



RESEARCH

26

REPORT

SERIES

**A Study On S.R.P. And S.P.M.
Dropouts In Penang**

**Pusat Penyelidikan Dadah dan Ubat-Ubatan
(Centre for Drug Research)
U.N./W.H.O. Research and Training Centre
Universiti Sains Malaysia
Penang, MALAYSIA**

A STUDY ON S.R.P. AND S.P.M.
DROPOUTS IN PENANG

V. NAVARATNAM
AMINUDIN SULAIMAN
TAN BEE LENG

RESEARCH REPORT SERIES NO. 26

THIS STUDY WAS FUNDED BY UNIVERSITI SAINS MALAYSIA
UNDER A SHORT-TERM RESEARCH GRANT

COPYRIGHT C 1991, BY PUSAT PENYELIDIKAN DADAH DAN UBAT-UBATAN,
UNIVERSITI SAINS MALAYSIA.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

NO PART OF THIS PUBLICATION MAY BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED IN
ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, INCLUDING
PHOTOCOPY, RECORDING, OR ANY INFORMATION STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL
SYSTEM, WITHOUT PERMISSION IN WRITING FROM THE AUTHOR (S).

Pusat Penyelidikan Dadah dan Ubat-Ubatan
*
(Centre for Drug Research)
Universiti Sains Malaysia
Minden, Pulau Pinang
Malaysia

ISBN 983-9700-13-8

* U.N./W.H.O. Research and Training Centre on Drug Dependence
and Psychotropic Drug Use.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This study would not have materialised without the kind
cooperation and assistance of many persons, of whom only some
have been mentioned here:

1. Y.A.B. Datuk Seri (Dr.) Mahathir Mohamad, Prime Minister,
as Chairman of the National Anti Dadah Committee, National
Security Council.
2. Y.B. Dato' Dr. Sulaiman Daud, Minister of Education,
Ministry of Education.
3. Y.B. Datuk Megat Junid b. Megat Ayob, Deputy Minister,
Ministry of Home Affairs.
4. Y.B. Datuk Musa Mohamad, Vice-Chancellor, Universiti Sains
Malaysia, for his continued support and providing the
facilities essential for this study.
5. Y. Bhg. Tan Sri Haji Mohd. Haniff Omar, Inspector General
of Police, Malaysia for his support.
6. Secretary-General, Ministry of Education.
7. Secretary-General, Ministry of Home Affairs, for his
interest and support.
8. Director General, Ministry of Education.
9. The Director, Department of Education, Pulau Pinang.
10. The Director and Staff, Anti Dadah Task Force.
11. The technical and secretarial staff of the Centre for Drug
Research for their tireless efforts during the study and
in the preparation of the report.

CONTENTS

Page

	Page		
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	i	2.2 Educational Background	19
CONTENTS	ii - iv	2.2.1 Causes of Failure	20
SUMMARY	v - viii	2.2.2 Retake Exams?	22
LIST OF TABLES	xi - xii	2.2.3 Continue Studies and Type of Training	23
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1	2.2.4 Encouraged to Continue Studies	26
1.1 Objectives of Study	1	2.2.5 Reasons for Encouraging	28
1.2 Literature Review	2	2.2.6 Discouraged to Continue Studies	31
1.3 Research Questions	8	2.2.7 Reasons for Discouraging	33
1.4 Methodology	9	3.0 DRUG USE HISTORY	36
1.4.1 Questionnaire	9	3.1 Drug Use	36
1.4.2 Population and Sample	10	3.2 Type of Drugs Ever Used	37
1.4.3 Data Collection	11	3.3 Age at First Use	38
1.5 Interviewers' Comment	12	3.4 Level of School at First Use	38
2.0 SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC AND EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND	17	3.5 Who Introduced	39
2.1 Socio-demographic Background	17	3.6 Reasons for Initial Drug Use	39
2.1.1 Age	17	3.7 Duration of Drug Use	40
2.1.2 Religion	17	3.8 Frequency of Drug Use	40
2.1.3 Ethnicity	17	3.9 Reasons for Drug Use	41
2.1.4 Marital Status	17	4.0 DEVIANT ACTIVITIES AND CRIMINALITY	51
2.1.5 Age Left School	18	4.1 Deviant Activities	51
2.1.6 Family Composition	18	4.2 Criminality	52
2.1.7 People Lived With	18	5.0 ACTIVITIES AFTER DROPPING OUT	59
2.1.8 Residence - Type of Community	18	5.1 Total Period of Employment	59
2.1.9 (a) Father's Employment	18	5.2 Type of Employment	59
(b) Mother's Employment	19	5.3 Average Monthly Income	60
2.1.10 Parent's Income	19	5.4 Average Monthly Expenditure	61
2.1.11 (a) Father's Occupation	19		
(b) Mother's Occupation	19		

5.5	Total Period of Courses	61
5.6	Type of Courses	62
5.7	Average Monthly Pocket Money While Attending Courses	62
5.8	Average Monthly Expenses While Attending Courses	63
5.9	Total period of Unemployment	63
5.10	Average Monthly Pocket Money from Parents	64
5.11	Average Monthly Expenses While Unemployed	64
5.12	Employment	65
5.13	Courses	66
5.14	Unemployment	67
6.0	DISCUSSION	97
7.0	CONCLUSION	101
	REFERENCES	102
	APPENDIX	105
	PUBLICATIONS	119

Introduction

This report presents findings from an analysis of data collected on school dropouts from four examination groups: S.R.P. 1985, S.P.M. 1987, S.R.P. 1987 and S.P.M. 1989. The purpose of this study is to examine the activities of the dropouts such as deviancy, criminality, employment or unemployment and courses pursued. The areas which were examined include socio-demographic background, educational background, drug use history, deviancy, criminality and activities after dropping out of school.

Research Methodology

A total of 600 respondents from 8 selected schools were obtained. The respondents were between 18 to 21 years old at the time of interview. The data collected from the questionnaires were presented in tables and comparison were made between groups to see the patterns of the variables concerned.

Results

The main results of the study are summarised below:-

- o A big proportion of their fathers worked as labourers, with S.R.P. groups showing higher percentages.
- o More than 70% of their mothers were housewives.
- o Majority of the parents were earning between \$351 - \$600 but bigger proportions of the S.P.M. dropouts' parents were earning between \$601- \$1000 compared to the S.R.P. dropouts' parents.
- o Overall, more of S.P.M. dropouts' parents attained higher levels of education.
- o 99% of the respondents dropped out because they failed the examination. 73.82% said they had no time to study, with S.R.P. 1985 group showing a higher percentage and 30 - 50% failed because of involvement in sports.
- o More than 70% of the respondents would like to continue studies if given the opportunity and about half of them preferred vocational education.

- o Almost half (49.17%) of the respondents were involved in drugs (cigarettes, alcohol and cannabis). S.R.P. 1985 group showed the highest rate of involvement at 60.67% followed by S.P.M. 1987 group at 52.32%.
- o 47.17% of the respondents smoked cigarettes or cigarettes with other drugs and S.R.P. 1985 group showed the largest proportion followed by S.P.M. 1987 group.
- o 18.17% of the respondents drank alcohol or alcohol with other drugs and S.R.P. 1985 group also showed the highest percentage followed by S.P.M. 1987 group.
- o 1.83% of the respondents used cannabis or cannabis with other drugs with also S.R.P. 1985 group showing the highest number of respondents involved followed by S.P.M. 1987 group.
- o Majority started smoking at age 16 except S.P.M. 1987 respondents who started later at age 18.
- o More of S.R.P. 1985 respondents started drinking earlier at age 16 while majority of the other groups started at ages 17 and 18.
- o Generally, more of S.R.P. respondents started using drugs earlier compared to S.P.M. respondents.
- o Other than the S.P.M. 1989 group, most of the other respondents got involved in drugs after dropping out at age 16 for S.R.P. respondents and at age 18 for S.P.M. 1987 respondents. About three quarter of S.P.M. 1989 group started using drugs while they were still in school and a large proportion started when they were in Form 3.
- o 65 - 100% were introduced to drugs by friends with S.R.P. 1985 group showing the highest percentage. Majority cited that their reason for initial use was to get along with peers.
- o Deviant activities decreased after S.R.P. compared to before S.R.P.. The respondents showed the highest rate of involvement in 'arguments or fights'.
- o More S.R.P. dropouts were involved in deviant activities with more S.R.P. 1985 dropouts involved in more types of deviant activities.

- o They were involved in criminality only after dropping out of school and only a small percentage of the respondents were involved. Ten or 2% of the respondents have been arrested once with more of S.R.P. 1985 respondents involved. Out of those arrested, six were arrested for the use or possession of narcotics or controlled substances. Only 4 (0.67%) of them were convicted, of which 3 were from S.R.P. 1985 group and one from S.P.M. 1989 group.
- o S.R.P. 1985 group has the highest number of respondents who were employed (N=145) and S.P.M. 1989 group has the lowest number (N=121) but we must take into consideration that S.R.P. 1985 group involved a longer time frame and S.P.M. 1989 group, a shorter time frame.
- o Although both S.P.M. 1987 and S.R.P. 1987 groups involved the same length of time, more of S.P.M. 1987 respondents were able to get employed during that period.
- o The S.P.M. respondents were earning more than the S.R.P. respondents and they were also spending more but a few of S.R.P. 1985 respondents were earning more than the respondents from the other groups.
- o A large proportion of the respondents started working as salesmen (more S.R.P. respondents), followed by service workers (more S.P.M. respondents) and labourers (more S.R.P. respondents).
- o Majority of the respondents attended courses between 7-12 months regardless of the different time frame involved for the 4 groups. Most of them continued school or did self study with the percentages higher among S.R.P. groups.
- o The S.P.M. respondents received more pocket money than the S.R.P. respondents when attending courses and they also spent more.
- o Slightly more of S.R.P. 1985 respondents were unemployed for a longer period compared to the other groups.
- o The S.P.M. respondents received more pocket money during their unemployment and also spent more while S.R.P. 1985 respondents received the least pocket money and spent the least.

Conclusion

There seemed to be some influence on the dropouts by the parents' education levels and their income as the study showed that more of S.P.M. dropouts' parents earned more and attained higher levels of education than the S.R.P. dropouts' parents. Majority of the respondents started taking drugs at age 16 and above, that was after dropping out of S.R.P.. Deviant activities decreased tremendously after the S.R.P. examination compared to before S.R.P.. They were only involved in criminality after dropping out of S.R.P. and it involved mostly S.R.P. 1985 dropouts (this group involved a longer time frame). The two groups of S.P.M. respondents seemed to have better employment opportunities than the S.R.P. dropouts.

At this stage, it is still too early to make any concrete conclusion and to generalise it to all dropouts as the samples themselves are no guarantee that they represent the whole dropout population. Since this is just an exploratory study, a follow-up study is very much needed.

LIST OF TABLES

	Page	
Table 1.1	Interviewer's Comments On The Conditions Of Interview	13
Table 1.2	Interviewer's Comments On The Characteristics Of The Subjects	14
Table 2.1	Distribution Of Respondents By Causes Of Failure	21
Table 2.2	Distribution Of Respondents Who Did Retake And Who Did Not Retake S.R.P./S.P.M. And Their Reasons	24
Table 2.3	Distribution Of Respondents Who Would Continue Studies If Given The Opportunity And The Type Of Study/Training They Prefer	25
Table 2.4	Distribution Of Respondents By The People Who Encouraged Them To Continue Studies	27
Table 2.5	Distribution Of Respondents By The People Who Encouraged Them To Continue Studies And Their Reasons For Encouraging	29
Table 2.6	Distribution Of Respondents By The People Who Discouraged Them To Continue Studies	32
Table 2.7	Distribution Of Respondents By The People They Were Discouraged To Continue Studies And Their Reasons For Discouraging	34
Table 3.1	Distribution Of Respondents By Drug Use	36
Table 3.2	Distribution Of Respondents By Type Of Drugs Ever Used	37
Table 3.3	Distribution Of Respondents Who Have Ever Used Drugs By Age At First Use	42

	Page
Table 3.4 Distribution Of Respondents Who Have Ever Used Drugs By Level Of School At First Use	44
Table 3.5 Distribution Of Respondents Who Have Ever Used Drugs By Persons Who Introduced Them To Drugs	45
Table 3.6 Distribution Of Respondents Who Used Drugs By Reasons For Initial Use	46
Table 3.7 Distribution Of Respondents Who Used Drugs By Duration of Use	47
Table 3.8 Distribution Of Respondents Who Used Drugs By Frequency Of Use	48
Table 3.9 Distribution Of Respondents Who Used Drugs By Reasons For Use	50
Table 4.1 Distribution Of Respondents By Deviant Activities	54
Table 4.2(a) Distribution Of Respondents By Criminal Record - Arrested	56
Table 4.2(b) Distribution Of Respondents By Criminal Record - Convicted	57
Table 4.2(c) Distribution Of Respondents By Criminal Record - Incarcerated	58
Table 5.1 Distribution Of Respondents By Total Period Of Employment	69
Table 5.2(a) Distribution Of Respondents By Type Of Employment (0 - 6 months)	70
Table 5.2(b) Distribution Of Respondents By Type Of Employment (7 - 12 months)	71

	Page
Table 5.2(c) Distribution Of Respondents By Type Of Employment (13 - 18 months)	72
Table 5.2(d) Distribution Of Respondents By Type Of Employment (19 - 24 months)	73
Table 5.2(e) Distribution Of Respondents By Type Of Employment (25 - 30 months)	74
Table 5.2(f) Distribution Of Respondents By Type Of Employment (31 - 36 months)	75
Table 5.2(g) Distribution Of Respondents By Type Of Employment (37 - 42 months)	76
Table 5.2(h) Distribution Of Respondents By Type Of Employment (43 - 48 months)	77
Table 5.3 Distribution Of Respondents By Average Monthly Income While Employed	78
Table 5.4 Distribution Of Respondents By Average Monthly Expenditure While Employed	79
Table 5.5 Distribution Of Respondents By Total Period Of Courses Attended	80
Table 5.6(a) Distribution Of Respondents By Type Of Courses Attended (0 - 6 months)	81
Table 5.6(b) Distribution Of Respondents By Type Of Courses Attended (7 - 12 months)	82
Table 5.6(c) Distribution Of Respondents By Type Of Courses Attended (13 - 18 months)	83
Table 5.6(d) Distribution Of Respondents By Type Of Courses Attended (19 - 24 months)	84

	Page
Table 5.6(e) Distribution Of Respondents By Type Of Courses Attended (25 - 30 months)	85
Table 5.6(f) Distribution Of Respondents By Type Of Courses Attended (31 - 36 months)	86
Table 5.6(g) Distribution Of Respondents By Type Of Courses Attended (37 - 42 months)	87
Table 5.6(h) Distribution Of Respondents By Type Of Courses Attended (43 - 48 months)	88
Table 5.7 Distribution Of Respondents By Average Monthly Pocket Money While Attending Courses	89
Table 5.8 Distribution Of Respondents By Average Monthly Expenses While Attending Courses	90
Table 5.9 Distribution Of Respondents By Total Period Of Unemployment	91
Table 5.10 Distribution Of Respondents By Average Monthly Pocket Money While Unemployed	92
Table 5.11 Distribution Of Respondents By Average Monthly Expenses While Unemployed	93
Table 5.12 Distribution Of Respondents By Examination Groups And Employment	94
Table 5.13 Distribution Of Respondents By Examination Groups And Courses	95
Table 5.14 Distribution Of Respondents By Examination Groups and Unemployment	96

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Over the last decade, the involvement of young people in drug abuse remains at an alarming high level that demands immediate implementation of corrective actions covering prevention, treatment and rehabilitation activities to contain, and reduce drug experimentation and abuse.

Based on the data collected by the Centre for Drug Research, Universiti Sains Malaysia, three quarter (75%) of the drug addicts identified in the last decade were in the age group of 15 to 29 years old (Foong and Navaratnam, 1987a, 1987b). In a subsequent study on the young adolescent abusers who were 21 years old and below (V. Navaratnam, K. Foong, S.K. Hoo - 1990), it was found out that 95.4% of these young abusers were non-students and majority (45.83%) of them dropped out from the formal education at Sijil Rendah Pelajaran level (Lower Certificate of Education). Thirty-five to forty percent of the Sijil Rendah Pelajaran examination candidates dropped out of formal education every year.

Although not all the dropouts from the schools will become involved in drug abuse, the Centre for Drug Research together with the Ministry of Education have identified the need for better understanding of this group from the aspects of human behaviour and the economics of education.

Basically this study is designed to delve into the lifestyle of the S.R.P. dropouts in comparison to their contemporaries who dropped out two years later, i.e. after Form 5. The objectives of this study are to examine the socio-demographic characteristics of the dropouts, ascertain the reasons given for dropping out, study their involvement in social deviant activities (including drug abuse) and find out the contributory factors to these attitudes/behaviours. Furthermore, the study attempts to identify the social and family support systems for the dropouts as well as to explore the plans for the future in terms of equipping themselves with the expertise to fit themselves in the world of employment. In addition, the project will also study the contribution of the dropouts in the labour market. In this regard, it is important to take into account the employment of the dropouts in the labour market as well as their productivity from the economic point of view.

1.1 OBJECTIVES OF STUDY

The study aims to examine the lifestyle of the dropouts and the role played by them in the society.

The objectives are:

- (1) To examine the socio-demographic characteristics of the dropouts.
- (2) To study the involvement of the dropouts in social deviant activities (including drug abuse).
- (3) To find out the factors contributing to these behaviours.
- (4) To examine the social and family support systems and acceptance of the dropouts.
- (5) To measure the opportunity given for vocational training and employment in the labour market.
- (6) To study the relative contribution of the dropouts in the labour market as well as their productivity from the economic point of view.

The long term aim of this project is to provide a clear understanding of the dropouts from the aspects of human behaviour and economics of education for the policy makers and education programme planners to initiate modification, innovation and reformation on the present policies and education programme if necessary. The project will help to answer the question 'is the extra two years in school necessary?'. This is of utmost importance in reducing social cost and enhancing the productivity of our available resources.

1.2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Drug Use

Drug is a substance that by its chemical nature, affects the structure or functions of the living organism. However, in contemporary society, the word drug has two connotations - one positive, explaining its crucial role in medicine, and the other one negative, the self destruction and socially deleterious patterns of misuse which alters the body or its function (Jones et. al., 1973).

Therefore, illicit drug use are usually made on the basis of either type of substance used or of different levels of frequency of use. According to Nowlis (1975) such levels are (i) experimental use, often defined as one to three times, (ii) casual or occasional use, which may be not more than once or twice a month; (iii) regular use, which may be weekly or several times a week, depending on the particular substance used; and (iv) heavy or compulsive use, which usually implies daily use, although it may occur on a spree basis with extremely heavy use for several days on a periodic basis.

However, according to Jones et. al., (1973) the term 'addict' is applied to someone chronically abusing physically dependent, or addicting drugs. These are the depressant drugs such as opium and its derivatives, synthetic narcotics, barbiturates, alcohol and solvents. The term 'user' is often applied to one who is abusing stimulant drugs (cocaine, amphetamines, marijuana, LSD or often hallucinogenic drugs).

Crime

Crime is an act forbidden by the law of the land, and one which is considered sufficiently serious to warrant providing penalties for its commission (Darrow, 1934).

Deviance

Deviant behaviour is that behaviour which does not conform to social expectations (McCaghy, 1976).

Dropouts and Non-Dropouts

According to a follow-up study by Combs and Cooley (1968) regarding employment and earning of dropouts and graduates, the comparisons of work related data showed that not only were the male dropouts earning as much money as the graduates but they had also been earning it longer.

Regarding the relationship between dropouts and non-dropouts and drug use, Navaratnam and Spencer (1976) found that 13.4% of 5808 students were drug users for the state of Penang alone. This statement is backed by Foong et. al. (1986) when their study showed that 72.6% of their student respondents were not using any substance. It also showed that for those who were using substance, 14.3% used alcohol only, 6.8% used cigarettes only and 3.3% used both alcohol and cigarettes. Alcohol, cigarettes and hard drugs were used by 1.2%, 0.8% used hard drug, 0.8% used alcohol and drugs and 0.2% used cigarettes and drugs. This shows that only 3% used hard drug with or without alcohol and cigarettes. About 14% out of 1178 students respondents reported that they consumed alcohol and only 7% reported smoking. About 3% out of 231 in the alcoholic subgroup took alcohol regularly. In the smokers subgroup, only 9% admitted that they regularly smoked.

In the view of criminality, Sutherland and Cressey (1974) indicated that crime decreases with the increase in formal education. A large proportion of delinquents do poor school work, and they are retarded in reading, writing and arithmetic.

Farrington et. al. (1986) found that the offending rate was slightly less while the youths were at school using the simple Poisson technique. Their study also showed that school and employment offending rates was statistically significant, (although small) 0.11 offences per year at school as opposed to 0.15 in employment ($p=0.01$).

Age

A study conducted by Navaratnam and Foong (1987) showed that 9.3% of addicts were at the age of 15 to 19 years old and 31.8% were 20 to 24 years old. It also revealed that 23.9% of reported addicts started taking drugs at the age of 15 to 19 years old and 38.1% started at the age of 20 to 24 years old. Meanwhile, Foong et. al. (1986) also indicated that 79% out of 231 respondents in the alcoholic subgroup started consuming alcohol at the age of 13 and above, with 49% of them started consuming alcohol at the age of 16 and above. The percentage is more or less the same for the smokers subgroup. However for the hard drug user, 83% of them started taking drugs at the age of 13 and above, where 58% out of this number started using drug at the age of 16 and above.

According to a study done in USSR by Glazov et. al. (1989), they indicated that 70.4% of the technical school students used alcohol and typically began using it at 14 to 15 years of age.

As of the relationship between age and criminality, Sutherland and Cressey (1974) stated that the age of maximum general criminality is during and shortly before adolescence. English statistics showed that the age category of maximum convictions for indictable crimes is 14 to 17, while American statistics place this age slightly higher. For all crimes and for each specific crime, the rate decreases steadily from the age of maximum criminality to the end of life.

According to Sue Titus Reid (1976), young people aged 11 to 25 constitute roughly 25% of the population accounted for 75% of all arrests for serious crimes in 1973. She added that if the age category is stopped at 18, then 44.7% of the arrests for serious crime are accounted for. Grande (1988) quoted that in 1981, FBI Uniform Crime Report reported that four-fifths of all persons arrested in the US were under the age of 20 (US Department of Justice, 1983). Relatively few delinquents received their first caution or conviction either before the age of 12 years or after the age of 16, according to Ouston (1984).

Religion

Navaratnam and Spencer (1976) stated that eventhough religion is not a predictor of drug use pattern, but it shows some significant differences between groups. Their study showed that out of approximately 11% of drug use throughout the sample, Muslim and Buddhist states a slightly lower than average number of users (9.5% and 9.3% respectively), whereas the Hindu and no religious affiliation groups are consistently higher than average in the number of those reporting use (12.3% and 15.3%).

According to Foong et. al. (1986), relatively, most of the drug using students did not feel that religion has any strong influence on their everyday life compared to non-drug using students.

Forney et. al. (1988) reported a correlation between drug use and religion, and alcohol and tobacco use with religion. This shows that those who were not involved in religious matters were more prone to becoming a drug user. This study's internal consistency reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) is 0.86 to 0.90.

Ethnicity

Rumberger (1983) revealed that minorities with the same background characteristics as whites are just as likely or even less likely to drop out of high school as whites.

Navaratnam and Foong (1987) reported that in 1985 and 1986, the frequency of reported drug addicts according to ethnicity were 52.3% Malays, 33.9% Chinese and 12.2% Indians. Forney et. al. (1988) stated a correlation between race and drug, alcohol and tobacco use. His study came out with r value of -0.12 ($p < 0.05$) for the correlation between race and drug use, $r = -0.26$ ($p < 0.001$) for race and alcohol use and $r = 0.1$ for race and tobacco use.

Sutherland and Cressey (1974) also stated that the general crime rate of Negro exceeds the rate among whites. The official statistics of arrest per 100,000 population of the same race 15 years of age and over for the entire United States suggest that blacks have arrest rates about 3 to 4 times more than those of the white population.

Ouston (1984) also indicated that ethnic origin has some correlation with delinquency. In her study, she found that respondents whom their parent's place of birth was West Indies showed greater delinquency (39.1%) than those from the United Kingdom and Eire, Cyprus and Indian and Pakistan origin.

A study done by Leflore (1988) reported that the delinquent group were significantly more likely to be black.

Marital Status

Forney et. al. found out that marital status has some influence on drug, alcohol and tobacco use. According to the study, the r value for marital status and drug use is 0.001, marital status and alcohol use is -0.10 while for the tobacco use is 0.15 ($p < 0.01$).

Parent's Occupation and Employment

Navaratnam and Spencer (1976) stated that 17.5% of drug users' fathers were not working and 17.4% were professionals, followed by 13.4% and 13.1% who were manual workers and shopowners respectively, as for the state of Penang. As for both states of Penang and Selangor, it showed that almost 20% of the drug users' mothers were professionals and 14.0% were semi-skilled workers, followed by 13.0% and 11.8% who were manual, and skilled workers respectively.

Miller and Cisin (1979) came to the conclusion that mother's current employment status has little or no influence on teenage drug use. However, Ouston (1984) found that there were clear relationships between delinquency and parental occupation. She indicated that 35.4% of the delinquent had parents that of semi-skilled and unskilled manual workers (including not working parents), 26.8% had skilled manual workers' parents and 17.3% had professional, managerial and skilled non-manual workers' parents. Chi-square value for the relationship between delinquency and parental occupation is 20.79 with d.f.=2 ($p < 0.001$).

Parent's Income

Rumberger (1983) indicated that higher levels of parents' earnings reduces the probability of dropping out (but only for whites).

According to Miller and Cisin (1979), family socio-economic status has little or no influence on teenage drug use. This statement is opposed by Carlson and Davis (1988) when their study came out with parental income discriminated between marijuana and recreational substance composite user and non-user group. Users of marijuana and recreational substance composite had significantly higher parental income.

Looking at the delinquency aspect, Grande (1988) reported that there was an absence of a specific relationship between socio-economic status and delinquency.

Family Composition

Navaratnam and Spencer (1976) stated that the size of the family of origin is not a factor which differentiates drug user from non-drug user, and the percentages of either group having older brothers, older sisters, younger brothers and younger sisters are very much comparable.

However, from the delinquency perspective, Leflore (1988) revealed that the delinquent group had significantly more siblings and in more cases they were the middle youth. Nevertheless, there was no significant difference in the number of people in the household.

Living With

According to Miller and Cisin (1979), over 80% of illicit drug users who live alone have tried marijuana, as have almost 90% of those who live with friends, roommates and spouse-type partners.

Type of Community

Rumberger (1983) suggested that the place of family residence at the age of 14 significantly affects the probability of dropping out for some cohorts. Hispanics who resided outside the United States at age 14 are much more likely to drop out than Hispanics who resided in United States compared to whites which showed lower dropout rates. This suggests that the whites' educational opportunities may have been better than their American counterparts. Current residence effects were also primarily significant among the males. Blacks and Hispanics males residing in the South displayed lower probabilities of dropping out. Black males currently residing in the central city have higher dropout rates than the individuals residing in rural or suburban areas.

Johnston et. al. (1981) stated that overall illicit drug use is highest in the largest metropolitan areas (61% annual prevalence), slightly lower in the other metropolitan areas (55%) and lowest in the non-metropolitan areas (48%).

This is agreed by Miller and Cisin (1978) when they indicated that rates of drug use are lower in sparsely populated rural areas than in other sections.

Forney et. al. (1988) also indicated a significant difference between drug, alcohol and tobacco use and urban and rural residence. Their study showed that a relationship exist between urban residence and drug use, urban residence and alcohol use and urban residence and tobacco use. There was significant relationship between rural residence and drug use, rural residence and alcohol use and rural residence and tobacco use.

Johnston et. al. (1981) concluded that the single most important factor in adolescent illicit drug use is the pattern of drug use by the adolescents best friend. The personal and lifestyle characteristics such as extent of participation in peer activities, radical political orientation, or poor school are more strongly related to drug use than socio demographic characteristics.

Parents' Education

According to Rumberger (1983), both parents' education levels appear important. Higher education levels for fathers reduce the likelihood of dropping out among all three male cohorts (black, hispanic and white), while mothers' education levels only affect the likelihood among black males (probability of -2.3).

1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Specifically, the study will answer the following research questions:

- (a) To what extent does dropping out of school after the SRP examination influence the students to be involved in deviant activities and drug abuse? Have these activities increased compared to when they were still in school?
- (b) Are the students that dropped out from SRP more easily influenced by social deviant activities compared to their contemporaries that continued their studies up to SPM level?
- (c) Do students that failed SRP have brighter opportunities in employment than their contemporaries who sat for SPM?
- (d) What are the social activities of the 2 groups?

- (e) Is it a good step to abolish the SRP examination to enable all students to continue their studies until Form 5? Will it be able to reduce the rate of involvement of teenagers in deviancy and criminality?

1.4 METHODOLOGY

1.4.1 Questionnaire

As the main objective of this study is to analyse the activities of the dropouts after the S.R.P. and S.P.M. examination, a questionnaire was prepared for that purpose. The activities meant here are education, deviancy (including drug abuse), criminality and employment:

i. Education

The respondents were asked on the courses/training they were pursuing. This includes continuing school and vocational training. Questions on family support in this aspect were also asked.

ii. Deviancy

Questions on deviant activities they were involved in and drug use were put forward.

iii. Criminality

The respondents were asked questions on their criminality record and other unhealthy activities that they were involved in.

iv. Employment

The objective here is to examine the types of jobs carried out by the respondents. Other than types of jobs, questions on the period of employment and salary were put forward. If the respondent was not working, questions on unemployment were asked.

1.4.2 Population and Sample

The population is made up of individuals who failed the S.R.P. 1985, S.R.P. 1987, S.P.M. 1987 and S.P.M. 1989 examinations. The lists of names were obtained from the schools.

The respondents for this study were picked from 8 secondary schools on Penang Island. There are 38 secondary schools on the island based on the list provided by the Jabatan Pelajaran Pulau Pinang and 35 more in Seberang Perai. To cutdown cost, the schools chosen were limited to those on the island only and schools that were not too far out. Religious schools, schools with hostels and those with female students only were not included.

The schools were then listed according to those that have high risk in drug use, followed by medium risk and low risk. In addition, the schools were listed according to their academic achievement: high academic achievement, medium and low. The academic achievement of each school was obtained from the S.R.P. and S.P.M. results, while the rates of drug abuse were taken from the urine test (these were obtained from the Department of Education).

Based on the above factors, 8 schools which involved all the above factors were chosen. The questionnaires were submitted to 4 groups of students as follows:

Groups	Attainments	No. of Respondents
S.R.P. 1985	Failed S.R.P.	150
S.R.P. 1987	Failed S.R.P.	148
S.P.M. 1987	Failed S.P.M.	151
S.P.M. 1989	Failed S.P.M.	151
Total		600

The reason for having these four groups is to enable comparisons between groups. For example, the students who have taken S.R.P. 1985 and S.P.M. 1987 are of the same age group. Therefore, a socio-economic comparison can be made between these two groups.

The S.R.P. 1987 group will be compared with the S.P.M. 1989 group. It is hoped that from this comparison, we shall arrive at an accurate result where a conclusion can be made whether there is a significant difference between the group that passed S.R.P. and the group that failed based on the above criterias.

1.4.3 Data Collection

A semi structured questionnaire was developed and pre-tested for the study. It was designed to elicit data primarily within these areas: socio-demographic characteristics, education, drug use, deviancy, criminality and events/activities after dropping out.

(a) Socio-demographic characteristics

- o Age
- o Ethnicity
- o Marital Status
- o Family Background

(b) Education

- o Causes of failure
- o Reason for retaking/not retaking exam
- o Courses/training
- o Family support

(c) Deviancy

- o Deviant activities
- o Drug use

(d) Criminality

- o Arrested
- o Convicted
- o Incarcerated

(e) Events/Activities After Dropping Out

- o Employment
- o Unemployment
- o Training/Course
- o Income
- o Expenses
- o Pocket money

1.5 INTERVIEWERS' COMMENTS

The amount and nature of the information given by the subjects were affected by the conditions in and outside the subjects during the interview. Therefore, the interviewer needs to make critical judgement on the effect of these conditions on the information received. In this study, the conditions of interview and the accuracy of responses given by subjects were evaluated immediately after leaving the subjects upon completion of the interview. Tables 1.1 and 1.2 present the interviewers' comments on the conditions of interviews conducted and characteristics of subjects in the study.

Generally, the conditions for the interviews in this study were satisfactory. Table 1.1 shows that 41.3% of the interviews were conducted in complete privacy while 55.3% in privacy most of the time. Privacy is the major factor that contribute to the truthfulness of the subject's answers during the interview. Interruptions during the interviews were minimal as revealed by the fact that 58.1% of the interviews had no interruptions while 41.0% were interrupted by others entering and leaving the place of interview. However, the people entering and leaving the place of interview were the family members of the subject, hence the interruption was minimal. During the interview, only one (0.2%) respondent left the room and only one interview was interrupted by a phone call for the respondent.

The respondents' characteristics during the interviews were satisfactory. As revealed in table 1.2, 90.4% of them were cooperative, 92.6% paid high attention to the interviewer and 94.6% had high understanding of questions and comprehension. Articulation of answers was high for 80.5% of the respondents. Among the respondents, 39.7% of them took little time to answers the questions while 47.2% of them took average time to answer the questions. Good physical health was apparent among majority (78.7%) of the respondents. The overall accuracy of the responses were evaluated and 91.9% of the responses showed high accuracy.

Table 1.1

Interviewer's Comments On The Conditions Of Interview

Comments	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Conditions of Interview		
A. <u>Privacy</u>		
Complete privacy	236	41.3
Privacy most of the time	316	55.3
Privacy some of the time	14	2.5
No privacy	5	0.9
	517*	100.0
* 29 cases (4.8%) have no information.		
B. <u>Interruptions</u>		
No interruptions	330	58.1
Others entering and leaving	233	41.0
Respondent left room	1	0.2
Phone calls	1	0.2
Others	3	0.5
	568*	100.0
* 32 cases (5.3%) have no information.		

Table 1.2

Interviewer's Comments On The Characteristics
Of The Subjects

Comments	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Respondents' Characteristics		
A. <u>Respondents' Attitude</u>		
Very cooperative	22	3.9
Cooperative	513	90.4
Average	31	5.5
Uncooperative	1	0.2
	567*	100.0

* 22 cases (3.9%) have no information.

Table 1.2 (Cont.)

Comments	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
D. <u>Articulation of Answers</u>		
Very high	6	1.1
High	447	80.5
Medium	101	18.2
Low	1	0.2
	555*	100.0

* 45 cases (7.5%) have no information.

Table 1.2 (Cont.)

Comments	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
G. Overall Evaluation		
Very high accuracy	15	2.7
High accuracy	511	91.9
Medium accuracy	29	5.2
Low accuracy	1	0.2
	556*	100.0

* 44 cases (7.3%) have no information.

2.0 SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC AND EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

This section will be divided into two parts. The first part will discuss the socio-demographic background of the respondents and the second part will discuss their educational background.

2.1 SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND

Characteristics such as age, religion, ethnicity, family composition, parents' employment, parents' income and so on will be discussed briefly to get a picture of the respondents' socio-demographic background. (Refer to Appendix A to see the tables).

2.1.1 Age

The S.R.P. 1985 and S.P.M. 1987 dropouts were of the same age group. Majority (more than 85%) of them were between 20 to 21 years old at the time of interview. As for the S.R.P. 1987 and S.P.M. 1989 dropouts, majority were between 18 to 19 years old at the time of interview. (Refer to Table A in Appendix A).

2.1.2 Religion

Among all the four groups of respondents, more than 40% of them were Muslims, about one-third were Taoists and about 15% of them practised Hinduism. (See Table B).

2.1.3 Ethnicity

There were almost the same number of Malays and Chinese among the respondents with just slightly more Malays. S.R.P. 1985 group had the same number of Malays and Chinese, S.P.M. 1987 group had more Chinese, while both S.R.P. 1987 and S.P.M. 1989 groups had more Malays. More than 70% of the respondents were made up of these two ethnicity groups and 26-28% were Indians.

2.1.4 Marital Status

Most of the respondents were single at the time of interview. Less than 7% of them were married. None of the S.P.M. 1989 respondents were married and only one from S.R.P. 1987 group was married.

2.1.5 Age Left School

Most of the S.R.P. dropouts left school between ages 15 to 16 while most of the S.P.M. dropouts left school between ages 17 to 18.

2.1.6 Family Composition

(a) Order

More than 43% of the respondents were the middle child, 20-30% were the eldest child, 23-28% were the youngest child and only 1-3% were the only child.

(b) Siblings

A large proportion of the respondents have three siblings (refer to mode). This is true except for S.R.P. 1985 group where the two siblings group was the highest. We can say that majority came from medium size families except for some who came from very large families.

2.1.7 People Lived With

About 90% and above of the respondents lived with their parents. However, S.P.M. 1987 group has a lower percentage who lived with parents compared to the other groups.

2.1.8 Residence - Type of Community

Majority of the respondents (26-30%) lived in towns except for S.P.M. 1987 group where majority (32%) lived in the suburb.

2.1.9 (a) Father's Employment

Majority (29-37%) of their fathers worked as labourers with S.R.P. groups showing higher percentages while 15-20% of their fathers were shop owners.

(b) Mother's Employment

More than 70% of the respondents' mothers were housewives. However, among the four groups, S.R.P. 1985 group has the highest percentage of their mothers who were housewives.

2.1.10 Parents' Income

A large proportion (42-50%) of the respondents' parents were earning between \$351-\$600 a month. More of the S.P.M. respondents have parents who were earning between \$601-\$1000 a month compared to the S.R.P. respondents. S.P.M. 1989 group has more parents who were earning more than \$2000 per month compared to the other groups.

2.1.11 (a) Father's Education

About 60-73% of their fathers had elementary education. Only 14% of S.R.P. 1985 group's fathers had education until Form 3 compared to the other three groups (17%). Both the S.P.M. groups showed more of their fathers (with S.P.M. 1989 group showing the higher percentage) had education until Form 5 compared to the S.R.P. groups. The S.P.M. groups also showed that a few of them had fathers who had university education.

(b) Mother's Education

More of the S.R.P. respondents (72%) had mothers who had elementary education compared to the S.P.M. groups (63-64%). The S.P.M. groups showed that more of their mothers attained a higher level of education compared to the S.R.P. groups.

2.2 EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

Most of the respondents dropped out of school because they failed the examination. Only 1% dropped out because they did not sit for the examination. Areas which will be examined include the reasons why they failed the examination, did they retake the examination and why, were they encouraged to continue studies, would they continue studies if given the opportunity and the type of studies/training they prefer.

2.2.1 Causes of Failure

'No time to study' seemed to be the main cause of failure (73-82%) followed by 'involvement in sports' (30-50%) and 'lack of interest in studies' (20-30%) (See Table 2.1).

Comparing respondents who dropped out at the same level of education, more of the S.R.P. 1985 group (82%) cited 'no time to study' as their main cause of failure compared to S.R.P. 1987 group (72.9%). However, the pattern is the reverse for the S.P.M. groups (73.51% from S.P.M. 1987 group and 80.13% from S.P.M. 1989 group). 'Involvement in sports' and 'lack of interest in studies' also showed similar pattern as above.

For the three main causes discussed above, when comparing the S.R.P. groups with their peers who dropped out two years later, less of the S.P.M. 1987 group gave those reasons as the causes of failure compared to S.R.P. 1985 group. However, it is the reverse for S.R.P. 1987 and S.P.M. 1989 groups where a larger proportion of S.P.M. 1989 respondents gave the above reasons as the causes of failure.

Table 2.1

Distribution of Respondents By Causes of Failure

Cause of failure	S.R.P. 1985 N = 150	S.P.M. 1987 N = 151	S.R.P. 1987 N = 148	S.P.M. 1989 N = 151
No time to study	123 (82.00)	111 (73.51)	108 (72.97)	121 (80.13)
Involved in sports	53 (35.33)	49 (32.45)	44 (29.73)	76 (50.33)
Lack of interest	42 (28.00)	30 (19.87)	41 (27.70)	45 (29.80)
Weak in studies	29 (19.33)	38 (25.17)	44 (29.73)	31 (20.53)
Problem interacting	29 (19.33)	39 (25.83)	25 (16.89)	15 (9.93)
Financial problem	10 (6.67)	6 (3.97)	10 (6.67)	15 (9.93)
Emotional problem	9 (6.00)	17 (11.26)	8 (5.41)	8 (5.30)
Health problem	7 (4.67)	5 (3.31)	7 (4.73)	3 (1.99)
Disciplinary problem	8 (5.33)	4 (2.65)	2 (1.35)	2 (1.32)
Others	17 (11.33)	18 (11.92)	26 (17.57)	41 (27.15)

* Percentages may exceed 100% due to multiple reporting.

2.2.2 Retake Exams?

Table 2.2 shows that 22-37% retook the examinations and a larger proportion of the S.R.P. groups sat for the examination again compared to the S.P.M. groups.

More of the S.R.P. 1985 group (36.6%) retook the examination compared to S.R.P. 1987 group (27.03%). However, only 22.52% of S.P.M. 1987 group retook the examination compared to 25.17% from S.P.M. 1989 group.

(a) Reasons for Retaking

It was found that most (80-85%) of those who retook the examination did it for a better future. More of the S.R.P. 1985 group (85.45%) retook the examination for this reason compared to S.R.P. 1987 group (82.50%). However, more of S.P.M. 1989 group (81.58%) took the exam again for this reason compared to S.P.M. 1987 group (79.41%).

When comparing the S.R.P. groups with their contemporaries who dropped out from S.P.M. two years later, a larger proportion of the S.R.P. groups retook the exams for a better future.

(b) Reasons for Not Retaking

Majority (30-40%) of those who did not retake the examination said they did not retake as they have to work to support themselves or family. Quite a large proportion (20-36%) said they felt that they could survive without the S.R.P./S.P.M. certificates. Some of them felt embarrassed to take the examination again while a small proportion cited financial problem.

More of the S.R.P. 1987 group (39.32%) said they have to work to support self/family compared to S.R.P. 1985 group (31.58%) and the pattern is similar for S.P.M. 1989 group compared to S.P.M. 1987 group.

When the S.R.P. 1985 group was compared with its contemporaries (S.P.M. 1987 group), a higher percentage (33.33%) of the S.P.M. 1987 group did not retake the examination as they had to work to support self/family. The pattern however, is reverse for S.R.P. 1987 and S.P.M. 1989 groups. More of the S.R.P. groups felt they could survive without the examination certificate compared to their contemporaries (S.P.M. groups) (See Table 2.2).

2.2.3 Continue Studies and Type of Training

More than 70% of the respondents said that they would continue their studies if given the opportunity, 11-16% would not continue their studies and 7-15% were not sure. (See Table 2.3). More of those who dropped out of the same level of examinations two years later said they would continue studies if given the opportunity.

About half of those who said they would continue their studies if given the opportunity preferred vocational education while about 30% preferred industrial training and 14-19% said they would retake the examination.

More of the S.R.P. 1985 group preferred vocational education compared to S.R.P. 1987 group. However, less of the S.P.M. 1987 group preferred vocational education compared to S.P.M. 1989 group. Slightly more of the S.R.P. 1987 group preferred industrial training compared to S.R.P. 1985 group. However, the pattern is reverse for the S.P.M. groups. The pattern is also similar for those who said they would retake the examination.

The S.R.P. groups when compared with their peers who failed the S.P.M. two years later showed that more of the S.R.P. groups preferred vocational education. More (33.93%) of the S.P.M. 1987 group preferred industrial training compared to S.R.P. 1985 group. However, for the S.P.M. 1989 and S.R.P. 1987 groups, there is almost no difference. (Refer Table 2.3).

Table 2.2

Distribution of Respondents Who Did Retake And Did Not Retake S.R.P./S.P.M. And Their Reasons

Did you retake S.R.P./S.P.M.?	S.R.P. 1985 N = 150	S.P.M. 1987 N = 151	S.R.P. 1987 N = 148	S.P.M. 1989 N = 151
Yes	55 (36.67)	34 (22.52)	40 (27.03)	38 (25.17)
No	95 (63.33)	117 (77.48)	108 (72.97)	113 (74.83)
If retake, why?				
For a better future	47 (85.45)	27 (79.41)	33 (82.50)	31 (81.58)
To satisfy parent's wishes	7 (12.73)	5 (14.71)	7 (17.50)	6 (15.79)
Friends took the exam	-	1 (2.94)	-	-
Others	1 (1.82)	1 (2.94)	-	1 (2.63)
If not retake, why?				
Have to work to support self/family	30 (31.58)	36 (33.33)	46 (39.32)	44 (38.94)
Could survive without certificate	34 (35.79)	24 (22.22)	34 (29.06)	23 (20.35)
Felt embarrassed	10 (10.53)	14 (12.96)	16 (13.68)	11 (9.73)
No money to retake exam	11 (11.58)	14 (12.96)	3 (2.56)	4 (3.54)
Others	10 (10.53)	20 (18.52)	18 (15.38)	31 (27.43)

Table 2.3

Distribution of Respondents Who Would Continue Studies If Given The Opportunity and The Type of Study/Training They Prefer

Would you continue studies if given the opportunity?	S.R.P. 1985 N = 150	S.P.M. 1987 N = 151	S.R.P. 1987 N = 148	S.P.M. 1989 N = 151
Yes	110 (73.33)	112 (74.17)	114 (77.03)	116 (76.82)
No	23 (15.33)	17 (11.26)	24 (16.22)	22 (14.57)
Not sure	17 (11.33)	22 (14.57)	10 (6.76)	13 (8.61)
Type of study/ training prefer				
Vocational Education	61 (55.45)	48 (42.86)	58 (50.88)	57 (49.14)
Industrial training	29 (26.36)	38 (33.93)	31 (27.19)	32 (27.59)
Retake exam	16 (14.55)	18 (16.07)	22 (19.30)	16 (13.79)
Agricultural training	1 (0.91)	1 (0.89)	0 (0.00)	2 (1.72)
Others	3 (2.73)	7 (6.25)	3 (2.63)	9 (7.76)
Total	110 (100.00)	112 (100.00)	114 (110.00)	116 (110.00)

2.2.4 Encouraged to Continue Studies

More than 90% of the respondents were encouraged to continue studies by their parents. About 64-79% were encouraged to continue studies by their brother/sister while more than 50% were encouraged by friends. About 30% were encouraged by teachers and some were encouraged by neighbours (See Table 2.4).

Of those who were encouraged by parents, S.R.P. 1985 group showed a higher percentage (92.62%) compared to S.R.P. 1987 group (91.89%), and S.P.M. 1987 group (97.35%) compared to S.P.M. 1989 (91.84%). This pattern is similar for those who were encouraged to continue studies by brother/sister. For those who were encouraged by friends, this similar pattern applies to S.R.P. 1985 and S.R.P. 1987 groups but the pattern changed for S.P.M. 1987 and S.P.M. 1989 group where S.P.M. 1989 group showed a higher percentage.

When comparing S.R.P. 1985 with S.P.M. 1987 group, a larger proportion of S.P.M. 1987 group were encouraged by parents, while there is no difference between S.R.P. 1987 and S.P.M. 1989 groups. A higher percentage of S.R.P. 1985 group (79.19%) were encouraged by brother/sister compared to S.P.M. 1987 group (71.52%) while there is no difference between S.R.P. 1987 and S.P.M. 1989 group. S.R.P. 1985 and S.P.M. 1987 groups showed that the same percentage were encouraged by friends while S.P.M. 1989 group showed more (64.63%) were encouraged by friends compared to S.R.P. 1987 group (50%).

Table 2.4

Distribution of Respondents By The People Who Encouraged Them To Continue Studies

Encouraged to continue studies by:	S.R.P. 1985 N = 150	S.P.M. 1987 N = 151	S.R.P. 1987 N = 148	S.P.M. 1989 N = 151
Parents	138 (92.62)	147 (97.35)	136 (91.89)	135 (91.84)
Brother/Sister	118 (79.19)	108 (71.52)	95 (64.19)	95 (64.63)
Friends	83 (55.70)	84 (55.63)	74 (50.00)	95 (64.63)
Teachers	53 (35.57)	41 (27.15)	49 (33.11)	43 (29.25)
Neighbours	31 (20.81)	16 (10.60)	27 (18.24)	21 (14.29)
Others	8 (5.41)	10 (6.62)	8 (5.41)	38 (26.21)

* Percentages may exceed 100% due to multiple reporting.

2.2.5 Reasons for Encouraging

Table 2.5 reveals that regardless of who the person was who encouraged them to continue studies, majority were encouraged to continue studies for a better future. However, a higher percentage were encouraged by neighbours, teachers, parents and friends for this reason. Although majority of the brother/sister encouraged the dropouts to continue studies for a better future, a large proportion of the respondents were also encouraged by them to continue studies to fulfill their parents' wishes.

A slightly higher percentage (95.65%) of S.R.P. 1985 group were encouraged to continue studies by parents for a better future compared to S.P.M. 1987 group (94.56%) but the pattern is reverse between S.R.P. 1987 (97.79%) and S.P.M. 1989 group (100.00%).

Among those who were encouraged by brother/sister, S.R.P. 1985 group showed almost the same percentages as S.R.P. 1987 group. It was found that S.P.M. 1987 group showed a higher percentage (72.22%) of the dropouts were encouraged to continue studies for a better future compared to the S.P.M. 1989 group (62.11%).

A lower percentage (66.10%) of the S.R.P. 1985 group were encouraged by their brother/sister for a better future compared to S.P.M. 1987 group (72.22%). The pattern is reverse between S.R.P. 1987 and S.P.M. 1989 groups.

More of the S.R.P. 1985 group (97.59%) were encouraged by friends for a better future compared to S.R.P. 1987 group (89.19%). However, the percentages are almost the same for both the S.P.M. groups.

Slightly more of the S.R.P. 1985 respondents were encouraged to continue studies by friends for a better future compared to S.P.M. 1987. The pattern however, is the reverse between S.R.P. 1987 and S.P.M. 1989 groups.

All (100%) of the teachers encouraged the dropouts to continue studies for a better future except for S.P.M. 1987 group (92.68%) and all of the neighbours encouraged them to continue studies for the same reason except for S.R.P. 1987 group (96.30%).

Table 2.5

Distribution of Respondents by the People Who Encouraged Them to Continue Studies and Their Reasons for Encouraging

Reasons for Encouraging	Encouraged to Continue Studies by:					
	Parents	Brother/Sister	Friends	Teachers	Neighbours	Others
S.R.P. 1985 (N=150)						
For a better future	132 (95.65)	78 (66.10)	81 (97.59)	53 (100.00)	31 (100.00)	7 (87.50)
To fulfill parents' wishes	5 (3.62)	39 (33.05)	1 (1.20)	-	-	1 (12.50)
To avoid wasting time with bad company	1 (0.72)	1 (0.85)	-	-	-	-
Others	-	-	1 (1.20)	-	-	-
Total	138 (100.00)	118 (100.00)	83 (100.00)	53 (100.00)	31 (100.00)	8 (100.00)
S.P.M. 1987 (N=151)						
For a better future	139 (94.56)	78 (72.22)	80 (95.24)	38 (92.68)	16 (100.00)	10 (100.00)
To fulfill parents' wishes	8 (5.44)	27 (25.00)	2 (2.38)	2 (4.88)	-	-
To avoid wasting time with bad company	-	2 (1.85)	-	1 (2.44)	-	-
Others	-	1 (0.93)	1 (2.38)	-	-	-
Total	147 (100.00)	108 (100.00)	84 (100.00)	41 (100.0)	16 (100.00)	10 (100.00)

Table 2.5 (Contd.)

Reasons for Encouraging	Encouraged to Continue Studies by:					
	Parents	Brother/Sister	Friends	Teachers	Neighbours	Others
S.R.P. 1987 (N=148)						
For a better future	133 (97.79)	63 (66.32)	66 (89.19)	49 (100.00)	26 (96.30)	8 (100.00)
To fulfill parents' wishes	3 (2.21)	32 (33.68)	2 (2.70)	-	1 (3.70)	-
To avoid wasting time with bad company	-	-	5 (6.76)	-	-	-
Others	-	-	1 (1.35)	-	-	-
Total	136 (100.00)	95 (100.00)	74 (100.00)	49 (100.00)	27 (100.00)	8 (100.00)
S.P.M. 1989 (N=151)						
For a better future	135 (100.00)	59 (62.11)	91 (95.79)	43 (100.00)	21 (100.00)	37 (97.37)
To fulfill parents' wishes	-	36 (37.89)	3 (3.16)	-	-	-
To avoid wasting time with bad company	-	-	1 (1.05)	-	-	-
Others	-	-	-	-	-	1 (2.63)
Total	135 (100.00)	95 (100.00)	95 (100.00)	43 (100.00)	21 (100.00)	38 (100.00)

2.2.6 Discouraged to Continue Studies

A big proportion of the respondents (23-39%) were discouraged to continue studies by friends, 3-10% were discouraged by teachers and only a few were discouraged by parents, brother/sister and neighbours. About 40-52% were discouraged by others.

Of those who were discouraged by friends, S.R.P. 1985 group has a higher percentage compared to S.R.P. 1987 group. However, S.P.M. 1987 group showed a lower percentage compared to S.P.M. 1989 group.

When comparing S.R.P. 1985 group with their contemporaries (S.P.M. 1987 group), S.R.P. 1985 group showed a larger proportion were discouraged by friends. However, S.R.P. 1987 group showed that a smaller proportion were discouraged by friends compared to their contemporaries (S.P.M. 1989 group) (Refer Table 2.6).

Table 2.6

Distribution of Respondents by The People Who Discouraged Them to Continue Studies

Discouraged to continue studies by:	S.R.P.	S.P.M.	S.R.P.	S.P.M.
	1985 N = 150	1987 N = 151	1987 N = 148	1989 N = 151
Parents	5 (3.42)	-	8 (5.71)	4 (2.92)
Brother/Sister	5 (3.42)	4 (2.80)	9 (6.43)	2 (1.46)
Friends	46 (31.51)	33 (23.08)	41 (29.29)	53 (38.69)
Teachers	9 (6.16)	14 (9.79)	12 (8.57)	4 (2.92)
Neighbours	2 (1.37)	1 (0.70)	2 (1.43)	1 (0.73)
Others	58 (39.73)	75 (52.45)	51 (36.43)	55 (40.15)

2.2.7 Reasons for Discouraging

Most parents discouraged the respondents to continue studies because the family needed money. Majority of the brother/sister discouraged them to continue studies as they believed there are other ways to be successful. Majority of their friends and neighbours discouraged them for this reason too.

More of the S.R.P. 1985 group (80%) were discouraged by parents as the family needed the money, followed by S.R.P. 1987 group (75%).

A higher percentage (75% and 100%) of the S.P.M. groups were discouraged by brother/sister as they believed there are other ways to be successful compared to the S.R.P. groups (40% and 55.56%).

A larger proportion (78-91%) of those who were discouraged to continue studies by friends were discouraged for the reason that there are other ways to be successful. More of the S.P.M. 1987 group were discouraged by friends for this reason (90.91%), followed by S.R.P. 1987 group (85.37%).

Table 2.7

Distribution of Respondents by the People They Were Discouraged to Continue Studies and Their Reasons for Discouraging

Reasons for Discouraging	Discouraged to Continue Studies by:					
	Parents	Brother/Sister	Friends	Teachers	Neighbours	Others
S.R.P. 1985 (N=150)						
There are other ways to be successful	1 (20.00)	2 (40.00)	36 (78.26)	-	2 (100.00)	32 (55.17)
Family needs the money	4 (80.00)	2 (40.00)	5 (10.87)	1 (11.11)	-	5 (8.62)
Discouraged by teachers	-	-	4 (8.70)	8 (88.89)	-	-
Others	-	1 (20.00)	1 (2.17)	-	-	21 (36.21)
Total	5 (100.00)	5 (100.00)	46 (100.00)	9 (100.00)	2 (100.00)	58 (100.00)
S.P.M. 1987 (N=151)						
There are other ways to be successful	-	3 (75.00)	30 (90.91)	1 (7.14)	1 (100.00)	53 (70.67)
Family needs the money	-	1 (25.00)	2 (6.06)	-	-	17 (22.67)
Discouraged by teachers	-	-	1 (3.03)	13 (92.86)	-	-
Others	-	-	-	-	-	5 (6.67)
Total	-	4 (100.00)	33 (100.00)	14 (100.00)	1 (100.00)	75 (100.00)

Table 2.7 (Contd.)

Reasons for Discouraging	Discouraged to Continue Studies by:					
	Parents	Brother/Sister	Friends	Teachers	Neighbours	Others
S.R.P. 1987 (N=148)						
There are other ways to be successful	2 (25.00)	5 (55.56)	35 (85.37)	3 (25.00)	1 (50.00)	28 (54.90)
Family needs the money	6 (75.00)	4 (44.44)	3 (7.32)	3 (25.11)	1 (50.00)	7 (13.73)
Discouraged by teachers	-	-	3 (7.32)	6 (50.00)	-	-
Others	-	-	-	-	-	16 (31.37)
Total	8 (100.00)	9 (100.00)	41 (100.00)	12 (100.00)	2 (100.00)	51 (100.00)
S.P.M. 1989 (N=151)						
There are other ways to be successful	1 (25.00)	2 (100.00)	44 (83.02)	-	1 (100.00)	17 (30.91)
Family needs the money	2 (50.00)	-	8 (15.09)	-	-	5 (9.09)
Discouraged by teachers	-	-	1 (1.89)	4 (100.00)	-	-
Others	1 (25.00)	-	-	-	-	33 (60.00)
Total	4 (100.00)	2 (100.00)	53 (100.00)	4 (100.00)	1 (100.00)	55 (100.00)

3.0 DRUG USE HISTORY

In this section, the drug use history of these dropouts will be examined to understand the ecology of drug use for these particular groups. Comparisons will be made between groups to see if there is any significant difference. Type of drugs used, age at first use, who introduced them to the drugs and reasons for drug use will be examined.

3.1. DRUG USE

Almost half (49.17%) of the 600 respondents have ever used drugs. Table 3.1 reveals that drug usage has decreased among respondents at the same level of examination over the period of two years. Among S.R.P. 1985 dropouts, 60.67% of them have ever used drugs while the number decreased to 41.22% for S.R.P. 1987 group. For S.P.M. 1987 group, 52.32% of them have ever used drugs and it was 42.38% for S.P.M. 1989 group.

There seemed to be a reduction in drug usage among dropouts between 1985 and 1987. S.R.P. 1985 dropouts showed a higher number (60.67%) were involved in drugs compared to their peers (52.32%) who were S.P.M. 1987 dropouts. However, the picture changed for S.R.P. 1987 and S.P.M. 1989 dropouts where there was a decreased in drug involvement rate compared to the earlier two groups. S.R.P. 1987 group showed only 41.22% were involved in drugs while S.P.M. 1989 group showed a slight increase (42.38%).

Table 3.1

Distribution of Respondents By Drug Use

Have you ever used drug?	S.R.P. 1985		S.P.M. 1987		S.R.P. 1987		S.P.M. 1989	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	91	(60.67)	79	(52.32)	61	(41.22)	64	(42.38)
No	59	(39.33)	72	(47.68)	87	(58.78)	87	(57.62)
Total	150	(100.00)	151	(100.00)	148	(100.00)	151	(100.00)

3.2 TYPE OF DRUGS EVER USED

The study showed that only three types of drug were ever used by the respondents. They were cigarettes (nicotine), alcohol and cannabis.

There seemed to be a reduction in drug usage between the S.R.P. groups and between the S.P.M. groups over the two-year period. Table 3.2 shows that 59.33% of the S.R.P. 1985 group have ever smoked cigarettes while it was 40.54% for S.R.P. 1987 group. S.P.M. 1987 group has 48.34% who smoked while 40.40% of S.P.M. 1989 dropouts smoked. The pattern is the same for alcohol and cannabis where there was a reduction in usage between respondents at the same level of examination two years later.

The group that failed S.R.P. in 1985 showed a higher number (59.33%) of respondents who have ever smoked compared to their peers that failed S.P.M. in 1987 (48.34%). However, the S.R.P. 1987 group and S.P.M. 1989 group showed almost no difference. A larger number from the S.R.P. 1985 group has ever drank alcohol compared to the S.P.M. 1987 group. However, it is the reverse for the S.R.P. 1987 and S.P.M. 1989 group where a higher percentage of S.P.M. 1989 group has ever drank alcohol. The pattern is similar for cannabis. It showed that S.R.P. 1985 group has the highest rate of drug usage among the four groups and the rates were decreasing for S.P.M. 1987, S.R.P. 1987 and S.P.M. 1989 groups for cigarette use. For alcohol and cannabis it also showed the same decreasing pattern but there was an increase for S.P.M. 1989 group.

Table 3.2

Distribution of Respondents By Type of Drugs Ever Used

Type of Drugs Ever Used	S.R.P. 1985 (N=150)		S.P.M. 1987 (N=151)		S.R.P. 1987 (N=148)		S.P.M. 1989 (N=151)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Cigarettes	89	(59.33)	73	(48.34)	60	(40.54)	61	(40.40)
Alcohol	38	(25.33)	31	(20.53)	14	(9.46)	26	(17.22)
Cannabis	7	(4.67)	3	(1.99)	0	(0.00)	1	(0.66)
Opiate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Others	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

* Note: The total as given above does not tally with Table 3.1 since Table 3.2 above records individuals who smoked cigarettes, drank alcohol and used cannabis separately. Therefore, there will be multiple counts for certain cases.

3.3 AGE AT FIRST USE

Generally, most of those who smoked cigarettes first started when they were 16 years old except for S.P.M. 1987 group where majority started two years later, at age 18. As for alcohol, most of them first started taking it later, at 17 and 18 years old except for S.R.P. 1985 group where majority started at age 16, the same age when they started smoking.

When comparing those who dropped out at the same level of examination (S.R.P. 1985 and 1987), majority of both groups started smoking at age 16. For alcohol, majority of S.R.P. 1987 group started drinking a year later at age 17 compared to S.R.P. 1985 group. There is a change in the pattern for S.P.M. 1987 and S.P.M. 1989 groups where majority of S.P.M. 1989 group started smoking cigarettes and drinking alcohol earlier than S.P.M. 1987 group.

When comparing the S.R.P. dropouts and their peers who dropped out from S.P.M. two years later, majority of S.R.P. 1985 group started smoking and drinking earlier (at age 16) and majority of S.P.M. 1987 group started two years later. For S.R.P. 1987 and S.P.M. 1989 groups, the pattern is the same for both groups. Majority of both groups started smoking at age 16 and started drinking alcohol a year later.

S.R.P. 1985 group started using cannabis earlier compared to S.P.M. 1987 group.

3.4 LEVEL OF SCHOOL AT FIRST USE

Table 3.4 reveals that except for S.P.M. 1989 group, most of them got involved with drugs after dropping out of school, that is after S.R.P. at 16 years of age as illustrated in Table 3.3 earlier and after S.P.M. at age 18 for S.P.M. 1987 group.

More (57.30%) of S.R.P. 1985 group started smoking after they dropped out of school compared to S.R.P. 1987 group (55.00%). The pattern is the same as above for S.P.M. 1987 group and S.P.M. 1989 group and the same pattern also applies to alcohol usage.

A larger number of the S.R.P. groups took cigarettes and alcohol after they dropped out of school compared to their peers who dropped out after S.P.M. two years later.

For those who started smoking while they were still in school, a large proportion of them started when they were in Form Three. More of S.P.M. 1989 dropouts started smoking and drinking while they were still in school.

The study showed that at age 16 or Form 3 (if they were still in school), is the time where the respondents were most easily influenced by drugs. Majority of the respondents were involved in drugs after dropping out of school except S.P.M. 1989 respondents where more of them were involved in drugs while they were still in school (Form 3).

3.5 WHO INTRODUCED

Most (65% - 100%) of those who used drugs were introduced to them by their friends. When comparing those who dropped out at the same examination level, a higher proportion of the S.R.P. 1985 group who used drugs were introduced by their friends compared to those in S.R.P. 1987 group (Table 3.5). The picture is different for the S.P.M. groups where more of the S.P.M. 1989 dropouts were introduced to cigarettes and alcohol by their friends compared to S.P.M. 1987 dropouts.

Nearly the same proportion (73%) of the S.R.P. 1985 and S.P.M. 1987 dropouts were introduced to cigarettes by their friends. However, for S.R.P. 1987 dropouts, a smaller number (65.00%) of them were introduced to cigarettes by friends compared to S.P.M. 1989 group (91.23%).

A higher proportion of the S.R.P. 1987 group introduced themselves to cigarettes and alcohol compared to the other groups. Those who used cannabis were introduced to it by friends solely.

3.6 REASONS FOR INITIAL DRUG USE

Table 3.6 shows that majority of those who used drugs took them to go along with peers. It implied that peer influence was very strong.

When the S.R.P. 1985 group was compared with S.R.P. 1987 group, it showed that an increasing number began using drugs because of peer influence. So was the situation when comparing S.P.M. 1987 and S.P.M. 1989 groups for cigarettes, but as for alcohol 87.50% of S.P.M. 1987 group started using drugs to get along with peers and the percentage decreased slightly to 86.96% for S.P.M. 1989 group.

For cigarette use, peer influence appeared to be stronger among S.P.M. groups compared to S.R.P. groups. The table showed that 64.79% of S.P.M. 1987 group smoked to go along with peers compared to 62.79% for S.R.P. 1985 group. For S.P.M. 1989 group, it was 83.93% compared to 66.67% from S.R.P. 1987 group.

Curiosity appeared to be the second reason for initiation of drug use among the dropouts except for alcohol usage among S.P.M. 1989 group whereas 'to get pleasure/high' appeared to be the second reason for initial use.

3.7 DURATION OF DRUG USE

Majority of those who used cigarettes and those who drank alcohol have been using them for more than 36 months except for S.R.P. 1987 dropouts where majority have been using drugs between 24 - 36 months. Table 3.7 also shows that among those who have been smoking and those who have been drinking for more than 36 months, S.R.P. 1985 group showed the highest percentages (73.26% and 60% respectively).

For those who have been smoking and drinking for more than 36 months, there was a decrease in the number when comparing those who sat for the same level of examination two years later. For example, 73.26% of the S.R.P. 1985 group have been smoking for more than 36 months compared to 42.37% for S.R.P. 1987 group.

Comparing those who smoked cigarettes and those who drank alcohol between the S.R.P. groups and their peers who dropped out from S.P.M. two years later, there also seemed to be a decreasing trend except for the S.R.P. 1987 group who drank alcohol. That is, a higher percentage (73.26%) of S.R.P. 1985 group smoked for more than 36 months compared to S.P.M. 1987 group (49.28%). For S.R.P. 1987 group, it was 42.37% compared to 35.71% for S.P.M. 1989 group. Sixty percent of S.R.P. 1985 group have been drinking for more than 36 months compared to 50% for S.P.M. 1987 group.

As for cannabis, majority have been using it for 24 months or less and S.R.P. 1985 group have been taking it longer compared to S.P.M. 1987 group (S.R.P. 1985 respondents have been out of school longer).

3.8 FREQUENCY OF DRUG USE

More than three quarter of the respondents who smoked has been smoking everyday for all the four groups. For alcohol, more than 50% from all the four group used it 3 to 11 times a year.

A higher percentage (86.67%) of the S.R.P. 1985 group smoked everyday compared to S.R.P. 1987 group (79.63%). However, the pattern is reverse for the S.P.M. groups where a lower percentage (75.38%) of S.P.M. 1987 group smoked everyday compared to S.P.M. 1989 group (78.72%).

For alcohol, it showed an increasing trend among those at the same examination level who have been consuming it 3 to 11 times a year. Sixty percent of S.R.P. 1987 group drank 3 to 11 times a year compared to only 53.85% from S.R.P. 1985 group and 57.14% from S.P.M. 1989 group compared to 52.17% from S.P.M. 1987 group.

More of S.R.P. dropouts smoked everyday compared to their peers who dropped out from S.P.M. two years later. Similar pattern applies to alcohol for those who used it 3 to 11 times a year (Refer Table 3.8).

3.9 REASONS FOR DRUG USE

Table 3.9 reveals that majority who smoked cigarettes continued smoking to get pleasure/high. Here, their reason for continuing to smoke changed compared to their reason for initial use where they began smoking to get along with peers (refer table 3.6). Therefore, we can say that they continued smoking not because of peer influence anymore but because they were addicted to it.

For alcohol, their reason for continuing remained the same, that is, 'to get along with peers'.

Less of S.R.P. 1987 group (40.75%) smoked to get pleasure/high compared to S.R.P. 1985 group. Similar pattern applied to S.P.M. 1989 and S.P.M. 1987 group. The pattern was also the same for alcohol use where less of S.R.P. 1987 group (60.00%) drank compared to S.R.P. 1985 group (69.23%).

More of S.R.P. 1985 dropouts (50.00%) continued smoking to get pleasure/high compared to their peers (41.54%). Similar pattern applied to S.R.P. 1987 group and S.P.M. 1989 group. Alcohol use to get along with peers also showed the same pattern.

TABLE 3.3

Distribution of Respondent Who Have Ever Used Drugs By Age at First Use

Age at First Use	S.P.M. 1985		S.P.M. 1987		S.R.P. 1987		S.P.M. 1989	
	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis	Cigarette	Alcohol
13	9 (10.11)	-	3 (4.11)	-	5 (8.33)	1 (7.14)	2 (3.28)	1 (3.85)
14	7 (7.87)	1 (2.63)	3 (4.11)	-	4 (6.67)	1 (7.14)	6 (9.84)	1 (100.0)
15	12 (13.48)	5 (13.16)	3 (42.86)	11 (15.07)	13 (21.67)	-	12 (19.67)	-
16	20 (22.47)	12 (31.58)	2 (28.57)	7 (9.59)	2 (6.45)	1 (33.33)	4 (28.57)	16 (26.23)

CONT. TABLE 3.3

Age at First Use	S.R.P. 1985		S.P.M. 1987		S.R.P. 1987		S.P.M. 1989	
	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis	Cigarette	Alcohol
17	17 (19.10)	8 (21.05)	1 (14.29)	10 (13.70)	3 (9.68)	1 (33.33)	10 (16.67)	3 (35.71)
18	14 (15.73)	7 (18.42)	-	23 (31.51)	12 (38.71)	1 (33.33)	6 (10.00)	3 (21.43)
19	9 (10.11)	4 (10.53)	1 (9.09)	10 (13.70)	11 (35.45)	-	1 (1.67)	-
20	1 (1.12)	1 (2.63)	-	6 (8.22)	3 (9.68)	-	-	-
							16 (22.95)	7 (38.46)
							11 (18.03)	8 (30.77)

TABLE 3.4

Distribution of Respondents Who Have Ever Used Drugs By Level of School at First Use

Level of School at First Use	S.R.P. 1985			S.P.M. 1987			S.R.P. 1987			S.P.M. 1989		
	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis
Form 1	9 (10.11)	1 (2.63)	-	5 (6.85)	-	-	3 (5.00)	-	-	4 (6.56)	1 (1.48)	-
Form 2	6 (6.74)	1 (2.63)	1 (14.29)	3 (4.11)	-	-	6 (10.00)	2 (14.29)	-	7 (11.48)	-	1 (100.00)
Form 3	18 (20.22)	8 (21.05)	2 (28.57)	16 (21.92)	2 (6.45)	1 (33.33)	14 (23.33)	2 (14.29)	-	17 (27.87)	7 (26.92)	-
Form 4	3 (3.37)	1 (2.63)	-	6 (8.22)	1 (3.23)	-	4 (6.67)	1 (7.14)	-	12 (19.67)	6 (23.08)	-
Form 5	2 (2.25)	-	-	13 (17.81)	6 (19.35)	-	-	-	-	10 (16.39)	5 (19.23)	-
Already dropped out of school	51 (57.30)	27 (71.05)	4 (57.14)	30 (41.10)	22 (70.97)	2 (66.67)	33 (55.00)	9 (64.29)	-	11 (18.03)	7 (26.92)	-

TABLE 3.5

Distribution of Respondents Who Have Ever Used Drugs By Persons Who Introduced Them to Drugs

Introduced by:	S.R.P. 1985			S.P.M. 1987			S.R.P. 1987			S.P.M. 1989		
	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis
Friends	63 (73.26)	29 (96.67)	6 (100.00)	52 (73.24)	18 (75.00)	1 (100.00)	39 (65.00)	10 (76.92)	-	52 (91.23)	21 (91.30)	-
Relatives	1 (1.16)	-	-	4 (16.67)	-	-	-	1 (7.69)	-	-	-	-
Self	22 (25.58)	1 (3.33)	-	19 (26.76)	2 (8.33)	-	21 (35.00)	2 (15.38)	-	5 (8.77)	2 (8.70)	-

TABLE 3.6

Distribution of Respondents Who Used Drugs By Reasons for Initial Use

Reason for initial use	S.R.P. 1985		S.P.M. 1987		S.R.P. 1987		S.P.M. 1989			
	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis	Alcohol	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis
To go along with peers	54 (62.79)	23 (76.67)	3 (50.00)	46 (64.79)	21 (87.50)	1 (100.00)	40 (66.67)	11 (91.67)	47 (83.93)	20 (86.96)
To get pleasure/high	11 (12.79)	3 (10.00)	-	5 (7.04)	1 (4.17)	-	5 (8.33)	1 (8.33)	2 (3.57)	2 (8.70)
To overcome depression/tension	7 (8.14)	1 (3.33)	1 (16.67)	3 (4.23)	-	-	6 (10.00)	-	2 (3.57)	-
Curiosity	12 (13.95)	3 (10.00)	2 (33.33)	16 (22.54)	2 (8.33)	-	8 (13.33)	-	5 (8.93)	1 (4.35)
Others	2 (2.33)	-	-	1 (1.41)	-	-	1 (1.67)	-	-	-

46

Note: The total involved would not correspond to the total in the sample, i.e. 295 as multiple answers were given by respondents.

TABLE 3.7

Distribution of Respondents Who Used Drugs By Duration of Use

Duration of Use	S.R.P. 1985		S.P.M. 1987		S.R.P. 1987		S.P.M. 1989			
	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis	Alcohol	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis
< 6 months	3 (3.49)	6 (20.00)	2 (33.33)	3 (4.35)	2 (8.33)	-	1 (8.33)	2 (3.57)	2 (8.70)	-
6 - 12 months	3 (3.49)	2 (6.67)	-	3 (4.35)	3 (12.50)	1 (100.00)	2 (3.39)	2 (16.67)	4 (7.14)	3 (13.04)
12 - 24 months	5 (5.81)	2 (6.67)	2 (33.33)	4 (5.80)	3 (12.=0)	-	4 (6.78)	-	18 (32.14)	4 (17.39)
24 - 36 months	12 (13.95)	2 (6.67)	1 (16.67)	25 (36.23)	4 (16.67)	-	28 (47.46)	2 (16.67)	12 (21.43)	6 (26.09)
> 36 months	65 (73.26)	18 (60.00)	1 (16.67)	34 (49.28)	12 (50.00)	-	25 (42.37)	7 (7.87)	20 (35.71)	8 (34.78)

47

TABLE 3.8

Distribution of Respondents Who Used Drugs By Frequency of Use

Frequency of Use	S.R.P. 1985		S.P.M. 1987		S.R.P. 1987		S.P.M. 1989	
	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis	Cigarette	Alcohol
1 - 2 times a year	1 (1.33)	3 (11.54)	1 (1.54)	1 (1.54)	5 (21.74)	1 (10.00)	1 (4.76)	1 (4.76)
3 - 11 times a year	-	14 (53.85)	1 (1.54)	12 (52.17)	-	6 (60.00)	1 (2.13)	12 (57.14)
Once a month	-	3 (11.54)	1 (1.54)	2 (8.70)	1 (1.85)	1 (10.00)	1 (2.13)	2 (9.52)
2 - 3 times a month	2 (2.67)	3 (11.54)	3 (4.62)	1 (4.35)	-	1 (10.00)	-	-

48

CONT. TABLE 3.8

Frequency of Use	S.R.P. 1985		S.P.M. 1987		S.R.P. 1987		S.P.M. 1989	
	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis	Cigarette	Alcohol
Once a week	1 (1.33)	1 (3.85)	1 (25.00)	1 (1.54)	1 (4.35)	1 (10.00)	1 (4.76)	-
2 - 3 times a week	2 (2.67)	-	4 (6.15)	1 (4.35)	7 (12.96)	-	3 (6.38)	3 (14.29)
4 - 6 times a week	4 (5.33)	2 (7.69)	1 (25.00)	5 (7.69)	3 (5.56)	-	5 (10.64)	-
Everyday	65 (86.67)	-	49 (75.38)	1 (4.35)	43 (79.63)	-	37 (78.72)	2 (9.52)

49

TABLE 3.9

Distribution of Respondents Who Used Drugs By Reasons for Use

Reason for Use	S.R.P. 1985		S.P.M. 1987		S.R.P. 1987		S.P.M. 1989		
	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis	Cigarette	Alcohol	Cannabis	Cigarette	Alcohol	
To go along with peers	6 (8.11)	18 (69.23)	1 (25.00)	9 (13.85)	15 (65.22)	4 (7.41)	6 (60.00)	4 (8.51)	12 (57.14)
To get pleasure/high	37 (50.00)	6 (23.08)	2 (50.00)	27 (41.54)	5 (21.74)	22 (40.74)	1 (10.00)	13 (27.66)	4 (19.05)
To overcome depression/tension	23 (31.08)	2 (7.69)	1 (25.00)	21 (32.31)	2 (8.70)	20 (37.04)	3 (30.00)	20 (42.55)	3 (14.29)
Curiosity	8 (10.81)			7 (10.77)	1 (4.35)	8 (14.81)		10 (21.28)	2 (9.52)
Others				1 (1.54)					

50

4.0 DEVIANT ACTIVITIES AND CRIMINALITY

This section focuses on the deviant activities of the respondents before and after the S.R.P. examination. Comparison will be made to see if there is any difference in these activities before and after the examination and comparison will be made between groups as well.

Next, the criminality record of the respondents will be discussed. Areas which will be examined include whether they have been arrested before, convicted and incarcerated, and what were the offences involved.

4.1 DEVIANT ACTIVITIES

Overall deviant activities for all the four groups decreased after S.R.P. compared to before S.R.P.. The activity that tops the list before and after S.R.P. is 'argued/fight', follow by 'serious fight'. Only a small proportion (less than 2%) of 1985 dropouts and less than 1% of S.P.M. 1989 dropouts were involved with drug related offences (Refer Table 4.1).

Generally, deviant activities declined over the period comparing respondents at the same level of examinations i.e. S.R.P. 1985 and S.R.P. 1987. However, this does not apply to 'argued/fight' for S.R.P. 1987 group where 57.43% were involved in 'argued/fight' before S.R.P. compared to 56% from S.R.P. 1985 group. We have the same declining pattern when comparing S.R.P. dropouts with their peers who dropped out from S.P.M. two years later. This mean that more of the S.R.P. dropouts were involved in deviant activities compared to their peers who dropped out two years later.

It was found that a large proportion of the respondents were involved in 'arguments or fights' before and after S.R.P. but S.P.M. 1989 group showed the lowest proportion among the four groups.

For 'serious fights', about 20% of the respondents were involved before S.R.P., except for S.P.M. 1989 group and it decreased incredibly (between 14-17%) after S.R.P.. The rate of involvement in 'serious fights' for S.P.M. 1989 group was much lower, at 4.79% and only decreased to 3.45% after S.R.P..

However, more of the S.P.M. 1989 group (21.92%) were involved in damaging property before S.R.P. compared to the other groups where only 8-12% were involved. After S.R.P. the rate of involvement for S.P.M. 1989 group decreased to only 2.07% while the other three groups decreased not so much to about 4-5%.

51

More of S.R.P. 1985 dropouts were involved in deviant activities and more types of deviant activities compared to the other groups. S.R.P. 1985 group showed the highest number of deviant activities involved. S.P.M. 1987 group came second followed by S.R.P. 1987 group and finally S.P.M. 1989 group.

4.2 CRIMINALITY

There was not any criminality record before S.R.P. among the respondents. The small percentages that were involved in criminality only did so after dropping out.

(a) Arrested

Only a small proportion of the respondents were ever arrested and all of them involved were only arrested once as shown in Table 4.2(a).

More of S.R.P. 1985 group (3.33%) have ever been arrested compared to S.R.P. 1987 group (0.68%). However, the proportion is almost the same for both the S.P.M. groups.

More of S.R.P. 1985 groups (3.33%) have ever been arrested compared to their peers who sat for S.P.M. two years later (1.33%). However, the patterns are different between S.R.P. 1987 (0.68%) and S.P.M. 1989 (1.37%).

Most of them were arrested for use or possession of narcotics or controlled substances.

(b) Convicted

As shown in Table 4.2(b), only a very small percentage of the respondents have ever been convicted and all of them have been convicted once.

The table showed that only 3 (2%) from the S.R.P. 1985 group and one (0.66%) from S.P.M. 1989 group have ever been convicted. None from S.P.M. 1987 group and S.R.P. 1987 group have ever been convicted.

Out of the three from S.R.P. 1985 group who were convicted, one was convicted for use or possession of narcotics or controlled substances, one was convicted for sale or manufacture of narcotics or controlled substances and another was convicted for weapons offence. The S.P.M. 1989 dropout was arrested for stolen property/fencing.

(c) Incarcerated

A very small number of the respondents were ever incarcerated and they were only incarcerated once. Table 3.3 shows that only two of the S.R.P. 1985 dropouts and one of S.P.M. 1989 dropout were ever incarcerated while none from the S.R.P. 1987 and S.P.M. 1987 groups were ever incarcerated.

Out of the two S.R.P. 1985 dropouts who were incarcerated, one was incarcerated for use or possession of narcotics or controlled substances while the other was incarcerated for sale or manufacture of narcotics or controlled substances. The S.P.M. 1989 dropout was incarcerated for stolen property/fencing (Refer Table 4.2(c)).

Although the number involved was small, S.R.P. 1985 group has more respondents who were involved in criminality and mostly were drug related.

TABLE 4.1

Distribution of Respondents By Deviant Activities

Deviant Activities	S.R.P. 1985		S.P.M. 1987		S.R.P. 1987		S.P.M. 1989	
	Before S.R.P.	After S.R.P.	Before S.R.P.	After S.R.P.	Before S.R.P.	After S.R.P.	Before S.R.P.	After S.R.P.
Argued/fight	84 (56.00)	66 (44.00)	86 (57.33)	67 (44.67)	85 (57.43)	64 (43.24)	70 (47.95)	54 (37.24)
Serious fight	31 (20.67)	9 (6.00)	26 (17.33)	2 (1.33)	29 (19.59)	3 (2.03)	7 (4.79)	5 (3.45)
Damaged property	16 (10.67)	6 (4.73)	18 (12.00)	6 (4.00)	12 (8.11)	7 (4.73)	32 (21.92)	3 (2.07)
Taken something	9 (6.00)	3 (2.00)	10 (6.67)	4 (2.67)	4 (2.70)	2 (1.35)	-	-
Trouble with police	1 (0.67)	2 (1.33)	2 (1.33)	1 (0.67)	2 (1.35)	-	1 (0.68)	-
Arson	2 (1.33)	1 (0.67)	-	-	-	1 (0.68)	2 (1.37)	1 (0.69)

54

CONT. TABLE 4.1

Deviant Activities	S.R.P. 1985		S.P.M. 1987		S.R.P. 1987		S.P.M. 1989	
	Before S.R.P.	After S.R.P.	Before S.R.P.	After S.R.P.	Before S.R.P.	After S.R.P.	Before S.R.P.	After S.R.P.
Shoplifting	3 (2.00)	-	-	-	1 (0.68)	-	-	-
Sold drugs	2 (1.33)	1 (0.67)	-	-	-	-	1 (0.68)	-
Taken a car without permission	2 (1.33)	2 (1.33)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Broken into a house	1 (0.67)	-	-	-	-	-	1 (0.68)	-
Armed robbery	1 (0.67)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Illegal activities	1 (0.67)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

55

* Percentage may exceed 100% due to multiple reporting.

Table 4.2(a)

Distribution of Respondents By Criminal Record - Arrested

Have you ever been arrested?	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Yes	5 (3.33)	2 (1.33)	1 (0.68)	2 (1.37)
No	145 (96.67)	148 (98.67)	146 (99.32)	144 (98.63)

How many times?				
1	5 (100)	2 (100)	1 (100)	2 (100)

For what offence?				
Use or possession of narcotics or controlled substances	4 (80.00)	1 (50.00)	-	1 (50.00)
Sale or manufacture of narcotics or controlled substances	1 (20.00)	-	-	-
Stolen property/fencing	-	-	-	1 (50.00)
Buglary	-	1 (50.00)	-	-
Attacks on person	-	-	1 (100.0)	-

Table 4.2(b)

Distribution of Respondents By Criminal Record - Convicted

Have you ever been convicted?	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Yes	3 (2.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (0.66)
No	147 (98.00)	151 (100.00)	148 (100.00)	150 (99.34)

How many times convicted?				
1	3 (2.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (0.66)

Offence Convicted:				
Use or possession of narcotics or controlled substances	1 (33.33)	-	-	-
Sale or manufacture of narcotics or controlled substances	1 (33.33)	-	-	-
Stolen property/fencing	0 (0.00)	-	-	1 (100.00)
Weapons offence	1 (33.33)	-	-	-

Table 4.2(c)

Distribution of Respondents By Criminal Record - Incarcerated

Have you ever been incarcerated?	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Yes	2 (1.33)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (0.66)
No	148 (98.67)	151 (100.00)	148 (100.00)	150 (99.34)

How many times incarcerated?				
1	2 (1.33)	-	-	1 (0.66)

Offence Incarcerated:				
Use or possession of narcotics or controlled substances	1 (50.00)	-	-	-
Sale or manufacture of narcotics or controlled substances	1 (50.00)	-	-	-
Stolen property/fencing	-	-	-	1 (100.00)

5.0 ACTIVITIES AFTER DROPPING OUT

This section will examine the activities of the dropouts after dropping out of school such as employment, unemployment and type of courses taken. We must bear in mind the different time frame for the four groups involved.

5.1 TOTAL PERIOD OF EMPLOYMENT

The total period of employment differs among the groups as they were from different years and examination groups. Therefore, the period of employment involved is from 1 to 48 months for S.R.P. 1985 group, 1 to 36 months for S.R.P. 1987 and S.P.M. 1987 groups and 1 to 12 months for S.P.M. 1989 group as shown in Table 5.1.

One hundred and forty five of S.R.P. 1985 respondents were employed during that period. Out of this number, almost half (48.28%) were employed for nearly four years (43-48 months). Among S.P.M. 1987 respondents, 142 of them were employed within the period of 1 to 36 months and 44.37% of them were employed within 31-36 months. As for S.R.P. 1987 dropouts, 128 of them were employed within the same period but a slightly lower number of them (43.75%) were employed within 31-36 months. For S.P.M. 1989 dropouts, 121 were employed within the period of one year and majority (77.69%) were employed for 7-12 months.

More of S.R.P. 1985 respondents were employed compared to S.P.M. 1987 and S.R.P. 1987 groups as the time frame involved is different. S.R.P. 1985 group involved a longer time frame (4 years) compared to the other 2 groups (3 years) and this may be the reason more of S.R.P. 1985 respondents were employed as they had a longer period to look for jobs. Although both S.P.M. 1987 and S.R.P. 1987 groups involved the same time frame (36 months), more of S.P.M. 1987 respondents were able to get employed within that period.

5.2 TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT

Tables 5.2(a) to 5.2(h) show the type of jobs the respondents were involved in for all the periods involved. As all the four groups involved a different time frame, it is difficult to make a comparison. The S.P.M. 1989 group involved too short a time to make any conclusion. However, if we look at the first four periods involved [Tables 5.2(a)-5.2(d)], more of S.P.M. 1987 respondents were employed compared to the S.R.P. groups.

If we look at table 5.2(a), a large proportion of the respondents first started working as salesmen except for S.P.M. 1987 respondents where majority of them started as semi-skilled workers. From this period to 24 months after dropping out, we can see the picture that a large proportion of S.R.P. 1985 and S.R.P. 1987 groups worked as salesmen and a larger proportion of S.P.M. 1987 respondents worked as semi-skilled workers. Within the period of 2 to 3 years after dropping out, the picture still remained the same for both S.R.P. 1985 and S.P.M. 1987 groups but the picture changed for S.R.P. 1987 group. Majority of them now work as semi-skilled workers. For the following 6 months (37-42 months), majority of S.R.P. 1985 respondents still worked as salesmen although the percentages have been decreasing over the periods and finally, within the period of 43 to 48 months, majority of the S.R.P. 1985 respondents worked as semi-skilled workers.

More of the S.P.M. respondents were able to get employed faster. However, two years after dropping out, more and more of S.R.P. 1985 respondents were able to get jobs.

5.3 AVERAGE MONTHLY INCOME

Table 5.3 shows the average monthly income of the respondents while they were employed. S.R.P. 1985 group involved a total period of 48 months. Within that period, 28.97% were earning an average of \$201-\$300 each, 28.28% were earning between \$101-\$200 and 15.58% were earning between \$301-\$400 per month.

S.P.M. 1987 and S.R.P. 1987 groups involved a total period of 36 months. Within that period, 28.87% of S.P.M. 1987 group were earning between \$201-\$300 per month, 26.76% were earning between \$301-\$400 and 19.01% were earning between \$101-\$200. Within that same period, 38.58% of S.R.P. 1987 group were earning between \$201-\$300, 29.13% were earning between \$101-\$200 and 15.75% were earning between \$301-\$400.

S.P.M. 1989 group involved a total period of 12 months. A large proportion (29.66%) of them were earning an average of \$201 - \$300 per month, 27.12% were earning between \$301-\$400 per month and 22.03% were earning between \$101 - \$200 per month.

Regardless of the different time frame, a large proportion (29.39%) of respondents from the four groups were earning between \$201 - \$300 per month with S.R.P. 1987 group showing the highest mode followed by S.R.P. 1985 group. The table also reveals that the S.P.M. respondents were earning more than the S.R.P. respondents. A bigger proportion of the S.P.M.

respondents were earning between \$301 - \$400 compared to the S.R.P. respondents. The pattern is also the same for those who were earning between \$401 - \$500, \$501 - \$600 and so on. However, a few of S.R.P. 1985 respondents were earning more than \$700 while none from the other three groups were earning as high as that.

5.4 AVERAGE MONTHLY EXPENDITURE

Table 5.4 shows the average monthly expenditure of the respondents while they were employed. Within the period of 48 months, 28.13% of S.R.P. 1985 group were spending between \$201-\$300 per month, 23.44% were spending between \$301-\$400 and 20.31% were spending between \$101-\$200 per month each.

Both S.P.M. 1987 and S.R.P. 1987 groups involved a total period of 36 months. S.P.M. 1987 group has 32.84% of respondents who spent between \$101-\$200, 23.88% spent between \$201-\$300 and 20.90% spent between \$301-\$400. S.R.P. 1987 group has 30.65% who spent between \$201-\$300, 27.42% spent between \$101-\$200 and 19.35% spent \$100 or less per month.

S.P.M. 1989 group involved a total of 12 months. Within this period, 32.14% were spending an average of \$201 - \$300 per month each, 28.57% spent about \$101-\$200 and 19.64% spent between \$301-\$400 per month.

The table reveals that except for S.P.M. 1987 group where a large proportion (32.84%) spent between \$101-\$200, a large proportion (28%-32%) from the other three groups spent an average of \$201-\$300 per month.

5.5 TOTAL PERIOD OF COURSES

Here we shall discuss the total period of courses taken by the respondents between the time of dropping out and the time of interview. Within the period of 48 months, 59 of S.R.P. 1985 respondents attended courses. Out of this, 33.90% attended courses for 7-12 months and 18.64% attended courses for 31-36 months. Thirty six out of 151 S.P.M. 1987 respondents attended courses within the period of 36 months. Out of the 36 months involved, 36.11% attended courses for 7-12 months while 27.78% attended courses for 31-36 months. S.R.P. 1987 group has 47 respondents who attended courses within that period. Out of this number, 27.66% attended courses between 7-12 months and 25.53% between 31-36 months.

The pattern is the same for all the 3 groups discussed above where a large proportion attended courses between 7-12 months followed by 31-36 months. Forty four S.P.M. 1989 respondents attended courses within the period of 12 months and majority of them (63.64%) attended courses between 7-12 months. Therefore, regardless of the different time frame involved, a large proportion of the respondents from the 4 groups attended courses between 7-12 months.

5.6 TYPE OF COURSES

The type of courses taken by the respondents from the time of dropping out to the time of interview will be discussed. However, different groups involved different time frame. For example, S.P.M. 1989 group will involve a shorter period and S.R.P. 1985 group will involve a longer period. Tables 5.6(a) to 5.6(h) show the type of courses attended by the respondents at different periods of time.

The tables reveal that within the first 12 months after dropping out, most of the respondents continued school/self study. Furthermore, the tables also reveal that the percentages are higher among S.R.P. respondents compared to S.P.M. respondents.

For the next 24 months (Table 5.6(c) - 5.6(f), majority of both the S.R.P. groups still continued school/self study but a large proportion of S.P.M. 1987 respondents took academic courses. For the next 12 months or 37-48 months after dropping out, only a small number of them took courses, with well dispersed types of courses.

A large number of the respondents took up courses within 0 - 6 months after dropping out and the number slowly decreased over time.

5.7 AVERAGE MONTHLY POCKET MONEY WHILE ATTENDING COURSES

Table 5.7 shows the average monthly pocket money while attending courses of the four groups of respondents. More than 80% of the respondents from each examination group received \$50 or less per month except for S.P.M. 1987 group which showed a lower percentage (63.64%).

A bigger proportion (18.19%) of S.P.M. 1987 group received between \$51 - \$100 pocket money per month followed by S.R.P. 1987 group (12.90%), S.R.P. 1985 group (8.57%) and S.P.M. 1989 group (6.25%).

A bigger proportion (18.19%) of S.P.M. 1987 group received more than \$150 per month compared to the other groups.

We notice here that the number of respondents who received pocket money are less than the number of respondents who attended courses. Some of the respondents did not receive any pocket money while they were attending courses as they were already working and had income of their own.

5.8 AVERAGE MONTHLY EXPENSES WHILE ATTENDING COURSES

Table 5.8 shows the average monthly expenses of the respondents who attended courses. S.R.P. 1985 group has 63.16% who spent an average of \$50 or less per month within the period of 48 months, 15.79% spent between \$51 - \$100 and another 15.79% spent between \$101 - \$150.

S.P.M. 1987 group showed 36.84% of them spent more than \$200 per month within that 36 months and 21.58% spent \$50 or less while S.R.P. 1987 group has 64% who spent \$50 or less per month within that period and 20% spent between \$51-\$100. If we compare these two groups, S.P.M. 1987 group has more respondents who spent more than \$200 (36.84% compared to 8.00% from S.R.P. 1987 group).

S.P.M. 1989 group has 47.06% who spent more than \$200 per month within the period of 12 months and 29.41% spent between \$101 - \$150 per month.

The S.P.M. respondents who attended courses spent more than the S.R.P. respondents. Majority (63.64%) of the S.R.P. respondents spent \$50 or less per month while majority of the S.P.M. respondents spent more than \$200 per month while attending courses with S.P.M. 1989 respondents spending more. It was found that 47.06% of S.P.M. 1989 group spent more than \$200 compared to 36.84% from S.P.M. 1987 group and 29.41% of S.P.M. 1989 group spent between \$101 - \$150 per month compare to 5.26% from S.P.M. 1987 group.

5.9 TOTAL PERIOD OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Table 5.9 shows the total period of unemployment of the respondents. Although the periods involved for each of the groups were different, with S.R.P. 1985 group having a longer time frame and S.P.M. 1989 group having a shorter time frame, all the four groups showed that majority were unemployed between 1-6 months.

Sixty five of S.R.P. 1985 respondents were unemployed within the period of 1-42 months out of 48 months involved. Out of this, 55.38% were unemployed between 1-6 months and 18.46% between 7-12 months. For S.P.M. 1987 group, 52 of them were unemployed within the period of 36 months and 69.23% were unemployed between 1-6 months and 17.31% between 7-12 months. Among S.R.P. 1987 respondents, 51 of them were unemployed within the period of 36 months and out of this, 66.67% were unemployed between 1-6 months while 15.69% were unemployed between 7-12 months. The table also shows that only 27 of S.P.M. 1989 respondents were unemployed within the period of 12 months involved and 77.78% of them were unemployed between 1-6 months while 22.22% between 7-12 months.

5.10 AVERAGE MONTHLY POCKET MONEY FROM PARENTS

Table 5.10 shows the average pocket money the respondents received from their parents while they were unemployed. Most of the respondents received \$30 or less per month from their parents while they were unemployed. S.R.P. 1985 group showed the highest percentage (92.86%) of respondents who received \$30 or less per month followed by S.R.P. 1987 group at 81.82%, S.P.M. 1987 group at 70% and S.P.M. 1989 group at 50%.

Thirty percent of those involved in S.P.M. 1987 group received more pocket money as 10% of them received between \$61 - \$90 per month while they were unemployed and 20% received more than \$90 per month.

As we can see from the data, only a small number of the respondents received pocket money while they were unemployed as most of them stayed with their family who provided them with food and their basic needs. Therefore, most of them received very little or no pocket money from their parents during their unemployment.

5.11 AVERAGE MONTHLY EXPENSES WHILE UNEMPLOYED

Only a small number of the respondents incurred expenses while they were unemployed. The reason is similar to why very few of them received pocket money or received very little pocket money during their unemployment. Majority of the respondents were staying with their parents and therefore they incurred very little expenses as food, and their basic needs were provided by their parents.

Majority of those involved spent less than \$30 per month during their unemployment. However, from Table 5.11, we can see that more of S.P.M. 1987 respondents who were unemployed incurred expenses and they also spent slightly more than the others.

5.12 EMPLOYMENT

Table 5.12 shows the average period of employment per person, average income per month for each of the respondents and average expenses per month for the four groups.

Among S.R.P. 1985 respondents, 145 (96.67%) of them were employed within the period of 48 months. The average period of employment per person was 36.79 months (76.65%) out of 48 months. The average income per month for each respondent was \$267.18. Only 64 out of 145 who were employed incurred expenses. Majority of the respondents were staying with their parents and therefore, quite a number of them did not incur any expenses. The average expenses per month for each of the 64 respondents involved was \$264.74.

For S.P.M. 1987 group, 142 (94.04%) of the respondents were employed. The average period of employment per person over the period of 36 months was 28.36 months or 80.44% of the time involved employed. Average income per month was \$301.38. They were earning more compared to their peers who dropped out two years earlier (S.R.P. 1985 group). Their average expenses per month was \$274.52 each. If we compare them with their peers (S.R.P. 1985), they also spent slightly more.

For S.R.P. 1987 group, 128 or 86.49% of the respondents were employed and their average period of employment was 28.26 months out of 36 months or 79.89% of the time employed. Out of 128 who worked, one respondent did not report his income. The average income per month was \$236.49. This amount was lower compared to those who dropped out at the same level of examination two years earlier (S.R.P. 1985). Their expenses per month was only \$219.48.

S.P.M. 1989 group showed that 121 (80.13%) of them were employed within the period of dropping out and the time of interview (12 months). Their average period of employment per person was 9.91 months out of 12 months or 82.50% of that period employed. Their average income per month was \$295.87 each and \$285.50 for expenses.

S.R.P. 1985 has the highest number of respondents (N=145 or 96.67%) who were employed, followed by S.P.M. 1987 group (N=142 or 94.04%), S.R.P. 1987 group (N=128 or 86.49%) and S.P.M. 1989 group (N=121 or 80.13%). This maybe due to S.R.P. 1985 group being out of school longer and therefore most of them have been able to get a job within that period of 48 months. S.P.M. 1989 group however, has been only out of school about 12 months and therefore, less of them were able to get employed within that short period. S.R.P. 1987 group and S.P.M. 1987 group dropped out about the same time but more of the S.P.M. 1987 group were able to get employed within that period.

S.P.M. 1987 group has the highest average income per month at \$301.38, followed by S.P.M. 1989 group at \$295.87, S.R.P. 1985 group at \$267.18 and S.R.P. 1987 group at \$236.49. The data showed that the S.P.M. groups has a higher average income per month compared to the S.R.P. groups. Among those who achieved the same level of education, those who dropped out 2 years earlier were able to earn more. For example, the average income per month for S.R.P. 1985 group was \$267.18 compared to \$236.49 for S.R.P. 1987 group.

S.P.M. 1989 group had the highest average expenses per month (\$285.50) followed by S.P.M. 1987 group (\$274.52), S.R.P. 1985 group (\$264.74) and S.R.P. 1987 group (\$219.48). Their expenses were affected by their income. The S.P.M. groups spent more than the S.R.P. groups while S.R.P. 1985 group spent more than S.R.P. 1987 group and S.P.M. 1989 spent more than S.P.M. 1987 group.

5.13 COURSES

Among S.R.P. 1985 respondents, 59 or 39.33% of them have attended courses. Their average period of courses each was 21.76 months (45.33%) out of 48 months. Among those involved, 35 of them received pocket money when attending courses. Their average pocket money per month was \$26.74. Only 19 of them reported their expenses when attending courses. Their average expenses per month when attending courses was \$52.20.

S.P.M. 1987 group has 36 respondents (23.84%) who attended courses. Their average period of courses was 20.22 months (57.33%) out of 36 months. Twenty two of them received pocket money when attending courses. Their average pocket money per month was \$126.89. Only 19 of them incurred expenses when attending courses. Their average expenses per month was \$273.04.

Among S.R.P. 1987 group, 47 (31.76%) of them have attended courses during that period. Their average period of courses was 21.17 months out of 36 months. Thirty one reported they received pocket money when attending courses. Their average pocket money per month was \$39.77. Twenty five reported their average expenses per month when attending courses which was \$64.20.

Forty four (29.14%) of the S.P.M. 1989 respondents attended courses. Their average period of courses was 9.32 months out of 12 months. Sixteen of them reported their pocket money for that period. Their average pocket money per month when attending courses was \$51.88 while their expenses was \$340.29.

S.R.P. 1985 group has the highest number of respondents who attended courses followed by S.R.P. 1987 group, S.P.M. 1989 group and lastly S.P.M. 1987 group. S.R.P. 1985 group also has the highest average period of courses at 21.76 months. However, S.P.M. 1989 group has the highest ratio of average period of courses. Table 5.13 shows that among the 44 respondents who attended courses, S.P.M. 1989 group attended courses 77.67% of the period involved, while it was 59.50% for S.R.P. 1987 group followed by S.P.M. 1987 group which showed 57.33% and finally S.R.P. 1985 group (45.33%).

S.P.M. 1987 group showed the highest average pocket money per month when attending courses at \$126.89. Next was S.P.M. 1989 group at \$51.88, followed by S.R.P. 1987 group (\$39.77) and S.R.P. 1985 group (\$26.74). The S.P.M. groups showed higher average pocket money per month compared to the S.R.P. groups.

S.P.M. 1989 group showed the highest average expenses per month (\$340.29), followed by S.P.M. 1987 group (\$273.04), S.R.P. 1987 group (\$64.20) and S.R.P. 1985 group (\$52.20). The S.P.M. groups showed a higher average expense per month compared to the S.R.P. groups.

5.14 UNEMPLOYMENT

S.R.P. 1985 group showed that 65 (43.33%) of them were unemployed. Their average period of unemployment for each of those involved was 10.75 months out of 48 months or 22.40% of that period unemployed. Fourteen of them reported that they received pocket money during their unemployment. Their average pocket money per month was \$12.63. Only 3 of the respondents reported they incurred expenses during their unemployment. This was because as mentioned earlier, majority of the respondents were staying with their parents. Their average expenses per month was \$4.38.

S.P.M. 1987 group showed that 52 (34.44%) of them were unemployed. Their average period of unemployment was 6.82 months out 36 months involved. Ten of them reported they received pocket money from their parents. Their average pocket money per month was \$58.77. Eight of them reported they incurred expenses during their unemployment. Their average expenses per month was \$16.14.

Among S.R.P. 1987 group, 51 (34.46%) of them were unemployed. The average period of unemployment was 7.92 months (22.00%) out of 36 months. Out of those who were unemployed, 11 of them reported they received pocket money. Their average pocket money per month was \$16.82 while their average expenses per month was \$9.44.

Among S.P.M. 1989 respondents, 27 (17.88%) of them were unemployed. The average period of unemployment was 4.85 months (40.42%) out of the 12 months involved. Only 2 of them reported they received pocket money during that period and their average pocket money per month was \$32.50 while none of them incurred any expenses.

S.R.P. 1985 group showed the highest number of unemployment (N=65 or 43.33%) while both S.P.M. 1987 and S.R.P. 1987 groups showed almost the same percentages. S.P.M. 1989 group showed the lowest number of unemployment. However, if we compare the period of unemployment, S.P.M. 1989 group showed the highest percentage (40.42%). It means that they were unemployed 40.42% of the period involved. The S.R.P. 1985 and S.R.P. 1987 groups showed almost the same percentages while it was the lowest for S.P.M. 1987 group.

The average pocket money per month was highest among the S.P.M. 1987 group followed by S.P.M. 1989 group, S.R.P. 1987 group and S.R.P. 1985 group. The table shows that S.P.M. respondents received more pocket money than S.R.P. respondents.

S.P.M. 1987 group showed the highest average expenses per month compared to the other groups followed by S.R.P. 1987 and S.R.P. 1985 groups.

Table 5.1

Distribution of Respondents By Total Period of Employment

Total Period of Employment	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
1 - 6 months	3 (2.07)	4 (2.28)	7 (5.47)	27 (22.31)
7 - 12 months	12 (8.28)	6 (4.23)	4 (3.13)	94 (77.69)
13 - 18 months	5 (3.45)	13 (9.15)	14 (10.94)	-
19 - 24 months	16 (11.03)	21 (14.79)	12 (9.38)	-
25 - 30 months	6 (4.14)	35 (24.65)	35 (27.34)	-
31 - 36 months	21 (14.48)	63 (44.37)	56 (43.75)	-
37 - 42 months	12 (8.28)	-	-	-
43 - 48 months	70 (48.28)	-	-	-
Total	145 (100.00)	142 (100.00)	128 (100.00)	121 (100.00)

Table 5.2(a)

Distribution of Respondents By Type of Employment
(0 - 6 months)

Employment (0 - 6 months)	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Labourer	14 (17.50)	12 (10.53)	23 (24.21)	18 (15.25)
Service Worker	14 (17.50)	22 (19.30)	13 (13.68)	23 (19.49)
Semi-Skilled Worker	8 (10.00)	37 (32.46)	20 (21.05)	25 (21.19)
Salesman	25 (31.25)	22 (19.30)	26 (27.37)	26 (22.03)
Office Worker	4 (5.00)	11 (9.65)	3 (3.16)	13 (11.02)
Protective Service	-	1 (0.88)	-	-
Skilled Worker	10 (12.50)	4 (3.51)	8 (8.42)	8 (6.78)
Businessman	5 (6.25)	2 (1.75)	1 (1.05)	-
Sales Representative	-	1 (0.88)	1 (1.05)	3 (2.54)
Others	-	2 (1.75)	-	2 (1.69)
Total	80 (100.00)	114 (100.00)	95 (100.00)	118 (100.00)

Table 5.2(b)

Distribution of Respondents By Type of Employment
(7 - 12 months)

Employment (7 - 12 months)	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Labourer	15 (16.85)	15 (12.61)	20 (19.05)	18 (18.56)
Service Worker	14 (15.73)	21 (17.65)	15 (14.29)	20 (20.62)
Semi-Skilled Worker	13 (14.61)	44 (36.97)	16 (15.24)	18 (18.56)
Salesman	30 (33.71)	20 (16.81)	35 (33.33)	16 (16.49)
Office Worker	3 (3.37)	8 (6.72)	7 (6.67)	13 (13.40)
Protective Service	-	1 (0.84)	-	-
Skilled Worker	10 (11.24)	6 (5.04)	11 (10.48)	7 (7.22)
Businessman	4 (4.49)	1 (0.84)	-	1 (1.03)
Sales Representative	-	1 (0.84)	1 (0.95)	3 (3.09)
Others	-	2 (1.68)	-	1 (1.03)
Total	89 (100.00)	119 (100.00)	105 (100.00)	97 (100.00)

Table 5.2(c)

Distribution of Respondents By Type of Employment
(13 - 18 months)

Employment (13 - 18 months)	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Labourer	23 (21.10)	9 (6.72)	15 (13.39)	-
Service Worker	24 (22.02)	29 (21.64)	14 (12.50)	-
Semi-Skilled Worker	12 (11.01)	53 (39.55)	27 (24.11)	-
Salesman	27 (24.77)	23 (17.16)	32 (28.57)	-
Office Worker	4 (3.67)	8 (5.97)	8 (7.14)	-
Protective Service	-	2 (1.49)	-	-
Skilled Worker	13 (11.93)	6 (4.48)	14 (12.50)	-
Businessman	6 (5.50)	2 (1.49)	1 (0.89)	-
Sales Representative	-	1 (0.75)	1 (0.89)	-
Others	-	1 (0.75)	-	-
Total	109 (100.00)	134 (100.00)	112 (100.00)	-

Table 5.2(d)

Distribution of Respondents By Type of Employment
(19 - 24 months)

Employment (19 - 24 months)	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Labourer	27 (23.68)	8 (6.06)	16 (14.16)	-
Service Worker	20 (17.54)	26 (19.70)	11 (9.73)	-
Semi-Skilled Worker	16 (14.04)	53 (40.15)	30 (26.55)	-
Salesman	28 (24.56)	20 (15.15)	31 (27.43)	-
Office Worker	2 (1.75)	11 (8.33)	10 (8.85)	-
Protective Service	-	2 (1.52)	-	-
Skilled Worker	15 (13.16)	7 (5.30)	13 (11.50)	-
Businessman	6 (5.26)	3 (2.27)	1 (0.88)	-
Sales Representative	-	1 (0.76)	1 (0.88)	-
Others	-	1 (0.76)	-	-
Total	114 (100.00)	132 (100.00)	113 (100.00)	-

Table 5.2(e)

Distribution of Respondents By Type of Employment
(25 - 30 months)

Employment (25 - 30 months)	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Labourer	19 (14.96)	8 (6.67)	18 (15.65)	-
Service Worker	20 (15.75)	24 (20.00)	16 (13.91)	-
Semi-Skilled Worker	19 (14.96)	44 (36.67)	30 (26.09)	-
Salesman	31 (24.41)	20 (16.67)	29 (25.22)	-
Office Worker	8 (6.30)	9 (7.50)	10 (8.70)	-
Protective Service	2 (1.57)	2 (1.67)	-	-
Skilled Worker	18 (14.17)	7 (5.83)	9 (7.83)	-
Businessman	8 (6.30)	3 (2.50)	1 (0.87)	-
Sales Representative	-	1 (0.83)	2 (1.74)	-
Others	2 (1.57)	2 (1.67)	-	-
Total	127 (100.00)	120 (100.00)	115 (100.00)	-

Table 5.2(f)

Distribution of Respondents By Type of Employment
(31 - 36 months)

Employment (31 - 36 months)	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Labourer	21 (16.94)	6 (7.79)	7 (9.59)	-
Service Worker	14 (11.29)	13 (16.88)	10 (13.70)	-
Semi-Skilled Worker	22 (17.74)	26 (33.77)	22 (30.14)	-
Salesman	27 (21.77)	12 (15.58)	18 (24.66)	-
Office Worker	9 (7.26)	8 (10.39)	5 (6.85)	-
Protective Service	1 (0.81)	2 (2.60)	-	-
Skilled Worker	19 (15.32)	6 (7.79)	9 (12.33)	-
Businessman	9 (7.26)	1 (1.30)	-	-
Sales Representative	-	1 (1.30)	2 (2.74)	-
Others	2 (1.61)	2 (2.60)	-	-
Total	124 (100.00)	77 (100.00)	73 (100.00)	-

Table 5.2(g)

Distribution of Respondents By Type of Employment
(37 - 42 months)

Employment (37 - 42 months)	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Labourer	24 (17.91)	-	-	-
Service Worker	16 (11.94)	-	-	-
Semi-Skilled Worker	26 (19.40)	-	-	-
Salesman	27 (20.15)	-	-	-
Office Worker	11 (8.21)	-	-	-
Protective Service	1 (0.75)	-	-	-
Skilled Worker	20 (14.93)	-	-	-
Businessman	7 (5.22)	-	-	-
Sales Representative	-	-	-	-
Others	2 (1.49)	-	-	-
Total	134 (100.00)	-	-	-

Table 5.2(h)

Distribution of Respondents By Type of Employment
(43 - 48 months)

Employment (43 - 48 months)	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Labourer	22 (16.06)	-	-	-
Service Worker	19 (13.87)	-	-	-
Semi-Skilled Worker	36 (26.28)	-	-	-
Salesman	19 (13.87)	-	-	-
Office Worker	14 (10.22)	-	-	-
Protective Service	1 (0.73)	-	-	-
Skilled Worker	18 (13.14)	-	-	-
Businessman	5 (3.65)	-	-	-
Sales Representative	1 (0.73)	-	-	-
Others	2 (1.46)	-	-	-
Total	137 (100.00)	-	-	-

Table 5.3

Distribution of Respondents By Average Monthly Income
While Employed

Total Average Income While Employed	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
≤ \$100	18 (12.41)	12 (8.45)	13 (10.24)	7 (5.93)
\$ 101 - \$200	41 (28.28)	27 (19.01)	37 (29.13)	26 (22.03)
\$ 201 - \$300	42 (28.97)	41 (28.87)	49 (38.58)	35 (29.66)
\$ 301 - \$400	23 (15.86)	38 (26.76)	20 (15.75)	32 (27.12)
\$ 401 - \$500	9 (6.21)	13 (9.15)	4 (3.15)	10 (8.47)
\$ 501 - \$600	5 (3.45)	6 (4.23)	3 (2.36)	5 (4.24)
\$ 601 - \$700	4 (2.76)	4 (2.82)	1 (0.79)	3 (2.54)
≥\$701	3 (2.07)	1 (0.70)	-	-
Total	145 (100.00)	142 (100.00)	127 (100.00)	118 (100.00)

Table 5.4

Distribution of Respondents By Average Monthly Expenditure
While Employed

Total Average Expenditure While Employed	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
≤ \$100	9 (14.06)	7 (10.45)	12 (19.35)	4 (7.14)
\$101 - \$200	13 (20.31)	22 (32.84)	17 (27.42)	16 (28.57)
\$201 - \$300	18 (28.13)	16 (23.88)	19 (30.65)	18 (32.14)
\$301 - \$400	15 (23.44)	14 (20.90)	10 (16.13)	11 (19.64)
\$401 - \$500	6 (9.38)	4 (5.97)	3 (4.84)	5 (8.93)
\$501 - \$600	1 (1.56)	2 (2.99)	1 (1.61)	1 (1.79)
\$601 - \$700	2 (3.13)	1 (1.49)	-	1 (1.79)
≥ \$701	-	1 (1.49)	-	-
Total	64 (100.00)	67 (100.00)	62 (100.00)	56 (100.00)

Table 5.5

Distribution of Respondents By Total Period of Courses Attended

Total Period of Courses	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
1 - 6 months	8 (13.56)	4 (11.11)	7 (14.89)	16 (36.36)
7 - 12 months	20 (33.90)	13 (36.11)	13 (27.66)	28 (63.64)
13 - 18 months	3 (5.08)	4 (11.11)	2 (4.26)	-
19 - 24 months	8 (13.56)	3 (8.33)	7 (14.89)	-
25 - 30 months	3 (5.08)	2 (5.56)	6 (12.77)	-
31 - 36 months	11 (18.64)	10 (27.78)	12 (25.53)	-
37 - 42 months	2 (3.39)	-	-	-
43 - 48 months	4 (6.78)	-	-	-
Total	59 (100.00)	36 (100.00)	47 (100.00)	44 (100.00)

Table 5.6(a)

Distribution of Respondents By Type of Courses Attended (0 - 6 months)

Courses (0 - 6 months)	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Electrical	-	-	-	1 (2.50)
Architecture	-	-	-	-
Handicraft	-	-	2 (4.44)	1 (2.50)
Mechanical	-	1 (3.33)	3 (6.67)	3 (7.50)
Machinery	-	-	-	-
Continue school/ self study	54 (98.18)	21 (70.00)	39 (86.67)	30 (75.00)
Academic	-	6 (20.00)	-	3 (7.50)
Business Management	-	-	-	1 (2.50)
Welding	-	-	1 (2.22)	-
Religion	1 (1.82)	-	-	-
Others	-	2 (6.67)	-	1 (2.50)
Total	55 (100.00)	30 (100.00)	45 (100.00)	40 (100.00)

Table 5.6(b)

Distribution of Respondents By Type of Courses
Attended (7 - 12 months)

Courses (7 - 12 months)	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Electrical	-	1 (3.33)	-	1 (3.03)
Architecture	-	-	-	-
Handicraft	-	-	1 (2.63)	1 (3.03)
Mechanical	-	1 (3.33)	1 (2.63)	2 (6.06)
Machinery	-	-	-	-
Continue school/ self study	49 (96.08)	21 (70.00)	35 (92.11)	23 (69.70)
Academic	-	6 (20.00)	-	5 (15.15)
Business Management	-	-	-	1 (3.03)
Welding	-	-	1 (2.63)	-
Religion	1 (1.96)	-	-	-
Others	1 (1.96)	1 (3.33)	-	-
Total	51 (100.00)	30 (100.00)	38 (100.00)	33 (100.00)

Table 5.6(c)

Distribution of Respondents By Type of Courses
Attended (13 - 18 months)

Courses (13-12 months)	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Electrical	-	1 (6.67)	-	-
Architecture	-	-	-	-
Handicraft	-	-	1 (3.85)	-
Mechanical	-	1 (6.67)	-	-
Machinery	1 (3.33)	-	-	-
Continue school/ self study	27 (90.00)	5 (33.33)	23 (88.46)	-
Academic	-	8 (53.33)	-	-
Business Management	-	-	-	-
Welding	-	-	1 (3.85)	-
Religion	1 (3.33)	-	-	-
Others	1 (3.33)	-	1 (3.85)	-
Total	30 (100.00)	15 (100.00)	26 (100.00)	-

Table 5.6(d)

Distribution of Respondents By Type of Courses
Attended (19 - 24 months)

Courses (19-24 months)	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Electrical	-	1 (5.56)	-	-
Architecture	-	1 (5.56)	-	-
Handicraft	-	-	1 (4.00)	-
Mechanical	-	3 (16.67)	-	-
Machinery	1 (3.57)	-	-	-
Continue school/ self study	24 (85.71)	5 (27.78)	23 (92.00)	-
Academic	-	8 (44.44)	-	-
Business Management	-	-	-	-
Welding	-	-	-	-
Religion	1 (3.57)	-	-	-
Others	2 (7.14)	-	-	-
Total	28 (100.00)	18 (100.00)	25 (100.00)	-

Table 5.6(e)

Distribution of Respondents By Type of Courses
Attended (25 - 30 months)

Courses (25-30 months)	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Electrical	-	1 (5.56)	-	-
Architecture	-	1 (5.56)	-	-
Handicraft	1 (4.55)	-	1 (5.26)	-
Mechanical	1 (4.55)	3 (16.67)	-	-
Machinery	1 (4.55)	-	-	-
Continue school/ self study	17 (77.27)	4 (22.22)	17 (89.47)	-
Academic	-	7 (38.89)	1 (5.26)	-
Business Management	-	1 (5.56)	-	-
Welding	-	-	-	-
Religion	1 (4.55)	-	-	-
Others	1 (4.55)	1 (5.56)	-	-
Total	22 (100.00)	18 (100.00)	19 (100.00)	-

Table 5.6(f)

Distribution of Respondents By Type of Courses
Attended (31 - 36 months)

Courses (31-36 months)	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Electrical	-	-	-	-
Architecture	-	1 (8.33)	-	-
Handicraft	1 (5.26)	-	1 (7.69)	-
Mechanical	1 (5.26)	1 (8.33)	-	-
Machinery	1 (5.26)	-	-	-
Continue school/ self study	14 (73.68)	2 (16.67)	11 (84.62)	-
Academic	-	7 (58.33)	-	-
Business Management	-	1 (8.33)	-	-
Welding	-	-	-	-
Religion	1 (5.26)	-	-	-
Others	1 (5.26)	-	1 (7.69)	-
Total	19 (100.00)	12 (100.00)	13 (100.00)	-

Table 5.6(g)

Distribution of Respondents By Type of Courses
(37 - 42 months)

Courses (37-42 months)	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Electrical	-	-	-	-
Architecture	1 (14.29)	-	-	-
Handicraft	1 (14.29)	-	-	-
Mechanical	1 (14.29)	-	-	-
Machinery	1 (14.29)	-	-	-
Continue school/ self study	1 (14.29)	-	-	-
Academic	1 (14.29)	-	-	-
Business Management	1 (14.29)	-	-	-
Welding	-	-	-	-
Religion	-	-	-	-
Others	-	-	-	-
Total	7 (100.00)	-	-	-

Table 5.6(h)

Distribution of Respondents By Type of Courses
(43 - 48 months)

Courses (43-48 months)	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Electrical	-	-	-	-
Architecture	1 (20.00)	-	-	-
Handicraft	1 (20.00)	-	-	-
Mechanical	1 (20.00)	-	-	-
Machinery	-	-	-	-
Continue school/ self study	-	-	-	-
Academic	1 (20.00)	-	-	-
Business Management	1 (20.00)	-	-	-
Welding	-	-	-	-
Religion	-	-	-	-
Others	-	-	-	-
Total	5 (100.00)	-	-	-

Table 5.7

Distribution of Respondents By Average Monthly Pocket
Money While Attending Courses

Average Monthly pocket money/ courses	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
≤ \$50	31 (88.57)	14 (63.64)	25 (80.65)	14 (87.50)
\$51 - \$100	3 (8.57)	4 (18.19)	4 (12.90)	1 (6.25)
\$101 - \$150	1 (2.86)	-	1 (3.23)	-
≥ \$151	-	4 (18.19)	1 (3.23)	1 (6.25)
Total	35 (100.00)	22 (100.00)	31 (100.00)	16 (100.00)

Table 5.8

Distribution of Respondents By Average Monthly Expenses
While Attending Courses

Average Monthly expenses/courses	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
≤ \$50	12 (63.16)	6 (31.58)	16 (64.00)	3 (17.65)
\$51 - \$100	3 (15.79)	5 (26.32)	5 (20.00)	1 (5.88)
\$101 - \$150	3 (15.79)	1 (5.26)	1 (4.00)	5 (29.41)
≥ \$201	-	7 (36.84)	2 (8.00)	8 (47.06)
Total	19 (100.00)	19 (100.00)	25 (100.00)	17 (100.00)

Table 5.9

Distribution of Respondents By Total Period of Unemployment

Total period of unemployment	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
1 - 6 months	36 (55.38)	36 (69.23)	34 (66.67)	21 (77.78)
7 - 12 months	12 (18.46)	9 (17.31)	8 (15.69)	6 (22.22)
13 - 18 months	4 (6.15)	4 (7.69)	4 (7.84)	-
19 - 24 months	6 (9.23)	2 (3.85)	1 (1.96)	-
25 - 30 months	5 (7.69)	-	2 (3.92)	-
31 - 36 months	1 (1.54)	1 (1.92)	2 (3.92)	-
37 - 42 months	1 (1.54)	-	-	-
Total	65 (100.00)	52 (100.00)	51 (100.00)	27 (100.00)

Table 5.10

Distribution of Respondents By Average Monthly Pocket Money While Unemployed

Average monthly pocket money from parent/unemployed	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
≤ \$30	13 (92.86)	7 (70.00)	9 (81.82)	1 (50.00)
\$ 31 - \$ 60	1 (7.14)	-	2 (18.18)	1 (50.00)
\$ 61 - \$ 90	-	1 (10.00)	-	-
≥ \$91	-	2 (20.00)	-	-
Total	14 (100.00)	10 (100.00)	11 (100.00)	2 (100.00)

Table 5.11

Distribution of Respondents By Average Monthly Expenses While Unemployed

Average Monthly expenses/unemployed	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
≤ \$30	3 (100.00)	7 (87.50)	3 (100.00)	-
\$31 - \$60	-	1 (12.50)	-	-
Total	3 (100.00)	8 (100.00)	3 (100.00)	-

Table 5.12

Distribution of Respondents By Examination Groups and Employment

Employment	S.R.P. 1985			S.P.M. 1987			S.R.P. 1987			S.P.M. 1989		
	N	Mean	± S.D.	N	Mean	± S.D.	N	Mean	± S.D.	N	Mean	± S.D.
Average period of employment (Month)	145	36.79	13.03	142	28.36	8.45	128	28.26	8.84	121	9.91	3.22
	(96.67%)	(76.65%)		(94.04%)	(80.44%)		(86.49%)	(79.89%)		(80.13%)	(82.50%)	
Average income per month (\$)	145	267.18	178.21	142	301.38	207.67	127	236.49	111.37	118	295.87	134.46
Average expenses per month (\$)	64	264.74	140.23	67	274.52	180.51	62	219.48	114.92	56	285.50	125.45

Table 5.13

Distribution of Respondents By Examination Groups and Courses

Courses	S.R.P. 1985			S.P.M. 1987			S.R.P. 1987			S.P.M. 1989		
	N	Mean	± S.D.	N	Mean	± S.D.	N	Mean	± S.D.	N	Mean	± S.D.
Average period of courses (month)	59	21.76	13.17	36	20.22	11.07	47	21.17	11.60	44	9.32	3.50
	(39.33%)	(45.33%)		(23.84%)	(57.33%)		(31.76%)	(59.50%)		(29.14%)	(77.67%)	
Average income per month when attending courses (\$)	35	26.74	26.19	22	126.89	295.94	31	39.77	56.16	16	51.88	93.65
Average expenses per month when attending courses (\$)	19	52.20	50.24	19	273.04	405.26	25	64.20	84.33	17	340.29	355.76

Table 5.14

Distribution of Respondents By Examination Groups and Unemployment

Unemployment	S.R.P. 1985			S.P.M. 1987			S.R.P. 1987			S.P.M. 1989		
	N	Mean	± S.D.	N	Mean	± S.D.	N	Mean	± S.D.	N	Mean	± S.D.
Average period of unemployment (Month)	65 (43.33%)	10.75 (22.40%)	9.35	52 (34.44%)	6.82 (18.94%)	6.67	51 (34.46%)	7.92 (22.00%)	8.29	27 (17.88%)	4.85 (40.42%)	3.71
Average pocket money per month (\$)	14	12.63	9.67	10	58.77	92.37	11	16.82	14.25	2	32.50	24.75
Average expenses per month (\$)	3	4.38	2.86	8	16.14	15.63	3	9.44	6.74	0		

6.0 DISCUSSION

The previous section has reported in detail the extensive findings of this study. In this section, we shall first discuss the broader implications of the study and then evaluate the findings in terms of the specific research questions addressed.

General Implications

First, we need to be reminded that this is an exploratory study. It is not an exercise in theory testing for we did not begin with any a priori hypothesis to be tested. Our main concern is to explore and find out what happens to individuals who drop out of school after failing in the S.R.P. examination. Do they differ from their more successful peers who proceed to do their S.P.M. --- in terms of employment opportunities available to them and their involvement in social and deviant activities?

Secondly, we need to be aware of that the eight schools from which we obtained 600 respondents selectively for easier data collection. These schools, purposively chosen, are therefore not quite representative of the local population of 38 secondary schools on the island.

However, these selected schools do sufficiently reflect two critical criteria that distinguish the general population of secondary schools on the island. The selected schools do reflect:

- (i) variation in drug-taking risk (low, medium, high risk) and
- (iii) academic achievement levels (low, medium, high achievement levels)

Thirdly, in arriving at a valid profile of S.R.P. dropouts, we compared this group with those who did not drop out but proceeded to do their S.P.M.. Thus, inspite of the absence of a randomization in the sample selection, we are still able to draw sufficiently valid conclusions on what happen to the S.R.P. dropouts and their more successful peers.

Research Questions

In general, our findings do not reveal any distinct pattern that discriminates clearly the behaviour of S.R.P. dropouts from their successful peers. In other words, we do not have clear-cut evidence to support the notions that: S.R.P. dropouts have brighter employment opportunities than their contemporaries who sat for the

S.P.M., that their social activities differ considerably, and that S.R.P. dropouts are more easily influenced by deviant activities than their S.P.M. counterparts. Thus, we cannot answer convincingly the question of whether the S.R.P. examination should be abolished to enable unsuccessful students to continue their studies and to prevent them from involvement in deviant activities.

However, despite the absence of any general pattern that distinguishes S.R.P. dropouts from their successful peers, there are certain specific qualifying details that show variation between the two groups. We shall mention these qualifiers.

(a) Background

One distinguishing feature that discriminates between S.R.P. dropouts and their successful peers is family background. More of those who dropped out earlier, that is at S.R.P. level come from families with lower income and their parents were less educated than those who passed the S.R.P. but failed the S.P.M.. Similar trend was observed in an earlier finding by Russel W. Rumberger where it was found that family background strongly influences the propensity to drop out of school.

(b) Deviant Activities

First, we need to highlight the fact that involvement in drug use such as cannabis (excluding cigarettes and alcohol) is small and declining. To recall, the figures are 5% (S.R.P. 1985), 2% (S.P.M. 1987), 0.0% (S.R.P. 1987) and 1% (S.P.M. 1989). Even if we were to include cigarettes, alcohol and cannabis as drugs, their use --- although substantially larger because cigarette-smoking is predominant --- the figures again show a distinct decline. Recall again the figures: 89% (S.R.P. 1985), 71% (S.P.M. 1987), 50% (S.R.P. 1987) and 58% (S.P.M. 1989).

Secondly, when we consider the other forms of deviant activities (arguments, fights, damaging properties, trouble with the police etc.) --- although involving about half of each group --- show no major inter-group variation but overall it shows slight decline: 58% (S.R.P. 1985), 54% (S.P.M. 1987), 50% (S.R.P. 1987), and 41% (S.P.M. 1989).

However, it must be noted that the S.P.M. groups generally started later, by a year or two, in deviant activities than their S.R.P. dropouts. But their main source of influence remain the same: peer influence plays a major role in their involvement. Most of them were introduced to drugs by friends and they took it to go along with peers. Denis Kandel in his study concluded that the single most important factor in adolescent illicit drug use is the pattern of drug use by the adolescent's best friends.

(c) Employment Opportunities

Our study does not show any variation between S.R.P. dropouts and their successful contemporaries at S.P.M. in terms of being employed after school. Since leaving school, 97% of S.R.P. 1985 dropouts and 96% of S.P.M. 1987 dropouts get employed. The employment figures for S.R.P. 1987 dropouts and S.P.M. 1989 dropouts are 85% and 80% respectively, their higher unemployment rates compared to their earlier generation are probably due to their recent entrance into the labour market.

However, we do notice that the S.R.P. 1985 dropouts have since gotten better jobs than their S.R.P. 1987 dropouts. A slightly higher proportion of the former group (about 14%) are now in the more skilled and white collar occupation than the latter group. We can only speculate that this qualitative differential may be due to, among other things, that the S.R.P.'s have been in the labour market longer than their counterparts.

(d) Social Activities

The picture is mixed here and, again, no general pattern is distinctively visible between the groups. We only have evidence to show that a larger proportion of S.R.P. 1985 were involved in long-duration courses than their S.P.M. 1987 counterparts; and that more in the former group were involved in self study and repeating their S.R.P. compared to the latter group who undertook academic courses. But this picture changed for the succeeding S.R.P. 1987 and S.P.M. 1989 groups; less of them in both groups and in almost equal proportion undertook such courses.

(e) Abolishment of S.R.P. Examination

Whether it is "good" to abolish the S.R.P. examination --- to enable dropouts to continue their studies and prevent them from involvement in deviant activities --- cannot be answered categorically in our study. We simply do not have clear evidence to answer in the affirmative or negative.

Our findings show a larger number of S.R.P. dropouts were interested in continuing with their studies to either resit for the same examination or undergo other self-study and long-duration courses. We also have evidence to indicate that the S.R.P. dropouts are neither more likely nor less likely to be involved in deviant activities than their successful peers who attended the S.P.M.. But we can speculate safely, as previous literature suggest, that students at the S.R.P. level belong to the high risk age-group that is more vulnerable to the pressures of early adolescence and thus more likely to commit mistakes. If this assumption holds, then our effort should be directed to these groups of students still in school, counsel them more effectively to encourage more positive attitude towards school work and discourage them from participating in deviant activities. And such effort must be especially directed towards the higher risk group: i.e. those coming from low income families.

7.0 CONCLUSION

The irony of this study is that it does not present a bleak picture of the secondary school dropouts on Penang Island. The study does not provide reasons for us to conclude that S.R.P. dropouts are any more likely to get less employment opportunities or to be involved in deviant activities than their successful peers. If anything, the picture is not alarming. S.R.P. dropouts do get employed eventually just like their successful peers; more important, we see an encouraging sign that their involvement in deviant activities are declining.

REFERENCES

- Carlson, B.R. and Davis, J.L. (1988), 'Demographic Variables and Recreational Substance Use Among College Students'. *Journal of Drug Education* Vol. 18(1).
- Combs, Janet and Cooley, W.W., (1968), 'Dropout: In High School and After High School'. *American Educational Research Journal* Vol. J.
- Darrow, Clarence (1934), 'Crime: Its Cause and Treatment'. London: Watts & Co.
- Farrington, D.P., Gallagher, Bernard, Marley, Linda, St. Ledger, R.J. and West, D.J. (1986), 'Unemployment, School Leaving, and Crime'. *British Journal of Criminology* Vol. 26(4).
- Foong, C.P., Maznah Ismail, Navaratnam, V. and Kong, H.S. (1986), 'A Comparative Study of the Psycho-Social/Profile of Drug Using and Non-Drug Using School Children'. National Drug Research Centre, Penang.
- Foong, K. and Navaratnam, V. 'Assessment of Drug Dependence in Malaysia - A Trend Analyses'. The Centre for Drug Research, Monograph Series No. 5, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Pulau Pinang, 1987.
- Forney et.al. (1988), 'Socio-Cultural Correlates of Substance Use Among Medical Students'. *Journal of Drug Education* Vol. 18(2).
- Glazov, A.A., Kuznets, M.E., Poluboyarinov, A.A. and Tsetlin, M.G. (1989), 'A System of Early Detection and Prevention of Alcohol Dependence in Secondary Schools in the USSR'. A paper presented at the Symposium on Experiences with Community Action Projects for the Prevention of Alcohol and Other Drug Problems, held at the Guild Inn, Scarborough, Ontario, Canada.
- Grande, C.G. (1988), 'Delinquency: The Learning Disabled Student's Reaction to Academic School Failure?'. *Adolescence* Vol. 23(89).
- Johnston, L.D., Bachman, J.G. and O'Malley, P.M. (1981), 'Drugs and The Nation's High School Students'. *Drug Abuse in Modern World - A Perspective for the Eighties*. An International Symposium held at the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Columbia University.
- Jones, Kenneth L., Shaiberg, L.W. and Byer, C.O. (1973), 'Drugs and Alcohol'. USA: Harper & Row.
- Leflore, Larry (1988), 'Delinquent Youths and Family'. *Adolescence*, Vol. 23(91).
- McCaghy, Charles H. (1976), 'Deviant Behavior'. London: Collier MacMillan Publisher.
- Miller, J.D. and Cisin, I.H. (1979), 'Highlights from the National Survey on Drug Abuse: 1979'. Social Research Group, The George Washington University. National Institute on Drug Abuse.
- Navaratnam, V. and Spencer, C.P. (1976), 'A Study of the Misuse of Drugs Among Secondary School Children in the State of Penang and Selangor'. Monograph Series No. 3. Centre for Drug Research, Penang.
- Navaratnam, V. and Foong, K. (1987), 'Assessment of Drug Dependence in Malaysia - An Update Analysis 1985 and 1986'. Monograph Series No. 6. Centre for Drug Research, Penang.
- Nowlis, Helan (1975), 'Drugs Demystified'. Paris: The Unesco Press.

Ouston, Janet (1984), 'Delinquency, Family Background and Educational Attainment'. British Journal of Criminology Vol. 24(1).

Rumberger, Russell W. (1983), 'Dropping Out of High School: The Influence of Race, Sex and Family Background'. American Educational Research Journal Vol. 20(2).

Sue Titus Reid, J.D. (1976), 'Crime and Crimonology'. Illinois: The Dryden Press.

Sutherland, E.H. and Cressey, D.R. (1974), 'Criminology'. J.B. Lippincott Company.

V. Navaratnam, K. Foong and S.K. Hoo, 'Drug Abuse and Dependence Among Adolescents in Malaysia'. The Centre for Drug Research, Research Report Series No. 24, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Pulau Pinang, 1990.

APPENDIX A
SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Table A
Distribution of Respondents By Examination Groups And Age

Age	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
17	-	-	7 (4.73)	2 (1.32)
18	1 (0.67)	3 (1.99)	63 (42.57)	66 (43.71)
19	9 (6.00)	7 (4.64)	56 (37.84)	78 (51.66)
20	79 (52.67)	61 (40.40)	17 (11.49)	5 (3.31)
21	49 (32.67)	72 (47.68)	4 (2.70)	-
22	12 (8.00)	8 (38.10)	1 (0.68)	-
Total	150 (100.00)	151 (100.00)	148 (100.00)	151 (100.00)

Table B

Distribution of Respondents By Examination
Groups And Religion

Religion	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Islam	70 (46.67)	62 (41.06)	73 (49.32)	72 (47.68)
Taoism	48 (32.00)	52 (34.44)	46 (31.08)	50 (33.11)
Hinduism	25 (16.67)	24 (15.89)	22 (14.86)	23 (15.23)
Christianity	1 (0.67)	8 (5.30)	4 (2.70)	6 (3.97)
Buddhism	5 (3.33)	4 (2.65)	1 (0.68)	-
Others	1 (0.67)	1 (0.66)	2 (1.35)	-
Total	150 (100.00)	151 (100.00)	148 (100.00)	151 (100.00)

Table C

Distribution of Respondents By Examination
Groups And Ethnicity

Ethnicity	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Malay	54 (36.00)	52 (34.44)	57 (38.51)	55 (36.42)
Chinese	54 (36.00)	58 (38.41)	47 (31.76)	51 (33.77)
Indian	42 (28.00)	40 (26.49)	41 (27.70)	39 (25.83)
Others	-	1 (0.66)	3 (2.03)	6 (3.98)
Total	150 (100.00)	151 (100.00)	148 (100.00)	151 (100.00)

Table D

Distribution of Respondents By Examination
Groups And Marital Status

Marital Status	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Married	10 (6.67)	5 (3.31)	1 (0.68)	-
Single	140 (93.33)	146 (96.69)	147 (99.32)	151 (100.00)
Total	150 (100.00)	151 (100.00)	148 (100.00)	151 (100.00)

Table E

Distribution of Respondents By Examination
Group And Age Left School

Age Left School	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
≤ 14	2 (1.34)	1 (0.68)	2 (1.40)	1 (0.66)
15	57 (38.26)	2 (1.35)	64 (44.76)	-
16	62 (41.61)	8 (5.41)	43 (30.07)	-
17	16 (10.74)	52 (35.14)	26 (18.18)	69 (45.70)
18	10 (6.71)	62 (41.89)	4 (2.80)	77 (50.99)
19	2 (1.34)	23 (15.54)	4 (2.80)	4 (2.65)
Total	150 (100.00)	151 (100.00)	148 (100.00)	151 (100.00)

Table F

Distribution of Respondents By Examination
Groups And Family Composition-Order

Family Composition	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Only Child	2 (1.33)	5 (3.31)	5 (3.38)	3 (1.99)
Eldest Child	30 (20.00)	40 (26.49)	44 (29.73)	36 (23.84)
Youngest Child	39 (26.00)	34 (22.52)	34 (22.97)	42 (27.81)
Middle Child	79 (52.67)	72 (47.68)	65 (43.92)	70 (46.36)
Total	150 (100.00)	151 (100.00)	148 (100.00)	151 (100.00)

Table G

Distribution of Respondents By Examination
Groups And Number of Siblings

No. of siblings	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
0	2 (1.33)	6 (3.97)	3 (2.03)	4 (2.65)
1	16 (10.67)	15 (9.93)	13 (8.78)	19 (12.58)
2	27 (18.00)	34 (22.52)	26 (17.57)	26 (17.22)
3	24 (16.00)	39 (25.83)	28 (18.92)	45 (29.80)
4	25 (16.67)	17 (11.26)	24 (16.22)	20 (13.25)
5	21 (14.00)	12 (7.95)	18 (12.16)	14 (9.27)
6	15 (10.00)	14 (9.27)	15 (10.14)	5 (3.31)
7	6 (4.00)	6 (3.97)	10 (6.76)	8 (5.30)
8	4 (2.67)	1 (0.66)	3 (2.03)	4 (2.65)
9	6 (4.00)	4 (2.65)	6 (4.05)	2 (1.32)
10	1 (0.67)	2 (1.32)	1 (0.68)	1 (0.66)
11	2 (1.33)	1 (0.66)	1 (0.68)	2 (1.32)
12	-	-	-	1 (1.32)
13	1 (0.67)	-	-	-
Total	150 (100.00)	151 (100.00)	148 (100.00)	151 (100.00)

Table H

Distribution of Respondents By Examination
Groups And The People They Lived With

Whom Did You Live With	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Parents	142 (94.67)	133 (88.08)	139 (93.92)	145 (96.03)
Relatives	6 (4.00)	7 (4.64)	5 (3.38)	4 (2.65)
Friends	2 (1.33)	4 (2.65)	1 (0.68)	-
Alone	-	5 (3.31)	-	2 (1.32)
Others	-	2 (1.32)	3 (2.03)	-
Total	150 (100.00)	151 (100.00)	148 (100.00)	151 (100.00)

Table I

Distribution of Respondents By Examination Groups And
Their Residence-Type of Community

Type of Community	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Farm/Village	37 (24.67)	26 (17.22)	41 (27.70)	27 (17.88)
Small Town	22 (14.67)	20 (13.25)	16 (10.81)	20 (13.25)
Town	40 (26.67)	45 (29.80)	42 (28.38)	40 (26.49)
Suburb	31 (20.67)	49 (32.45)	27 (18.24)	26 (17.22)
City	20 (13.33)	11 (7.28)	22 (14.86)	38 (25.17)
Total	150 (100.00)	151 (100.00)	148 (100.00)	151 (100.00)

Table J

Distribution of Respondents By Examination
Groups And Father's Employment

Father's Employment	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Labourer	53 (35.33)	44 (29.14)	55 (37.16)	48 (31.79)
Service Worker	5 (3.33)	18 (11.92)	12 (8.11)	22 (14.57)
Semi-Skilled Worker	10 (6.67)	5 (3.31)	6 (4.05)	1 (0.66)
Clerical Worker	8 (5.33)	6 (3.98)	3 (2.03)	5 (3.31)
Protective Service	2 (1.33)	3 (1.99)	1 (0.68)	1 (0.66)
Skilled Labour	3 (2.00)	2 (1.32)	8 (5.41)	10 (6.62)
Shop Owner	25 (16.67)	22 (14.57)	25 (16.89)	30 (19.87)
Manager	2 (1.33)	3 (1.99)	-	-
Agent/Broker	-	3 (1.99)	1 (0.68)	1 (0.66)
Professionals	1 (0.67)	5 (3.31)	2 (1.35)	-
Retired	16 (10.67)	20 (13.25)	13 (8.78)	14 (9.27)
Deceased	22 (14.67)	17 (11.26)	19 (12.84)	17 (11.26)
Others	3 (2.00)	3 (1.99)	3 (2.03)	2 (1.32)
Total	150 (100.00)	151 (100.00)	148 (100.00)	151 (100.00)

Table K

Distribution of Respondents By Examination
Groups And Mother's Employment

Mother's Employment	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
Labourer	11 (7.33)	15 (9.93)	14 (9.46)	19 (12.58)
Service Worker	4 (2.67)	10 (6.62)	8 (5.41)	9 (5.96)
Semi-Skilled Worker	2 (1.33)	-	1 (0.68)	1 (0.66)
Clerical Worker	2 (1.33)	2 (1.32)	3 (2.03)	1 (0.66)
Skilled Labour	-	-	2 (1.35)	-
Shop Owner	2 (1.33)	4 (2.65)	7 (4.73)	3 (1.99)
Manager	1 (0.67)	1 (0.66)	-	-
Professional	1 (0.67)	2 (1.32)	1 (0.68)	2 (1.32)
Housewife	123 (82.00)	108 (71.52)	106 (71.62)	110 (72.85)
Retired	1 (0.67)	2 (1.32)	2 (1.35)	2 (1.32)
Deceased	2 (1.33)	7 (4.64)	3 (2.03)	4 (2.65)
Others	1 (0.67)	-	1 (0.68)	-
Total	150 (100.00)	151 (100.00)	148 (100.00)	151 (100.00)

Table L

Distribution of Respondents By Examination
Groups And Parents' Income

Parents' Income	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
No Income	19 (12.67)	13 (8.61)	10 (6.76)	14 (9.27)
\$ 1 - \$250	9 (6.00)	6 (3.98)	15 (10.13)	7 (4.64)
\$251 - \$350	22 (14.67)	18 (11.92)	17 (11.49)	12 (7.95)
\$351 - \$600	65 (43.33)	63 (41.72)	76 (50.33)	71 (47.02)
\$601 - \$1000	25 (16.67)	35 (23.79)	28 (18.54)	39 (25.83)
\$1001 - \$1500	8 (5.33)	10 (6.62)	1 (0.66)	4 (2.65)
\$1501 - \$2000	-	4 (2.65)	1 (0.66)	-
≥ \$2001	2 (1.33)	2 (1.32)	-	4 (2.65)
Total	150 (100.00)	151 (100.00)	148 (100.00)	151 (100.00)

Table M

Distribution of Respondents By Examination
Groups And Father's Education

Father's Education	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
No Schooling	18 (12.00)	11 (7.28)	7 (4.73)	9 (5.96)
Elementary	100 (66.67)	90 (59.60)	108 (72.97)	91 (60.26)
Form 3	21 (14.00)	27 (17.88)	26 (17.57)	26 (17.22)
Form 5	8 (5.33)	14 (9.27)	3 (2.03)	17 (11.26)
Form 6	3 (2.00)	6 (3.97)	2 (1.35)	3 (1.99)
College	-	-	2 (1.35)	3 (1.99)
University	-	3 (1.99)	-	2 (1.32)
Total	150 (100.00)	151 (100.00)	148 (100.00)	151 (100.00)

Table N

Distribution of Respondents By Examination
Groups And Mother's Education

Mother's Education	S.R.P. 1985	S.P.M. 1987	S.R.P. 1987	S.P.M. 1989
No Schooling	34 (22.67)	25 (16.56)	24 (16.22)	27 (17.88)
Elementary	108 (72.00)	97 (64.24)	107 (72.30)	95 (62.91)
Form 3	6 (4.00)	16 (10.60)	13 (8.78)	16 (10.60)
Form 5	1 (0.67)	7 (4.64)	3 (2.03)	9 (5.96)
Form 6	1 (0.67)	2 (1.32)	1 (0.68)	1 (0.66)
College	-	2 (1.32)	-	2 (1.32)
University	-	2 (1.32)	-	1 (0.66)
Total	150 (100.00)	151 (100.00)	148 (100.00)	151 (100.00)

PUBLICATIONS OF THE CENTRE FOR DRUG RESEARCH
UNIVERSITI SAINS MALAYSIA
PENANG

INTERNATIONAL MONOGRAPH SERIES

1. Abuse of Volatile Solvents and Inhalants: Papers Presented at W.H.O. Advisory Meeting.
International Monograph Series No. 1.
2. The Validation of Chemical and Immunological Tests for Antimalarials in Body Fluids: Papers Presented at a W.H.O./Universiti Sains Malaysia Workshop.
International Monograph Series No. 3.
3. The Comparative Evaluation Of Chemical, Chromatographic And Immunological Tests For The Detection Of Mefloquine And Other Antimalarial Drugs In Body Fluids.
International Monograph Series No. 4.

MONOGRAPH SERIES

1. The Misuse of Drugs Among Secondary School Children in the State of Penang and Selangor.
Monograph Series No. 1.
2. Drug Abuse Among Malaysian Youths - Originally Published as "A Study of the Misuse of Drugs Among Secondary School Children in the States of Penang and Selangor".
Monograph Series No. 2.
3. Opiate Consumption Pattern in Asia.
Monograph Series No. 3.
4. A Survey of Drug Abuse Prevention Strategies.
Monograph Series No. 4.
5. Assessment of Drug Dependence in Malaysia - A Trend Analysis.
Monograph Series No. 5.
6. Assessment of Drug Dependence in Malaysia - An Update Analysis 1985 and 1986.
Monograph Series No. 6.

RESEARCH REPORT SERIES

1. A Study on the Misuse of Drugs Among Secondary School Children in the State of Kelantan.
Research Report No. 1.
2. A General Overview on the Practices Relating to the Traditional Treatment of Drug Dependence in Malaysia.
Research Report No. 2.
3. A Comparative Analysis of the Psychological Profile of Drug Using And Non-Drug Using Population.
Research Report No. 3.
4. An Overview of Dadah Use in a high Risk Area - Rifle Range Flats.
Research Report No. 4.
5. Impact of Scheduling Drugs Under the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances - The Benzodiazepines Reappraised.
Research Report No. 5.
6. A Study on Comparative Study of EMIT vs GC-MS In the Determination of Cannabis in Urine.
7. An Evaluation Study of the Waters QA-1 Quality Analyser Liquid Chromatograph. Research Report No. 7.
8. Impact of Scheduling Drugs under the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances - A Follow-up Study.
Research Report No. 8.
9. A Study Into Certain Aspects of Drug Education Programmes in Malaysian Schools.
Research Report No. 9.

10. A Study of Opinions Regarding Selected Posters on Drug Education.
Research Report No. 10.
11. A Comparative Analysis of the Psychological Profile of Institutionalised Drug Using Population.
Research Report No. 11.
12. Analytical Methods for the Identification And Confirmation of the Principal Cannabinoid Metabolite In Urine.
Research Report No. 12.
13. A Comparative Study of the Psychosocial Profile of Drug Using and Non-Drug Using School Children.
Research Report No. 13.
14. Women Involved in Drug Dependence in Malaysia - A Preliminary Study.
Research Report No. 14.
15. An Evaluation Study of the Efficacy of PEMADAM Supervision Programmes - A Preliminary Report (In Bahasa Malaysia).
Research Report No. 15.
16. Natural History of Heroin Addiction and Adjunctive Drug Use.
Research Report No. 16.
17. Determination of Naltrexone Dosage for Narcotic Against Blockade in Detoxified Asian Addicts.
Research Report No. 17.
18. The Health Knowledge Survey on the Primary School Children. (In Bahasa Malaysia)
Research Report No. 18.

19. The Survey on the Health Knowledge and the Attitude towards drug use of the Secondary School Children. (In Bahasa Malaysia).
Research Report No. 19.
20. The Survey on the Health Knowledge and the Attitude towards drug use of the Trainee Teachers. (In Bahasa Malaysia).
Research Report No. 20.
21. Women Involved in Drug Dependence in Malaysia An In-Depth Study.
Research Report No. 21.
22. An Evaluation and Development of Chromatographic Methods for The Study of Chemical Profiles of Illicit Heroin Samples.
Research Report No. 22.
23. Chromatographic Methods For The Detection of The Principal Cannabinoid Metabolite In Urine.
Research Report No. 23.
24. Drug Abuse and Dependence Among Adolescent In Malaysia.
Research Report No. 24.
25. A Ten Year Retrospective Follow-Up of Drug Dependence Career.
Research Report No. 25.