT (p.11)	

7. ALTERNATIVE SANCTIONS FOR ALCOHOL OFFENSES (p.13)	

8. SERVER TRAINING (p.15)	

9. ALTERNATIVE ACTIVITIES FOR YOUTH (p.17)	

10. YOUTH GROUP TRAINING (p.19)	

11. ALCOHOL-FREE COLLEGES/UNIVERSITIES (p.21)	

12. POLICY DEVELOPMENT FOR COLLEGES/UNIVERSITIES (p.23)	

13. ADULT PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION (p.25)	

14. ALCOHOL-FREE YOUTH GROUPS (p.27)	

15. RANDOM ALCOHOL TESTING (p.29)	

16. CHANGES IN DESIGN AND DISTRIBUTION OF DRIVER LICENSES (p.31)	

17. INCREASED PENALTIES FOR FALSE IDENTIFICATION (p.33)	

18. STUDENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS (p.35)	
