



Students and Chemical Dependency

**Report of a Conference on
Alcohol and Other Drugs
in School and College:
The Changing Context of Our Work:
Ways of Thinking, Ways of Living**

**April 27, 1996
Brown University
Providence, Rhode Island**

**Bruce E. Donovan,
Associate Dean of The College
Associate Dean for Problems
of Chemical Dependency**

and

Rebecca Kanost

selves. The practices she would introduce throughout the conference are designed to address taking care of the self and have been important in her own development.

Opening Presentation: Facing the “New Puritanism”

There are recurring cycles in America’s confrontation with drug use; the current incarnation is the “New Puritanism” — the attempt by today’s society to prevent young people from engaging in the sorts of behavior quite characteristic of youth culture in previous times.

Who is society?

How do society’s pressures affect the educational mission and processes in our democracy?

What dilemmas arise when a desire to punish displaces more broadly educational goals?

How do “zero tolerance” messages affect students?

How can the credibility of administrative leadership and educational programs survive competing assumptions about institutional responsibility and the efficacy of prevention programs?

Bruce Donovan noted that, when he first began working in the field of chemical dependency, policy, even on the national level, was not thought of or spoken about much, especially on college campuses. What policy that did exist focused on employee assistance for faculty and staff members. He recalled hearing someone say, “If you don’t have a policy, the policy is, ‘We don’t care.’” Policy was allowed to occur pretty much as it would, until the 1980’s, when professionals concerned with chemical dependency were called upon to devise, implement and, in some cases, enforce policies about chemical dependency within a variety of institutional contexts. At present, in order to meet federal requirements nearly all institutions have some form of written policy regarding chemical dependency. Professionals today must grapple with the relationships between their written policies and how they enforce them, dubbed by some as “Discretionary Enforcement.” Donovan illustrated this phenomenon by citing other “policies” which our culture enforces differentially, according to its biases. One is our position in relation to prostitution: our culture allows prostitution to exist more readily under some circumstances than others, disap-

proving of women who participate in its practice more than men. Further, he cited a low-income housing program where the eradication of poverty becomes secondary to combating drug use if and when residents found possessing or using illegal drugs are expelled to the streets. Donovan found that these examples helped him to see that we put a higher premium on claiming to have drug-free campuses than we have concern about putting students at risk, e.g., out on the street without structure, support or guidance.

Issues would include those [to be addressed by the conference's keynote speaker, David Duncan, Dr. P.H. and Research Fellow at the Center for Alcohol and Addiction Studies at Brown University,] surrounding the prevailing tendency to value a drug-free campus more than engaging with students who have substance abuse problems.. Mr. Duncan began his presentation by stating that "America has a drug problem...a problem which disrupts education and thwarts careers...that rips families asunder and wastes corporate resources of dollars...that exacerbates conflicts between races, between the rich and the poor, between the haves and the have-nots, between native-born and immigrant [and] in some ways threatens the very foundations of America as a free society." This problem, said Duncan, is not drug addiction and drug abuse, but rather "the problem of drug hysteria [and] over-reaction to drugs and drug problems, to disinformation and self-defeating policies which get in the way of our dealing with...problems of addiction and abuse."

Duncan described this phenomenon further as "the over-reaction and mass hysteria Americans display in response to drug problems" characterized by the "Just Say No" and "Zero Tolerance" approaches to drug abuse. He listed the drugs he takes regularly in order to function, such as arthritis and blood pressure medications, to illustrate why he wouldn't want to live in a truly "Drug-Free Society." In all history, said Duncan, the Eskimos of North America have had the only entirely drug-free civilization. As soon as their society interacted with white culture, they developed a 100% alcoholism rate and one of the highest heroin addiction rates in the world. Duncan presented this example to illustrate the danger of being a drug-free society: it only "works" when no drugs are present.

Duncan stated that our drug policies tend to be based on irrational views and hysteria. He explained how the Harrison Act, the first national drug law in the United States, was passed in re-

sponse to hysterical reports that white women on the West coast were being drugged into prostitution by sinister Chinese men and that, on the East coast, black men were raping white women, black men so coked up on cocaine that they were impervious to police bullets and couldn't be stopped when caught by police in the act. Later, anti-marijuana legislation was passed in response to rumors of an epidemic of homicidal mania among marijuana users: witnesses testified to Congress that marijuana use was immediately addictive and led inevitably to insanity. LSD was outlawed because users did such things as stare at the sun and jump out of buildings, though instances of neither behavior were ever documented. Would the racism and sensationalism that clearly marked the creation of those laws fool us now; Duncan wondered. Presumably not, he opined, yet cited recent reports about drug use which he feels are equally removed from fact.

Currently, for example, the numbers of crack babies that have been reported in the media exceeded the number of crack addicts in America. The crack baby phenomenon is greatly exaggerated, he claimed, asserting that most crack babies grow into children who are indistinguishable from other children in terms of I.Q. scores, social behavior, school grades and achievement test scores. Duncan questioned whether the phenomenon had been worthy of a cover story in *Newsweek* magazine which elicited responses such as that of the President of Boston University, who questioned whether money should be spent to keep crack babies alive when they would never develop enough intellectually "to have consciousness of God." Duncan claimed that the actual damage done to a child by pre-natal crack use is equivalent to that done by pre-natal tobacco use.

This type of counter-productive, irrational response to drug use and abuse has been labeled the "New Puritanism," a term first used to describe feminists who joined with right-wing groups to take action against the production of pornography. The term has now come to be applied to groups that promote a "high standard of purity for our society," which includes not allowing anyone to "have the slightest blemish of the type [the self-appointed censors] happen to disapprove of." The movement, with its attitude that health and healthy behavior are not simply desirable—they are morally imperative—has had an especially pernicious effect in the public health field. The rigid and intolerant moral stance is used to

justify criticizing others for less healthy — and therefore “im-moral” — behaviors such as smoking and overeating.

The New Puritanism is not satisfied with intervening in demonstrably problematic behaviors around substance abuse. Adherents go further to promote—or *require*—more invasive strategies for curtailing drug abuse through drug testing corporate and government employees and sometimes requiring those who test positive for drug use to enter treatment, even when drug use has never been demonstrated to affect job performance. Some employers even fire employees under these circumstances. President Clinton recently decided that, regardless of their assumed innocence, all accused persons released on bail by federal courts will be periodically tested for the use of alcohol and other drugs.

Duncan questioned the manner in which the New Puritanism defines “drugs,” citing how truck drivers are tested for on-the-job use only of illicit drugs and not for alcohol, though alcohol has a more detrimental effect on driving than other drugs; is more widely-used; and is associated with more automobile accidents. The Supreme Court has decided that high school athletes can be subjected to drug testing and can be barred from competition, if they refuse to be tested. At the University of Maryland, students protested a plan that would expel them from campus housing, if they tested positive for drug use. A few Missouri school districts have purchased “quadrotrackers,” electronic devices which don’t have to be plugged in or supplied with batteries. These devices are advertised as capable of detecting drugs in the possession of those individuals at which they are pointed, in the bodies of those who have recently taken drugs, and in rooms where drugs have recently been used.

Duncan also cited current legislation that would exclude from elderly and disabled housing those individuals who have even a history of drug use or abuse, including having been treated or in treatment for alcoholism. He noted that the number of drug-related arrests on college campuses are rising dramatically, as distinct from arrests related to alcohol use, which are also rising but at a lower rate. Actual drug use is also increasing, but at a much slower rate than arrests. *The Chronicle for Higher Education* reports that more aggressive policing on campuses and a greater willingness among students to report on their peers seem responsible for these trends.

Duncan questioned some definitions used in research reporting alcohol use on campuses. Application of the term “epidemic” to college drinking implies an increase over the usual level, which the research does not support. Another problematic definition is that which qualifies “binge drinking” as the consumption of five or more alcoholic drinks in one night. In Duncan’s college experience this sort of “binge drinking” was “par for the course” on a Friday night and led to some obnoxious undergraduate behavior, but did not create patterns of alcohol abuse that continued into adulthood. On today’s college campuses, he claimed, similar behavior would be viewed as sufficient grounds for intervention.

Although the ineffectiveness of Project D.A.R.E. has been widely demonstrated and the greater effectiveness of other programs has been shown, Duncan said that this is one of the most widely-used programs for educating children about drug abuse in America and perhaps the best-funded, receiving grants from the federal government and private industry. Additionally, the President recently praised Project D.A.R.E. in a State of the Union address; and yet the program doesn’t work, asserted Duncan. Drug-abuse prevention programs that consist of no more than asking teachers to “teach something” about drugs, have proven more effective than Project D.A.R.E.. The program’s “Recognize, Resist and Report” agenda encourages children to look through parents’ drawers at home and to report friends’ and parental drug use to authorities, which Duncan characterized as behavior reminiscent of Nazi Germany. Rather than looking at drug involvement in terms of people’s lives, this perspective focuses on testing urine.

Duncan outlined four major ways in which the New Puritanism harms efforts to reduce drug use and dependence: it diverts resources, undercuts credibility, increases abuse and addiction, and diminishes democratic values.

The New Puritanism encourages diverting resources away from treating the 20% of the population who have substance-abuse problems and wastes those resources on discouraging drug use by the 80% of the population who are not addicts and whose occasional drug use does no harm to themselves or others. Because the New Puritanism employs a rigidly binary view of drug-taking — one either uses drugs (which equals abuse) or abstains from use, it does not allow for distinctions to be made between experimenting with drugs, occasional drug use and addiction. This prevents funding and attention from being focused on addictive drug abuse

where they are needed. In addition, drugs are defined as whatever is not used or favored by those spearheading anti-drug efforts. Use of illegal drugs is often the target of programs, while nicotine and alcohol consumption—both as lethal and addictive as illegal drugs—goes unaddressed. Duncan also pointed out that even television and erotica have been classified as drugs by some New Puritans.

He said that the New Puritanism refuses to acknowledge that drug experimentation is a normal part of development. Adolescents go on drinking binges when they are learning to drink, just as toddlers go on walking and talking “binges” and people learning to use computers spend hours at a time exploring computer functions. He opined that those who do not experiment with drug use are unhealthy, positing that in later life people who abstain from drug use during the high school years will display characteristics similar to those of drug abusers. The New Puritanism’s efforts to prevent *all* drug use spread resources too thin and waste a large percentage of them on trying to prevent this normal process of learning about drinking.

The second way in which the New Puritanism’s approach is damaging lies in its misinforming people about the effects of drugs. For example, the “advertisements” which metaphorically depict “Your brain on drugs” as a pan of fried eggs, are “nonsense.” There is no evidence that the brain sustains permanent damage from the use of any drug except alcohol, Duncan stated. Teenagers and children who are presented with these “bad metaphors” and who discover the discrepancies between them and first-hand experience will conclude that adults are untruthful and unreliable. We nevertheless persist in presenting youth with what Duncan characterized as “prophylactic lies” because we have good intentions. This creates a situation in which children will not believe us even when we do give them accurate information: adolescents do not take heed when the same health educators who misinformed them a few years ago by saying cocaine would kill them *now* warn them about the dangers of HIV infection. To complicate matters further, professionals who try to provide young people with accurate information about drug use are branded by the New Puritan movement as encouraging drug use.

Another area in which the New Puritans do more harm than good is in their focus on drug *use* rather than on drug *abuse*. The insistence that drug use leads automatically to drug abuse can

create self-fulfilling prophecies for some adolescents: if you give a child a label, he or she will live up to it. Duncan described one example in a Houston high school with lots of drug problems. Those students who *used* drugs were put in a special class about drug abuse to prepare them to be peer counselors. When word got around that these drug *users* were receiving this training, the students involved were labeled by their peers as *heavy* drugs users. However, participation in the class had been determined by polling teachers and counselors about students who *used* drugs: and the heaviest users in the school were *not* selected. Duncan also asserted that the more dramatic a reaction to the discovery of a student's drug use— reaction such as suspension or exclusion from extracurricular activities— the more likely the student is to become a regular user. Dramatic intervention techniques and harsh "tough love" practices also correlate with increased drug abuse and dependence, rather than a decrease.

The last major source of harm generated by the New Puritanism's approach, in Duncan's view, is that "the War on Drugs has served as the justification for major expansion of the power of police and prosecutors." Techniques for catching drug sellers in the act, which were formerly considered illegal forms of entrapment, are now legal and accepted as normal. Some cases of entrapment are shown on the television program "Cops," where police sell drugs and then arrest the buyers. Such practices, Duncan asserted, do not bring about a decrease in drug use. Duncan described one case in which a dentist was convicted for participation in a conspiracy to buy illegal drugs because a check he wrote to an employee was cashed by that employee's brother and used to buy drugs. Police traced the check to the dentist and prosecuted him and the employee; they also seized the dentist's practice (because the check had been written on a business account), thereby involving the business in a drug transaction. If a hitch-hiker carrying a marijuana cigarette is arrested while riding in one's car, the car can be confiscated by the federal government, Duncan said, further illustrating the extent to which police power has grown in the area of drug law. Duncan characterized such "extensions of power" as disturbing and anti-democratic and noted that in 80% of drug-related cases in which property is seized, prosecution is not successful yet the confiscated property is almost never returned to its owners.

Duncan reported that another drug-related abuse of power within the legal system is apparent in the fact that, although the majority of drug users and dealers in the United States are white, the majority of those serving drug-related prison sentences are non-white. The use of crack cocaine, more common among the poor and non-whites, carries stiffer legal penalties than use of cocaine hydrochloride, which tends to be used more by wealthy whites; yet both are forms of the same drug. This inequity has been declared racist by the U.S. Sentencing Commission, which has no power to change the law. However, Congress has refused to change the law and the administration has refused to take action on the problem. African-American males are more likely to go to prison for drug-related offenses than they are to go to college, though far more whites commit drug crimes. He claimed that the New Puritanism fails to acknowledge these issues, clinging to the rigid position that if one does not support existing drug laws, one "surrenders to" drugs.

In closing, Mr. Duncan noted that the term "drug" includes a wide spectrum of commonly-used substances. He displayed a book cover which pictured a variety of drugs representative of that range, including coffee, cigarettes and alcohol. He recalled showing the cover to a person whose response was, "It's a shame we have to tell everyone they can't use any of those." This response reflected the limitations of the New Puritanism's all-or-nothing, hardline approach to drugs which Mr. Duncan asserted "should not be our message. Our message should be, 'Don't misuse it.'"

Panel Response

Seasoned practitioners from school and college join with a student of public health to reflect on the keynote message.

- Are there realistic alternatives to the "New Puritanism" on campuses and in schools?

-How can important constituencies, e.g., upper level administrators, parents, trustees, be convinced of the need for patience in expecting changes in campus culture?

-Do "reasonable" justifications exist for long-term educational strategies that target realistic goals like harm reduction, increased social options, the shifting of norms and support for non-problematic users?

The first panelist, a dean of students at a large university, noted how the puritanical response to the use and abuse of alcohol

and other drugs has risen out of frustration born of working for years to combat substance abuse with less success than was hoped for. Professionals who deal with drug use and abuse on campuses have become impatient that the problem is more complex than anticipated, when it first became a focus for their attention. They are also frustrated that even more of a commitment than that already made is required to significantly reduce drug-related problems. She reported that 40% of college students engage in binge drinking, or drinking to get drunk.

Those working on campuses are also affected by the fact that there is no consensus in our culture about how to view alcohol use by students. There is disagreement on whether to view drinking as a rite of passage, on what the legal drinking age should be and on the amount of harm drinking does. Law enforcement is inconsistent in its approach to drinking, and parents have a wide variety of responses to their children's drinking. There is a greater degree of consensus in our culture about alcohol use in general: it is an acceptable — sometimes "necessary" — component of social and ritual occasions and is used to relieve stress and disappointment. As a result of these cultural attitudes there is sometimes an insistence on campuses that alcohol be present at events which include older adults, as well as students.

The fact that they must operate schools in an environment which lacks agreement about alcohol puts professionals in a peculiar position: they may feel responsible *for* the problem rather than responsible *to* their constituencies to take what actions they can to deal with the problem as they find it. They must nonetheless be careful to acknowledge that many serious problems result from alcohol use — violence between students, acquaintance rape, unplanned sex, unplanned pregnancy and transmission of sexual diseases. It makes sense for school professionals to try to address these problems in order to reduce the risks alcohol use and abuse present to student health and safety, but they must avoid being pushed into trying to cope with these problems in ways that they are not able. A school could spend all available resources on trying to completely prevent student alcohol use, without succeeding.

Schools must concentrate their efforts on what they do best: education and its long-term approach to solving problems. Such education should deal with values; dispense factual information about drug use and abuse; and provide students with avenues for addressing the problems they face in dealing with each other.

These types of approach represent the strengths upon which colleges should draw, rather than "be deluded into thinking that slogans and easy prohibitions are things that are going to help us."

The associate dean of a private secondary school spoke next, noting that percentages of students with substance abuse problems are much lower at the secondary than at the collegiate level. Her school's program evolved out of a response to students who asked for support in dealing with drug-related problems, particularly stopping marijuana use. A continuum ranges from drug use and extends through misuse to drug abuse and addiction: a basic problem for schools is to identify who amongst its students constitute the percentage at risk for drug abuse and addiction, so that they can be given help before they damage their lives. Often those most at risk do not realize, until considerable damage is done, that they have a problem. Discerning whom to help and when, and whom to let alone and allow to experiment with drug use is a challenge which presents a constant tension. There are no easy answers to these problems other than to recognize the need to be constantly aware of this tension and to maintain a balance between education and our actions in reaction to drug use and abuse.

The speaker suggested providing sound information about alcohol and other drugs, rather than hysteria or messages that exaggerate fact and are emotionally weighted, and, in addition, offering opportunities to students for conversation about drugs. She described sessions provided at her school where students and faculty write questions they've always wanted to ask of the other group about drug use. The two groups then answer the other's questions, which opens the way for honest interchange. These meetings may also develop a greater willingness in students to approach an adult at the school for help, if they feel they have a problem with alcohol or other drugs. Although students will probably still turn to a peer friend in such instances, she feels it is important to open other avenues.

The line between education and over-zealousness is like an invisible thread, and difficult to locate. Her school's discipline system is becoming increasingly more strict as a result of the New Puritanism. Trying to fight this trend while maintaining professional and personal credibility puts her in "an interesting position." She sees no other option for professionals in the field but to keep educating and refining what our message is and to whom we give it. Faculty need to be educated every few years. They can be the most

resistant to these messages, partly because they don't want to have to deal with such things, partly because they prefer that matters related to student alcohol and drug use be simple and easy to address.

The fourth respondent to Mr. Duncan's presentation was a graduate degree candidate in public health. He sought to "defend the side of rules," stating that rules and laws, guidelines and policies can be effective. In states which have lowered allowable blood alcohol levels in drivers to .002 — to "virtual zero tolerance" — there have been significant decreases in fatalities in single-auto crashes involving adolescent drivers aged 15 to 20. "Why does that rule work?" he asked. Similar, though not as extreme, decreases in adult injuries are also being observed where allowable alcohol levels have been decreased to .08 and .06.

He cited the assertion by theorists of deterrence that swift, certain punishment makes laws more effective. Some rules are indeed not good rules, but in other cases, "There may be a question as to whether we have the courage to enforce the rules and to sacrifice the freedoms that we believe we have by avoiding enforcement."

He described an example at a New England prep school, where student drug pushers were tracked down by student prefects and made to turn themselves in to school authorities, who expelled them. One of the prefects was quoted as saying that her actions resulted from realizing that younger students were frightened and didn't feel they had a place that was safe. Rules should exist, he suggested, to protect the 80 to 90 per cent of the student population that are trying to learn, rather than to address the 10 to 20 per cent who have problems.

Part of teaching prevention includes teaching decision-making. Students need to learn that there are consequences to their actions: rules provide those consequences. Credible rules that are enforced have credible consequences, even when penalties are severe. Without enforcement, there is no reason to have policies and rules. Policies on paper only fail, as do educational efforts that teach meaningless lessons. To teach decision-making, meaningful and credible consequences must result from decisions students make. At the crux of the matter is not so much whether a law is good or bad, as whether its consequences are real and meaningful.

To illustrate his next point, the panelist described how a type of crisis situation is created in an intervention, in order to get an individual to change his or her behavior. Effecting this change involves sacrificing things that are important to those doing the intervention. On a larger scale, when working within the paradigm of the New Puritanism we may have to sacrifice a certain amount of freedom in order to achieve the levels of community and family functioning that we aspire to. Accountability involves taking responsibility and being willing to sacrifice things dear to us for something larger and better.

How can one operate as a prevention and treatment counselor in schools where the New Puritanism has created the environment? While admitting there are no easy answers to this question, the panelist recommended an approach akin to the practice of Tai Chi: take the framework given and the oncoming energy from the New Puritanism and turn it to one's advantage. Dance with it and convert it into another sort of energy, redirected in a positive direction. Whether or not we like the existing rules is unimportant, he maintained; what is important is that we use those rules as tools to focus on the 80 per cent of students who do well and try their best, while helping those who have problems to get appropriate help.

Participants were invited to ask questions of Mr. Duncan and the panelists and to comment on issues of concern. One participant said she disagreed with much of what Mr. Duncan had to say, acknowledging that, while suspending a student for violating school rules may be ineffective, there nevertheless should be consequences for breaking those rules. If students who break drug-use rules are provided with more extracurricular activities as a means to address their special needs, "What do the other people (who don't use drugs) see?" she asked. How did Mr. Duncan reconcile his ideas with the concept of learning from the consequences of one's actions? She also questioned the idea that heavy drinking episodes could be part of productive learning to control or abstain from drinking.

Mr. Duncan described how Maria Montessori and Scott Williamson at the Pioneer Home Center first observed in children and less often in adults a pattern of optimal learning, which included periods when they engaged in newly-learned behaviors so frequently and with such intensity that other parts of their lives temporarily suffered. People who engage in this learning pattern may appear to be over-doing, ordinarily a negative thing. During

learning, however, these patterns are "just part of the way human beings behave." He suggested that a lot of adolescent binge drinking is "learning to use alcohol, and one of the things you do when you're learning a new trait — that you're really interested in and really excited about — is to do too much of it." Adolescent binge drinking should give no more cause for alarm than adolescent over-use of a new computer or videogame, if the binge period doesn't last too long.

Mr. Duncan responded to the question about consequences. "It doesn't make sense to have the consequence be something that makes the problem worse." Expelling a student athlete from a school team, when participation on the team "may be one of the best protections against abuse, is even crazier than expelling a kid for truancy: you're making the problem worse." Consequences should be imposed that do not exacerbate problem behaviors. Many such alternatives are possible.

A participant responded that these alternate consequences would carry "a good message for the others." Mr. Duncan replied that he would not choose consequences in light of how the larger student population would perceive them; he did not think they would have an impact. "There is no evidence at all for the deterrence theory," he stated. "The modeling studies show that you can get people to do things by presenting them with role models, but showing other people getting punished" doesn't decrease incidence of the behavior being punished.

Making further use of the analogy between a toddler learning to walk and an adolescent binge drinking, another participant noted that small children are not allowed to learn to walk and run in a street or at the top of a flight of stairs. Through unsupervised use of alcohol and other drugs, college and secondary school students can come to harm in many ways, ranging from poor academic performance to date rape and death during hazing. The questioner suggested that these immediate consequences are health issues at least as much as they are social issues. Mr. Duncan agreed, stating that he supports zero-tolerance alcohol level driving laws because driving under the influence constitutes a high risk to the driver and others. Distinctions should be made, he continued, between making laws to address clearly demonstrable safety hazards and instituting policies which do not tolerate any alcohol and drug use by students. The State University of New York has found that having a bar on campus reduced student auto accidents and

other problems resulting from drunken behavior. Students got into fewer fights in the school bar because they were subject to school disciplinary action there; the bar was also frequented by faculty members.

A panelist noted that, with higher legal drinking ages, an on-campus bar is no longer an option, although it is a good idea. There are fewer opportunities now to "engage students with older adults in settings which are safe." She returned attention to the issue of consequences. She believes accountability is important and that it is important for a school to be aware of its drug policies and to know "what the consequences are, what the severity of the consequences are and what the relationships are between those and the school's whole system of enforcement and policy." If penalties are too severe, infractions will not be reported by those who disapprove of that severity, and attention will be drawn *away* from problem behaviors and drawn *to* argument over the suitability of punishments. Decisions about how and when to enforce disciplinary measures for the young often tend to turn into a "power trip." We need to think about the effect on concepts of equity when we are careless about the fairness and severity of penalties, she stressed. "Our society is very prone to unequal enforcement of its rules. It means that some people pay disproportionately for the values of our society." A participant added that these inequities also produce "credibility gaps," resulting in rules that are no longer credible.

Another panelist noted that there are other types of unequal enforcement of rules. Sometimes athletes are allowed to get away with behavior that is unacceptable for other students. The types of expectations schools have of students need to be more equal.

A participant asked Mr. Duncan to comment on how the University of Minnesota and Cornell University have implemented programs which effectively decrease student drug use. He replied that those programs provide students with accurate information; don't rely on scare stories; focus on developing general decision-making skills; and encourage the development of communication skills which enable students to better ask for and give help. These programs have been well-evaluated and have been found to "make a real difference" in significantly reducing the use of alcohol and tobacco.