Texas School Survey
of Substance Use
2002
Methodology Report and Validity Analysis

For the Texas Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse

Prepared by

James A. Dyer, Ph.D.
Melissa Tackett-Gibson, Ph.D.
and
Kavita Jaswal

Public Policy Research Institute

Texas A&M University

College Station, TX 77843-4476

Introduction

The Public Policy Research Institute (PPRI), in conjunction with the Texas Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse (TCADA), conducted the seventh statewide survey of drug and alcohol use among Texas elementary and secondary students in the Spring of 2002. Originally implemented in 1988 as a component of a larger survey assessing substance use among the state's general population, the school survey has since become an ongoing, independent project. District surveys are offered every year with a statewide survey conducted every two years. The 2002 effort provides follow-up data reflecting changes over the past fourteen years in grades four through twelve.

The *Texas School Survey* project has two primary objectives. First, it serves to inform state and local policy-makers about the extent and nature of the substance use problem in Texas schools. Second, the statewide survey provides a standard of comparison for districts conducting local assessments of drug and alcohol use.

The purpose of this document is to describe the methodology used to administer the 2002 *Texas School Survey of Substance Use*. Following a brief introduction to the survey instrument itself, attention is then focused on sample selection and survey administration procedures. Next, methods for data processing and quality control are described and the report concludes with a review of standard error estimates.

Survey Instrument

Two versions of the 2002 *Texas School Survey of Substance Use* were developed and administered. The first was a six-page questionnaire designed for students in grades seven through twelve. The second was a simplified three-page instrument created for students in grades four through six. The elementary survey differs from the secondary survey in that it has simplified language and some complex questions were omitted. Elementary students were asked about only four types of substances including tobacco (cigarettes, snuff, and chewing tobacco), alcohol (beer, wine, wine coolers, and liquor), inhalants, and marijuana. Secondary students were asked about the same substances, as well as a broader range of illicit drugs including powdered cocaine, crack, hallucinogens, uppers, downers, steroids, ecstasy, Rohypnol, and heroin. Other sets of questions on both the elementary and secondary instruments were designed to assess behavioral correlates of substance use and students' perceptions of support available to help them cope with substance-related problems.

The questionnaire was in a format that could be scanned optically, similar to that used for standardized testing. It was designed for anonymous self-administration by students with the aid of a staff member to pass out the survey, read a common set of instructions, monitor the class during survey administration, and collect the instruments after they are completed. The survey instruments are included in Appendix A.

Survey Content

The 2002 *Texas School Survey of Substance Use* content remained the same as that of 2000. In 1998, items on the elementary and secondary questionnaires were revised from those of previous years. The latter modifications, particularly with regard to the secondary questionnaire, were implemented in order to increase accuracy of response and to reduce the length and repetition of the questionnaires. Those revisions were made to ensure compatibility with previous survey data.

Survey Sample

The sample of students for the 2002 survey was designed to be a random sample of all public school students between the fourth and twelfth grades in the state. In order to make administration practical, students were selected using a multi-stage stratified sampling procedure. This involved sampling districts, schools within districts, and classrooms within districts. All students in a sampled classroom were asked to participate in the survey.

The 2002 sample design replicated the design developed in 2000. In 2000, modifications were made to the sampling design in order to increase the precision of survey results. This design took advantage of newly available software packages that easily provide estimates of standard errors of the estimators resulting from complex sample designs. These computations were not possible prior to the arrival of these packages.

Selection of Districts

The primary analytic cluster was the school district since the approval needed to administer the survey had to be obtained at that level. First, the districts were stratified according to how urban the counties were in which they were located. Stratification along a variable deemed to be highly correlated with the characteristics of interest is a means of increasing the precision of estimates in complex sampling designs. The strata were formed as follows. First, 28 border counties formed a separate border stratum. Of the remaining counties, the most urban stratum involved counties with metropolitan populations of 1,000,000 or more, the next stratum with those between 250,000 and 1,000,000, and the third stratum with those metropolitan areas with less than 250,000. The remainder of the state constituted a final major stratum.

The strata were further subdivided by relative size of the districts, so that each stratum had a combination of large and small districts. Due to their large size relative to other districts, a total of nine districts were sampled with a probability of one. This means that these districts are always selected as part of the sample. They formed two of the substrata. The strata are listed in Table 1.

Districts were selected for the state sample from the 11 strata, above, in the following manner. The nine districts that formed strata 1-A and 2-A were included with probability one. From each of the remaining strata, excluding the border stratum, a simple random sample of districts was selected. The districts in the border stratum were also selected with probability one in that all districts constituting that stratum were invited to participate. The districts that were selected in this manner are listed in Table 2.

If a non-probability one district refused to participate, it was replaced with another district selected at random from within the stratum.

TABLE 1. Distribution of Selected Districts by Urban Class Size

Stratum	Group
1-A	Large Urban Counties- 55,000 < enrollment (probability one districts)
1-B	Large Urban Counties- 20,000 < enrollment < 55,000
1-C	Large Urban Counties- 10,000 < enrollment <20,000
1-D	Large Urban Counties- enrollment <10,000
2-A	Medium Urban Counties- 20,000 < enrollment (probability one districts)
2-B	Medium Urban Counties- enrollment <20,000
3-A	Small Urban Counties- 10,000 < enrollment
3-B	Small Urban Counties- enrollment <10,000
4-A	Non-Urban Counties- 5,000 < enrollment
4-B	Non-Urban Counties- enrollment <5,000
5-A	Border (28 counties)

TABLE 2. State Sample by Strata

Original State Sample (n=180)	Actual State Sample (n=78)
Stratum 1-A: District Name (rank)	**Stratum 1-A: District Name**
Arlington (1)	Arlington
Northside (2)	Fort Worth
Cypress-Fairbanks (3)	Houston
San Antonio (4)	Northside
Dallas(5)	
Houston (6)	
Fort Worth (7)	
Stratum 1-B: District Name (rank)	**Stratum 1-B: District Name**
Conroe (1)	Birdville
Richardson (2)	Garland
Spring (3)	Humble
Carrollton-Farmers Branch (4)	Plano (alternate)
Birdville (5)	Spring Branch (alternate)
Garland (6)	
Irving (7)	
Humble (8)	
Katy (9)	
Alief (10)	
Spring-Branch (14) (alternate)	
Plano (15) (alternate)	

TABLE 2. State Sample by Strata (cont.)

Stratum 1-C: District Name (rank)	Stratum 1-C: District Name
Lamar CISD (1)	Duncanville
South San Antonio (2)	Edgewood
Grand Prairie (3)	Grand Prairie
Mansfield (4)	
Duncanville (5)	
Edgewood (6)	

Stratum 1-D: District Name (rank)	Stratum 1-D: District Name
Anna (1)	Castleberry
Farmersville (2)	Ennis
Krum (3)	Forney
Kendleton (4)	Krum
Wylie (5)	Pilot Point
Stafford MSD (6)	Rockwall
Ennis (7)	
Cleveland (8)	
Lovejoy (9)	
Rockwall (10)	
Castleberry (11) (alternate)	
Pilot Point (13) (alternate)	
Forney (15) (alternate)	

Stratum 2-A: District Name (rank)	Stratum 2-A: District Name
Beaumont (1)	Austin
Round Rock (2)	Beaumont
Austin (3)	Round Rock
Corpus Christi (4)	

Stratum 2-B: District Name (rank)	Stratum 2-B: District Name
Nederland (1)	Del Valle
Granger (2)	Georgetown
Lumberton (3)	Granger
Gregory-Portland (4)	Jarrell
Georgetown (5)	Lumberton
Manor (6)	Nederland
Port Aransas (7)	Robstown
Flour Bluff (8)	
Robstown (9) (alternate)	
Del Valle (10) (alternate)	
Jarrell (13) (alternate)	

TABLE 2. State Sample by Strata (cont.)

Stratum 3-A: District Name (rank)	Stratum 3-A: District Name
Pearland (1)	Alvin
Ector County (2)	Midland
Killeen (3)	Pearland
Abilene (4)	Tyler
Wichita Falls (5)	
Midland (8) (alternate)	
Alvin (9) (alternate)	
Tyler (12) (alternate)	

Stratum 3-B: District Name (rank)	Stratum 3-B: District Name
Copperas Cove (1)	Bartlett
Red Lick (2)	Salado
Bartlett (3)	
Oglesby (4)	
Pine Tree (5)	
Bushland (6)	
Salado (9) (alternate)	

Stratum 4-A: District Name (rank)	Stratum 4-A: District Name
Bastrop (1)	Bastrop
Greenville (2)	Corsicana
San Angelo (3)	Granbury
Huntsville (4)	Nacogdoches
Sherman (5)	Plainview
Plainview (7) (alternate)	San Angelo
Nacogdoches (9) (alternate)	Sherman
Corsicana (12) (alternate)	
Granbury (13) (alternate)	

Stratum 4-B: District Name (rank)		Stratum 4-B: District Name
Medina (1)	Burnet CISD (8)	Burnet CISD
Yantis (2)	Hunt (9)	Vega
Amherst (3)	Brady (10)	
Abernathy (4)	Loraine (11)	
Buckholts (5)	Blanco (12)	
Boyd (6)	Vega (17) (alternate)	
Huntington (7)		

TABLE 2. State Sample by Strata (cont.)

Stratum 5-A: All ISDs in counties listed (n=90)		Stratum 5-A: District Name (rank)	
Brewster	Kinney	Benavides (78)	Mission (43)
Brooks	La Salle	Brackett (72)	Monte Alto (15)
Cameron	Maverick	Brownsville (67)	Pharr-San Juan-Alamo (20)
Culberson	Pecos	Comstock (25)	Ramirez (63)
Dimmit	Presidio	Dell City (13)	Rio Grande City (14)
Duval	Reeves	Donna (28)	Roma (89)
Edwards	Starr	Edinburg (84)	San Benito (36)
El Paso	Terrell	Ft. Hancock (12)	San Diego (11)
Hidalgo	Uvalde	Hidalgo (30)	San Felipe-Del Rio (87)
Hudspeth	Val Verde	Jim Hogg County (70)	Santa Maria (74)
Jeff Davis	Webb	La Joya (42)	Sharyland (75)
Jim Hogg	Willacy	La Villa (68)	South Texas (29)
Jim Wells	Zapata	Laredo (81)	Uvalde (26)
Kennedy	Zavala	Lasara (57)	Valley View (24)
		Los Fresnos (53)	Webb (32)
		Lyford (65)	Weslaco (10)
		McAllen (80)	Zapata County (73)
		Mercedes (22)	

Obtaining cooperation from those districts that were randomly selected for the state sample when the selected district did not plan to do a local survey was sometimes a problem. Yet, it was critical to get data from as many of the originally selected districts as possible. Some state sample districts that were initially hesitant were persuaded to cooperate by the use of incentives. The various incentives used included waiving participation and sampling fees, offering to discount the fees for participating the following year, paying all shipping costs, and discounting campus level analyses fees.

Sixty-one of the original 163 selected districts participated in the study. One-hundred and two districts were not able to participate, and most declined due to the lack of time and resources involved in survey administration. In lieu of the declining districts, an additional seventeen districts were included as alternates for the final sample.

Participation of Border School Districts

In order to allow further analysis of substance use among students living on the Texas-Mexico border, school districts along the border were strongly encouraged to participate in the 2002 *Texas School Survey*. The survey was offered free of charge to border districts, and data was collected from a broadly defined 28-county area. The border sample was designed to collect data from approximately 500,000 students. Ninety school districts from 28 counties were invited to participate in the 2002 survey. Each border district surveyed was included in the state survey sample (see Strata 5 in Table 2).

The cooperation rate of the selected districts was 43 percent. Rates ranged by strata from 16 to 75 percent. The cooperation rate was lowest for small districts in non-urban counties (Strata 4-B). Overall there were no consistent differences in cooperation rates between urban and non-urban districts. However, there was a general trend for small districts to have lower cooperation rates than large districts (see Table 3).

The original sample included 2.14 million elementary and secondary students. A total of 54 percent of the students in the original sample were in the final sampling frame (see Table 4). Seventy of the 78 districts sampled submitted both elementary and secondary surveys. Seven districts, Bastrop, Burnet, Forney, South Texas, Spring Branch, Vega, and Webb, did not administer surveys to elementary students. Ramirez CISD, which does not service middle school or secondary students, only surveyed elementary students.

TABLE 3. Cooperation Rate of Districts by Strata

	Strata 1A	**Strata 1B**	**Strata 1C**	**Strata 1D**	**Strata 2A**	**Strata 2B**	**Strata 3A**	**Strata 3B**	**Strata 4A**	**Strata 4B**	**Strata 5-A**
Total Cooperation Rate (43%)	57%	42%	50%	46%	75%	64%	50%	33%	78%	16%	39%

TABLE 4. Percentage of Students Included in Final Sampling Frame by Strata

	Strata 1A	**Strata 1B**	**Strata 1C**	**Strata 1D**	**Strata 2A**	**Strata 2B**	**Strata 3A**	**Strata 3B**	**Strata 4A**	**Strata 4B**	**Strata 5-A**
Total Rate (54%)	59%	44%	53%	61%	76%	68%	37%	11%	81%	30%	49%

Allocation of Surveys among Districts

The state survey sample was designed to collect data from a minimum sample of about 5,555 students per grade, however, many districts chose to survey more than the minimum number of students specified in the state sampling plan. Some extremely small districts received somewhat more than a strict proportional allocation because, while the data was technically only needed from one or two students per grade, the survey was administered to the entire classroom. Similarly, in a few extremely large (urban) districts, fewer students were need for accuracy than would result from a true proportional allocation. All surveys submitted from a cooperating district were included in the sample. Accordingly, in the final analyses, the data were weighted to provide an accurate proportional allocation.

Thus, although we had estimated that the state sample would include approximately 50,000 students, it actually included 88,929 elementary students and 149,220 secondary students (See Table 4). This significantly improves the accuracy of estimates.

TABLE 4. Number of Surveys Included in State Sample

	Total Non-blank Surveys	Number of Useable	Number Rejected*	Percent Rejected
Secondary	156,733	149,220	7,513	4.8%
Elementary	89,830	88,929	901	1.0%
Total	246,563	238,149	8,414	3.4%

*Surveys were rejected because the responses indicated exaggeration or the survey could not be matched to a sampled school and grade.

Allocation of Surveys among Classrooms and Campuses

Once the number of surveys to be administered in each district was established, the next step was to determine the number of classrooms to be surveyed per grade. This was achieved by dividing the number of questionnaires per grade (ascertained for each district using proportional population calculations) by the average number of students per class---20 for grades four through six, 22 for grades seven through twelve. The result of this computation indicated the total number of classes to be surveyed. These classes were selected so that as many different campuses as possible were in the final sample. Ideally, the classrooms surveyed were evenly distributed across all campuses in the district. If there were more campuses containing a given grade than classrooms needed, then a simple random selection procedure was used to determine which campuses would be sampled. In general, once a campus was selected, all relevant grades at that campus were surveyed. Therefore, campus selection was not independent between grades.

TABLE 5. Survey Distribution by Grade

	Grade	Number of Usable Surveys	Percentage
Elementary	4th	27,433	31%
	5th	29,335	33%
	6th	32,161	36%
		88,929	100%
Secondary	7th	28,596	19%
	8th	27,891	19%
	9th	28,738	19%
	10th	24,026	16%
	11th	21,088	14%
	12th	18,881	13%
		149,220	100%

Selection of Classrooms within Campuses

After the total number of classrooms to be surveyed in each grade at each campus was determined, it was necessary to identify specific classrooms. This selection procedure was performed by campus personnel based on a set of guidelines provided by PPRI (illustrated in Appendix C). Members of campus staff were asked to make a list by grade (according to teacher's last name or some other convenient method) of all classes held during a selected class period. They were then instructed to use a random number table to select the exact classes to survey in each grade.

Other Sampling Considerations

Some school districts sampled all students in all or some of the grades. In these districts, the methodology outlined above did not apply to the grades sampled at 100 percent. In Houston and Austin, the district used a list of all students from which to conduct a random sample of the students. Therefore, there are no campuses and classrooms sampled in these districts.

Survey Administration Procedures

Districts selected for inclusion in the state sample were notified about the project via letter and were sent a descriptive brochure, illustrated in Appendix D. State sample districts that planned to administer a local drug and alcohol survey had virtually no procedural changes resulting from their involvement in the statewide project. In those districts that surveyed grades four through twelve, sufficient data was collected from all relevant campuses to meet the data collection needs of the statewide survey. These districts benefited from their inclusion in the state survey project because they were not charged for the surveys that became part of the state database. The larger number of surveys from these districts was weighted down so that their contribution to the final sample was in correct proportion.

In those instances where state sample districts were collecting local data for an incomplete combination of grades, or where they were not conducting local surveys at all, the campus and classroom selection procedures described above were applied. Arrangements for giving the survey were established on an individual basis with these districts. Since those not doing local surveys did not stand to gain directly from having the survey administered in their district, an effort was made to be as accommodating as possible. PPRI was able to arrange survey administration in the selected schools and classes by school personnel.

In Houston and Austin, the district uses the computer to draw a random sample of all students. On each campus where the students are located, the students are requested to go to a specified room where the survey is conducted. Once in the room, the survey is conducted, as it would be in a classroom in the other districts.

Relevant personnel in the selected districts and campuses were provided with complete instructions and materials necessary to administer the survey (see Appendix E). Classrooms were selected randomly by PPRI based on information from a computer printout from the district or Campus Information Form. Teachers in selected classrooms were given a script to read so that all students would receive a standardized set of instructions. Teachers were also asked to complete a Classroom Identification Form that provided data on the number of students that should have

taken the survey but were absent, and the number that was present but failed to complete the survey. This information was useful for computing error estimates. After the surveys were administered in each classroom, they were sealed in an envelope along with the Classroom Identification Form. The envelopes from all participating classrooms were collected and returned to PPRI.

Data Entry and Analyses

As noted earlier, the format of the survey instruments enabled them to be scanned optically. Upon receipt at PPRI, the instruments were logged in, coded, and scanned by staff or trained personnel.

Exaggerated Responses

Because the *Texas School Survey* data is based entirely upon respondents' description of their own behavior, it is inevitable that some students will under- or over-report their use of drugs or alcohol, and to the extent possible PPRI attempted to identify and eliminate data from those respondents. Two checks were incorporated into the data analysis program to identify exaggerators. First, both elementary and secondary students were asked about their use of a false drug call "cosma." Data from students claiming to have used this substance were considered suspect and dropped from the analyses.

Second, checks were run to identify any students claiming extremely high levels of drug and alcohol use. Unbelievable high substance use for elementary students was defined as the use of five or more substances, 11 or more times in the past school year or over a lifetime. Secondary students were defined as exaggerators based on the following criteria: (1) students reported that they had five or more drinks of two or more beverages every day; (2) students reported that they had consumed three or more alcoholic beverages every day; or (3) students reported that they used four or more drugs (other than cigarettes, alcohol, or steroids) eleven or more times in the past month. As in those cases where students reported using "cosma," data from students reporting exaggerated use were also dropped from the analyses. Less than two percent (1.53%) of the total elementary sample exaggerated. The percentage of secondary school students who exaggerated (4.69%) was more than three times that of elementary students.

Unreported Grade Levels

When students failed to report their grade level, it was impossible to determine unequivocally in which grade these students' data should be analyzed. When a grade level was missing, an estimate of the grade was made based on the students' age and the data were retained. Table 6 identifies the range of students' ages and the corresponding grade levels that were assigned. If both grade and age were missing, the data were dropped from the analyses.

TABLE 6. Age-Based Grade Assignments.

Age	Elementary Grade Level	Age	Secondary Grade Level
9	4th Grade	12	7th Grade
10	5th Grade	13	8th Grade
11	6th Grade	14	9th Grade
		15	10th Grade
		16	11th Grade
		17 or older	12th Grade

Quality Control Measures

To ensure the quality of the statewide survey data, a number of internal checks were put into place to guide survey processing. First, a quality control analyst oversaw the implementation of all pre- and post-analysis quality control procedures. As the following paragraphs describe, many aspects of PPRI's plan for quality control were embedded in automated procedures. However, there is no replacement for human oversight. The quality control analyst monitored and tracked the processing of each district's surveys from the initial mailing through the production of the final state report. Responsibilities included ensuring that surveys were properly coded and scanned and checking for anomalies in the final table of results.

In addition to the safeguards resulting from careful project oversight, there were also a number of procedural checks against error. For example, there was a possibility, however remote, that after the bindings of a set of survey instruments were cut, the instruments could be dropped or otherwise placed out of order. If this occurred, it is conceivable that some pages of data could have been read into the incorrect computer record. To resolve this problem, each instrument used in the 2002 survey was printed with a five-digit "litho-code" number. With this coding process, every page of a given instrument is printed with the same scannable number, but a unique number is assigned to every instrument. By using the litho-code, when each page of an instrument is scanned it will automatically be read into the correct computer record. In this way, even if the pages from different instruments were shuffled together and read randomly, all data derived from the same instrument would automatically be read to the same data record.

Litho-coding also enabled PPRI to confirm that data from every survey instrument read was associated with the correct district. Survey instruments were mailed to participating districts in consecutive order. By recording the beginning and ending instrument numbers going to each district, PPRI was able to check the litho-codes scanned for a given district. In this way, any stacks of data that could potentially have been inadvertently mislabeled could be easily identified.

Programming checks were also incorporated into the data analysis program by cross-analysis. That is, the same data was run in several different ways using existing programs, and program outputs were then compared for consistency. Confidence is high that these quality control features will ensure valid and reliable survey findings.

Weights, Standard Errors, and Confidence Intervals

Weights were applied to each case based on the strata (i.e., Urban Class I though IV), district, and campus. The weights were applied so that the aggregation of students in each campus, district, and strata reflected their proportions in the actual district, campus, and strata populations. The formulae use to determine these weights are presented in Appendix F.

Standard errors and confidence intervals were estimated for each grade and the aggregation. The formulae used are presented in Appendix G. The table of standard errors and confidence intervals for 30 day and lifetime use of substances by grades are presented in Appendix H.

Item Response Analysis

As with any survey, there were potential threats to the validity of the conclusions drawn from the data. Therefore it was important to examine the ways in which students' were responding to the questionnaire. Following the collection and TCADA approval of the data, all of the items on the survey were analyzed to assess the integrity of the data in 2002. We were specifically interested in exploring potential misinterpretation of questions, dishonest responses, and inattention to the survey questions and instructions.

Separate analyses were conducted for the total sample of elementary and secondary school survey responses. Additional analyses, exploring potential ethnic and grade-level differences were also conducted for the statewide secondary instrument.

In sum, the vast majority of students in both elementary and secondary schools appeared to have provided valid responses to the 2002 Texas School Survey of Substance Use. Few students were classified as giving exaggerated responses and inconsistency in responding was generally most likely due to inattention to the survey task, misinterpretation of the question, or fatigue. On the whole there was little difference between the results of the 1998 and the 2002 survey item analyses. The major specific findings of the item analyses for each survey are listed below.

Elementary

- Only 1.53% of elementary respondents were classified as exaggerators.
- A small proportion of students use “never heard of” and “never used” response options interchangeably. While few do so, in comparison to 1998 data, the percentage of those interchanging responses has risen. This is not a substantial problem however, given that the inconsistencies are between two responses that indicate non-use.
- Less than one percent of those surveyed provided inconsistent responses in a comparison of use over a lifetime and use during the school year.
- When reports of lifetime use were compared to reported age of first use, respondents are most likely to provide inconsistent responses when asked about the use of alcoholic beverages. This may be due to the fact the greater reported use of alcohol presents greater opportunities for inconsistencies.

- Other comparisons of response inconsistency indicate that inconsistent responses are attributable to those who report infrequent substance use. This may suggest that "no use" and "never used" responses are read as "not used regularly".
- Questions are somewhat more likely to be left unanswered as their position in the survey approached the end.
- Participants are willing to begin and end an item that contained multiple parts, but routinely omitted substances that came in the middle of a list.

Secondary

- Nearly five percent (4.69%) of the respondents were classified as exaggerators.
- Inconsistencies within the total secondary school sample may be attributable to differential interpretations of the term "use." While in some questions students appear to be responding with respect to regularity of use, they are at other times giving answers that refer to whether or not they have ever tried the substance.
- In general, individuals in older grades are more likely to provide inconsistent data than are students in lower grades. Again this may be related to use levels which increase with older students.
- Overall, Asian Americans and Caucasians responded more consistently than did respondents of other ethnic backgrounds.
- There was a general trend for student to leave items nearing the end of the survey blank. However missing data were concentrated around three questions related to extracurricular activities, methods of marijuana use, and sources of substance abuse information.
- Younger students in grades seven and eight are generally more likely than older students to skip questions.
- African American and Native American students are more likely than other ethnic groups to ignore questions on the survey.
- The patterns of missing responses differ very little across grades and ethnic groups.

Conclusion

The *Texas School Survey* has become a valuable policy tool for both state and local educators and policy-makers. The survey, performed every two years, provides timely and relevant information about current drug and alcohol use patterns among young people enrolled in the Texas' public schools. Furthermore, longitudinal analysis can provide insight into changes in drug and alcohol prevalence over time. As was noted in the introduction, every state survey culminates in a TCADA publication providing an overview of findings to date. Data is also available for independent analysis by policy-makers and academicians.