Alaska Meth Education Project: Process and Outcome Evaluation, 2009

Prepared for the
Alaska Meth Education Project

by

Marny Rivera, Ph.D.
UAA Justice Center
3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, AK 99508
(907) 786-1126
afmsr1@uaa.alaska.edu

Jennifer McMullen, M.A.
UAA Justice Center
3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, AK 99508
(907) 786-4886
anjem1@uaa.alaska.edu

JC0904

September 30, 2009

UAA Justice Center
University of Alaska Anchorage

Justice Center
University of Alaska Anchorage
Anchorage, Alaska 99508

Printed in the United States of America

This project was supported in part by Congressional Earmark Grant No. 1H79SP014832-01, awarded to the Municipality of Anchorage by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Center for Substance Abuse Prevention.

UAA UNIVERSITY of ALASKA ANCHORAGE

Alaska Meth Education Project: Process and Outcome Evaluation, 2009

Table of Contents

Alaska Meth Education Project: Process and Outcome Evaluation, 2009

Index of Tables and Figures

Alaska Meth Education Project: Process and Outcome Evaluation, 2009

Acknowledgements

We thank the Municipality of Anchorage for contracting with the UAA Justice Center to conduct this evaluation. This project was supported in part by Congressional Earmark Grant No. 1H79SP014832-01, awarded to the Municipality of Anchorage by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Center for Substance Abuse Prevention. The remaining funding required to complete the evaluation was supplied by the Justice Center as part of our ongoing commitment to provide a service to the people of Alaska.

We are grateful to Allison Biastock, former Alaska Meth Education (AME) Project Coordinator for her excellent coordination and leadership of the AME Project. Allison also provided useful contributions to various data collection instruments and feedback on drafts of this document. We are also grateful to Jennifer Baker, current AME Project Coordinator for her leadership and feedback on this report.

Several items used in the student survey and the mail survey were taken or modified from the Montana Meth Use and Attitudes Survey (available at http://www.methproject.org/documents/National_Survey817.pdf). We thank the Montana Meth Project and GfK Roper Public Affairs and Media for making their design and instruments publicly available on the world wide web. We acknowledge the Montana Meth Project for being pioneers in producing and distributing anti-meth media messages as part of their crusade to prevent meth use and its associated harms. We were greatly informed by the expertise of GfK Roper Public Affairs and Media in their collection of data on attitudes and behaviors regarding meth.

We are indebted to the many participants who took the time to contribute data to our study in the form of their attitudes and opinions. These participants whose contributions we are grateful for include community education presentation attendees, UAA Justice students, mail and web survey respondents, and the AME Project statewide advisory committee members. We also extend our gratitude to the AME Project trainers who led the community education presentations, and assisted in collecting data for that component of the evaluation.

We want to acknowledge the many efforts— prevention, education, treatment, and enforcement— of all those in and outside of Alaska who aim to reduce and repair the damage caused by meth.

Alaska Meth Education Project: Process and Outcome Evaluation, 2009

Executive Summary

Community Education Presentations

The AME Project had 28 trained presenters provide 146 anti-meth community education presentations. Two of the presenters gave 10 or more presentations, while eight individual presenters and one team of presenters presented to over 100 total attendees. The presentations were attended by 2,227 people, of which, 54% were adult, and 29% were youth. While Fairbanks (24%) was the region with the greatest percentage of attendees, the Kenai Peninsula (29%) was the region with the greatest percentage of presentations given. The Mat-Su region had the greatest number of youth attendees (49%) and the Kenai Peninsula had the greatest number of adult attendees (36%). Those ages 18 to 25 years (the target age group) made up 18% of the total adult attendees. Seventy-one percent of the attendees were white and 15% were Alaska Native.

When rating the presentations, 84% of attendees felt the physical facility that was used was appropriate for the presentation, and 66% strongly agreed that the presentation met its stated objectives. Forty-seven percent of attendees strongly agreed and 26% agreed that the presentation was relevant to them. In addition, 86% felt that the presentation met their personal expectations. The majority of attendees strongly agreed (71%) or agreed (19%) that they would recommend the presentation to others.

Attendees were asked to rate their knowledge of meth on a scale of one (poor) to five (excellent), before and after the presentation. The majority of attendees reported an increase in knowledge. While 35% of attendees reported having average knowledge about meth before the presentation, only 10% reported this level of knowledge after the presentation. The percentage of attendees who reported their level of knowledge as above average or excellent increased from 34% before the presentation to 53% after the presentation. After listening to the presentation, on the scale of one (poor) to five (excellent), most attendees reported their knowledge of meth to have increased by one point.

Among the responses provided for the open-ended question, six themes were recognized as the most valuable thing learned by attendees: dangers of meth, awareness, extent of the problem, anti-meth attitudes, responsibility, and presentation quality. The theme “dangers of meth” (219 comments) was the theme most commonly mentioned by attendees. Comments about the dangers of meth related to the dangers to self (addiction, effects on brain and body), and dangers to community (effects on children, environment, others). The second most common theme was awareness (177 comments).

Student Survey

A group of UAA Justice students were intentionally exposed to the AME Project radio ads and were surveyed about meth and the radio ads using an instrument similar to the mail survey. This exposed

group of students consisted of 58 students. The average age of the students was 22 years. Eighty-nine percent of the students who reported their age were 18 to 25 years old. Fifty-two percent of all students who reported their age were female, and 48% were male.

Among mediums for seeing or hearing anti-meth advertising, radio ads were the most frequently reported for both 18 to 25 year old students and all students (39%). Thirty-nine percent of 18 to 25 year old students, and 47% of all students saw or heard non-advertising information. The most frequently encountered source of non-advertising meth information was the internet (82% of 18 to 25 year old students and 85% of all students), followed by the University Health and Counseling Center (31% of 18 to 25 year old students and 28% of all students). Students reported encountering non-advertising meth information less frequently from radio (5% for both groups) and magazines (5% of 18 to 25 year old students and 7% of all students).

Students rated the following as either valuable or highly valuable sources of information: television news (80% of 18 to 25 year old students and 71% of all students), ads at school (72% of 18 to 25 year old students and 64% of all students), and the radio (64% of 18 to 25 year old students and 59% of all students). Information sources that were rated by students as either invaluable or highly invaluable included television commercials (24% of 18 to 25 year old students and 28% of all students), posters on buses and bus stops (23% of 18 to 25 year old students and 28% of all students) and outdoor billboards (21% of 18 to 25 year old students and 28% of all students).

The majority of students reported that they frequently listen to the radio. Seventy-two percent of students aged 18 to 25 years listen to the radio every day or almost every day, as did seventy-four percent of all students. Eighteen percent of 18 to 25 year old students and 14% of all students also reported listening to the radio one to three times per week. Students most frequently encountered anti-meth ads on the radio one to three times a month (28% of 18 to 25 year old students and 33% of all students), or less than once a month (28% of 18 to 25 year old students and 26% of all students). None of the students encountered anti- meth ads more than once a day. Twenty-six percent of students aged 18 to 25 years and 24% of all students did not hear any anti-meth ads on the radio. Only one of three complete ad cycles had taken place by the time the students were surveyed. In other words, the AME Project anti-meth radio ads had only aired for a total of three weeks.

After being exposed to the AME Project anti-meth radio ads, 33% of students ages 18 to 25 years, and 39% of all students reported that they had previously heard the band story ad on the radio. The bank teller ad was previously heard by 27% of 18 to 25 year old students and 34% of all students. Eighteen percent of 18 to 25 year old students and 23% of all students had previously heard the North Slope ad.

The majority of students reported that the band story ad was clearly about meth (95% of students) and clearly an anti-drug ad (95% of 18 to 25 year old students and 93% of all students). The band story ad was also reported by the majority of students to be a good ad for the target audience of 18 to 25 year olds (79% of 18 to 25 year old students and 83% of all students). Forty-seven percent of students reported that the band story ad was better than most anti-drug ads on the radio, and 53% reported that it was not better than most anti-drug ads on the radio.

The bank teller ad was reported by 87% of 18 to 25 year old students and 88% of all students to be clearly about meth, and was seen as clearly an anti-drug ad by 92% of 18 to 25 year old students and 91% of all students. Seventy-one percent of 18 to 25 year old students, and 72% of all students reported that the bank teller ad was a good ad for the target audience of 18 to 25 year olds. Many students reported that the bank teller ad was better than most anti-drug ads (40% of 18 to 25 year old students and 46% of all students).

Ninety-five percent of 18 to 25 year old students and 91% of all students reported that the North Slope ad was clearly an anti-drug ad, while 84% of 18 to 25 year old students and 88% of all students reported that the ad was clearly about meth. The North Slope ad was reported to be a good ad for the target audience by 74% of 18 to 25 year old students and 72% of all students. Fifty percent of 18 to 25 year olds students and 49% of all students reported that the North Slope ad was better than most radio anti-drug ads.

When asked for their impressions about meth based on the AME Project radio ads, 42% of 18 to 25 year old students reported that band story gave them the impression that meth was more dangerous to try than they originally thought. Thirty-seven percent of 18 to 25 year olds students reported that the band story ad probably did not give the impression that meth would make them act in a way they would not want to act. The majority of 18 to 25 year old students reported that the band story ad probably didn't give them the impression that meth would make them look different than usual (47%), and probably didn't give them new information (55%). Thirty-seven percent of 18 to 25 year old students reported that the band story ad slightly did give them the impression that meth is something to avoid if you've got big plans in life.

Thirty-nine percent of 18 to 25 year old students reported that the bank teller ad probably did not give them the impression that meth is more dangerous to try than they originally thought. The bank teller ad slightly did give the impression to 18 to 25 year old students that meth will make you act in a way you do not want to act (39%). An equal number of 18 to 25 year old students (33%) reported that the bank teller ad slightly did and probably didn't give them the impression that meth would make them look different than usual. Sixty-four percent of 18 to 25 year old students reported that the bank teller ad probably didn't give them new information, and 44% reported that the ad slightly did give the impression that meth is something to avoid if you've got big plans in life.

A large percentage of 18 to 25 year old students reported that the North Slope ad probably didn't give them the impression that meth is more dangerous to try than they originally thought (47%). The North Slope ad probably didn't give 18 to 25 year old students the impression that meth would make you act in a way you do not want to act (40%), or make you look different than usual (47%). Fifty percent of 18 to 25 year old students reported that the North Slope ad probably didn't give them new information, while 42% reported the ad strongly did give them the impression that meth is something to avoid if you've got big plans in life.

Mail Survey

A total of 2,115 surveys were completed by participants. The majority of surveys (71%) were completed on paper, and 29% were completed online. Sixty percent of survey participants were female

and 40% were male. Survey participants were largely White (87%) and on average were 48 years old. Only 3% of survey participants were in the target age group (18 to 25 years) for the media campaign. Over half of the survey participants (58%) reported that one or more children under the age of 18 was living in their home, and 40% reported that one or more people 18 to 25 years old was living in their home. Most survey participants (72%) reported being married and 49% reported their gross annual household income to be $80,000 or more.

Regarding the effects of meth use, 83% of survey participants strongly disagreed that meth makes you more intelligent, 76% strongly disagree that meth use makes you popular, and 74% strongly disagreed that meth use helps you study. Survey participants strongly agreed or agreed that meth helps you lose weight (31%), makes you feel euphoric or very happy (23%), and gives you energy (22%). A large percentage of survey participants reported that a person who tries meth runs a great risk of being a negative influence on a younger brother or sister (73%), making their problems worse (66%), getting hooked on meth (63%), or losing control of themselves (63%). Nineteen percent of survey participants were unsure whether a person who tries meth once would risk insomnia or not being able to sleep, 17% were unsure if the one time meth user risked becoming violent and 16% were unsure whether the one time user risked tooth decay.

Of five drugs rated for risk (heroin, meth, cocaine, marijuana, and alcohol) 79% of survey participants rated trying heroin once or twice as posing a great risk to the user and 74% rated meth as posing a great risk. Ninety-five percent of participants reported there was great risk in using meth regularly and 95% reported there was great risk in using heroin regularly. Survey participants strongly disapproved of trying heroin once or twice (91%) and 90% strongly disapproved of trying meth once or twice. Ninety-seven percent of survey participants strongly disapproved of regular heroin use and 97% strongly disapproved of regular meth use.

When asked how difficult or easy it would be for a young adult (18 to 25 years) to get the five drugs rated for risk and approved use, 88% reported it would be very easy or somewhat easy for young adults to obtain marijuana and 72% reported it would be very easy or somewhat easy for young adults to obtain meth. Forty-one percent of survey participants reported it was extremely likely or very likely that young adults in their area use meth. Survey participants were asked to evaluate the extent of drug problems in their area. Sixty-two percent of survey participants reported that alcohol use was a big problem in their area and 52% reported that meth use was a big problem in their area.

Survey participants were asked about their exposure to anti-meth advertising. Seventy-four percent reported that they had encountered some form of anti-meth advertising recently. The media sources (including printed posters, newspaper, internet and television) most frequently reported as sources of anti-meth advertising were television and the internet (24% each). Seventy-one percent of survey participants also reported encountering non-advertising meth information recently. Fifty-three percent reported encountering non-advertising meth information in the newspaper and 52% reported encountering non-advertising meth information in the television news. Other common sources of meth information included word of mouth, work, other types of ads, and personal experience.

Across all survey participants, 34% reported hearing anti-meth radio ads. Among 18 to 25 year olds, 55% reported hearing anti-meth radio ads. Forty-seven percent of survey participants 18 to 25 years old reported hearing anti-meth radio ads at least one to three times a month while 16% of survey

participants 26 years and older reported hearing anti-meth radio ads with this frequency. Sixty-eight percent of survey participants reported listening to the radio every day or almost every day, so radio is a suitable medium for disseminating anti-meth messages.

When asked specifically about anti-meth radio ads that were part of the AME Project advertising campaign, 17% of survey participants reported hearing the bank teller ad, 15% reported hearing the band story ad, and 14% reported hearing the North Slope ad. Fifty-six percent of participants indicated that the North Slope ad was better than most anti-drug ads on the radio, 55% indicated the band story ad was a better ad, and 53% reported the bank teller ad was better than most anti-drug ads on the radio. The majority of survey participants reported that the ads were clearly anti-drug ads (92% for bank teller, and 86% each for band story and North Slope). A significant percentage of survey participants also reported that the ads were clearly about meth (91% for bank teller, and 82% each for band story and North Slope). Smaller percentages of 18 to 25 year old survey participants indicated that the bank teller and North Slope ads were appropriate for the target age group. Thirty-nine percent of 18 to 25 year old survey participants reported the bank teller ad was appropriate for the target audience of 18 to 25 year olds while 78% of survey participants 26 years and older reported the bank teller ad was appropriate for the target age group. Similarly, 33% of 18 to 25 year old survey participants reported the North Slope ad was appropriate for the target audience while 76% of survey participants 26 years and older reported the North Slope ad was appropriate for the target audience.

Regarding the ability of the ads to give the impression that meth was a drug to avoid if you have got big plans in life, 87% of survey participants reported that the bank teller ad strongly or slightly gave the impression that meth use is something to avoid while 86% reported the band story ad conveyed this impression, and 84% of survey participants reported the North Slope ad gave this impression. In terms of the ads giving the impression that meth is more dangerous than originally thought, 66% of survey participants reported the ad strongly or slightly gave this impression for the band story ad, 65% reported the bank teller ad gave this impression, and 62% reported the North Slope ad gave this impression. More survey participants reported that the ads definitely or probably did not provide new information about meth (53% for the band story ad, 52% for the North Slope ad, and 47% for the bank teller ad).

Process Evaluation

Interviews were conducted with 8 statewide advisory committee members and the coordinator. Most members of the committee understood the goals of the AME Project to be educating about, and preventing the use of, meth. The most common alternative goal suggested by members was to expand the project to include drugs other than methamphetamine. Members agreed that the project is achieving its goals, but that goal achievement could be enhanced through collaboration and information sharing with organizations that have similar purposes as the AME Project. It was also suggested that the members of the committee be given more active roles in the project, and that the committee be expanded to include representatives from law enforcement and behavioral health. Members felt that the information sharing the project has been doing through media and the community education presentations is the most unique contribution the AME Project has made in most communities. Committee members also thought that an annual face-to-face meeting would be beneficial for the project. Five recommendations were presented for consideration, based on the responses provided by the advisory committee members.

Alaska Meth Education Project: Process and Outcome Evaluation, 2009

This report provides results from an evaluation of AME Project efforts. This report is the first to provide information regarding Alaskans' perceptions of meth, including effects and risks associated with meth use and perceptions regarding the availability and use of meth by young adults in Alaska. It is also the first evaluation conducted on AME Project efforts. We begin this report by providing a brief overview of the AME Project and of the meth problem in Alaska. We then discuss the purpose of this evaluation and its methodology, including the use of a survey to evaluate community education presentations, a survey conducted with UAA Justice students exposed to the anti-meth radio advertisements generated by the AME Project, a survey of 10,000 randomly sampled Alaskans, and a process evaluation involving interviews conducted with AME Project statewide advisory committee members. Results are then presented in four sections. These sections are associated with the four components of the evaluation: community education presentations, the student survey, the mail survey, and the process evaluation.

Brief Overview of the Alaska Meth Education Project

The Alaska Meth Education Project is the result of the efforts of five local Alaska governments (Municipality of Anchorage, Matanuska Susitna Borough, Kenai Peninsula Borough, Fairbanks North Star Borough, and Juneau Borough) and has been operating since 2006. The AME Project is served by a Statewide Advisory Committee and a Project Coordinator. The advisory committee is comprised of volunteers, many of whom have been appointed by their local borough or municipal mayor. The AME Project originally began through a combination of public and private funds, and is currently funded through a federal grant from Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) (AME Project, 2009a). As a statewide effort, the mission of the AME Project is to reduce meth use and availability in Alaska by educating all Alaskans about, and preventing youth from trying, meth.

As a means of achieving their mission, the AME Project provides Alaskans with free community education presentations and has an anti-meth media campaign. The community education presentations are a collaborative effort with community partners in Anchorage, Fairbanks, Mat-Su, Juneau, and the Kenai Peninsula. The presentations use Partnership For Drug Free America's Meth 360 Program. Meth 360 addresses all aspects of meth use including identification of meth, modes of production, and the effects of meth on individuals and communities. The media campaign involves radio and print ads that focus on both anti-drug attitudes and recovery to reduce rates of use and to appeal to families and current meth users. In addition, the AME Project has held two anti-meth summits, and hosts a website and Facebook page that provide information, local resources, and links to their campaign ads (AME Project, 2009a).

Brief Overview of the Meth Problem in Alaska

Data on meth use and treatment in Alaska is limited, as there is only one state-level survey that collects information on meth use, and Alaska is not included in some national studies or surveys. Limited information that is available comes from the National Survey on Drug Use and Health, the National Drug Intelligence Center, the state-level Youth Risk Behavior Survey, Alaska Bureau of Drug and Alcohol Enforcement, Treatment Episode Data Set, Quest, and the AME Project's compilation of information from state agencies. The various data sources include information about meth in the areas of: law enforcement such as lab seizures and production and importing trends, rates of use among youth, adult use rates (including workplace positive rates), and treatment rates. Relevant meth information is summarized in this section.

The Alaska Bureau of Drug and Alcohol Enforcement (ABADE), and the National Drug Intelligence Center (NDIC) collect law enforcement information about meth. Information from these two sources indicates that meth is a concern for law enforcement in Alaska. The ABADE 2008 annual report describes methamphetamines as one of five primary substances of abuse at the center of law enforcement efforts in Alaska (ABADE, 2008). According to the National Meth Threat Assessment 2009, 87% of local law enforcement agencies in the Pacific Region of the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force (of which Alaska is a part) reported that meth was their greatest drug threat, compared to 29% nationally (NDIC, 2009). Law enforcement agencies in the Pacific Region further report that meth is the drug that most contributes to violent and property crimes in the region (NDIC, 2009).

Lab seizures in Alaska are also tracked by ABADE and NDIC. Trends indicate that although local lab production has decreased over the past few years, it is likely to increase once again. The number of meth labs discovered in Alaska was similar in 2008 (12 labs) and 2007 (11 labs). However, this is a slight decrease from 2006 (18 labs), and a significant decrease from the 62 labs discovered in Alaska in 2004 (ABADE, 2008). Although lab seizures have decreased within the state, there has been an increase in manufactured meth imported to Alaska from other cities (ABADE, 2008, p10). The NDIC anticipates an increase in small-scale meth production in the U.S. generally, due to the relocation of Mexican meth producers to California, and the emergence of smurfing operations that are able to circumvent precursor chemical laws to purchase pseudoephedrine (NDIC, 2009).

Information about rates of meth use among youth in Alaska is collected through the National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH) and the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS). Data from the NSDUH from 2002 to 2005 show that between 0.48 and 0.89% of youth ages 12 to 17 in Alaska reported using meth within the year they were surveyed (Office of Applied Studies, 2006). According to the 2007 YRBS (the latest available data), 4.6% of Alaska youth from grades nine to 12 reported trying meth at least once in their life time (Alaska Division of Public Health and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2007). The percent of youth reporting lifetime use in 2007 was highest for grades 10 and 11 (6.1% and 6.5 % respectively), and the percentages for these two grades were also higher than the national average (4.1 % for grade 10 and 5.4% for grade 11). Overall, 4.6% of Alaska and 4.4% of U.S. youth reported having used meth in their lifetime in the 2007 YRBS (Alaska Division of Public Health and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2007). In 2003 (the only other comparable meth data for the YRBS), YRBS data showed that rates of lifetime use among Alaskan youth had been lower than the national average (5.9% in Alaska versus 9.8% in the U.S) (Alaska Division of Public Health and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2003). Although meth use among youth in Alaska has decreased, it appears to now be slightly higher than the national average.

State, regional, and national information about rates of meth use among adults are collected by the Office of Applied Studies (through the NSDUH) and by Quest Diagnostics in the form of workplace positive results. NSDUH findings from 2002 to 2005 indicate that past year meth use, for both females and males, was more likely in the west region (which includes Alaska) than in other regions of the U.S (1.4 % versus 0.6% for the next highest rate in a given region) (Office of Applied Studies, 2005). Over this same time frame, 2.14 to 2.91% of Alaskans ages 18 to 25 reported using meth within the year they were surveyed (Office of Applied Studies, 2006). Adult meth use rates were higher in Alaska from 2002 to 2005 than the reported national average of 1.6 % from 2002 to 2004 (Office of Applied Studies, 2005). The ONDCP reported in 2006 that Quest data showed a general increase in Alaska for workplace positive rates for methamphetamine from 0.18% in January 2000 to 0.47% in May 2005. The rates then decreased to 0.25% in May 2006. Workplace positive trends in Alaska follow the same general trend as the national average over the same time frame (ONDCP, 2006). Although they did not comment on Alaska specifically, the NDIC reported that the national rates of workplace positive meth results continued to decrease from 2006 to the first quarter of 2008 (NDIC, 2009).

Another way to examine the meth problem in Alaska is to study meth-related treatment admissions and emergency room visits. While treatment admissions in Alaska have increased for meth (according to the Alaska Department of Health and Social Services and data collected from the Treatment Episode Data Set), meth-related emergency room visits in Alaska appear to be decreasing. Data from Treatment Episode Data Set (TEDS) for 1996 to 2003 indicate that primary meth admissions

for those ages 12 and older in Alaska had a slight, general increase over that time frame, from 8/100,000 in 1996 to 13/100,000 in 2003. This follows with the national trend over 1996 to 2006 (Office of Applied Studies, 2008, p3).[1] A recent report by the AME Project (2009b) reveals that the State of Alaska Department of Health and Social Services has reported an increase in the number of Alaskans seeking treatment for meth abuse from 2005 (10.3 admissions/month) to 2008 (22.5 admissions/month). In order to obtain figures on meth-related emergency room visits in Alaska, The AME Project contacted Providence Medical Center in Anchorage and the Central Peninsula General Hospital (two hospitals in Alaska) in 2009. Those hospitals reported either stable or decreasing numbers of emergency room visits that are meth-related. Providence reported 75 meth-related ER visits in 2005, 108 in 2006, 93 in 2007, and 88 in 2008, while Central Peninsula reported three in 2007, and five in 2008 (AME Project, 2009b).

According to the information that is available, meth production, use, and treatment are areas of concern for Alaska. Meth is listed by ABADE as one of the five primary substances of concern for Alaska. Although lab seizures have decreased in the state, meth is being imported to Alaska from other sources, and small-scale production in the U.S. in general is expected to increase as a result of the movement of Mexican producers, and the abilities of groups to develop ways of avoiding precursor chemical laws. As with the national average, meth use among Alaskan youth has decreased since 2003. However, whereas meth use among Alaskan youth was lower than the national average in 2003, it was slightly higher than the national average in 2007. Meth Use among 18 to 25 year olds in Alaska was also higher than the national average for that age group from 2002 to 2005. Workplace positive tests for meth in Alaska increased from 2000 to 2005 and dropped in 2006. The national trend is for workplace positive results to continue to decrease after 2006. Similar to the national trend, treatment admissions for meth in Alaska have been shown to be increasing, while meth-related emergency room visits in the state have either decreased or remained stable.

[1] TEDS information for Alaska is not available for 2004 to 2006 because the data is incomplete (As cited in Office of Applied Studies, 2008, p. 92).

Methods

The outcome evaluation encompasses two activities of the AME Project: the community education presentations and the anti-meth media campaign. Evaluation of the community education presentations involves surveys completed by volunteer attendees following community education presentations on the topic of methamphetamine. Evaluation of the media campaign was conducted by surveying two groups. First, a group administered survey was conducted with UAA Justice students who were exposed to radio advertisements/commercials generated by the AME Project. Second, a self-administered mail survey of 10,000 randomly sampled Alaskans was employed. A process evaluation was also undertaken in order to evaluate the processes utilized by the AME Project, the coordinator, and the statewide advisory committee to achieve project goals. The process evaluation took the form of structured telephone interviews with AME Project statewide advisory committee members.

Each component of the evaluation was approved by the University of Alaska Anchorage Institutional Review Board. Participation by individuals in the research project was voluntary and confidential. Written informed consent was obtained for the student survey portion of the media evaluation and for the process evaluation. For the community education presentation and mail survey components of the evaluation, the voluntary nature of participation was explained and participants signified their consent by completing the provided surveys. Minors were excluded from participation in all components of the evaluation.

Community Education Evaluation Survey

Community education presentations are one component of the prevention and educational efforts of the AME Project. Community presentations were provided by trained facilitators in the project's five designated boroughs (Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, Kenai and Mat-Su Valley). Places such as not-for-profit organizations and schools and universities were the typical presentation sites. Twenty-eight presenters received two days of training in fall 2008 related to the content and format of their community education presentations. A two-day follow up training was conducted in spring 2009. Each trained presenter was asked to provide community education presentations to a minimum of 100 community members for a total of at least 2,500 youth and/or adult attendees. The purpose of these presentations was to educate Alaskans about the dangers of meth, promote awareness of the local meth situation and to inform Alaskans about treatment options and resources in their local areas. These presentations were offered free-of-charge to interested community groups in each of the five areas between fall 2008 and summer 2009.

The research design for this component of the AME Project evaluation involved surveying a census of volunteer adult attendees of a community education presentation in their area. The survey was designed to provide feedback from attendees on the effectiveness of the presentation and whether it served its purpose of educating attendees. The central purpose of this component of the evaluation was to determine whether attendees experienced an increase in knowledge of meth issues following the AME Project's educational presentations.

In order to evaluate knowledge change on the part of attendees, a retrospective pretest posttest design was used. Attendees were asked, at the conclusion of the presentation, to rate their knowledge of

meth issues both before and after the presentation. The retrospective pretest design minimizes response shift bias where participants are presumed to inflate ratings of their self-reported knowledge, skills or abilities before a class or training so that post-ratings actually decline when participants come to realize how much there was to learn (Drennan and Hyde, 2008).

Surveys were chosen as the method of data collection because they provide an efficient way for gathering a large number of attendee's opinions and perceptions. The survey instrument is provided in Appendix A. A census of all attendees was employed, rather than a representative random sample, because it better suited the goals of the research study. Specifically, the goal of this component of the evaluation is to use feedback from attendees to strengthen future community education efforts on the topic of meth issues. Since the goal is not to generalize these findings to a larger population, random sampling methods were unnecessary and therefore were not employed.

Participants were volunteer attendees of community education presentations. All attendees 18 years of age and older were encouraged to participate in the research project by completing an evaluation survey. While no specific research participants were recruited for research purposes, the grant funding for these community education presentations indicates that the target audience includes 18-25 year olds and their parents.

At the end of each community education presentation, presenters encouraged attendees to complete evaluation surveys. Presenters received training that outlined the importance of collecting data from participants regarding the presentations. Trainers were given instruction on providing evaluation surveys to presentation attendees and on collecting the anonymous surveys from the attendees who voluntarily chose to participate in evaluation research efforts. Site authorization allowing the post-presentation survey was secured by the trainers at the time they reserved the sites.

In addition to surveys, data was collected from event reports generated by the trained presenters. The event reports include the date of the presentation, presenter, location, and group presented to. The number of people attending the presentation, the number of evaluation surveys distributed, and the number of returned surveys is also provided on the event reports. The event report data allowed for the computation of a survey response rate, a determination of the number of attendees presented to by each presenter, and the generation of a mid-term rating summary for each presenter for review by the AME Project coordinator.

The data collected from the community education evaluation surveys and event reports were analyzed using SPSS for quantitative analysis and Excel for qualitative analysis. Qualitative analysis was conducted on responses to the open-ended survey question asking about the most valuable thing learned from the presentation. The quantitative analyses employed were largely descriptive in nature and included the calculation of frequencies and percentages.

The qualitative analysis of the open-ended item involved the development of an inductive thematic analysis that was based on a preliminary review of the first 267 presentation evaluation surveys. The thematic analysis formed the basis of the coding framework developed for further analysis of all evaluation surveys. All responses were deductively coded for the major themes that were found to be relevant in the initial thematic analysis. The process was an iterative one in that an undefined variable

was included in the coding framework to allow for inductive coding of additional themes that emerged throughout the coding process.

Thematic categories included the extent of the problem, a value statement made against meth (Meth Value Against), the dangers of meth, awareness, presentation quality, and call to action. When a comment was made in any of the predetermined categories, the participant was first coded as having made a response. Responses in any of the theme areas were then indicated by placing a one in the corresponding category. The Sum and Filter functions were used to determine the frequency of responses in each thematic area and to draw exemplary comments from within each theme. See Appendix B for the detailed coding framework.

Media Campaign Evaluation

Another component of the AME Project is an anti-meth print and radio media campaign. Evaluation efforts focused on the radio advertisement portion of the media campaign. The AME Project anti-meth radio ads were played on stations that reached each of the five designated areas (Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, Kenai and Mat-Su Valley). The target audience for these ads was people ages 18 to 25 years living in each of the five designated areas. The ads played from February 2009 to August 2009, in three separate segments. Each segment was a six-week period, during which the ads aired on alternating weeks (one week on and one week off). The projected average reach of the three week run for four of the five areas was 67.20% of listeners, ranging from 52% in Matanuska-Susitna to 80.80% in Anchorage. There were no available ratings data for the Fairbanks area. The 15 stations that aired the anti-meth ads can be organized by location and genre. In Anchorage and the Mat-Su valley the following stations aired the anti-meth ads: KASH (country), KDBZ (modern adult contemporary), KFAT (rhythmic contemporary hit radio), KGOT (contemporary hits), and KZND (alternative rock). In Kenai and Soldotna the following stations aired the anti-meth ads: KKIS (hot adult contemporary), KFSE (infused rock), KWHQ (hot country), and listeners can also pick up KASH and KFAT from Anchorage. In Juneau the following stations aired the anti-meth ads: KSUP (hot adult contemporary), KTKU (modern country), and KXLL (public radio station for pop and rock). In Fairbanks the following stations aired the anti-meth ads: KAKQ (top 40), KDJF (country), KIAK (country), and KWLF (contemporary hit radio).

Three different radio ads were developed for use in the AME Project media campaign, band story, bank teller, and North Slope. Band Story was a scenario about a band that was holding auditions for a new bass player because the previous bass player started using meth, “flaked out on gigs” and could no longer play guitar because he was “tweaking on meth.” The Bank Teller ad tells the story of a bank teller whose friend, Carrie, “got hooked on meth fast” and who was once pretty, but now shows signs of deteriorating from meth use. Carrie stopped showing up for work, was going to lose her job, and the bank teller does not hang out with her anymore. The North Slope ad is about a man who worked on the North Slope, one of the highest paying jobs in Alaska, but he tested positive in a work place drug test for using meth and was fired.

The media campaign evaluation involved surveying a group of students who were intentionally exposed to the ads as well as a mail survey to a random sample of 10,000 Alaskans living in each of the five designated areas of the project. The student and mail surveys are discussed in detail in this section.

Student survey.

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the radio advertisement portion of the media campaign, a group of UAA Justice students was surveyed following exposure to the AME Project radio ads. There were two main research objectives for this component of the evaluation. The first objective was to determine the perceptions of 18 to 25 year old UAA Justice students regarding the effects of meth, risks of meth relative to other drug use, effects of use, and ability of young adults to obtain meth in Alaskan communities. The second objective was to assess perceptions of 18 to 25 year old UAA Justice students regarding the main message, quality, impact, and appropriateness of the three radio ads for the target age group.

The research design involved a group administered survey to a convenience sample of UAA students taking Justice courses taught by the principal investigator for the AME Project evaluation. This sample was chosen because the media campaign had a target audience of 18 to 25 year olds. The intention was to gather data from 18 to 25 year olds as part of the related mail survey component of the media campaign evaluation. However, collecting data from students increased the likelihood that opinions, attitudes and perceptions regarding meth and the radio ads were collected from the target age group.

The surveys were administered to three separate Justice classes held on the same day in April 2009. Students were invited to complete the survey during their normally scheduled class. An announcement was made at the beginning of the class period describing the study and inviting voluntary participation. The student sample size was dependent on class attendance on the survey date, and the willingness of individual students to complete the survey. A copy of the survey is available in Appendix C.

Data from the completed student surveys was entered into SPSS and descriptive analyses including frequencies and percentages were performed. In many cases, results of descriptive analyses are reported for the 18 to 25 year old group of students as well as the entire group of survey participants.

Mail survey.

In a separate portion of the media campaign evaluation, a self-administered mail survey (similar to the one used in the exposed group student survey) was sent to 10,000 randomly selected Alaskans. The survey was designed to measure the number of people exposed to the AME Project media campaign and to assess their anti-drug (particularly meth) attitudes. The survey contained items regarding participants' perceptions of the relative risks of meth as well as accessibility and use by young adults aged 18 to 25 in their communities. This survey is one of the first comprehensive assessments of Alaskans' (in the participating communities) perceptions of meth. Until now, some of the only data collected includes a single item on the Alaska Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS) which asks respondents how many times they have used meth. The only people who take the YRBS and answer this question are high school students.

The research method for this component of the media campaign evaluation was a mixed mode mail and web survey involving a sample of individuals from each of the five designated areas described above. A representative random sample of people in the indicated areas was chosen for the purpose of generalizing results to the larger population of Alaskans living in those areas.

The random sample was purchased from InfoUSA as an Excel spread sheet containing mailing addresses. InfoUSA employs researchers who compile and update a database of millions of consumers and businesses across the United States from public records. Such data can be purchased for research and marketing purposes. The random sample requested from InfoUSA was limited to adults eighteen years and older. Of that group, 50% of the heads of household selected were to be male, and 50% were to be female. The sample was generated without regard to homeownership, gender, race, employment status, substance use or criminal justice involvement. Data collection for this portion of the media evaluation began in June, 2009, after the second set of radio ads finished airing and concluded in the first week of August.

There were three research objectives associated with this aspect of the evaluation. The first objective was to determine Alaskans' perceptions regarding the effects of meth, risks of meth relative to other drug use, and ability of young adults to obtain meth. The second objective was to determine how many people were exposed to anti-meth media messages provided via radio, print and internet. The third objective was to understand how perceptions of meth and anti-meth advertising differ between people living in the five locations involved in the AME Project and between those in and out of the target age group (18 to 25 year olds). The survey items are available in Appendix D.

Implementation of the survey followed the steps for a four-phase mail out survey as outlined in the Tailored Design Method (Dillman, 2007), while incorporating a mixed mode design that allowed participants to complete the survey online if they preferred. The web version of the survey employed a unique PIN log-in that restricted access to the survey to only those people who were included in the random sample. In the first mail out phase, all sampled individuals were mailed a prenotification letter informing them of the study, and a meth drug treatment and prevention and an educational resource sheet was included. No incentive was employed. In phase two, one week later, the sampled individuals were mailed a paper version of the mail survey, accompanied by a cover letter outlining our request for participation, survey usefulness, a confidentiality notice, a means to opt-out of the survey and future mailings, our appreciation, and a reiteration of the option to complete the survey on the web. In phase three, a postcard reminder of the importance of completing the survey, was sent to sampled individuals approximately ten days after phase two. In phase four, two weeks after phase three, a new cover letter and replacement mail survey were sent to the remaining individuals who either did not respond to the first three mail notifications or who did not request removal from the mail list.

Data from the completed mail surveys was entered into SPSS and analyses were largely descriptive including frequencies and percentages. For some of the data, results were presented by geographic area or demographic groups in addition to the entire population.

Process Evaluation

The AME Project is served by a statewide advisory committee comprised of individuals who have been appointed by their local borough/municipal Mayor. The advisory committee meets regularly with the AME Project Coordinator (AME Project website, 2009). The emphasis of the process evaluation is on the processes involving the AME Project, the coordinator, and the statewide advisory committee. The purpose of the process evaluation was to gather information about the AME Project

statewide advisory committee's perceptions of the project's goals and achievement, functionality of the statewide advisory committee, past and present successes, and recommendations for future improvement. This information was used to assess whether the AME Project has been implemented as intended and to determine the processes that have contributed to program outcomes. The results of this evaluation will be used for planning purposes to enhance the ability of the AME Project to achieve its goals by addressing the shared and unique meth-related issues brought forth by statewide advisory committee members representing the five designated areas and the AME Project coordinator.

The process evaluation addressed four main research questions. One area of interest was to identify the AME Project statewide advisory committee members' perceptions of project goals and the ability of the AME Project to achieve them. Secondly, the process evaluation was also a useful way of describing the effectiveness of the coordination and communication between the AME Project coordinator and the statewide advisory committee members. Third, the process evaluation assisted in determining the degree to which the AME Project and advisory committee respond to unique and shared meth-related issues across the five involved communities. Fourth, the results of the process evaluation offer a means of suggesting future direction for the AME Project and statewide advisory committee based on past and current successes and challenges.

Data collection for this process evaluation involved telephone interviews with a census of appointed Alaska Meth Education Project statewide advisory committee members. Telephone interviews were employed for data collection due to the location of statewide advisory committee members in the Mat-Su Valley, Kenai Peninsula, Juneau, Fairbanks, and Anchorage. It was not feasible for researchers to travel to the four communities outside of Anchorage. The structured, open-ended question format selected for the telephone interviews was appropriate based on the exploratory nature of this inquiry. The inquiry was exploratory due to the short time the statewide advisory committee has been operating (approximately two years) and to the fact that committee members have never before been asked about their perceptions of the AME Project, coordinator, or committee processes, and how these impact program outcomes.

There are approximately thirteen members on the AME Project statewide advisory committee, and one coordinator. The goal was to achieve a census of committee members. The statewide advisory committee members were selected for participation based on their committee membership. No demographic characteristics were involved in their selection. Interviews with the members of the committee took place in June and July 2009. Committee members were asked to provide their input on three aspects of the AME project: goals, the statewide advisory committee, and the past, present and future of the project. The interview schedule is provided in Appendix E.

Each interview was digitally recorded and then transcribed and imported to NVivo for coding and analysis. The first level of coding was an auto code that placed interviewee responses into nodes (themes) based on the interview questions. Each question node was then further defined as a tree node (sub-themes were identified) as themes were uncovered within the interviewees' answers. A few question nodes contained responses that intersected with responses from other question nodes. In these cases, the questions were collapsed, and related questions were coded to a single node. Collapsed questions include the project goals node, which was coded with the questions that asked for current and alternative project goals, as well as the question that asked for recommendations for future coordination

and communication efforts, which was coded into the nodes for the most important practices to retain or change for the AME coordinator and committee.

We now describe the results of the AME Program evaluation beginning with the outcome evaluation which included community education presentations, a student survey and a mail survey. We will then present findings from the process evaluation involving interviews with AME Project statewide advisory committee members.

Community Education Presentations

The AME Project set a goal of training 25 presenters to provide 250 presentations to 2,500 attendees. The data collection period for the community education presentation portion of the evaluation ended Aug 7, 2009. Only data collected from presentations that were given on or before this date are included in the following analyses. Trained community presenters continued to conduct presentations and relayed information to the AME Project Coordinator. By August 31, 107 presentations had been conducted and were attended by 2,574 individuals. It is also noteworthy that the time period for utilizing SAMHSA funding awarded to the AME Project was extended, so some presenters will continue conducting presentations after the evaluation report has been submitted.

Although the AME Project set a goal of training 25 presenters, some of the agencies involved in the AME Project provided more than one individual for training. As a result, the presentation workload was shared by team presenters. This resulted in a total of 28 different presenters who gave individual and/or team community education presentations. The 28 presenters provided a total of 146 presentations (Table 1). Two individual presenters gave ten or more presentations: Presenter A (13) and Presenter E (11). Eight individual presenters, and one team of presenters, reported overall attendance levels of more than 100 attendees at their presentations. The greatest number of attendees for any presenter was 206 (Presenter A).

Table 1. Frequency of Presentations and Attendees at Community Education Anti-meth Presentations by Presenter

Column percentages

	Frequency of Presentations		Frequency of Attendees	
	N	%	N	%
Single presenter				
A	13	8.9 %	206	9.3 %
B	3	2.1	205	9.2
C	9	6.2	120	5.4
D	6	4.1	115	5.2
E	11	7.5	112	5.0
F	9	6.2	102	4.6
G	9	6.2	101	4.5
H	8	5.5	101	4.5
I	3	2.1	98	4.4
J	4	2.7	95	4.3
K	5	3.4	67	3.0
L	5	3.4	64	2.9
M	4	2.7	59	2.6
N	5	3.4	46	2.1
O	4	2.7	44	2.0
P	8	5.5	41	1.8
Q	2	1.4	28	1.3
R	3	2.1	24	1.1
S	3	2.1	19	0.9
T	3	2.1	16	0.7
U	1	0.7	12	0.5
V	1	0.7	4	0.2
Team presenters				
A	9	6.2 %	197	8.8 %
B	6	4.1	83	3.7
C	2	1.4	82	3.7
D	3	2.1	50	2.2
E	1	0.7	40	1.8
F	1	0.7	35	1.6
G	1	0.7	26	1.2
H	1	0.7	20	0.9
I	3	2.1	15	0.7
Total	**146**		**2,227**	

Source of data: *AME Project Presentations (2008-2009)*

AME Project presentations were provided to a variety of types of organizations. Community and not-for-profit groups were the most common type of organizations that presentations were provided to (33%), followed by schools and universities (27%) (Table 2). Presentations were also provided at government departments or agencies (13%), correctional centers and facilities (10%), businesses (8%), and hotels and cafés (6%).

Table 2. Frequency of Presentations by Type of Organization

Column percentages

Organization Type	Frequency of Presentations N	%
Community or not-for-profit	47	32.6 %
School or university	39	27.1
Government agency or department	19	13.2
Correctional Center or facility	14	9.7
Business	12	8.3
Hotel or café	8	5.6
Other	5	3.5
Total	**144**	

Source of data: *AME Project Presentations (2008-2009)*

The AME Project anti-meth community education presentations were given to both youth and adult audiences in each of the five regions involved with the AME Project. While the number of youth attendees at each presentation was reported by AME Project presenters, the youth were not given the opportunity to complete the evaluation surveys. Participation of youth in the evaluation surveys would have required parental consent. As it was not feasible to obtain parental consent at the time of the presentations, youth could not be asked to complete the survey. As a result of the exclusion of youth from the evaluations, much of the results presented in this section are for adult attendees only.

Out of a total 144 presentations for which the audience type was provided, 63% were given to adult audiences and 23% percent were given to youth audiences (Table 3). Some of the presentations were given to audiences that were a mix of youth and adults, and in some cases the composition of the audience was unclear (youth may or may not have been in attendance) due to the method of reporting by the presenter. Six percent of the presentations involved both youth and adult attendees, and in nine percent of the cases, it was not clear whether youth were in attendance. Across the 146 presentations that were provided, a total of 2,227 people were reported by presenters to have been in attendance at the conclusion of the data collection period.

Overall, 1,201 attendees (54%) were adults and 636 (29%) were youth. An additional 390 attendees (18%) were a combination of youth and adults.

Table 3. Frequency of Presentations and Attendees at Community Education Anti-meth Presentations by Audience Type

Column percentages

	Frequency of presentations		Frequency of attendees	
Audience	N	%	N	%
Adult	90	62.5 %	1,201	53.9 %
Youth	33	22.9	636	28.6
Unclear	13	9.0	288	12.9
Combination	8	5.6	102	4.6
Total	**144**		**2,227**	

Source of data: *AME Project Presentations (2008-2009)*

The city presentations were given in was known for 95% of all attendees. Fairbanks was the city with the largest number of attendees overall (21%) (Table 4). Other cities with large percentages of attendees include Wasilla (17%), Anchorage (16%), and Soldotna (12%). Presentations in Nome, Healy, and Yakutat each had less than 1% of all attendees.

Table 4. Frequency of Attendees at Community Education Anti-meth Presentations by City

Column percentages

	Frequency of all attendees	
Location	N	%
Fairbanks City	452	21.4 %
Wasilla	350	16.5
Anchorage City	345	16.3
Soldotna	258	12.2
Homer	206	9.7
Juneau City	138	6.5
Kenai	112	5.3
Palmer	53	2.5
Nikiski	38	1.8
Sterling	36	1.7
North Pole	29	1.4
Kodiak	26	1.2
Eagle River	25	1.2
Namcat	23	1.1
Nome	13	0.6
Healy	7	0.3
Yakutat	5	0.2
Total	**2,116**	

Source of data: *AME Project Presentations (2008-2009)*

Among attendees who could be identified with a particular region, 32% were located on Kenai Peninsula (Table 5). Twenty-four percent of attendees were in Fairbanks, 19% were in Mat-Su, and 19% were in Anchorage. A smaller percentage of attendees were located in Juneau (7%). Twenty-nine percent of all presentations for which a region was provided were held on the Kenai Peninsula, and 24% were in Fairbanks. Smaller percentages of the presentations were held in Anchorage (19%), Mat-Su (16%), and Juneau (12%).

Table 5. Frequency of Attendees and Presentations by Location

Column percentages

	Frequency of all attendees		Frequency of presentations	
Region	N	%	N	%
Kenai Peninsula	676	31.9 %	39	28.9 %
Fairbanks	501	23.7	32	23.7
Mat-Su	403	19.0	22	16.3
Anchorage	393	18.6	26	19.3
Juneau	143	6.8	16	11.9
Total	**2,116**		**135**	

Source of data: *AME Project Presentations (2008-2009)*

Among adult attendees (for adult-only audiences), 36% attended presentations on the Kenai Peninsula, and 24% were in Anchorage. Mat-Su (9%) and Juneau (8%) had lower percentages of attendees from adult-only audiences. Youth audiences were more likely to be in Mat-Su (49% of all attendees in youth-only audiences), and Fairbanks (27%). Overall, youth attendance was lower in Anchorage (7%) and Juneau (3%) (Table 6).

Table 6. Frequency of Youth and Adult Attendees at Community Education Anti-meth Presentations by Location

Column percentages

	Frequency of youth attendees		Frequency of adult attendees		Total	
Region	N	%	N	%	N	%
Kenai Peninsula	92	14.9 %	402	36.3 %	494	28.7 %
Fairbanks	163	26.5	243	22.0	406	23.6
Mat-Su	300	48.7	103	9.3	403	23.4
Anchorage	41	6.7	268	24.2	309	17.9
Juneau	20	3.2	91	8.2	111	6.4
Total	**616**		**1,107**		**1,723**	

Source of data: *AME Project Presentations (2008-2009)*

Evaluations were collected for presentations given to audiences that were wholly or partially adult, and only from attendees aged 18 years and older. Overall, 965 evaluations were completed. Evaluation surveys were collected for 99 presentations (68%). Presentations that evaluations were not collected for were either instances where the presenter was not able to give out the surveys (due to lack of time, impromptu presentations, etc.), or presentations that were attended by youth-only audiences.

Of the adults who completed the evaluation survey and provided their age, 28% were in the age group 36 to 49 years and 18% were ages 18 to 25 years (Table 7). Those ages 65 and older made up the smallest age group of adult attendees (8%).

Table 7. Age of Adult Attendees at Community Education Anti-meth Presentations

Column percentages

	Attendees	
Age group	N	%
18 to 25	168	18.0 %
26 to 35	211	22.6
36 to 49	260	27.9
50 to 64	223	23.9
65 and older	71	7.6
Total	**933**	

Source of data: *AME Project Presentations (2008-2009)*

The majority of adult attendees (71%) identified themselves as white, and 15% self-identified as Alaska Native (Table 8). Self-identified Asians (2%) and Hispanics (2%) were the groups least in attendance at the community education presentations.

Table 8. Race of Adult Attendees at Community Education Anti-meth Presentations

Column percentages

	Attendees	
Race	N	%
White	676	71.2 %
Alaska Native	138	14.5
Multi-race	58	6.1
Black	28	3.0
Asian	14	1.5
Hispanic	14	1.5
Other	21	2.2
Total	**949**	

Source of data: *AME Project Presentations (2008-2009)*

The majority of adult attendees (84%) reported positively about the facilities used for the presentations. Fifty-six percent of the attendees strongly agreed and 28% agreed that the physical facilities used for the presentation they attended were appropriate (Table 9). Six percent of attendees disagreed or strongly disagreed that the facilities were appropriate, and nine percent were neutral.

Table 9. Ratings of Physical Facilities for Community Education Anti-meth Presentations

Column percentages

	Attendees	
Physical facilities appropriate	N	%
Strongly agree	532	55.9 %
Agree	268	28.2
Neutral	83	8.7
Disagree	23	2.4
Strongly disagree	31	3.3
Not applicable	14	1.5
Total	**951**	

Source of data: *AME Project Presentations (2008-2009)*

Most members (66%) strongly agreed that the community education presentation met its stated objectives (Table 10). An additional 25% agreed that the objectives of the presentation were met. Four percent of the attendees either disagreed or strongly disagreed that the objectives of the presentation were met, and four percent were neutral.

Table 10. Ratings of Objectives Met by Community Education Anti-meth Presentations

Column percentages

	Attendees	
Met objectives	N	%
Strongly agree	627	65.6 %
Agree	240	25.1
Neutral	42	4.4
Disagree	6	0.6
Strongly disagree	33	3.5
Not applicable	8	0.8
Total	**956**	

Source of data: *AME Project Presentations (2008-2009)*

The content of the presentations was reported by attendees as being relevant to them. Of the attendees, 47% strongly agreed and 26% agreed that the community education presentation was relevant

to them (Table 11). Thirteen percent of attendees were neutral, and 10% either disagreed or strongly disagreed that the presentation was relevant to them.

Table 11. Ratings of Community Education Anti-meth Presentation Relevance

Column percentages

	Attendees	
Presentation was relevant	N	%
Strongly agree	449	47.0 %
Agree	251	26.3
Neutral	128	13.4
Disagree	31	3.2
Strongly disagree	69	7.2
Not applicable	27	2.8
Total	**955**	

Source of data: *AME Project Presentations (2008-2009)*

Overall, the community education presentations met the expectations of attendees. Eighty-six percent of the attendees at the community presentations either agreed or strongly agreed that the presentation met their personal expectations. Six percent either disagreed or strongly disagreed that their personal expectations were met (Table 12).

Table 12. Ratings of Expectations Met by Community Education Anti-meth Presentations

Column percentages

	Attendees	
Met expectations	N	%
Strongly agree	551	57.7 %
Agree	266	27.9
Neutral	71	7.4
Disagree	19	2.0
Strongly disagree	35	3.7
Not applicable	13	1.4
Total	**955**	

Source of data: *AME Project Presentations (2008-2009)*

The majority of attendees (89%) reported that they would recommend the AME Project community education presentation to others. When asked if they would recommend the community education anti-meth presentation to others, 71% of attendees strongly agreed, and 19% agreed that they would (Table 13). Five percent disagreed or strongly disagreed that they would recommend the presentation to others.

Table 13. Likelihood of Recommending Community Education Anti-meth Presentation to Others

Column percentages

	Attendees	
Would recommend to others	N	%
Strongly agree	678	70.8 %
Agree	177	18.5
Neutral	48	5.0
Disagree	9	0.9
Strongly disagree	34	3.6
Not applicable	11	1.1
Total	**957**	

Source of data: *AME Project Presentations (2008-2009)*

Attendees were asked to rate their knowledge of meth before and after their attendance at the AME Project community education presentation. Attendees were provided with a scale of knowledge that ranged from poor (1) to excellent (5). Attendees' level of knowledge about meth increased overall after attending the community education presentation. Prior to hearing the presentation, 31% of adult attendees reported their level of knowledge to be either poor or below average. After hearing the presentation, only 2% of attendees reported their knowledge about meth to be poor or below average. The percentage of people who reported having average knowledge about meth decreased from 35% before the presentation to 10% after the presentation (Table 14). Thirty-four percent of attendees reported their level of knowledge as above average or excellent prior to attending the community presentation, and 53% reported this level of knowledge after the presentation. Higher self-reported levels of knowledge among attendees prior to the presentation may in part be attributable to the number of presentations that were given to professional and service groups.

Table 14. Frequency of Attendees' Knowledge Ratings Before and After Community Education Anti-meth Presentations

Column percentages

	Before presentation		After presentation		Change	
Knowledge	N	%	N	%	N	%
Poor (1)	124	12.9 %	9	0.9 %	-115	-12.0 %
Below average (2)	169	17.6	9	0.9	-160	-16.6
Average (3)	334	34.7	92	9.6	-242	-25.2
Above average (4)	224	23.3	417	43.3	193	20.1
Excellent (5)	103	10.7	423	44.0	320	33.3
Not applicable	8	0.8	10	1.0	2	0.2
Total	**962**		**960**			

Source of data: *AME Project Presentations (2008-2009)*

Most attendees reported their knowledge of meth to have increased by one or more points after hearing the AME Project community education presentation. The largest increase in knowledge was for those who reported an increase of one point (Table 15). Many attendees reported a knowledge increase of two points, and fewer reported increases of three and four points. A number of attendees reported that their level of knowledge about meth did not change, and this may in part be related to the number of attendees who rated their knowledge as already above average or excellent prior to the presentation. A small number of attendees reported a decrease in knowledge about meth after hearing the presentation. An individual's report of a decrease in knowledge could be the result of hearing information in the AME Project presentation that conflicted with his/her prior knowledge.

Table 15. Change in Knowledge Following Community Education Anti-meth Presentations

Column percentages

	Attendees		
Knowledge change	N	%	
-4	1	0.1	%
-3	2	0.2	
-2	4	0.4	
-1	7	0.7	
0	250	26.0	
1	328	34.2	
2	222	23.1	
3	104	10.8	
4	42	4.4	
Total	**960**		

Source of data: *AME Project Presentations (2008-2009)*

The community education presentation evaluation survey included one open-ended question that asked attendees, "the most valuable thing I learned about methamphetamine from this presentation was…" A total of 733 attendees in the presentations completed the open-ended question on the evaluation form. Attendees' responses were analyzed with an inductive process and thematic categories were developed through a preliminary review of the first 267 responses received. All responses were deductively coded for the major themes that were developed in the preliminary review and the process remained iterative to allow for new themes to emerge from the data. There were six thematic categories developed from attendees' responses: *dangers of meth*, *awareness*, *extent of the problem*, *anti-meth attitudes*, *responsibility*, and *presentation quality*.

Dangers of Meth

The most common point of interest for attendees was the *dangers of meth* (219 comments). Comments were placed in the dangers of meth theme when they related to the personal, community, and environmental dangers or effects caused by meth use and production. The dangers to children and those who come in contact with or live in homes where meth is produced were also included in this theme.

The *dangers to self* sub-theme was used when comments were made about the individual-level effects of meth such as addiction, physical consequences of use, health, and psychological effects. The *dangers to others* sub-theme was used when the comment related to the effects and consequences of use and production for families, communities, the environment, children, etc. Within the *dangers of meth* theme, 133 comments related to the sub-theme *dangers to self,* and were most frequently about addiction and the effects of meth on the body and brain. Examples include:

"How extremely addictive it is!"
"What meth can do and how it affects the body, mind, soul and spirit."

Seventy-two attendees made comments that fit under the sub-theme *dangers to community*. Comments within this sub-theme included:

"It can affect everyone in your community."
"How much it affected others; people in the community and children, which is extremely important to know."

Other comments in the dangers of meth theme related to both the *dangers to self* and *dangers to community* sub-themes (21comments), and to the dangers of meth generally without further description.

Awareness

Awareness was the second-most common theme in attendee responses to the open-ended question. The *awareness* theme was used to indicate when attendees' commented that the presentation has given them the ability to recognize meth itself, users of meth, and meth lab operations. In addition, this theme was used for awareness of local resources, treatment options, state laws, and current efforts in research, education, etc.

This theme consisted of 177 comments that can be divided into five sub-themes: *drug- user- product awareness, treatment, current measures, Alaska laws* and, *Resources*. Ninety-six comments were made about the sub-theme *drug- user- product awareness*. These comments most often referred to the signs of use and production, knowing how meth is used and produced, and what meth looks like and what its street names are. Attendees commented:

"What it consists of, signs of use, importance of knowledge."
"[I] can recognize usage within my workplace and family."
"Additional names for the product and signs to look for in users."
"What chemicals actually are used to manufacture the drug and what it does to your body."

Forty-five attendees made comments about the sub-theme *treatment*. Comments in this theme included the ability to treat meth users, the idea that people can recover, and the types and challenges of treatment. One attendee stated, "Was that treatment can help. I had heard in [20]05 there was no hope in help." Another person wrote, "I didn't realize true recovery can take 10 years! It helps me understand my clients better." Twelve comments in the awareness theme were about the sub-theme *current measures* (such as prevention and research). Seven comments fit within the sub-theme *Alaska laws*, and

six comments were made that fit within the sub-theme *resources*. Other comments were made about awareness without further detail, and about multiple sub-themes.

Extent of the Problem

Extent of the problem was the next most frequently cited theme in attendee comments. Responses to the open-ended question were placed in the *extent of problem* thematic category when they referred to the extent of the problem that meth presents. This includes statements that mention learning about the amount of meth use in local communities or in the state of Alaska, the use and prevalence of meth generally, existence of local labs, the amount of imported meth, the availability and ease of access to ingredients, and the extent of meth use by particular age groups. There were a total of 128 comments made in this theme. Fifty-one comments were in the sub- theme *extent of state/local meth problem*. Attendees' comments in this sub-theme include:

"The scope of the problem in my state. I thought Alaska was somewhat shielded by distance and isolation from access to drugs."
"How prevalent the meth problem is in our immediate community."

Forty-six comments were about the *widespread-nature of the problem in the United States*. One statement in this sub-theme was, "How pervasive [meth is] and why the drug became so engrained in American lives." A further eighteen comments were in the sub-theme *extent of meth production problem*, and thirteen were under the sub-theme *extent of meth use by age*. Comments about age generally related to use by young people and those ages 18-25.

Anti-meth Attitudes

The *anti-meth attitudes* theme was used to indicate whether listening to the presentation had encouraged the participant to make a value statement either against meth itself or against the use of meth. Seventy-five attendees made comments that fit within the theme *anti-meth attitudes*. Of these, 40 were indications that the information in the presentation convinced the attendee not to try or use meth. Examples of this sub-theme include such statements as:

"I don't do meth. With this presentation I wouldn't start."
"Never tried it. Now I never will."
"Don't ever start and you don't have to stop."
"That I should never use it."

Another 19 anti-meth value statements were made about the sub-theme *effects of meth*. This sub-theme is illustrated by the statement, "Its killing kids, ruining people forever". Sixteen additional comments were made about meth having such *negative qualities* as bad, scary, nasty, awful, etc. An example of this sub-theme is one attendee's statement that, "[Meth is] really scary".

Responsibility

The thematic category *responsibility* was coded when the attendee's comment suggested they felt either a personal or collective responsibility for being more active in the community, lobbying politicians, educating others, and talking to children about the dangers of meth.

Forty-nine comments were made by attendees about the theme *responsibility*. Of these, 20 belong to the sub-theme *call to action*, and 19 to the sub-theme *talk to children*. Examples of these include, "We need to be more proactive within our community" and, "Learning the importance of talking and educating my children very early."

Presentation Quality

The *presentation quality* thematic category was used when attendees commented about the quality of presentation, including whether participant thought the presentation was good or bad overall or provided new or useful information, as well as comments about visual or other aids used in the presentation.

The theme *presentation quality* had 72 comments that were divided among three sub-themes: *presentation negative*, *presentation positive* and, *presentation neutral*. Attendees whose comments fit within the *presentation neutral* sub-theme (19 comments) indicated that they did not learn anything new from the presentation. The *presentation negative* sub-theme (seven comments) related more to content then to presenters themselves. As one attendee stated, "This reflects on content, not the presenter - the presenter was fine. I just don't like the shock value training". The *presentation positive* sub-theme (46 comments) included statements such as,

"Everything was valuable. A very fantastic and informative presentation."
"This class was a great refresher course on meth."
"The presenter was knowledgeable and did a great job. This is a[n] eye opener."

Student Survey

A total of 58 students made up the student exposed group survey population. It is important to remember that the convenience sample of students enrolled in one of three selected UAA Justice courses are not a random sample of 18 to 25 year old individuals in Alaska. The views of young adult students summarized here should not be presumed to represent the views of 18 to 25 year old individuals generally. Over three-quarters of the students (76%) reported their age while 24% of students left this item blank. Of the students who reported their age, 89% indicated they were 18 to 25 years old, 7% indicated they were 26 to 35 years old, and 5% indicated they were 36 to 49 years old (Table 16). None of the students reported being less than 18 years or more than 49 years of age. The average age of students was 22.39 years (s = 5.5, results not shown). Due to the fact that several students did not report their age and because the target age group for the media campaign is 18 to 25 year old young adults, many of the analyses will be provided separately for all students who provided data and for the subgroup of 18 to 25 year old students.

Table 16. Age of Student Survey Participants

Column percentages

	Students	
Age group	N	%
18 to 25	39	88.6 %
26 to 35	3	6.8
36 to 49	2	4.5
Total	**44**	

Source of data: *AME Project Student Survey (2009)*

Thirty-eight of the 58 students who completed the survey reported their gender. For students who reported their gender, 53% of 18 to 25 year old students and 52% of all students were female (Table 17). Forty-seven percent of 18 to 25 year old students and 48% of all students were male.

Table 17. Gender of Student Survey Participants

Column percentages

	18-25 Year old students		All students	
Gender	N	%	N	%
Female	20	52.6 %	23	52.3 %
Male	18	47.4	21	47.7
Total	**38**		**44**	

Source of data: *AME Project Student Survey (2009)*

For both groups of students (18 to 25 and all students surveyed), radio ads were the most frequently reported medium in which they saw or heard anti-meth advertising recently (39%) (Table 18). These radio ads may or may not have been the AME Project anti-meth radio ads. The next most frequently reported medium in which they saw or heard anti-meth ads was "other" (37% of 18 to 25 year old students and 39% of all students). For those who responded to the open ended item asking students to describe the other places they saw anti-meth ads, most indicated they saw them on television. Other less frequently reported places students reported seeing ads included bar bathrooms (Gallos, Peanut Farm, and Long Branch), Off the Rocks Theatre, and on t-shirts.

Table 18. Frequency of Students Who Saw or Heard Anti-meth Advertising in Various Media

Row percentages

	18 to 25 Year old students							All students						
	Yes		No		Unsure			Yes		No		Unsure		
Media	N	%	N	%	N	%	**Total**	N	%	N	%	N	%	**Total**
Radio ads	15	38.5 %	21	53.8 %	3	7.7 %	**39**	22	38.6 %	26	45.6 %	9	15.8 %	**57**
Printed poster ads	5	13.5	28	75.7	4	10.8	**37**	10	17.9	37	66.1	9	16.1	**56**
Newspaper ads	3	7.9	28	73.7	7	18.4	**38**	4	7.1	39	69.6	13	23.2	**56**
Internet ads	9	23.7	27	71.1	2	5.3	**38**	16	28.6	37	66.1	3	5.4	**56**
Other ads	13	37.1	18	51.4	4	11.4	**35**	20	38.5	25	48.1	7	13.5	**52**

Source of data: *AME Project Student Survey (2009)*

A smaller percentage of students reported having seen or heard meth information that was not advertising. Of the 18 to 25 year old students, 39% reported seeing or hearing non-advertising information and 47% of all students reported seeing or hearing non-advertising information (Table 19). It must be remembered that since these students were taking classes with the principal investigator on the AME project evaluation, the non-ad meth information they mentioned seeing and/or hearing may include information about meth that was presented in class.

Table 19. Frequency of Students Who Saw or Heard Meth Information that was Not Advertising

Row percentages

	Yes		No		
Age groups who saw/heard non-ad meth information	N	%	N	%	**Total**
18 to 25 year old students	15	38.5 %	24	61.5 %	**39**
All students	27	46.6	31	53.4	**58**

Source of data: *AME Project Student Survey (2009)*

Students were asked about sources of meth information. The most frequently reported source of meth information was the internet (82% of 18 to 25 year old students and 85% of all students) (Table 20). Other commonly reported sources of meth information for students included the University Health and Counseling Center (31% of 18 to 25 year old students and 28% of all students), their friends (26% of 18 to 25 year old students and 31% of all students), and newspapers or local papers (18% of 18 to 25 year old students and 19% of all students). Less frequently reported sources of meth information were the radio (5% for both groups) and magazines (5% of 18 to 25 year old students and 7% of all students). When asked about any other sources of meth information, students reported school, books and journals, family, friends, and personnel from drug enforcement and drug abuse treatment agencies.

Table 20. Sources of Information about Meth

Row percentages

	18 to 25 Year old students			All students		
Sources of meth info	N	%	**Total**	N	%	**Total**
Friends	10	25.6 %	**39**	18	31.0 %	**58**
University health and counseling center	12	30.8	**39**	16	27.6	**58**
Internet, websites	32	82.1	**39**	49	84.5	**58**
Television	6	15.4	**39**	9	15.5	**58**
Radio	2	5.1	**39**	3	5.2	**58**
Magazines	2	5.1	**39**	4	6.9	**58**
Newspapers or local papers	7	17.9	**39**	11	19.0	**58**

Source of data: *AME Project Student Survey (2009)*

Students were asked to rate the value of various sources of information generally. The top three information sources rated as valuable or highly valuable included television news (80% of 18 to 25 year old students and 71% of all students), ads at school (72% of 18 to 25 year old students and 64% of all students), and radio (64% of 18 to 25 year old students and 59% of all students) (Table 21). The top three information sources rated as invaluable or highly invaluable included television commercials (24% of 18 to 25 year old students and 28% of all students), posters on buses and bus stops (23% of 18 to 25 year old students and 28% of all students) and outdoor billboards (21% of 18 to 25 year old students and 28% of all students).

Table 21. Student Value Ratings for Information Sources

Row percentages

	Doesn't apply to me (5)	Highly invaluable (4)	Invaluable (3)	Valuable (2)	Highly valuable (1)	Neither valuable nor invaluable (0)	Average score
Sources of information for 18 to 25 year old students							
TV commercials	5.3 %	13.2 %	10.5 %	28.9 %	10.5 %	31.6 %	1.8
TV news	2.6	2.6	2.6	56.4	23.1	12.8	1.7
Print ads in newspapers or magazines	2.6	2.6	15.4	38.5	12.8	28.2	1.6
Outdoor billboards	12.8	2.6	17.9	25.6	7.7	33.3	1.9
Posters on buses and bus stops	2.6	2.6	20.5	30.8	10.3	33.3	1.6
Radio	--	5.1	7.7	53.8	10.3	23.1	1.6
Ads at school	--	5.1	5.1	61.5	10.3	17.9	1.7
Ads at places you hang out at	2.6	5.1	10.3	30.8	10.3	41.0	1.4
Local not-for-profit groups	7.7	5.1	7.7	41.0	10.3	28.2	1.7
Sources of information for all students							
TV commercials	5.3 %	14.0 %	14.0 %	26.3 %	12.3 %	28.1 %	1.9
TV news	3.4	3.4	8.6	46.6	24.1	13.8	1.7
Print ads in newspapers or magazines	1.7	5.2	15.5	34.5	12.1	31.0	1.6
Outdoor billboards	10.3	6.9	20.7	24.1	5.2	32.8	2.0
Posters on buses and bus stops	1.7	5.2	22.4	27.6	12.1	31.0	1.6
Radio	--	6.9	10.3	48.3	10.3	24.1	1.7
Ads at school	--	6.9	6.9	50.0	13.8	22.4	1.6
Ads at places you hang out at	1.7	5.2	10.3	29.3	10.3	43.1	1.3
Local not-for-profit groups	6.9	5.2	10.3	36.2	13.8	27.6	1.7

Source of data: *AME Project Student Survey (2009)*

Students were asked how frequently they listen to the radio and the majority reported that they listen to the radio quite frequently. Of the 18 to 25 year old students, 72% reported listening to the radio every day or almost every day (Table 22). Of the entire group of students who completed the survey, 74% reported listening to the radio every day or almost every day. The next most frequently reported category was listening to the radio one to three times a week (18% of 18 to 25 year old students and 14% of all students).

Table 22. Frequency of Student Radio Listening

Column percentages

Frequency of radio listening	18 to 25 Year old students N	18 to 25 Year old students %	All students N	All students %
Every day or almost every day	28	71.8 %	43	74.1 %
1-3 times a week	7	17.9	8	13.8
1-3 times a month	2	5.1	3	5.2
Less than once a month	--	--	1	1.7
Not at all	2	5.1	3	5.2
Total	**39**		**58**	

Source of data: *AME Project Student Survey (2009)*

Before the AME project radio ads were played for students in the classroom, the students were asked how frequently they had heard any radio commercials or ads about meth in the last six months in Alaska. Student reports of the frequency with which they heard anti-meth ads on the radio may or may not include AME project anti-meth ads. Students most frequently reported hearing anti-meth ads one to three times a month (28% of 18 to 25 year old students and 33% of all students) (Table 23). Many students also reported hearing anti-meth ads on the radio less than once a month (28% of 18 to 25 year old students and 26% of all students). There were several students who reported that they had not heard any anti-meth ads on the radio (26% of 18 to 25 year old students and 24% of all students). Few students reported hearing anti-meth ads on the radio every day or almost every day (8% of 18 to 25 year old students and 5% of all students) and none of the students reported hearing anti-meth ads on the radio more than once a day.

Table 23. Frequency of Students Who Heard any Radio Ads Before Intentional Exposure

Column percentages

Frequency heard meth ads	18 to 25 Year old students N	18 to 25 Year old students %	All students N	All students %
More than once a day	--	-- %	--	-- %
Every day or almost every day	3	7.7	3	5.2
1-3 times a week	4	10.3	7	12.1
1-3 times a month	11	28.2	19	32.8
Less than once a month	11	28.2	15	25.9
Not at all	10	25.6	14	24.1
Total	**39**		**58**	

Source of data: *AME Project Student Survey (2009)*

After hearing the three AME project radio ads, students were asked if they had previously heard the ads. The AME project radio ad that most students reported hearing was band story (33% of 18 to 25 year old students and 39% of all students). The bank teller was the next most frequently heard radio advertisement. Twenty-seven percent of the 18 to 25 year old students and 34% of all students reported hearing the radio ad about the bank teller (Table 24). A smaller number of students reported hearing the North Slope ad (18% of 18 to 25 year old students and 23% of all students). Only one of three complete ad cycles had taken place by the time the students were surveyed. In other words, the AME Project anti-meth radio ads had only aired for a total of three weeks.

Table 24. Frequency of Students Who Heard AME Project Radio Ads Before Intentional Exposure

Row percentages

	18 to 25 Year old students							All students						
	Yes		No		Unsure			Yes		No		Unsure		
Heard radio ad	N	%	N	%	N	%	**Total**	N	%	N	%	N	%	**Total**
Band story	12	33.3 %	22	61.1 %	2	5.6 %	**36**	21	38.9 %	31	57.4 %	2	3.7 %	**54**
Bank teller	10	27.0	24	64.9	3	8.1	**37**	19	33.9	34	60.7	3	5.4	**56**
North Slope	7	18.4	29	76.3	2	5.3	**38**	13	22.8	42	73.7	2	3.5	**57**

Source of data: *AME Project Student Survey (2009)*

Students were asked to report on the quality of the three AME project anti-meth ads that were played for them in the classroom. The students reported overwhelmingly that the band story ad was clearly about meth and clearly an anti-drug ad. Ninety-five percent of students reported that the band story ad was clearly about meth (Table 25). Ninety-five percent of 18 to 25 year olds and 93% of all students reported that the band story ad was clearly an anti-drug advertisement. The majority of students reported that the band story radio ad was a good ad for the target group of 18 to 25 year olds (79% of 18 to 25 year old students and 83% of all students). When asked to compare the band story ad to other anti-drug ads on the radio 47% of students in both groups (18 to 25 year olds and all students) reported that the band story ad was better than most radio anti-drug ads while 53% of students in both groups reported that the band story ad was not better than most radio anti-drug ads.

Regarding the bank teller ad, 87% of 18 to 25 year old students and 88% of all students reported that the ad was clearly about meth. Ninety-two percent of 18 to 25 year olds and 91% of all students reported that the bank teller ad was clearly an anti-drug advertisement. The majority of students reported that the bank teller radio ad was a good ad for the target group of 18 to 25 year olds (71% of 18 to 25 year old students and 72% of all students). When asked to compare the bank teller ad to other anti-drug ads on the radio 40% of the 18 to 25 year old students and 46% of all students reported that the bank teller ad was better than most radio anti-drug ads. Sixty-one percent of 18 to 25 year old students and 54% of all students reported that the bank teller ad was not better than most anti-drug ads on the radio.

The students reported that the North Slope ad was clearly an anti-drug ad (95% of 18 to 25 year old students and 91% of all students). Regarding the North Slope ad, 84% of 18 to 25 year old students and 88% of all students reported that the ad was clearly about meth. The majority of students reported that the North Slope radio ad was a good ad for the target group of 18 to 25 year olds (74% of 18 to 25 year old students and 72% of all students). When asked to compare the North Slope ad to other anti-drug ads on the radio 50% of the 18 to 25 year old students and 49% of all students reported that the North Slope ad was better than most radio anti-drug ads. Fifty percent of 18 to 25 year old students and 51% of all students reported that the bank teller ad was not better than most anti-drug ads on the radio.

According to student reports of ad quality, the band story advertisement had the largest percentage of 18 to 25 year old students indicating the ad was clearly about meth and clearly an anti-drug advertisement. In terms of relative ad quality, the North Slope ad had the largest percentage of students indicating the ad was better than most anti-drug ads on the radio. The student quality ratings of the bank teller ad were in between the band story and the North Slope ads on all measures.

Table 25. Student Assessment of Meth Radio Advertisement Quality

Row percentages

	18 to 25 Year old students					All students				
	Yes		No			Yes		No		
Measures of band story ad quality	N	%	N	%	**Total**	N	%	N	%	**Total**
Better than most radio anti-drug ads	18	47.4 %	20	52.6 %	**38**	27	47.4 %	30	52.6 %	**57**
Good ad for ages 18 to 25	30	78.9	8	21.1	**38**	47	82.5	10	17.5	**57**
Clearly ad about meth	36	94.7	2	5.3	**38**	54	94.7	3	5.3	**57**
Clearly anti-drug ad	36	94.7	2	5.3	**38**	53	93.0	4	7.0	**57**
Measures of bank teller ad quality	N	%	N	%	**Total**	N	%	N	%	**Total**
Better than most radio anti-drug ads	15	39.5 %	23	60.5 %	**38**	26	45.6 %	31	54.4 %	**57**
Good ad for ages 18 to 25	27	71.1	11	28.9	**38**	41	71.9	16	28.1	**57**
Clearly ad about meth	33	86.8	5	13.2	**38**	50	87.7	7	12.3	**57**
Clearly anti-drug ad	35	92.1	3	7.9	**38**	52	91.2	5	8.8	**57**
Measures of north slope ad quality	N	%	N	%	**Total**	N	%	N	%	**Total**
Better than most radio anti-drug ads	19	50.0 %	19	50.0 %	**38**	28	49.1 %	29	50.9 %	**57**
Good ad for ages 18 to 25	28	73.7	10	26.3	**38**	41	71.9	16	28.1	**57**
Clearly ad about meth	32	84.2	6	15.8	**38**	50	87.7	7	12.3	**57**
Clearly anti-drug ad	36	94.7	2	5.3	**38**	52	91.2	5	8.8	**57**

Source of data: *AME Project Student Survey (2009)*

Students were also asked their impressions of meth based on the content of the three ads. The impressions of 18 to 25 year old students are described here and summarized in Table 26. According to student reports, there were several impressions the band story ad did not provide. For example, when asked if the band story ad gave the impression that meth "is more dangerous to try than you originally thought," the most frequently occurring response was probably didn't (42% of 18 to 25 year old

students). When asked whether the band story ad gave the impression that meth "will make you act in a way you would not want to act," the most frequently occurring response was probably didn't (37% of 18 to 25 year old students). Regarding whether the band story ad gave the impression that meth "makes you look different than usual," the most frequently occurring response was probably didn't (47% of 18 to 25 year old students). In terms of whether the band story ad gave new information, the most frequently occurring response was probably didn't (55% of 18 to 25 year old students). In sum, 18 to 25 year old student survey participants felt the band story ad probably didn't give the impression that meth is more dangerous than originally thought, makes you act in ways you would not want to act, makes you look different than usual, or gave new information. When students were asked whether the band story ad gave the impression that meth "is something to avoid if you've got big plans in life," the most frequently occurring response was slightly did (37% of 18 to 25 year old students). The student impressions described here must be examined in the context of what the band story ad was designed to accomplish. For instance, the band story ad did not emphasize the message that meth may make users look different than usual.

The bank teller ad gave the 18 to 25 year old surveyed students a couple of impressions that the band story ad did not. A larger percentage of students reported that the bank teller ad slightly did give the impression that meth would make you act in a way you would not want to act, and make you look different than usual. When asked if the bank teller ad gave the impression that meth "is more dangerous to try than you originally thought," the most frequently occurring response was probably didn't (39% of 18 to 25 year old students). When asked whether the bank teller ad gave the impression that meth "will make you act in a way you would not want to act," the most frequently occurring response was slightly did (39% of 18 to 25 year old students). Regarding whether the bank teller ad gave the impression that meth "makes you look different than usual," two responses occurred most frequently. The same percentage of students (33% of 18 to 25 year old students) reported that the bank teller ad slightly did and probably didn't give the impression that meth "makes you look different than usual." In terms of whether the bank teller ad gave new information, the most frequently occurring response was probably didn't (64% of 18 to 25 year old students). When students were asked whether the bank teller ad gave the impression that meth "is something to avoid if you've got big plans in life," the most frequently occurring response was slightly did (44% of 18 to 25 year old students). Students appeared to pick up on the messages emphasized in the bank teller ad, including the effect of meth use on one's looks and on making someone act in a way they would not want to act, such as missing work.

There were several impressions the North Slope ad did not provide, according to student reports. For example, when asked if the North Slope ad gave the impression that meth "is more dangerous to try than you originally thought," the most frequently occurring response was probably didn't (47% of 18 to 25 year old students). When asked whether the North Slope ad gave the impression that meth "makes you act in a way you would not want to act," the most frequently occurring response was probably didn't (40% of 18 to 25 year old students). Regarding whether the North Slope ad gave the impression that meth "makes you look different than usual," the most frequently occurring response was probably didn't (47% of 18 to 25 year old students). In terms of whether the North Slope ad gave new information, the most frequently occurring response was probably didn't (50% of 18 to 25 year old students). In sum, 18 to 25 year old survey participants felt the North Slope ad probably didn't give the impression that meth is more dangerous than originally thought, makes you act in ways you would not want to act, makes you look different than usual, or gave new information. When students were asked whether the North Slope ad gave the impression that meth "is something to avoid if you've got big plans

in life," the most frequently occurring response was strongly did (42% of 18 to 25 year old students). The North Slope ad effectively communicated that meth use could negatively affect life plans.

Table 26. 18 to 25 Year Old Students' Impressions of AME Project Anti-Meth Radio Ads

Row percentages

	Strongly did (1)	Slightly did (2)	Probably didn't (2.5)	Definitely didn't (3)	Average score
18 to 25 Year old students' impressions about meth from Band Story ad					
More dangerous to try than originally thought	21.1 %	23.7 %	42.1 %	13.2 %	2.5
Makes you act in a way you would not want to act	28.9	26.3	36.8	7.9	2.2
Makes you look different than usual	21.1	23.7	47.4	7.9	2.4
Gave new information	7.9	5.3	55.3	31.6	3.1
Meth is something to avoid if you've got plans in life	31.6	36.8	18.4	13.2	2.1
18 to 25 Year old students' impressions about meth from Bank Teller ad					
More dangerous to try than originally thought	16.7 %	27.8 %	38.9 %	16.7 %	2.6
Makes you act in a way you would not want to act	19.4	38.9	33.3	8.3	2.3
Makes you look different than usual	27.8	33.3	33.3	5.6	2.2
Gave new information	8.3	8.3	63.9	19.4	2.9
Meth is something to avoid if you've got plans in life	22.2	44.4	27.8	5.6	2.2
18 to 25 Year old students' impressions about meth from North Slope ad					
More dangerous to try than originally thought	18.4 %	15.8 %	47.4 %	18.4 %	2.7
Makes you act in a way you would not want to act	18.4	28.9	39.5	13.2	2.5
Makes you look different than usual	13.2	18.4	47.4	21.1	2.8
Gave new information	7.9	10.5	50.0	31.6	3.1
Meth is something to avoid if you've got plans in life	42.1	36.8	13.2	7.9	1.9

Source of data: *AME Project Student Survey (2009)*

Consideration of all the student responses, rather than just the 18 to 25 year old group reported above, yielded a few slightly different results. For instance, when asked about whether the band story ad gave the impression that meth "makes you act in a way you would not want to act," the most frequently occurring response was strongly did (34% of all students) rather than probably didn't for 18 to 25 year old students (Table 27). When students were asked whether the band story ad gave the impression that meth "is something to avoid if you've got big plans in life," the most frequently occurring response was strongly did (38% of all students) rather than slightly did for 18 to 25 year old students. In terms of the bank teller ad, a larger percentage of students (36% of all students) reported that the ad slightly did give the impression that meth "makes you look different than usual." Regarding the North Slope ad, a larger percentage of all students (33%), relative to 18 to 25 year old students, reported that the ad slightly did give the impression that meth "makes you act in a way you would not want to act" while a smaller percentage of all students (33%), relative to 18 to 25 year old students, reported that the ad probably didn't give this impression.

Table 27. All Students' Impressions of AME Project Anti-Meth Radio Ads

Row percentages

	Strongly did (1)	Slightly did (2)	Probably didn't (2.5)	Definitely didn't (3)	Average score
All students' impressions about meth from Band Story ad					
More dangerous to try than originally thought	16.1 %	28.6 %	35.7 %	19.6 %	2.6
Makes you act in a way you would not want to act	33.9	32.1	25.0	8.9	2.1
Makes you look different than usual	21.4	26.8	39.3	12.5	2.4
Gave new information	7.1	8.9	42.9	41.1	3.2
Meth is something to avoid if you've got plans in life	37.5	35.7	14.3	12.5	2.0
All students' impressions about meth from Bank Teller ad					
More dangerous to try than originally thought	12.7 %	32.7 %	30.9 %	23.6 %	2.7
Makes you act in a way you would not want to act	23.6	40.0	25.5	10.9	2.2
Makes you look different than usual	32.7	36.4	21.8	9.1	2.1
Gave new information	7.3	14.5	50.9	27.3	3.0
Meth is something to avoid if you've got plans in life	30.9	41.8	20.0	7.3	2.0
All students' impressions about meth from North Slope ad					
More dangerous to try than originally thought	17.5 %	22.8 %	38.6 %	21.1 %	2.6
Makes you act in a way you would not want to act	21.1	33.3	33.3	12.3	2.4
Makes you look different than usual	10.5	28.1	40.4	21.1	2.7
Gave new information	8.8	14.0	43.9	33.3	3.0
Meth is something to avoid if you've got plans in life	44.6	35.7	12.5	7.1	1.8

Source of data: *AME Project Student Survey (2009)*

Mail Survey

Survey participants were randomly selected for our mail survey. We purchased a random sample including names and mailing addresses for 10,000 Alaskans from InfoUSA, a leading provider of information products and consumer databases. The sample was limited to adults 18 years of age and older and was comprised of 50% female and 50% male heads of households. The resulting sample included 2,000 female and male adult heads of households from each of the following communities: Municipality of Anchorage, Matanuska-Susitna Borough, Fairbanks North Star Borough, Juneau City and Borough, and Kenai Peninsula Borough. The original drawn sample of 10,000 potential participants was reduced as 65 addresses proved undeliverable and another 30 were delivered to children, deceased, mentally handicapped, or individuals otherwise unable to complete the survey. Thirteen completed surveys (nine web and four paper) were returned after the conclusion of data entry. The final sample included 9,905 potential participants.

The mail survey instrument consisted of 109 questions on seven pages (see Appendix D). Guided by the Tailored Design Method (Dillman, 2007), the UAA Justice Center mailed pre-notification letters to every randomly sampled individual one week before the questionnaire was mailed. Over the next six weeks, the UAA Justice Center mailed the *AME Project* survey, a follow-up postcard, and a replacement questionnaire to potential participants in the sample. Surveys could be completed online using a unique PIN login or filled out on the paper questionnaires provided. All completed surveys were delivered (electronically or by mail) to the UAA Justice Center.

Survey collection, data entry and database management occurred on-site at the UAA Justice Center. The Project Manager and a Research Assistant constructed an SPSS database to store the data, transcribed participant comments, and entered data into the database. Data entry for completed paper surveys began on June 15, 2009 and was finished September 1, 2009. A total of 2,115 completed surveys were received, and entered into the SPSS database. This represents a 21.4% response rate. The low response rate may have been a product of the survey topic. The principal investigator received numerous calls from potential participants who indicated that they knew nothing about methamphetamine and therefore did not intend to complete the survey. Other potential survey participants were curious as to how and why they were selected to participate in the survey. These reactions may have been shared by those in the sample who declined to participate in the study. The data from completed and returned surveys were analyzed and the results are provided here.

Background Information

Of the 2,115 completed surveys, 611 (29%) were completed online and 1,504 (71%) were completed on paper (Table 28). The total number of completed surveys from each community varied little. Twenty-two percent of the surveys were returned from Juneau. Twenty percent of the completed surveys came from each of the following locations: Anchorage, the Mat-Su Valley, and Fairbanks. Nineteen percent of the surveys were returned from Kenai. There was little variation in the percentage of surveys completed on the web versus on paper for four communities. The highest percentage of web submissions (30%) came from participants in Juneau. The remaining web submissions ranged from 16% in Kenai to 20% in Anchorage.

Table 28. Survey Returns by Format and Location

Column percentages

	Web Responses		Paper Responses		Total Responses	
Location	N	%	N	%	N	%
Anchorage	120	19.6 %	295	19.6 %	415	19.6 %
Mat-Su	101	16.5	316	21.0	417	19.7
Kenai	98	16.0	309	20.5	407	19.2
Fairbanks	110	18.0	304	20.2	414	19.6
Juneau	182	29.8	280	18.6	462	21.8
Total	**611**		**1,504**		**2,115**	

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Of the 2,115 people who completed the survey, 2,095 (99%) reported their gender. For people who reported their gender, 60% were female and 40% were male (Table 29). The percentage of female survey participants varied little between the five locations surveyed. Juneau had the smallest percentage of female survey participants (54%) and Kenai had the largest percentage of female survey participants (64%). Anchorage had 63% female survey participants, Mat-Su had 61% female survey participants, and Fairbanks had 60% female survey participants.

Table 29. Gender of Mail Survey Participants

Column percentages

	Anchorage		Mat-Su		Kenai		Fairbanks		Juneau		Total	
Gender	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Female	259	63.2 %	252	61.2 %	262	64.4 %	243	59.7 %	247	53.8 %	1,263	60.3 %
Male	151	36.8	160	38.8	145	35.6	164	40.3	212	46.2	832	39.7
Total	**410**		**412**		**407**		**407**		**459**		**2,095**	

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Information on the race of survey participants was provided by 2,087 (99%) of participants. Overall, the majority of participants were White (87%). Four percent of survey participants indicated they were Alaska Native, 3% were multi-race, 2% each were Hispanic, Asian, or other races, and 1% were African American. The majority of participants were White across all locations surveyed. There was some variability in the racial composition of survey participants between locations (Table 30).

Table 30. Race of Mail Survey Participants

Column percentages

	Anchorage		Mat-Su		Kenai		Fairbanks		Juneau		Total	
Race	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
White	345	84.6 %	371	90.0 %	360	89.6 %	331	81.3 %	403	88.0 %	1,810	86.7 %
Alaska Native	13	3.2	10	2.4	16	4.0	21	5.2	17	3.7	77	3.7
African American	8	2.0	2	0.5	--	--	8	2.0	--	--	18	0.9
Hispanic	7	1.7	5	1.2	7	1.7	11	2.7	5	1.1	35	1.7
Asian	14	3.4	4	1.0	2	0.5	9	2.2	18	3.9	47	2.3
Multi-race	13	3.2	14	3.4	13	3.2	17	4.2	11	2.4	68	3.3
Other	8	2.0	6	1.5	4	1.0	10	2.5	4	0.9	32	1.5
Total	**408**		**412**		**402**		**407**		**458**		**2,087**	

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Ninety-seven percent of participants (2,048) provided their age. On average, survey participants were 48.3 years old (s = 11.7, results not shown). The youngest survey participant was 18 years old, and the oldest was 88 years old. The majority of survey participants (33%) were in the 46 to 55 year old age group. Only 3% of survey participants were in the target age group for the media campaign, 18 to 25 years. Twelve percent of survey participants were 26 to 35 years old, 22% were 36 to 45 years old, and 4% were 66 years and older (Table 31). There was some variability between locations in the percentage of survey participants in each age group.

Table 31. Age of Mail Survey Participants

Column percentages

	Anchorage		Mat-Su		Kenai		Fairbanks		Juneau		Total	
Age group	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
18 to 25	24	6.0 %	10	2.5 %	8	2.0 %	15	3.7 %	10	2.2 %	67	3.3 %
26 to 35	50	12.6	52	12.9	41	10.4	56	13.9	52	11.6	251	12.3
36 to 45	85	21.4	95	23.6	82	20.7	81	20.0	109	24.3	452	22.1
46 to 55	137	34.5	136	33.8	138	34.8	130	32.2	140	31.2	681	33.3
56 to 65	93	23.4	90	22.4	109	27.5	113	28.0	120	26.7	525	25.6
66 and older	8	2.0	19	4.7	18	4.5	9	2.2	18	4.0	72	3.5
Total	**397**		**402**		**396**		**404**		**449**		**2,048**	

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Survey participants were asked to "please indicate the number of people in each age category that live in your home, including yourself." The provided age categories included the following: four or

younger, five to 13, 14 to 17, 18 to 25 and 26 or older. This item was created for two purposes. First, it was created to understand how many young people were living in the homes of survey participants. Adult survey participants were presumed to be parents, guardians, or otherwise potentially influential in the lives of these young people. Parents, guardians and other influential adults who espouse anti-drug attitudes and model desirable behaviors are resources in the prevention of drug use (Goode, 2008, p. 85). Second, the item was created to understand how many people in the target age group for the ad campaign (18 to 25 years) were living in the homes of survey participants, even if they were not survey participants.

The number of people in each category living in the home was recoded as a categorical variable with attributes yes and no in terms of whether any young people (under four to 17 years of age) were living in the homes of survey participants. Fifty-eight percent of survey participants who responded to this item indicated that young people were living in their home. Forty-two percent of survey participants who responded to this item indicated that there were no young people living in their home. The number of people in the 18 to 25 years age category was also recoded into a categorical variable with attributes yes (18 to 25 year old living in the home) and no (no 18 to 25 year old living in the home). Forty percent of survey participants who responded to this item indicated that at least one person in the 18 to 25 years age category was living in the home while 60% indicated there were no people in the 18 to 25 years age category living in the home (Table 32).

Table 32. Young People or Target Age Group in Survey Participants' Households

Column percentages

	Infant to 17		18 to 25	
Member in household	N	%	N	%
Yes	798	58.2 %	430	39.9 %
No	573	41.8	647	60.1
Total	**1,371**		**1,077**	

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Survey participants frequently reported being married (72%). Thirteen percent of survey participants reported they were divorced, 9% reported they were single, 3% reported they were widowed, 1% reported they were living together in a long-term relationship, 1% reported they were separated, and 1% of survey participants reported their marital status as "other" (Table 33).

Table 33. Marital Status of Mail Survey Participants

Column percentages

	Anchorage		Mat-Su		Kenai		Fairbanks		Juneau		Total	
Marital status	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Single	63	15.5 %	33	8.0 %	21	5.2 %	44	10.8 %	36	7.8 %	197	9.4 %
Married	271	66.7	311	74.9	291	72.0	274	67.5	347	75.6	1,494	71.5
Separated	6	1.5	5	1.2	2	0.5	9	2.2	6	1.3	28	1.3
Divorced	45	11.1	44	10.6	71	17.6	54	13.3	50	10.9	264	12.6
Widowed	12	3.0	14	3.4	10	2.5	15	3.7	12	2.6	63	3.0
Long-term/living together	6	1.5	6	1.4	4	1.0	6	1.5	6	1.3	28	1.3
Other	3	0.7	2	0.5	5	1.2	4	1.0	2	0.4	16	0.8
Total	**406**		**415**		**404**		**406**		**459**		**2,090**	

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

The majority of survey participants reported that they were in the higher categories of household income. The most frequently reported income category was $80,000 or more with 49% of survey participants reporting this income level. The frequency of survey participants in each income category largely generally declined as income declined. Thirteen percent of survey participants reported their income as $65,000 to $79,999, and 14% of survey participants reported their income as $50,000 to $64,999. Eleven percent of survey participants reported their income as $35,000 to $49,999. Seven percent of survey participants reported their income as $25,000 to $24,999, and another 7% of survey participants reported their income as under $25,000. There was some variability between locations in the percentage of survey participants in each household income category (Table 34).

Table 34. Gross Household Income of Mail Survey Participants

Column percentages

	Anchorage		Mat-Su		Kenai		Fairbanks		Juneau		Total	
Household income	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Under $25,000	18	4.6 %	26	6.8 %	47	12.4 %	32	8.3 %	16	3.7 %	139	7.0 %
$25,000 to $34,999	19	4.8	26	6.8	43	11.4	25	6.5	17	3.9	130	6.6
$35,000 to $49,999	49	12.5	42	10.9	40	10.6	50	12.9	32	7.4	213	10.8
$50,000 to $64,999	53	13.5	64	16.6	44	11.6	62	16.0	49	11.3	272	13.8
$65,000 to $79,999	43	10.9	57	14.8	52	13.8	42	10.9	71	16.4	265	13.4
$80,000 or more	211	53.7	170	44.2	152	40.2	176	45.5	249	57.4	958	48.5
Total	**393**		**385**		**378**		**387**		**434**		**1,977**	

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Risks and Availability of Meth and Other Drugs

Survey participants were asked about the effects of meth use. Each of the effects was phrased in a generally positive sense such as meth gives you energy, makes you feel euphoric/very happy or makes you more intelligent. Overwhelmingly, the modal response category regarding effects of meth use was "strongly disagree." In response to the suggestion that meth use makes you more intelligent, 83% of survey participants strongly disagreed (Table 35). Seventy-six percent of survey participants strongly disagreed that using meth makes you more popular. In response to the suggestion that meth use helps you study, 74% of survey participants strongly disagreed. Some of the effects of meth use that received the largest number of strongly agree or agree responses were: helps you lose weight (31% of responses), makes you feel euphoric/very happy (23% of responses), and gives you energy (22% of responses).

The responses were coded from one to four with strongly agree as one, agree as two, neither agree nor disagree as two and one half, disagree as three and strongly disagree as four. In other words, the more survey participants disagreed with positively phrased effects of meth, the larger the score. The average score across survey participants was three or more for every item, except helps you lose weight (2.9 average). A small number of survey participants strongly disagreed or disagreed with this item than with other items as mentioned above.

Table 35. Effects of Meth Use

Row percentages

	Strongly agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (2.5)	Disagree (3)	Strongly disagree (4)	Average score
Effects of meth use						
Helps you escape your problems	3.8 %	7.0 %	9.2 %	9.3 %	72.7 %	3.5
Helps you study	1.1	2.2	13.0	10.2	73.6	3.6
Gives you energy	6.5	15.9	16.6	7.1	53.9	3.2
Helps you deal with boredom	3.3	11.4	17.6	8.1	59.5	3.3
Makes you feel euphoric/very happy	5.9	17.1	22.9	4.4	49.7	3.1
Helps you lose weight	9.8	21.5	20.2	3.6	44.9	2.9
Makes you more intelligent	1.0	0.5	8.9	6.9	82.7	3.8
Makes you more popular	1.2	1.3	13.0	9.0	75.6	3.7
Makes you feel attractive	2.0	5.6	22.7	6.6	63.1	3.4

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Survey participants were asked about the negative consequences for someone who tries meth once. Table 36 shows that a large percentage of survey participants responded that a person who tries meth once has a great risk of being a negative influence on a younger brother or sister (73%), making their problems worse (66%), getting hooked on meth (63%), and losing control of themselves (63%). More than half of the survey participants responded that a person who tries meth once has a great risk of

having sex with someone they do not want to (60%), turning into someone they don't want to be (59%), suffering brain damage (53%), becoming paranoid (52%), and suffering from insomnia or not being able to sleep (51%). A smaller percentage of survey participants rated the following negative consequences as a great risk to a person who tries meth once: stealing (50%), dying (47%), becoming violent (46%), stop taking care of their hygiene (44%), and suffering tooth decay (38%).

Another way to examine attitudes and beliefs about the risks of negative consequences for someone who tries meth once is to examine the consequences that generated a large percentage of "not sure" responses. Consequences that survey participants were not sure would happen to a person who tries meth once included insomnia or not being able to sleep (19%), becoming violent (17%), and suffering tooth decay (16%). It is interesting that the largest percentage of survey participants (19%) who indicated they were not sure about a consequence for someone who tries meth once indicated they were not sure the person would suffer from insomnia or not being able to sleep. This is interesting since meth is a powerful stimulant that can affect the user for as long as 12 hours (Goode, 2008, p. 282).

Table 36. Risk of Negative Consequences for Someone Who Tries Meth Once

Row percentages

	Great risk (1)	Moderate risk (2)	Not sure (2.5)	Slight risk (3)	No risk (4)	Average score
Negative consequences						
Being a negative influence on a younger brother or sister	73.3 %	13.5 %	6.2 %	5.9 %	1.1 %	3.6
Making their problems worse	65.9	17.6	6.8	8.2	1.5	3.5
Getting hooked on meth	63.1	20.9	6.5	8.0	1.6	3.5
Losing control of themselves	62.6	18.7	8.9	8.8	1.0	3.5
Having sex with someone they don't want to	59.5	18.9	12.2	8.0	1.5	3.4
Turning into someone they don't want to be	58.9	17.0	9.3	10.6	4.2	3.4
Brain damage	52.5	18.6	12.6	13.8	2.4	3.3
Become paranoid	52.3	22.4	14.0	10.4	0.9	3.3
Insomnia/not being able to sleep	51.0	19.5	18.8	9.2	1.5	3.3
Stealing	50.0	19.1	13.4	13.2	4.3	3.2
Dying	47.1	22.7	11.3	17.4	1.4	3.2
Becoming violent	46.1	24.1	17.1	11.6	1.1	3.2
Stop taking care of their hygiene	44.4	17.9	13.7	15.1	8.9	3.0
Suffering tooth decay	37.5	13.9	16.2	18.0	14.4	2.8

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

The survey asked participants to indicate the relative risk of infrequent and frequent substance use. The substances participants were asked to rate included meth, heroin, marijuana, cocaine and alcohol. Infrequent use refers to one or two uses and frequent use refers to regular use of the noted substances. Of the five drugs rated for risk, infrequent heroin use was rated as a great risk by the largest percentage of survey participants (79%) and infrequent meth use was rated as great risk by the second largest percentage of survey participants (74%). Sixty-one percent of survey participants rated

infrequent cocaine use as a great risk, 24% rated infrequent marijuana use as a great risk, and 17% of participants rated infrequent alcohol use as a great risk (Table 37).

Survey participants rated regular use of the drugs noted above differently than infrequent use. In this case, regular heroin use and regular meth use were both rated as a great risk by the largest percentage of survey participants (95%). Regular cocaine use was rated as a great risk by 89% of participants. Participants rated regular alcohol use as a great risk (44%) and this was similar to rates regarding risk of regular marijuana use (43%).

Table 37. Relative Risk of Infrequent and Regular Substance Use

Row percentages

	Great risk (1)	Moderate risk (2)	Not sure (2.5)	Slight risk (3)	No risk (4)	Average score
Infrequent use						
Trying meth once or twice	73.5 %	14.9 %	4.8 %	5 %	1.9 %	3.6
Trying heroin once or twice	78.6	13.2	3.2	3.4	1.6	3.7
Trying marijuana once or twice	24.4	19.1	3.1	32.1	21.2	2.5
Trying cocaine once or twice	60.8	20.3	2.7	12.8	3.3	3.4
Trying alcohol once or twice	16.5	17.7	2.4	42.7	20.8	2.3
Regular use						
Using meth regularly	94.8 %	1.1 %	2.4 %	0.4 %	1.3 %	3.9
Using heroin regularly	95.0	1.1	2.1	0.3	1.6	3.9
Using marijuana regularly	42.9	28.8	2.5	19.2	6.6	3.1
Using cocaine regularly	89.2	5.5	1.9	1.9	1.6	3.8
Using alcohol regularly	43.9	36.9	1.7	15	2.5	3.2

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

One of the survey items asked participants to indicate the relative approval of infrequent (one or two uses) and regular substance use. The substances with which participants were asked to rate their approval were the same substances they rated risk in using including meth, heroin, marijuana, cocaine and alcohol. Participants were asked whether they approved of substance use and were provided the following response categories: strongly approve, somewhat approve, neither approve nor disapprove, somewhat disapprove, and strongly disapprove. Of the five drugs rated for approval of use, infrequent heroin use was rated as strongly disapproved by the largest percentage of survey participants (91%) and infrequent meth use was rated as strongly disapproved by a similarly large percentage of survey participants (90%). Seventy-eight percent of survey participants strongly disapproved of infrequent cocaine use, 40% strongly disapproved of infrequent marijuana use, and 19% of participants strongly disapproved of infrequent alcohol use (Table 38).

Survey participants also rated their approval of regular use of the drugs noted above. Once again, regular meth use and regular heroin use were both strongly disapproved of by the largest percentage of survey participants (97%). Regular cocaine use was strongly disapproved by 93% of participants. Fifty-

eight percent of survey participants strongly disapproved of regular marijuana use, and 40% of participants strongly disapproved of regular alcohol use.

Table 38. Relative Approval of Infrequent and Regular Substance Use

Row percentages

	Strongly approve (1)	Somewhat approve (2)	Neither approve nor disapprove (2.5)	Somewhat disapprove (3)	Strongly disapprove (4)	Average score
Infrequent substance use						
Trying meth once or twice	0.7 %	0.1 %	3.6 %	6.1 %	89.5 %	3.9
Trying heroin once or twice	0.7	0.2	2.5	5.7	90.9	3.9
Trying marijuana once or twice	3.8	6.9	30.2	19.6	39.5	3.1
Trying cocaine once or twice	0.9	1.2	8.0	12.1	77.8	3.7
Trying alcohol once or twice	3.7	13.4	50.3	13.6	19.0	2.7
Regular substance use						
Using meth regularly	0.8 %	-- %	0.9 %	1.3 %	97.1 %	4.0
Using heroin regularly	0.8	0.1	1.0	1.5	96.7	3.9
Using marijuana regularly	2.4	4.1	18.3	17.7	57.5	3.4
Using cocaine regularly	1.0	--	1.9	4.2	92.8	3.9
Using alcohol regularly	1.6	6.5	28.1	23.4	40.3	3.2

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Survey participants were asked “how difficult or easy do you think it would be for a young adult (18-25 years) to get each of the following types of drugs: meth, heroin, cocaine, and marijuana.” The response categories for this item were very difficult, somewhat difficult, somewhat easy, very easy and not sure. Eighty-eight percent of participants responded that it would be very easy or somewhat easy for young adults to obtain marijuana. Meth was the substance where the second largest frequency of participants (72%) indicated that it would be very easy or somewhat easy for young adults to obtain. Sixty-nine percent of survey participants reported that it would be very easy or somewhat easy for a young adult to access cocaine and 54% reported that it would be very easy or somewhat easy for a young adult to access heroin (Table 39).

Twenty-five percent of participants were not sure how difficult or easy it would be to obtain heroin. Meth and cocaine were the substances with the second largest percentage of participants (19%) indicating they were not sure how difficult or easy it would be for young adults to obtain. Ten percent of survey participants were not sure how difficult or easy it would be for young adults to obtain marijuana.

Table 39. Young Adult Access to Various Substances

Row percentages

	Very difficult (4)	Somewhat difficult (3)	Not sure (2.5)	Somewhat easy (2)	Very easy (1)	Average score
Substance						
Meth	1.0 %	7.6 %	19.1 %	29.5 %	42.9 %	1.8
Heroin	2.9	18.2	24.9	26.0	28.0	2.1
Marijuana	0.5	1.7	10.2	19.1	68.5	1.4
Cocaine	1.3	10.7	18.6	30.1	39.3	1.8

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Participants responded to an item specifically asking how likely it was that teens or young adults in their city use meth. The response categories provided were on a continuum from unlikely to highly likely as follows: not at all likely, not very likely, somewhat likely, very likely, extremely likely and not sure. Overall, the most common response across locations (41% of participants) was that it was extremely likely that teens or young adults use meth. Another 31% of survey participants reported that it was very likely teens or young adults in their area use meth. Across individual locations, the percentage of participants reporting it was extremely likely or very likely that teens or young adults use meth ranged from a low of 68% (Fairbanks) to a high of 75% (Juneau). The pattern of responses across individual locations was for a larger number of responses at the likely end of the response continuum regarding meth use to a smaller number of responses at the unlikely end of the response continuum. The percentage of not sure responses was 6% for Anchorage and 7% for the other locations (Table 40).

Table 40. Likelihood of Meth Use by Young Adults

Column percentages

	Anchorage		Mat-Su		Kenai		Fairbanks		Juneau		Total	
Likelihood	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not at all likely	2	0.5 %	--	-- %	--	-- %	1	0.2 %	--	-- %	3	0.1 %
Not very likely	8	1.9	9	2.2	13	3.2	8	1.9	9	2.0	47	2.2
Somewhat likely	80	19.4	87	21.0	73	18.1	93	22.6	75	16.3	408	19.4
Very likely	138	33.4	128	30.8	128	31.7	126	30.7	131	28.5	651	31.0
Extremely likely	160	38.7	162	39.0	161	39.9	154	37.5	214	46.6	851	40.5
Not sure	25	6.1	29	7.0	29	7.2	29	7.1	30	6.5	142	6.8
Total	**413**		**415**		**404**		**411**		**459**		**2,102**	

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Survey participants were asked to evaluate the extent of meth, heroin, cocaine, marijuana, and alcohol problems in their location. The response categories included big problem, moderate problem, not sure, small problem and not a problem. Across all locations, the substance generating the greatest frequency of responses as a big problem was alcohol (62%). The modal (most frequently occurring)

rating for meth was that it is a big problem (52%). Thirty-six percent of survey participants reported marijuana use as a big problem. Cocaine use was rated as a big problem by 30% of survey participants. At the other end of the continuum, less than 1% of participants indicated that meth use was not a problem in their location. The percentage of substances reported by survey participants to be not a problem ranged from a low of 1% (meth) to a high of 13% (marijuana). The percentage of responses in the not sure category regarding substance use and abuse ranged from 4% (alcohol) to 24% (heroin), and meth use was ranked as the middle substance with 11% of participants indicating they were not sure meth use was a problem in their location (Table 41).

Table 41. Extent of Substance Abuse Problem by Location

Row percentages

Substance in Anchorage	Big problem N	Big problem %	Moderate problem N	Moderate problem %	Not sure N	Not sure %	Small problem N	Small problem %	Not a problem N	Not a problem %	Total
Meth use	207	50.1 %	146	35.4 %	35	8.5 %	24	5.8 %	1	0.2 %	**413**
Heroin use	118	28.6	144	35.0	59	14.3	88	21.4	3	0.7	**412**
Marijuana use	148	35.8	93	22.5	28	6.8	87	21.1	57	13.8	**413**
Cocaine use	148	35.8	155	37.5	50	12.1	55	13.3	5	1.2	**413**
Alcohol use	257	62.2	113	27.4	10	2.4	24	5.8	9	2.2	**413**
Substance in Mat-Su	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Meth use	273	65.6 %	87	20.9 %	38	9.1 %	16	3.8 %	2	0.5 %	**416**
Heroin use	114	27.7	128	31.1	106	25.7	56	13.6	8	1.9	**412**
Marijuana use	178	43.1	95	23.0	36	8.7	57	13.8	47	11.4	**413**
Cocaine use	142	34.3	130	31.4	87	21.0	50	12.1	5	1.2	**414**
Alcohol use	238	57.6	105	25.4	25	6.1	40	9.7	5	1.2	**413**
Substance in Kenai	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Meth use	190	47.0 %	124	30.7 %	52	12.9 %	34	8.4 %	4	1.0 %	**404**
Heroin use	70	17.3	119	29.4	99	24.4	93	23.0	24	5.9	**405**
Marijuana use	174	42.9	101	24.9	34	8.4	55	13.5	42	10.3	**406**
Cocaine use	107	26.4	148	36.5	84	20.7	57	14.0	10	2.5	**406**
Alcohol use	255	62.8	98	24.1	19	4.7	29	7.1	5	1.2	**406**
Substance in Fairbanks	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Meth use	204	49.3 %	129	31.2 %	55	13.3 %	23	5.6 %	3	0.7 %	**414**
Heroin use	49	11.9	124	30.1	128	31.1	99	24.0	12	2.9	**412**
Marijuana use	123	29.8	101	24.5	48	11.6	82	19.9	59	14.3	**413**
Cocaine use	118	28.6	153	37.1	79	19.2	50	12.1	12	2.9	**412**
Alcohol use	264	64.1	100	24.3	21	5.1	25	6.1	2	0.5	**412**
Substance in Juneau	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Meth use	214	46.6 %	157	34.2 %	52	11.3 %	36	7.8 %	--	-- %	**459**
Heroin use	119	26.0	139	30.3	103	22.5	88	19.2	9	2.0	**458**
Marijuana use	143	31.2	115	25.1	36	7.9	95	20.7	69	15.1	**458**
Cocaine use	114	24.8	156	34.0	86	18.7	91	19.8	12	2.6	**459**
Alcohol use	295	64.3	113	24.6	18	3.9	29	6.3	4	0.9	**459**
Substance in all areas											
Meth use	1,088	51.7 %	643	30.5 %	232	11.0 %	133	6.3 %	10	0.5 %	**2,106**
Heroin use	470	22.4	654	31.2	495	23.6	424	20.2	56	2.7	**2,099**
Marijuana use	766	36.4	505	24.0	182	8.7	376	17.9	274	13.0	**2,103**
Cocaine use	629	29.9	742	35.3	386	18.3	303	14.4	44	2.1	**2,104**
Alcohol use	1,309	62.2	529	25.2	93	4.4	147	7.0	25	1.2	**2,103**

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Anti-Meth Advertising

The survey asked participants to recall generally whether they had seen or heard any anti-meth advertising recently (in the last six months). The response categories for this general item included yes, no, and not sure.

In a subsequent question, participants were also asked to indicate the forms of media in which they saw or heard anti-meth ads. The response categories for this item included printed poster ads, newspaper ads, internet ads, and other ads, and participants were again asked to report yes (they had seen or heard anti-meth advertising), no, or unsure. In some cases, there was a lack of congruity between participants' response to the general question regarding encountering any anti-meth advertising versus encountering specific types of anti-meth media via radio, newspaper, etc. This incongruity may have been generated by an unclear question and response categories, or because a listing of specific media sources may have triggered recollection. As a result, the data in Table 42 reflects a tally of any anti-meth ad encounters based on participants' responses to the item where they indicated whether or not they had encountered anti-meth in various forms of media.

The majority of research participants reported that they had encountered anti-meth ads recently and this was not dependent upon their location in Alaska. The percentage of participants who encountered anti-meth ads ranged from lower frequencies of 70% in Juneau and 71% in Mat-Su to the highest frequency of 78% in Kenai (Table 42). The percentage of participants indicating that they had encountered any anti-meth ads in Anchorage and Fairbanks was 77%. Across all locations, nearly three-quarters of survey participants reported that they had encountered some form of anti-meth advertising recently.

The largest number of participants reported that they encountered anti-meth advertising on television and on the internet (24% each). A smaller number of participants (14%) reported encountering anti-meth advertising in printed poster ads and 8% of participants reported encountering anti-meth advertising in newspaper ads (Table 43). It is possible some of the anti-meth ads reportedly encountered by survey participants were part of the AME anti-meth campaign. However, since the campaign focused on radio advertising and included printed posters, newspaper ads and the internet, the anti-meth television ads reportedly encountered by survey participants were not part of the current AME Project anti-meth advertising campaign. The AME Project has run television ads in the past, though the television ads last ran in 2007.

Table 42. Frequency of Participants in Each Location Who Encountered Anti-Meth Advertising

Row percentages

	Yes		No		Unsure		
Location	N	%	N	%	N	%	**Total**
Anchorage	315	76.6 %	63	15.3 %	33	8.0 %	**411**
Mat-Su	293	70.8	81	19.6	40	9.7	**414**
Kenai	316	78.0	66	16.3	23	5.7	**405**
Fairbanks	315	76.8	62	15.1	33	8.0	**410**
Juneau	319	69.8	92	20.1	46	10.1	**457**
Total	**1,558**	**74.3**	**364**	**17.4**	**175**	**8.3**	**2,097**

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Table 43. Frequency of Anti-meth Advertising by Media Source

Row percentages

	Yes		No		Unsure		
Media	N	%	N	%	N	%	**Total**
Printed poster ads	722	13.5 %	997	75.7 %	313	10.8 %	**2,032**
Newspaper ads	651	7.9	1,006	73.7	386	18.4	**2,043**
Internet ads	324	23.7	1,318	71.1	373	5.3	**2,015**
Television	1,243	23.7	624	71.1	211	5.3	**2,078**
Other ads	205	37.1	832	51.4	605	11.4	**1,642**

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Survey participants were also asked whether or not they had encountered non-advertising meth information in newspaper or magazine articles, television news or shows, movies, the internet, or from other sources. This question was included as a means of examining any differences in perceptions of meth between people who were exposed to meth in the media, whether through advertising or other types of information. The same recoding procedure that was used to produce the data in Table 42 was used to produce the data in Table 44.

The majority of research participants across the areas studied reported that they had encountered non-advertising meth information recently. Responses indicating that participants had encountered non-advertising meth information ranged from a low of 66% in Mat-Su to a high of 77% in Juneau. The percentage of participants in Anchorage and Kenai indicating that they had encountered non-advertising meth information was 70% in each area, and the percentage in Fairbanks was 75%. In other words, 70% or more of survey participants reported that they had encountered some form of non-advertising meth information recently.

Table 44. Frequency of Participants in Each Location Who Encountered Non-advertising Meth Information

Row percentages

	Yes		No		Unsure		
Location	N	%	N	%	N	%	**Total**
Anchorage	287	69.5 %	72	17.4 %	54	13.1 %	**413**
Mat-Su	271	65.6	86	20.8	56	13.6	**413**
Kenai	285	70.0	83	20.4	39	9.6	**407**
Fairbanks	306	74.8	64	15.6	39	9.5	**409**
Juneau	351	76.6	61	13.3	46	10.0	**458**
Total	**1,500**	**71.4**	**366**	**17.4**	**234**	**11.1**	**2,100**

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

The most common source of non-advertising meth information reported by participants was the news, including newspaper (53% of participants) and television news (52%). Nearly one third of survey participants (32%) reported encountering non-advertising meth information in magazine articles, and 30% encountered non-advertising meth information in television shows. Nineteen percent of survey participants reported encountering non-advertising meth information on the internet, and 16% reported encountering non-advertising meth information in a movie. Twenty percent of survey participants reported encountering non-advertising meth information from other sources (Table 45).

Table 45. Media Sources of Non-advertising Meth Info

Row percentages

	Yes		No		Unsure		
Media	N	%	N	%	N	%	**Total**
Newspaper articles	1,008	53.2 %	606	32.0 %	282	14.9 %	**1,896**
Magazine articles	585	31.7	914	49.6	344	18.7	**1,843**
Television news	973	51.8	629	33.5	278	14.8	**1,880**
Television show	545	29.6	936	50.8	362	19.6	**1,843**
Movie	288	15.8	1,143	62.8	388	21.3	**1,819**
Internet	339	18.8	1,091	60.5	374	20.7	**1,804**
Other	316	19.8	802	50.1	482	30.1	**1,600**

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Survey participants were asked about "other" sources from which they may have received advertising or non-advertising information about meth. A total of 321 comments were made about other information sources. The most common source of information was word of mouth (41% of all comments). Word of mouth includes informal conversations with friends, family, meth users, and co-workers (Table 46). Thirteen percent of comments identified the participant's place of work as another source of meth information, and 11% of comments were for other types of advertisements (such as bumper stickers, billboards seen in other states, t-shirts, etc.). Other less common sources of information

include health or other professionals, such as police and pharmacists (3%), community meetings or groups such as church (3%), and books, journals or other professional publications (6%).

Table 46. Frequency of Meth Information by Source

Column percentages

Source	Frequency N	%
Word of mouth	131	40.8 %
Work	40	12.5
Other types of ads	35	10.9
Personal experience	33	10.3
Class/presentation	24	7.5
Other	20	6.2
Book/journal/publication	19	5.9
Community meeting/group	11	3.4
Health/other professional	8	2.5
Total	**321**	

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Survey participants were asked generally if they had heard any anti-meth radio advertising. The results regarding any anti-meth radio advertising may or may not involve AME Project radio advertising efforts. Results regarding specific AME Project anti-meth radio ads are discussed later. This general question was included as a means of determining the number of people who were exposed to the anti-meth radio messages that were part of the AME Project advertising campaign. The frequency of participants who heard, did not hear and were unsure whether they heard anti-meth radio ads were analyzed by location (Table 47) as well as age group (Table 48). Across the majority of locations the most common response by survey participants was that they did not hear the anti-meth radio messages. The percentage of survey participants who heard the anti-meth radio messages ranged from a low of 29% in Anchorage, Mat-Su and Juneau to a high of 43% in Fairbanks. Thirty-one percent of survey participants from Juneau reported hearing anti-meth radio ads, 32% from Mat-Su, and 37% from Kenai reported hearing anti-meth radio ads.

The frequency of participants who reported hearing or not hearing the radio ads was also analyzed by age group. For this analysis the continuous age data were recoded into a categorical variable including one category for the target age group of participants 18 to 25 years old and another category for all other survey participants 26 and older. This was done because the 18 to 25 year old group was the target age group for the anti-meth radio campaign, and radio stations selected to play the ads were those with a high percentage of listeners in this age group. However, the 18 to 25 year old age group was underrepresented among survey participants. Although the 18 to 25 year old age group was underrepresented among survey participants, the percentage of this group who heard the anti-meth radio ads was greater than the percentage of older participants who heard the ads. Fifty-five percent of 18 to 25 year old survey participants indicated they had heard an anti-meth radio ad recently whereas 34% of participants 26 years and older indicated they had heard an anti-meth radio advertisement.

Table 47. Frequency of Participants in Each Location Who Heard Any Anti-meth Radio Advertising

Row percentages

	Yes		No		Unsure		
City	N	%	N	%	N	%	**Total**
Anchorage	115	28.6 %	208	51.7 %	79	19.7 %	**402**
Mat-Su	127	31.8	216	54.1	56	14.0	**399**
Kenai	145	37.0	193	49.2	54	13.8	**392**
Fairbanks	173	43.3	158	39.5	69	17.3	**400**
Juneau	137	30.7	223	50.0	86	19.3	**446**
Total	**697**	**34.2**	**998**	**48.9**	**344**	**16.9**	**2,039**

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Table 48. Frequency of Participants in Target Age Group Who Heard Any Anti-Meth Radio Advertising

Row percentages

	Yes		No		Unsure		
Age group	N	%	N	%	N	%	**Total**
18 to 25 years	36	54.5 %	22	33.3 %	8	12.1 %	**66**
26 and older	643	33.5	949	49.5	326	17.0	**1,918**
Total	**679**	**34.2**	**971**	**48.9**	**334**	**16.8**	**1,984**

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Table 49 summarizes how frequently survey participants heard any anti-meth radio ads and shows that the frequency of exposure differed for the target group relative to other survey participants. For both groups the most common response was that survey participants had not heard anti-meth radio ads as indicated by 33% of 18 to 25 year old survey participants and a larger percentage of survey participants 26 and older (45%). Categories representing more frequent exposure to anti-meth radio ads were reported by a larger percentage of target group survey participants while categories representing less frequent exposure were reported by a larger percentage of non-target group survey participants.

For survey participants who heard any anti-meth ads, 22% of non-target group survey participants reported the lowest rate of exposure, hearing ads less than once a month, while 20% of target group members reported hearing anti-meth ads at this lowest rate of exposure. Twelve percent of target group survey participants reported hearing ads every day or almost every day while only 4% of non-target group participants heard ads with this frequency. Overall, 47% of target group members reported hearing ads at least one to three times per month while only 16% of non-target group members reported this level of exposure.

Table 49. Frequency With Which Participants Heard Any Anti-meth Radio Advertising

Column percentages

	18 to 25 years		26 and older		Total	
Age group	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not at all	22	33.3 %	875	44.8 %	897	44.5 %
Less than once a month	13	19.7	423	21.7	436	21.6
1 to 3 times a month	11	16.7	347	17.8	358	17.7
1 to 3 times a week	9	13.6	209	10.7	218	10.8
Every day or almost every day	8	12.1	82	4.2	90	4.5
More than once a day	3	4.5	15	0.8	18	0.9
Total	**66**		**1,951**		**2,017**	

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Survey participants were asked how frequently they listen to the radio in order to determine whether radio is a suitable medium for delivering anti-meth messages. Most participants listen to the radio frequently and the percentage of participants in each listening category declined as the frequency of radio listening declined. Sixty-eight percent of survey participants reported that they listen to the radio every day or almost every day and another 19% of participants reported they listen to the radio one to three times per week (Table 50). Six percent of survey participants reported listening to the radio one to three times per month, four percent listen to the radio less than once a month, and three percent of participants reported that they do not listen to the radio at all. Since most survey participants listen to the radio frequently, radio is a suitable medium in which to disseminate anti-meth messages.

Table 50. Frequency of Participant Radio Listening

Column percentages

Radio listening	N	%
Not at all	68	3.3 %
Less than once a month	73	3.5
1 to 3 times a month	123	5.9
1 to 3 times a week	405	19.4
Every day or almost every day	1,415	67.9
Total	**2,084**	

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

The survey included items asking participants whether they heard specific anti-meth radio ads developed as part of the AME project. One item briefly summarized the contents of the three radio ads and participants were asked to indicate whether or not they heard the ads and were provided an unsure category. In response to this item, a smaller percentage of survey participants reported hearing the specific AME Project anti-meth radio ads than reported hearing any anti-meth radio ads. There was little variability in the percentage of survey participants who heard or did not hear each radio ad. Seventeen

percent of survey participants reported hearing the bank teller ad, 15% reported hearing the band story ad and 14% reported hearing the North Slope ad. Another 11 to 12% of participants were unsure whether they heard the band story, bank teller, or North Slope ads (Table 51).

Table 51. Frequency of Participants Who Heard AME Project Radio Ads

Row percentages

	Yes		No		Unsure		
Heard radio ads	N	%	N	%	N	%	**Total**
Band story	310	14.9 %	1,543	74.1 %	230	11.0 %	**2,083**
Bank teller	352	17.2	1,453	71.0	241	11.8	**2,046**
North Slope	280	13.8	1,518	74.6	237	11.6	**2,035**

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Survey participants who heard the radio ads were asked to report on the quality of the ads. The items were phrased positively, such as “the ad was better than most anti-drug ads.” Response categories included yes, no and unsure. The ads were generally rated by participants to be of high quality, considering the most frequently occurring response was yes to every measure of quality for each ad. One measure of quality where all three ads received the smallest percentage of affirmative responses was whether the ads were better than most anti-drug ads on the radio. Fifty-three percent of participants indicated that the bank teller ad was better than most comparable ads, 56% of participants indicated that the North Slope ad was better than comparable ads, and 55% of participants indicated that the band story ad was better than most anti-drug ads on the radio (Table 52).

Other quality items asked participants who heard the ads to indicate whether the ads were clearly anti-drug ads and clearly about meth. Ninety-two percent of participants reported that the bank teller ad was clearly anti-drug, and 86% of participants reported that the North Slope and band story ads were clearly anti-drug ads. Ninety-one percent of participants reported that the bank teller ad was clearly about meth, 82% reported the North Slope and band story ads were clearly about meth.

Table 52. Participant Assessment of Meth Radio Advertisement Quality

Row percentages

	Yes		No		Unsure		
Measures of band story ad quality	N	%	N	%	N	%	**Total**
Better than most radio anti-drug ads	182	54.7 %	30	9.0 %	121	36.3 %	**333**
Good ad for ages 18 to 25	237	72.3	10	3.0	81	24.7	**328**
Clearly ad about meth	272	82.2	16	4.8	43	13.0	**331**
Clearly anti-drug ad	284	86.3	9	2.7	36	10.9	**329**
Measures of bank teller ad quality	N	%	N	%	N	%	**Total**
Better than most radio anti-drug ads	137	52.7 %	24	9.2 %	99	38.1 %	**260**
Good ad for ages 18 to 25	193	75.7	10	3.9	52	20.4	**255**
Clearly ad about meth	234	91.1	4	1.6	19	7.4	**257**
Clearly anti-drug ad	234	92.1	2	0.8	18	7.1	**254**
Measures of North Slope ad quality	N	%	N	%	N	%	**Total**
Better than most radio anti-drug ads	118	55.7 %	25	11.8 %	69	32.5 %	**212**
Good ad for ages 18 to 25	153	72.9	12	5.7	45	21.4	**210**
Clearly ad about meth	172	81.5	9	4.3	30	14.2	**211**
Clearly anti-drug ad	181	85.8	4	1.9	26	12.3	**211**

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Ratings regarding the appropriateness of the ads for the target age group of 18 to 25 year olds varied depending on the age group of survey participants. Regarding the band story ad, 73% of survey participants 26 and older agreed that the ad was appropriate for the target age group while 57% of 18 to 25 year old survey participants agreed the band story ad was appropriate for the target age group Table 53). In the case of the bank teller ad, 78% of survey participants 26 and older agreed that the ad was appropriate for the target age group while only 39% of 18 to 25 year old survey participants agreed the bank teller ad was appropriate for the target age group (Table 54). Similarly, while 76% of survey participants 26 and older agreed that the North Slope ad was appropriate for the target age group, only 33% of 18 to 25 year old survey participants agreed the North Slope ad was appropriate for the target age group (Table 55).

Table 53. Participant Assessment of Band Story Ad Appropriateness for Target Age Group

Row percentages

	Yes		No		Unsure		
Age group	N	%	N	%	N	%	**Total**
18 to 25 years	8	57.1 %	3	21.4 %	3	21.4 %	**14**
26 and older	226	73.1	7	2.3	76	24.6	**309**

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Table 54. Participant Assessment of Bank Teller Ad Appropriateness for Target Age Group

Row percentages

	Yes		No		Unsure		
Age group	N	%	N	%	N	%	**Total**
18 to 25 years	5	38.5 %	3	23.1 %	5	38.5 %	**13**
26 and older	184	77.6	7	3.0	46	19.4	**237**

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Table 55. Participant Assessment of North Slope Ad Appropriateness for Target Age Group

Row percentages

	Yes		No		Unsure		
Age group	N	%	N	%	N	%	**Total**
18 to 25 years	4	33.3 %	4	33.3 %	4	33.3 %	**12**
26 and older	146	76.0	8	4.2	38	19.8	**192**

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Survey participants were asked their impressions about the anti-meth radio ads including the danger of the drug, its ability to affect the way you act, or make you look different. Participants were also asked to rate the ads' effectiveness in terms of providing new information or communicating that meth is a drug to avoid. Response categories included the following: strongly did, slightly did, not sure, probably didn't, and definitely didn't. The band story ad clearly communicated that meth would affect the way you act and was a drug to avoid. Eighty-four percent of survey participants reported that the band story ad strongly or slightly gave the impression that meth "makes you act in a way you would not want to act" and 86% of participants reported that the ad strongly or slightly gave the impression that "meth is something to avoid if you've got big plans in life." Sixty-six percent of participants reported the ad gave the impression that meth was "more dangerous to try than originally thought," and 64% of participants reported that the band story ad strongly or slightly gave the impression that meth "makes you look different than usual." Regarding whether the ad provided new information, 53% of participants reported that it probably didn't or definitely didn't (Table 56).

Reported impressions of the bank teller ad were fairly similar to the band story ad, though survey participants generally reported more positive impressions. For instance, 86% of participants reported that the bank teller ad strongly or slightly gave the impression that meth would affect your appearance and 84% reported the ad strongly or slightly gave the impression that meth would negatively affect the way you act. Eighty-seven percent of survey participants reported the bank teller ad strongly or slightly gave them the impression that meth was a drug to avoid if you've got big plans in life and 65% reported the ad strongly or slightly gave them the impression that meth was more dangerous than originally thought. Regarding whether the ad provided new information, 47% of participants reported that it probably didn't or definitely didn't.

In terms of the North Slope radio ad's ability to give the impressions that survey participants were asked to report on, the North Slope ad did not do as well as the other ads. While 84% of participants reported the North Slope ad strongly or slightly gave the impression that meth was a drug to avoid, only 74% reported the ad strongly or slightly gave them the impression it would make you act in a way you would not want to act. Sixty-two percent of participants reported the ad strongly or slightly gave the impression that meth was more dangerous to try than originally thought and 55% reported the ad strongly or slightly gave the impression meth would make you look different. Regarding whether the ad provided new information, 52% of participants reported that it probably didn't or definitely didn't.

The reports of survey participants must be interpreted from the context of what the ads were designed to accomplish. All three of the ads received relatively low scores on the ads' providing new information. However, the focus of the ads may have been more on discouraging use than on providing new information. Based on survey participant's reports, all three anti-meth radio ads gave the impression that meth is something to avoid if you've got plans in life. If communicating an anti-meth message was a main goal of the ad campaign, then this goal was achieved, according to listeners' reports.

Table 56. Survey Participants' Impressions of AME Project Anti-meth Radio Ads

Row percentages

	Strongly did (4)	Slightly did (3)	Not sure (2.5)	Probably didn't (2)	Definitely didn't (1)	Average score
Participants' impressions about meth from band story ad						
More dangerous to try than originally thought	36.5 %	29.1 %	12.9 %	16.9 %	4.6 %	3.0
Makes you act in a way you would not want to act	57.1	26.5	8.6	4.6	3.1	3.4
Makes you look different than usual	37.0	27.0	14.6	15.8	5.6	3.0
Gave new information	12.8	21.8	12.4	34.6	18.4	2.3
Meth is something to avoid if you've got plans in life	70.4	15.7	8.3	1.9	3.7	3.6
Participants' impressions about meth from bank teller ad						
More dangerous to try than originally thought	42.8 %	22.6 %	11.3 %	15.6 %	7.8 %	3.0
Makes you act in a way you would not want to act	61.4	24.8	7.9	3.9	2.0	3.5
Makes you look different than usual	63.1	23.1	8.6	3.9	1.2	3.5
Gave new information	19.7	24.0	9.8	28.0	18.5	2.5
Meth is something to avoid if you've got plans in life	67.8	19.6	7.9	3.5	1.2	3.6
Participants' impressions about meth from North Slope ad						
More dangerous to try than originally thought	40.0 %	22.4 %	11.0 %	17.6 %	9.0 %	3.0
Makes you act in a way you would not want to act	53.8	19.7	8.7	11.1	6.7	3.3
Makes you look different than usual	38.0	16.8	13.9	20.7	10.6	2.9
Gave new information	20.7	18.8	9.1	30.8	20.7	2.4
Meth is something to avoid if you've got plans in life	68.2	15.6	7.1	6.6	2.4	3.5

Source of data: *AME Project Mail Survey (2009)*

Process Evaluation

Interviews were conducted with the coordinator and eight of the 13 statewide advisory committee members. Three committee members were no longer involved with the Alaska Meth Education (AME) Project, and two members could not be reached. Each interview took approximately 30 minutes or less to complete and included sixteen main questions, and occasional sub-questions. A total of 16 main nodes (or themes), based on the interview questions, were developed during the coding process. These main themes were further divided into sub-themes. Two additional nodes (themes) were developed from themes that were found to appear across different questions. The results of the interviews are presented according to the sections of the interview schedule: goals of the project; the statewide advisory committee; and the past, present, and future of the AME Project.

Goals of the AME Project

The first section of the interviews dealt with the goals of the AME Project and consisted of four questions that addressed the following: 1) current and recommended goals, 2) the current degree of goal achievement, 3) steps that could be taken to enhance the ability of the AME Project to achieve its stated goals, and 4) goals that have been recommended by the committee members.

Committee members were first asked to describe the current goals of the AME Project from their perspective. While there was not a consensus among all members regarding the goals of the project, most members understood the goals to be educating about, and preventing the use of, meth. The majority of members mentioned meth education specifically, and approximately half referred to the prevention of meth use. In addition, a few members understood the current project goals to include the prevention of use, and education about, drugs other than meth.

When asked to provide their recommendations on alternative goals for the AME Project, committee members focused on three themes: 1) focus on sub-groups, 2) latitude (breadth of the project), and 3) best practices. Approximately half of the members suggested that the project could adopt a focus on particular sub-groups, but without consensus as to which sub-group. Sub-groups mentioned included adults, those ages 18 to 25, parents, and juveniles. The idea of latitude, expanding the program to include drugs other than meth, was mentioned by just under half of the members. A couple of members perceived a need to conform to best practices, or activities that are based on research and known to be effective, and based on state trends that the project continues to monitor.

Committee members were also asked about the degree to which the AME Project is achieving its goals and steps that could be taken to enhance the ability of the project to achieve its goals. In response to the degree the project is achieving its goals, committee members focused on the two main goals of prevention and education. Members who mentioned the education goal felt the project was achieving this goal based on the fact that the media ads and the community presentations were taking place. One member expressed concern over the set-up of the presentations and suggested that more thorough selection and training of presenters could take place. Members' responses on the prevention and reduction goal indicated a perception that prevention will occur as a result of the education efforts. There was some concern expressed by one member about the efficacy of the AME message, and whether the project is actually having an effect on use, or if it is mainly affecting supply.

Over half of the members thought that an important step toward enhancing the ability of the AME Project to achieve its goals would be more collaboration and information sharing with other organizations that have a similar purpose. Two of these references specifically mentioned the villages as groups that need to be included through coordinating information sharing, and by incorporating village travel in the community education presentations. Other members mentioned collaborating with law enforcement and local governments. Approximately half of the members also addressed things that could be done about the processes of the AME Project itself in order to enhance goal achievement. Suggestions for the project included retaining a paid coordinator, getting additional funding, training and education for committee members on what works and doesn't work in prevention, continuing to perform evaluations, and keeping the media ads specific to Alaska. One member also mentioned the need for flexibility in addressing other drugs, and another suggested taking a more active role in legislative issues as possibilities for enhancing the project's ability to achieve its goals.

Statewide Advisory Committee

The second portion of the interviews addressed the processes of the statewide advisory committee. Committee members were asked eight questions about their involvement with the committee, roles and duties of committee members, the composition of the committee, the committees' representation of and response to individual communities, the current processes of communication and coordination, and suggestions for future improvement.

The first question in this section asked committee members how they found out about or got involved with the AME Project. Most members indicated that they were either appointed to their position or asked to serve on the board by a boss or local mayor. One member was presented by another committee member with the suggestion to join, and one member contacted the board personally and asked to join the committee.

When asked to characterize the roles and duties of a statewide advisory committee member, almost all of the members said their role was to advise the project and project coordinator. Approximately half of the members felt that their role related to community in the sense of being an information liaison and doing community outreach. Two members characterized their duties in terms of the amount of work that is required in the position and suggested that little is required of them as committee members.

The committee members were also asked to suggest what they thought their roles and duties should be. More than half of the members suggested that there should be a more active role for them to play, such as being more active in their community and with their local borough, doing presentations, perhaps taking responsibility over some portion of the project, using what they learn and applying it to other areas, and more involvement with legislation. Two members had nothing to add to the duties.

The next question in this section asked members to evaluate how well the statewide advisory committee members represent agencies and organizations relevant to achieving the goals of the AME Project. Some members focused on the composition of the committee, in terms of its breadth, and others focused on the way individual members represented the organizations or communities they were

nominated from (in terms of promoting the goals of the project in their community, or in regard to the ideas and suggestions the individual members brought from their specific community/organization to the board discussions). Most members thought the committee did "pretty well" or "pretty good" at this task.

Committee members were asked if there were additional organizations they would recommend be represented on the committee, and a number of suggestions were made. Approximately half of the members felt that it would be helpful to have more representation from behavioral health and law enforcement on the committee. Treatment and government agencies were also suggested by a couple of members, and one reference was made to include Alaska Native communities, and the families of those in recovery.

Almost all of the committee members felt that communication and coordination between the coordinator and committee members is currently effective. Most comments about communication referred to the coordinator's activities. Committee members complimented the consistent availability of the coordinator to committee members, and the preparedness of the coordinator for meetings (providing notices, minutes, agendas, and being abreast of the discussion items). Some members also applauded the personal abilities and qualities of the current coordinator. A few of the committee members critiqued the advisory committee in response to this question, noting that: 1) attendance at meetings could have been higher, 2) there is very little communication among the committee members themselves, and 3) perhaps more effort could be made to relay information to the coordinator.

Recommendations for future coordination and communication efforts were made about things the coordinator can do and things the committee can do and were therefore coded along with the responses to the questions that asked about the most important practices to retain or change for the coordinator and for the committee. The results are further discussed within those questions in the section that deals with the past, present, and future of the AME Project.

When asked about the effectiveness of the AME Project at responding to unique and shared meth-related issues across the five represented communities in Alaska, a few members felt a response is happening; giving it ratings such as "good," or "as best it could be done." These evaluations were based on the fact that information is being shared. A few other members responded that they don't believe a response is occurring. Approximately half of the members thought that the unique contribution that has been made by the AME Project to their communities has been the sharing of information through media, community presentations, and the website.

AME Project – Past, Present, Future

The last section of the interview examined the past, present, and future of the AME Project and its processes. This section included five questions that addressed the effect of grant funding on the project in terms of positive changes that have occurred and potential changes when the funding ends, as well as concerns about the current and future project, committee, and coordinator.

Committee members were asked to share their ideas about the most positive changes that happened to the AME Project after receiving the grant funding and hiring a coordinator. About half of the members responded that the media campaign was the most important change in the project, while a

few others mentioned the level of communication and information sharing that has been established and the community education presentations as the most positive change to the program.

The media campaign, communication, and the community presentations were also what members thought would be most important for the AME Project to retain. A couple of members also suggested that it would be important for the project to maintain the statewide emphasis it currently has.

There were a number of suggestions made about the most important practices to change about the project. A couple of members mentioned the inclusion of other drugs to the mandate. Other suggestions included focusing on 18-25 year olds and on parental education, putting more effort into advertising and promoting the community education presentations, having meetings once or twice a year with the wellness team members to keep everyone up to date and on track and to make the wellness teams feel they are a valuable community resource, and moving the coordinator position back to the mayor's office.

The main things the committee members felt it was important for the coordinator to retain were communication and coordination. Approximately half of the members mentioned the importance of keeping the level of communication, coordination, and information sharing with committee members that has been established over the past year. Most members were happy with what they saw happening with the work of the coordinator. However, some suggestions for change included having the coordinator work with UAA to find research dollars to gather more information about meth and other substance abuse practices in Alaska, and to have the coordinator hold or attend joint meetings with other agencies that may be doing similar work and in turn share that information with the committee.

When asked about the most important practices to retain for the committee, just over half of the members responded that it was most important to maintain a regular monthly meeting schedule via telephone conferencing. Other suggestions for things to maintain for the committee included the need for committee members to maintain their willingness to stay abreast of what is occurring in their communities and to share that with the committee.

There were two main changes that members suggested could be made to the committee itself. The first suggestion was to coordinate with other groups that have similar foci, including sharing information from the committee with organizations in committee members' communities. The second suggestion was to have face-to-face meetings at least once a year that are accessible to all members of the committee. Another five members suggested adding various practices that come under the umbrella of developing a more active role for committee members. These included having committee members give presentations, higher attendance at meetings, more participation during meetings, having something official or routine about the duties of the members so they are doing more for the project than listening and being liaisons, taking a more active legislative approach, and providing more information to the mayors in their boroughs.

Committee members were also asked to discuss their biggest concerns about the current and future AME project, coordinator, and statewide advisory committee. When it came to the project itself, the main concern (mentioned by just over half of the members) was that the project maintains focus and momentum. These responses were based around a fear that the project will slow down and possibly be forgotten. A few members mentioned that funding was a major concern, recognizing a need to locate

additional funding for the project. Also mentioned in this section was a concern about diverting to the "witch hunt" mentality of media advertising, and a need to maintain the statewide focus.

The main concerns regarding the coordinator were about the ability of the coordinator to maintain the project's momentum when the hours are being cut and the position is being moved out of the mayor's office, concern about turn-over in the position and the subsequent difficulties that can cause, and the suggestion that the coordinator needs to have energy and be innovative in sharing the message of the AME Project.

A number of concerns were also expressed regarding the committee itself. Committee members responded that it would be important to have a process for outlining the composition of the advisory committee, have a process for selecting committee members, increase the involvement of committee members, and that committee members have a willingness to meet the challenge of the greater effort that will be required from them if and when the focus of the project is expanded to include other drugs.

The final question in the interview provided committee members with an opportunity to share their perceptions of the AME Project and statewide advisory committee. A couple of the committee members mentioned the idea of having government more involved with the project, having government recognize the importance of the project, and bringing the original government representatives back on track with the project. Members also shared concerns about the project itself, recommending the committee regroup, re-energize, agree on a direction, reevaluate the goals and mission, define the role of committee members, and develop a committee member orientation that outlines roles, duties, and expectations to ensure everyone is prepared at meetings and out in the community doing what they are charged with. One member responded that the committee should be prepared to make an argument to the coordinator and municipalities about what the project wants to do and how the committee wants it to be carried out.

The two additional themes that were found in responses throughout the interviews are indeterminacy and meth focus. Indeterminacy was used to describe members' expressed uncertainty about some portion of the project. Almost all of the members, at some point during their interview, expressed uncertainty about various aspects of the project. Those references included uncertainty about what the roles of the committee members are and should be, exactly who the current committee members are, what the goals of the project are, how effective the project has been and, in relation to that, the activities of the project that should be retained or changed.

The second theme, meth focus, refers to discussions of whether the AME Project should maintain a sole focus on meth, or if the scope of the project should be expanded to include other drugs. Approximately half of the members have expressed a desire to have the project expand its focus, and one member expressed an interest in maintaining a focus on meth.

Summary

In discussing the goals of the AME Project, committee members did not reach a consensus as to what the goals are, but most members understood the goals to be educating about, and preventing the use of, meth. Recommendations on alternative goals for the AME Project to adopt included a focus on

sub-groups, latitude, and best practices. The project is thought by some members of the committee to already include other drugs in its goals, while others believe that it is not currently a goal, but should be added. Members felt that the project is achieving its goals because information is being provided through media ads and presentations. A main recommendation for enhancing the project's goal achievement was increased collaboration and information sharing with other organizations that have purposes similar to the AME Project. Changes that could be made to the processes of the project to affect goal achievement included a continued paid coordinator, additional funding, training and education for committee members, continuing to evaluate efforts, and keeping the media ads specific to Alaska.

Members mainly see their role on the committee as an advisory one; however, a main suggestion was that there should be a more active role for members. Most members thought the committee had good representation of organizations relevant to achieving the goals of the AME Project, but many felt the addition of representatives from behavioral health and law enforcement would be beneficial to the project. Members were divided about the effectiveness of the project at responding to the communities it represents, and those who felt the project was effective based their evaluations on the fact that information is being shared. The most unique contribution that the AME Project is perceived to have made in communities has been the sharing of information through media, community presentations, and the website.

Committee members mainly perceive the media campaign, community education presentations, and the level of communication and information sharing that has been established as the most positive changes to the project since the grant funding was received. Suggestions to enhance the work of the committee and project included coordinating with other groups that have similar foci and to have face-to-face meetings at least once a year that are accessible to all members of the committee. Committee members also felt it would be necessary to maintain the focus and momentum of the project, define the composition of the advisory committee, develop a process for selecting committee members, and increase the involvement of the committee members.

Recommendations

Responses from committee members indicate that there are five steps the committee might consider taking at this time: 1) define the composition of the committee, develop a selection process for committee members, and define the role expectations of committee members; 2) expand the board to include behavioral health and law enforcement representatives; 3) develop a means for committee members to play more active roles in their positions; 4) develop a strategic plan for the project that addresses: refining the project goals, possibly expanding the project to include drugs other than meth, identifying target sub-populations (if any), identifying organizations with whom the project can align, and identifying funding opportunities; and 5) explore the feasibility of having an annual face-to-face meeting.

References

Alaska Bureau of Alcohol and Drug Enforcement (2008). *2008 ABADE annual report*. Retrieved from http://www.dps.state.ak.us/ast/ABADE/docs/2008ABADEAnnualReport.pdf

Alaska Division of Public Health and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2003). Alaska youth risk behavior survey 2003. Retrieved from http://www.hss.state.ak.us/dph/chronic/school/pubs/YRBSreport2003.pdf

Alaska Division of Public Health and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2007). Youth risk behavior survey. Retrieved from http://www.hss.state.ak.us/dph/chronic/school/pubs/YRBS-US.pdf

AME Project (2009a). http://www.alaskamethed.com

AME Project (2009b). *Current status of meth use in the US and Alaska*. Unpublished report.

Dillman, D., Smyth, J., and Christian, L.M. (2009). *Internet, mail, and mixed mode surveys: The tailored design method* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley, & Sons, Incorporated.

Dillman, D.A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). New York: J. Wiley.

Drennan, J., & Hyde, A. (2008). Controlling response shift bias: The use of the retrospective pre-test design in the evaluation of a master's program. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*(6), 699-709.

Goode, E. (2008). *Drugs in American society* (7th ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.

National Drug Intelligence Center (2009). *National methamphetamine threat assessment 2009*. Retrieved from http://www.usdoj.gov/ndic/pubs32/32166/32166p.pdf

Office of Applied Studies (2005). Methamphetamine use, abuse, and dependence: 2002, 2003,

and 2004. *The NSDUH Report*. Retrieved from http://www.oas.samhsa.gov/2k5/meth/meth.pdf

Office of Applied Studies (2006). State estimates of past year methamphetamine use. *The NSDUH report*, 37. Retrieved from http://www.oas.samhsa.gov/2k6/stateMeth/stateMeth.pdf

Office of Applied Studies (2008). Treatment episode data set (TEDS) 1996-2006: National admissions to substance abuse treatment services. Retrieved from http://wwwdasis. samhsa.gov/teds06/teds2k6aweb508.pdf

Office of National Drug Control Policy (2006). Pushing back against meth. Retrieved from http://www.whitehousedrugpolicy.gov/publications/pdf/pushingback_against_meth.pdf

Appendix A – Community Education Evaluation Survey

You are being asked to take part in a research study by completing a questionnaire evaluating the methamphetamine presentation you attended. If you agree to participate, it will take you approximately 10-15 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Completing the questionnaire means you have granted consent for the information you provided to be part of the research study. You may stop at any time and you do not have to answer any questions you don't want to answer. Nothing will happen to you if you choose not to answer any questions or if you decide not to participate. Your information will be kept confidential.

Name of Presenter: _____ Date:_____

Please place an X in the box that corresponds to your views using the following scale: 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree						
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
1. The presentation met its stated objectives						
2. The content of the presentation was relevant to me						
3. Overall, this presentation met my expectations						
4. The physical facilities were appropriate for this presentation						
5. I would recommend this presentation to others						
Please place an X in the box that corresponds to your views using the following scale: 1=Poor 2=Below Average 3 =Average 4=Above Average 5=Excellent						
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**NA**
6. My knowledge of methamphetamine before the presentation						
7. My knowledge of methamphetamine after the presentation						

8. The most valuable thing I learned about methamphetamine from this presentation was:

_____

_____

_____

9. Check one or more boxes that correspond to the races you consider yourself to be:

[ ] White
[ ] African American
[ ] Alaska Native
[ ] Hispanic
[ ] Asian
[ ] Other:_____

10. Check the box that corresponds to your age:

[ ] 18-25
[ ] 26-35
[ ] 36-49
[ ] 50-64
[ ] 65+

Appendix B – Coding Framework for Community Education Presentation Evaluation Survey Open-ended Item

Column Heading	Values/Description
Comment Made	Indication of whether a participant made a comment about the presentation or was a *no answer* response. • No answer cases were originally coded in SPSS using either *no answer* or *-1*. All cases were re-coded in Excel with the Find replace function, where *-1* was replaced with *no answer*. • In the coding framework, all cases in the *comment* category that include an actual comment will be coded in the *comment made* category as *1*. *No answer* will be left blank. • The sum function can be used to determine the number of participants that chose to make a comment regarding the presentation.
Meth Value Against	If value against, code=1. • Sum function will be used to determine number of comments against
Extent of Problem	If comment made, code=1 • Sum function for total comment made
EPQual1-S/L	Qualifier/sub-theme for extent of problem: State/local • If comment made, code=1 • Sum function for total comment
EPQual2-P	Qualifier/sub-theme for extent of problem: Production • If comment made, code=1 • Sum function for total comment
EPQual3-A	Qualifier/sub-theme for extent of problem: Age • If comment made, code=1 • Sum function for total comment
Dangers of Meth	If comment made, code=1 • Sum function for total comment
DMQual1-Self	Qualifier/sub-theme for dangers of meth: dangers to self • If comment made, code=1 • Sum function for total comment
DMQual2 – Others/Community	Qualifier/sub-theme for dangers of meth: dangers to others/community • If comment made, code=1 • Sum function for total comment
Awareness	If comment made, code=1 • Sum function for total comment
AQual1-DUP	Qualifier/sub-theme for awareness: Drug, User, Production knowledge • If comment made, code=1 • Sum function for total comment
AQual2-Res	Qualifier/sub-theme for awareness: Resources • If comment made, code=1

	• Sum function for total comment
AQual3-Treat	Qualifier/sub-theme for awareness: Treatment • If comment made, code=1 • Sum function for total comment
AQual4-Laws	Qualifier/sub-theme for awareness: Laws • If comment made, code=1 • Sum function for total comment
AQual5-Mea	Qualifier/Sub-theme for awareness: Current measures • If comment made, code=1 • Sum function for total comment
Responsibility	If comment made, code=1 • Sum function for total comment
Call to action	Qualifier/sub-theme for responsibility: call to action • If comment made, code=1 • Sum function for total comment
Talk to children	Qualifier/sub-theme for responsibility: talk to children • If comment made, code=1 • Sum function for total comment
Presentation Quality	If comment made, code=1 • Sum function for total comment
Present-Neg	Qualifier/sub-theme for presentation quality: Negative • If comment made, code=1 • Sum function for total comment
Present-Pos	Qualifier/sub-theme for presentation quality: positive • If comment made, code=1 • Sum function for total comment
Present-Neutral	Qualifier/sub-theme for presentation quality: neutral • If comment made, code=1 • Sum function for total comment
Theme Induction	Open category for inductive coding of additional themes.

For all categories listed above, the filter function was used to differentiate each theme, and each theme was copied into an individual spread sheet. The sort function was then used to display comments according to sub-themes. Sum functions were then used to determine the number of comments in each sub-theme and example comments were drawn by using the filter function to display lists of each sub-theme.

Appendix C – Student Survey

Spring 2009

Please return your completed questionnaire
to the professor before leaving class

AME Project

The Justice Center, University of Alaska Anchorage

3211 Providence Drive ~ Anchorage, AK 99508

Part I: Risks and Availability of Meth and Other Drugs

1. Whether or not you or someone you know uses meth, we would like your ideas. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following: Meth...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Helps you escape your problems	○	○	○	○	○
Helps you study	○	○	○	○	○
Gives you energy	○	○	○	○	○
Helps you deal with boredom	○	○	○	○	○
Makes you feel euphoric/very happy	○	○	○	○	○
Helps you lose weight	○	○	○	○	○
Makes you more intelligent	○	○	○	○	○
Makes you more popular	○	○	○	○	○
Makes you feel attractive	○	○	○	○	○

2. Please indicate how much risk, if any, you think there is involved in each of the following activities:

	Great risk	Moderate risk	Slight risk	No risk	Not sure
Trying meth once or twice	○	○	○	○	○
Using meth regularly	○	○	○	○	○
Trying heroin once or twice	○	○	○	○	○
Using heroin regularly	○	○	○	○	○
Trying marijuana once or twice	○	○	○	○	○
Using marijuana regularly	○	○	○	○	○
Trying cocaine once or twice	○	○	○	○	○
Using cocaine regularly	○	○	○	○	○
Trying alcohol once or twice	○	○	○	○	○
Using alcohol regularly	○	○	○	○	○

3. Please indicate how much risk you think there is that each of the following would happen to someone who tries meth once.

	Great risk	Moderate risk	Slight risk	No risk	Not sure
Getting hooked on meth	○	○	○	○	○
Becoming violent	○	○	○	○	○
Dying	○	○	○	○	○
Becoming paranoid	○	○	○	○	○
Brain damage	○	○	○	○	○
Suffering tooth decay	○	○	○	○	○
Insomnia/Not being able to sleep	○	○	○	○	○
Making their problems worse	○	○	○	○	○
Losing control of themselves	○	○	○	○	○
Having sex with someone they don't want to	○	○	○	○	○
Being a negative influence on a younger brother or sister	○	○	○	○	○
Stealing	○	○	○	○	○
Stop taking care of their hygiene	○	○	○	○	○
Turning into someone they don't want to be	○	○	○	○	○

4. How difficult or easy do you think it would be for a young adult (18 - 25 years) to get each of the following types of drugs?

	Very difficult	Somewhat difficult	Somewhat easy	Very easy	Not sure
Meth	○	○	○	○	○
Heroin	○	○	○	○	○
Marijuana	○	○	○	○	○
Cocaine	○	○	○	○	○

5. Please indicate how much you approve or disapprove of the following activities:

	Strongly approve	Somewhat approve	Neither approve nor disapprove	Somewhat disapprove	Strongly disapprove
Trying meth once or twice	○	○	○	○	○
Using meth regularly	○	○	○	○	○
Trying heroin once or twice	○	○	○	○	○
Using heroin regularly	○	○	○	○	○
Trying marijuana once or twice	○	○	○	○	○
Using marijuana regularly	○	○	○	○	○
Trying cocaine once or twice	○	○	○	○	○
Using cocaine regularly	○	○	○	○	○
Trying alcohol once or twice	○	○	○	○	○
Using alcohol regularly	○	○	○	○	○

6. How likely do you think it is that teens or young adults in Alaska communities use meth?

- ○ **Not at all likely**
- ○ **Not very likely**
- ○ **Somewhat likely**
- ○ **Very likely**
- ○ **Extremely likely**
- ○ **Not sure**

7. Please indicate the size of the problem you think the following are currently creating in Alaska communities:

	Not a problem	Big problem	Moderate problem	Small problem	Not sure
Meth use	○	○	○	○	○
Heroin use	○	○	○	○	○
Marijuana use	○	○	○	○	○
Cocaine use	○	○	○	○	○
Alcohol use	○	○	○	○	○

Part II: Advertising

Considering anti-drug campaigns, please think about all the different places you have seen, heard or read anti-drug information RECENTLY (in the last six months), including all the different kinds of advertising, sponsorship and other activities that promote them.

		No	Yes
8.	Have you seen, heard or read anything about meth anywhere RECENTLY?	○	○

9. Have you seen or heard anti-meth ADVERTISEMENTS recently in any of the following?

	No	Yes	Not sure
Radio	○	○	○
Printed posters	○	○	○
Newspapers	○	○	○
Internet	○	○	○
Television	○	○	○
Other	○	○	○

10. If you responded that you saw an anti-meth advertisement somewhere that wasn't listed in question 9, above, please specify below where you saw the anti-meth advertisement.

_____

_____

Sometimes you might see or hear about meth through things other than advertising, such as seeing or hearing about it on the news, reading about it in newspaper or magazine articles, and so on.

11. Have you seen or heard anything about meth recently which wasn't advertising? ○ No ○ Yes

12. Which of the following sources, if any, would you go to for information about meth? Please choose all that apply.

- ○ Friends
- ○ University Health and Counseling Centre
- ○ Internet, websites
- ○ Television
- ○ Radio
- ○ Magazines
- ○ Newspapers or local papers
- ○ Other: (please describe) _____

13. How much do you value each of the following as a source of information:

	Highly valuable	Valuable	Neither valuable nor invaluable	Invaluable	Highly invaluable	Doesn't apply to me
TV commercials	○	○	○	○	○	○
TV News	○	○	○	○	○	○
Print ads in newspapers or magazines	○	○	○	○	○	○
Outdoor billboards	○	○	○	○	○	○
Posters on buses and bus stops	○	○	○	○	○	○
Radio	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ads at school	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ads at places you hang out at	○	○	○	○	○	○
Local not-for-profit groups	○	○	○	○	○	○

14. How often do you listen to the radio?

- ○ **Not at all**
- ○ **Less than once a month**
- ○ **1-3 times a month**
- ○ **1-3 times a week**
- ○ **Every day or almost every day**

15. How frequently have you heard radio commercials or ads about meth in the last six months in Alaska?

- ○ **Not at all**
- ○ **Less than once a month**
- ○ **1-3 times a month**
- ○ **1-3 times a week**
- ○ **Every day or almost every day**
- ○ **More than once a day**

Please take a moment to listen to the following meth ad, called **Band Story**, before responding to question 16, below.

16. Have you heard **Band Story** on the radio in the last six months in Alaska? ○ No ○ Yes ○ Not sure

16, a:

After listening to **Band Story**, how strongly do you feel the ad gave you the impression that meth...

	Strongly did	Slightly did	Probably didn't	Definitely didn't
Is more dangerous to try than you originally thought?	○	○	○	○
Will make you act in a way you would not want to act?	○	○	○	○
Will make you look different than you usually do?	○	○	○	○
Gave you new information or told you things you didn't know about meth?	○	○	○	○
Is something you should not try if you've got plans in life?	○	○	○	○

16, b:

Please select No or Yes for each of the following questions to give an indication of how you may or may not feel about the **Band Story** ad.

	No	Yes
Was it better than most anti-drug ads on the radio?	○	○
Is this a good ad for young adults aged 18 - 25?	○	○
Was it clear that the ad was about meth?	○	○
Was it clear that this was an anti-drug ad?	○	○

Please take a moment to listen to the next meth ad, called **Bank Teller**, before answering question 17, below.

17. Have you heard **Bank Teller** on the radio in the last six months in Alaska? ○ No ○ Yes ○ Not sure

17, a:

Please select No or Yes for each of the following questions to give an indication of how you may or may not feel about the **Bank Teller** ad.

	No	Yes
Was it better than most anti-drug ads on the radio?	○	○
Is this a good ad for young adults aged 18 - 25?	○	○
Was it clear that the ad was about meth?	○	○
Was it clear that this was an anti-drug ad?	○	○

17, b:

After listening to **Bank Teller**, how strongly the ad give you the impression that meth...

	Strongly did	Slightly did	Probably didn't	Definitely didn't
Is more dangerous to try than you originally thought?	○	○	○	○
Will make you act in a way you would not want to act?	○	○	○	○
Will make you look different than you usually do?	○	○	○	○
Gave you new information or told you things you didn't know about meth?	○	○	○	○
Is something you should not try if you've got plans in life?	○	○	○	○

Please take a moment to listen to the last meth ad, called **North Slope**, before answering question 18, below.

18. Have you heard **North Slope** on the radio in the last six months in Alaska? ○ No ○ Yes ○ Not sure

18, a:

Please select No or Yes for each of the following questions to give an indication of how you may or may not feel about the **North Slope** ad.

	No	Yes
Was it better than most anti-drug ads on the radio?	○	○
Is this a good ad for young adults aged 18 - 25?	○	○
Was it clear that the ad was about meth?	○	○
Was it clear that this was an anti-drug ad?	○	○

18, b:

After listening to **North Slope**, how strongly did the ad give you the impression that meth...

	Strongly did	Slightly did	Probably didn't	Definitely didn't
Is more dangerous to try than you originally thought?	○	○	○	○
Will make you act in a way you would not want to act?	○	○	○	○
Will make you look different than you usually do?	○	○	○	○
Gave you new information or told you things you didn't know about meth?	○	○	○	○
Is something you should not try if you've got plans in life?	○	○	○	○

Part III: Participant Background Information

This demographic information helps researchers at the university to better understand features of attitudes as they relate to individual characteristics. These responses will be kept confidential, and your answers to these and all of the questions in this survey will not be traceable to you.

Nonetheless, if there are any questions that you do not wish to answer, please simply skip those items and move onto the next question in the survey. Your answers remain valuable whether you choose to answer every question or not.

19. How old were you on your last birthday? ____

20. What is your gender? ○ Female ○ Male

21. What is your current marital status?

- ○ **Single, never married**
- ○ **Married**
- ○ **Separated**
- ○ **Divorced**
- ○ **Widowed**

22. How many people currently live in your household, **including yourself**? _____

Appendix D – Mail Survey

Spring-Summer 2009

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

If you have any questions or concerns about your participation in this study, please contact us:

AME Project Evaluation

The Justice Center, University of Alaska Anchorage

3211 Providence Drive ~ Anchorage, AK 99508

Part I: Risks and Availability of Meth and Other Drugs

Whether or not you or someone you know uses meth, we would like to know your ideas about the following:

1. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following: Meth...

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Helps you escape your problems	○	○	○	○	○
Helps you study	○	○	○	○	○
Gives you energy	○	○	○	○	○
Helps you deal with boredom	○	○	○	○	○
Makes you feel euphoric/very happy	○	○	○	○	○
Helps you lose weight	○	○	○	○	○
Makes you more intelligent	○	○	○	○	○
Makes you more popular	○	○	○	○	○
Makes you feel attractive	○	○	○	○	○

2. Please indicate how much risk, if any, you think there is involved in each of the following activities:

	Great risk	Moderate risk	Slight risk	No risk	Not sure
Trying meth once or twice	○	○	○	○	○
Using meth regularly	○	○	○	○	○
Trying heroin once or twice	○	○	○	○	○
Using heroin regularly	○	○	○	○	○
Trying marijuana once or twice	○	○	○	○	○
Using marijuana regularly	○	○	○	○	○
Trying cocaine once or twice	○	○	○	○	○
Using cocaine regularly	○	○	○	○	○
Trying alcohol once or twice	○	○	○	○	○
Using alcohol regularly	○	○	○	○	○

3. Please indicate how much risk you think there is that each of the following would happen to someone who tries meth once:

	Great risk	Moderate risk	Slight risk	No risk	Not sure
Getting hooked on meth	○	○	○	○	○
Becoming violent	○	○	○	○	○
Dying	○	○	○	○	○
Becoming paranoid	○	○	○	○	○
Brain damage	○	○	○	○	○
Suffering tooth decay	○	○	○	○	○
Insomnia/not being able to sleep	○	○	○	○	○
Making their problems worse	○	○	○	○	○
Losing control of themselves	○	○	○	○	○
Having sex with someone they don't want to	○	○	○	○	○
Being a negative influence on a younger brother or sister	○	○	○	○	○
Stealing	○	○	○	○	○
Stop taking care of their hygiene	○	○	○	○	○
Turning into someone they don't want to be	○	○	○	○	○

4. Please indicate how much you approve or disapprove of the following activities:

	Strongly approve	Somewhat approve	Neither approve nor disapprove	Somewhat disapprove	Strongly disapprove
Trying meth once or twice	○	○	○	○	○
Using meth regularly	○	○	○	○	○
Trying heroin once or twice	○	○	○	○	○
Using heroin regularly	○	○	○	○	○
Trying marijuana once or twice	○	○	○	○	○
Using marijuana regularly	○	○	○	○	○
Trying cocaine once or twice	○	○	○	○	○
Using cocaine regularly	○	○	○	○	○
Trying alcohol once or twice	○	○	○	○	○
Using alcohol regularly	○	○	○	○	○

5. How difficult or easy do you think it would be for a young adult (18 - 25 years) to get each of the following types of drugs?

	Very difficult	Somewhat difficult	Somewhat easy	Very easy	Not sure
Meth	○	○	○	○	○
Heroin	○	○	○	○	○
Marijuana	○	○	○	○	○
Cocaine	○	○	○	○	○

6. How likely do you think it is that teens or young adults in *your city* use meth?

- ○ **Not at all likely**
- ○ **Not very likely**
- ○ **Somewhat likely**
- ○ **Very likely**
- ○ **Extremely likely**
- ○ **Not sure**

7. Please indicate the size of the problem you think the following are currently creating in *your city*:

	Big problem	Moderate problem	Small problem	Not a problem	Not sure
Meth use	○	○	○	○	○
Heroin use	○	○	○	○	○
Marijuana use	○	○	○	○	○
Cocaine use	○	○	○	○	○
Alcohol use	○	○	○	○	○

Part II: Advertising

Considering anti-drug advertisement campaigns, please think about all the different places you have seen, heard or read anti-drug information RECENTLY (in the last six months), including all the different kinds of advertising, sponsorship and other activities that promote them.

	No	Yes	Not sure
8. Have you seen, heard or read anything about meth anywhere RECENTLY?	○	○	○

9. Have you seen or heard anti-meth ADVERTISEMENTS recently in any of the following?

	No	Yes	Not sure
Radio	○	○	○
Printed posters	○	○	○
Newspapers	○	○	○
Internet	○	○	○
Television	○	○	○
Other	○	○	○

10. If you responded that you saw an anti-meth advertisement somewhere that wasn't listed, please specify below **where** you saw the anti-meth advertisement.

_____

_____

Sometimes you might see or hear about meth through things other than advertising, such as seeing or hearing about it on the news, reading about it in newspaper or magazine articles, and so on.

	No	Yes	Not sure
11. Have you seen or heard anything about meth recently which **wasn't** advertising?	○	○	○

12. Please indicate all of the sources for which you have recently seen or heard non-advertisement information about meth:

	No	Yes	Not sure
Newspaper articles	○	○	○
Magazine articles	○	○	○
Television news	○	○	○
Television show	○	○	○
Movie	○	○	○
Internet	○	○	○
Other	○	○	○

13. If you responded that you saw/heard non-advertisement information about meth somewhere that wasn't listed above, please specify below **where** you saw/heard the information:

    _____

14. How often do you listen to the radio?

- ○ **Not at all**
- ○ **Less than once a month**
- ○ **1 to 3 times a month**
- ○ **1 to 3 times a week**
- ○ **Every day or almost every day**

15. How frequently have you heard radio commercials or ads about meth in the last six months in Alaska?

- ○ **Not at all**
- ○ **Less than once a month**
- ○ **1 to 3 times a month**
- ○ **1 to 3 times a week**
- ○ **Every day or almost every day**
- ○ **More than once a day**

	No	Yes	Not sure
16. Thinking back to radio commercials or ads about meth that you have heard in the last six months in Alaska, have you heard **Band Story**, the ad about the band holding auditions for a new bass player? The previous bass player started using meth, flaked out on gigs and could no longer play guitar because he was tweaking on meth.	○	○	○

If **YES**, please answer questions 16 a and 16 b. If **NO or NOT SURE**, please go to question 17.

16, a:
You indicated that you heard the radio ad about the **Band Story**. The next few questions describe how you may or may not feel about this ad. Please select No or Yes for each of the following questions:

	No	Yes	Not sure
Was it better than most anti-drug ads on the radio?	○	○	○
Is this a good ad for young adults aged 18 - 25?	○	○	○
Was it clear that the ad was about meth?	○	○	○
Was it clear that this was an anti-drug ad?	○	○	○

16, b:
You indicated that you heard the radio ad about the **Band Story**. How strongly do you feel the Band Story ad:

	Strongly did	Slightly did	Probably didn't	Definitely didn't	Not sure
Clearly communicated that meth is more dangerous to try than you originally thought?	○	○	○	○	○
Gave you the impression that meth will make you act in a way you would not want to act?	○	○	○	○	○
Suggested that meth will make you look different than you usually do?	○	○	○	○	○
Gave you new information or told you things you didn't know about meth?	○	○	○	○	○
Clearly communicated that meth is something you should not try if you've got plans in life?	○	○	○	○	○

	No	Yes	Not sure
17. Thinking back to radio commercials or ads about meth that you have heard in the last six months in Alaska, have you heard **Bank Teller**, the ad about the bank teller whose friend got hooked on meth fast? Her friend Carrie used to be pretty, but now you can tell she is using meth. She's not showing up for work, she's going to lose her job and the bank teller does not even hang out with her friend anymore.	○	○	○

If **YES**, please answer questions 17 a and 17 b. If **NO or NOT SURE**, please go to question 18.

17, a:

You indicated that you heard the radio ad about the **Bank Teller**. The next few questions describe how you may or may not feel about this ad. Please select No or Yes for each of the following questions:

	No	Yes	Not sure
Was it better than most anti-drug ads on the radio?	○	○	○
Is this a good ad for young adults aged 18 - 25?	○	○	○
Was it clear that the ad was about meth?	○	○	○
Was it clear that this was an anti-drug ad?	○	○	○

17, b:

You indicated that you heard the radio ad about the **Bank Teller**. How strongly do you feel the Bank Teller ad:

	Strongly did	Slightly did	Probably didn't	Definitely didn't	Not sure
Clearly communicated that meth is more dangerous to try than you originally thought?	○	○	○	○	○
Gave you the impression that meth will make you act in a way you would not want to act?	○	○	○	○	○
Suggested that meth will make you look different than you usually do?	○	○	○	○	○
Gave you new information or told you things you didn't know about meth?	○	○	○	○	○
Clearly communicated that meth is something you should not try if you've got plans in life?	○	○	○	○	○

	No	Yes	Not sure
18. Thinking back to radio commercials or ads about meth that you have heard in the last six months in Alaska, have you heard **North Slope**, the ad about the guy who worked on the North Slope, one of the highest paying jobs in Alaska? He tested positive for meth and was fired from his slope job.	○	○	○

If **YES**, please answer questions 18 a and 18 b. If **NO or NOT SURE**, please go to Part III.

18, a:

You indicated that you heard the radio ad about the **North Slope**. The next few questions describe how you may or may not feel about this ad. Please select No or Yes for each of the following questions:

	No	Yes	Not sure
Was it better than most anti-drug ads on the radio?	○	○	○
Is this a good ad for young adults aged 18 - 25?	○	○	○
Was it clear that the ad was about meth?	○	○	○
Was it clear that this was an anti-drug ad?	○	○	○

18, b:

You indicated that you heard the radio ad about the **North Slope**. How strongly do you feel the North Slope ad:

	Strongly did	Slightly did	Probably didn't	Definitely didn't	Not sure
Clearly communicated that meth is more dangerous to try than you originally thought?	○	○	○	○	○
Gave you the impression that meth will make you act in a way you would not want to act?	○	○	○	○	○
Suggested that meth will make you look different than you usually do?	○	○	○	○	○
Gave you new information or told you things you didn't know about meth?	○	○	○	○	○
Clearly communicated that meth is something you should not try if you've got plans in life?	○	○	○	○	○

Part III: Participant Background Information

This demographic information helps researchers at the university to better understand features of attitudes as they relate to individual characteristics. These responses will be kept confidential, and your answers to these and all of the questions in this survey will not be traceable to you.

Nonetheless, if there are any questions that you do not wish to answer, please simply skip those items and move onto the next question in the survey. Your answers remain valuable whether you choose to answer every question or not.

		Female	Male
19.	What is your gender?	○	○

20. What race(s) do you consider yourself to be?
    - ○ **White**
    - ○ **Alaska Native**
    - ○ **African American**
    - ○ **Hispanic**
    - ○ **Asian**
    - ○ **Other** _____

21. How old were you on your last birthday? _____

22. What is your current marital status?
    - ○ **Single, never married**
    - ○ **Married**
    - ○ **Separated**
    - ○ **Divorced**
    - ○ **Widowed**
    - ○ **Other** _____

23. What is your best estimate of the total gross income in your household?

- ○ **Under $25,000**
- ○ **$25,000 to $34,999**
- ○ **$35,000 to $49,999**
- ○ **$50,000 to $64,999**
- ○ **$65,000 to $79,999**
- ○ **$80,000 or more**

24. Please indicate the number of people in each age category that live in your home, **including yourself**:

	None	1	2	3	4	5 or more
4 or younger	○	○	○	○	○	○
5 to 13	○	○	○	○	○	○
14 to17	○	○	○	○	○	○
18 to 25	○	○	○	○	○	○
26 and older	○	○	○	○	○	○

25. What is your five-digit zip code? _____

Appendix E – Process Evaluation Interview Schedule

- Goals of the Alaska Meth Education Project (AME)
  - Based on your understanding, what are the goals of the Alaska Meth Education Project (AME)?
    - What alternative goals (if any) would you recommend the AME project adopt?
  - To what degree do you feel the Alaska Meth Education Project (AME) is achieving its goals?
    - What information did you consider in evaluating AME project's goal achievement?
  - In your opinion, what could be done to enhance the ability of the AME project to achieve its stated goals and/or your recommended goals?
- Statewide Advisory Committee
  - How did you find out about or get involved with AME project?
  - How would you characterize the role and duties of a statewide advisory committee member?
    - What do you feel the role and duties of individual statewide advisory committee members should be?
  - How well do statewide advisory committee members represent agencies and organizations relevant to achieving the goals of the AME project?
    - Are there any additional agencies or organizations you recommend be represented on the statewide advisory committee?
    - How would these agencies enhance the AME project?
  - How would you characterize communication and coordination between the AME project coordinator and statewide advisory committee members?
    - What recommendations do you have, if any, for future coordination and communication efforts?
  - How would you rate the effectiveness of the AME project at responding to unique and shared meth-related issues across the five represented communities in Alaska (Anchorage, Mat-Su, Kenai, Juneau and Fairbanks)?
    - What unique contributions has the AME project made in your community that was or is not addressed by other agencies, organizations or committees?
- Past, Present and Future
  - What would you say are the most positive changes to the AME project that have taken place since fall 2008 when the grant was awarded and coordinator hired?
  - With the grant funding ending in August and potential changes to the coordinator position and statewide advisory committee, what would you advise are the most important practices for the AME project, coordinator and/or statewide advisory committee to retain or change?
  - What are your biggest concerns about the current and/or future AME project, coordinator and/or statewide advisory committee?
- Other
  - Is there anything else you would like to share regarding your perceptions of the AME project and/or statewide advisory committee?