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ABSTRACT

A Federally-funded community-based drug prevention program in Hawaii was studied in 1990 and 1991. A qualitative methodology which incorporated elements from grounded theory, qualitative evaluation, and action research provided the research tools for collecting and analyzing the field data. Analysis of this data was performed to examine how individual and organizational assumptions and perceptions affect processes of coalition formation and community action. The influence of initial and formative meanings on program processes is examined as an indication of predisposing factors important to the success of community-based innovations.

The study showed that purpose, focus, and power and control relationships, assumed at the initiation of a multi-level program of community development, are often unclear and unresolved. This lack of understanding exacerbates the conflicts which develop between individuals and organizations over fundamental definitions and approaches to community action.

Suggestions are made for overcoming these problems and implications of both study findings and recommendations are given for school-based management efforts now at the formative stage in Hawaii. It is asserted that educational restructuring must serve long term capability-building purposes at all levels to really impact the individual and
institutional regularities of school systems. Processes which serve that purpose are suggested.
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PREFACE

There is a famous poem by Robert Frost about "a road not taken" which discusses the consequences of the choices we make in life. The poem asserts that our decisions at discrete points in time determine our future direction. This very linear view suggests the crucial nature of outcomes of the choices we make. I believe the complexity of real life is more closely represented by the pronouncement of Yogi Berra, that famous New York Yankees coach, who said, "When you come to the fork in the road, take it." We often have to decide which fork to take without an inkling as to what lies ahead. Indeed, we often face non-linear situations about which we must make decisions implying linear outcomes.

This study examines various dimensions of a drug prevention education program on the island of Hawaii in the state of Hawaii. The initial intent was to identify patterns of interrelationships in an educative prevention program so that they can be applied to another educative program for Hawaii's schools, School Community-Based Management (SCBM).

At the same time, how this program was researched is presented. Gaining entry to the program was possible through working with the contracted external evaluation team. This research stands in relation to the evaluation of the program, but the first two yearly evaluation reports and most information about the evaluation are not elements of
the story that is told here. This study begins with the core people and processes observed, moves to groups and networks, and then to more complex processes. The reader is urged to view the story of this research as that of the people in three communities and their relationships. Although there are multiple perspectives presented here, the extent to which this study provides a picture of certain central players and central processes is likely to be the extent to which it is informative and useful. Fundamentally, this is a social analysis which is conducted to inform.

In the definition and development of this research, I have constantly reflected upon and reviewed what is going on in the program and where I have found myself in researching its people and actions. Chapters 1 and 2 set the context of my research enterprise and the context of the program's implementation. Chapters 3, 4 and 5 examine the definition and use of methodological tools for the analysis and a statement of results of the program. In Chapter 6, I consider the implications of the results for SCBM, which is the study's initial intent. Chapter 7 is my personal reflection as an educator on the meaning of the research.

The presentation proceeds in the non-linear fashion of: reflection --> examination and analysis --> reflection. I hope by charting this course that you, the reader, can see
the evolution of the research and better understand both the flow and discontinuities as they occur.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is threefold: first, to give an overview of the nature of this research; second, to define the social dimensions of this study; and third, to discuss the meaning of this study to its author.

Overview

This overview is a description of the larger and broader features of what will be examined more finely in later chapters. In the realm of implementing planned change through public social service organizations, as is the case with public health and education programs, there is now an emphasis on a restructuring of the human dynamics for the successful completion of social objectives emerging for the United States of the 1990s. This is reflected in the education reform movement in the United States. In the realm of social issues, there are certain substantive issues which recur as critical to an understanding of human activity. Among these critical social issues is the question of "whether consensus or conflict dominates human relationships" (Rhoads, 1991, 2). This critical social concern indicates that in any human enterprise individuals can agree upon a process of relationship to undertake a social action. Although a dichotomy at this level of
agreement is possible by specifying "consensus or conflict," levels of agreement are often more precisely defined as dynamic processes lying along a spectrum with many dimensions and levels of intensity.

Those attempting the challenge of restructuring in this generation are dealing with a different level of change than before. "The challenge of the 1990s will be to deal with more second order changes--changes that affect the culture and structure of schools, restructuring roles and reorganizing responsibilities" (Fullan, 1991, 29). These kinds of "second order" changes face many obstacles but will result in various levels of agreement among those who have a vested interest in the restructuring of the educational enterprise. In order to deal with these restructuring changes, stakeholders (vested parties to the changes) will become involved in a process of learning about and acting upon the changes that are being or have been chosen for implementation. As implementation of change takes place, certain stakeholders become involved in that implementation. These processes of human relationship provide a rich contextual setting for examining the level of agreement and cooperation among stakeholders in the process of restructuring roles and responsibilities in education.

This study examines the implementation of a drug prevention education program on the island of Hawaii in the state of Hawaii, in order to identify processes of planned
change in a community-based program. Processes such as problem identification, recognition of alternative solutions, the organization of a community approach to implementing proposed solutions, and a mechanism to check or control ongoing processes will be examined.

The study uses grounded theory procedures and techniques to give a "thick description" of the dynamics of the program studied (Geertz, 1973, 26). This grounded theory analysis will permit a constant critical questioning and contrasting of the concepts and processes which characterize the unique setting of this program. Findings from this study will be used to suggest dimensions of concern in implementing other community-based programs in Hawaii.

It is important to state that I have chosen to collect, analyze and make conclusions from data gathered from a drug prevention education program because of opportunity, timing, and background. Clearly, if I wish to make statements about school-community based education efforts in Hawaii, the easiest way of doing so is to examine the dynamics of schools implementing school-community based plans and processes. And, although this process is beginning in Hawaii, my intention is to examine community dynamics in Hawaii both as it develops into a full-fledged, operating program and, as much as possible, prior to the school and community changes that will be impacting education in Hawaii.
very soon. The Community Youth Activity Program provided the opportunity and timing I was seeking, as well as focusing on drug prevention, an area in which I have previous Masters research experience and in which I have worked as a part-time high school teacher on the island of Oahu.

Certainly there are limitations to such an examination. Nonetheless, I believe the findings will be of sufficient "thickness" and the analysis sufficiently explicit to make the level of generalizability of the stated implications clear to the reader.

The Social Dimensions of the Study

The purpose of this discussion of the social dimensions of this research is to make explicit the conceptual framework of the study, the level of social interaction that is the context of the investigation, and the process that will determine the concepts to be examined more fully in the analysis.

Since this research is based in the social foundations of education, it is important to specify the interdisciplinary nature of educational foundations. Educational foundations draw on the disciplines of history, philosophy, anthropology, psychology, sociology, and other reflective and comparative disciplines which lend themselves to an interpretive, normative and critical look at
educational policy and practice. There are thus multiple and widely divergent social science perspectives that can be used to examine social data of concern to educational foundations researchers. It is important at the outset to understand that this research is based primarily on the psychological/sociological conceptual framework. That is, the conceptual framework that most informs this investigation is based in the literature of psychology and sociology that deals with community-based social actions. Although the collected data may lead to conceptualizations that diverge from this framework, much of the initial conceptualization is likely to come from these two disciplines.

Phenomena being investigated as a part of social interaction can take place at a number of levels (see Figure 1.1). And although one may investigate a certain phenomenon at only a certain level, it can also stand in a conditional relationship to levels above and below it, as well as to the primary level of investigation (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, 162). So, for example

the term 'division of labor,' which refers to an action process for the carrying out of the phenomena of work, involves much more than different people doing different tasks to some end. This process also encompasses the negotiations, discussions, legitimation of boundaries, and so forth, that take place in order to arrive at and maintain a division of labor and accomplish its associated tasks (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, 164).
This study examines the collective interaction of small groups (coalitions) implementing drug education activities. This is the primary level of investigation. But clearly, for each phenomenon investigated, there are certain conditional relationships that will be present at levels above and below this level. Therefore, certain individual actions are undertaken by persons regarding a certain phenomenon, let's say, teaching school children. At the same time, at the organizational level, certain legitimating processes for teaching children have also occurred. Thus, the collective (coalition) level which affects the phenomena of teaching school children is conditional on relationships to private actions and to organizational processes.

The data collection process used in much qualitative research—and in this study—is generally inductive: that is, it is based on conceptualization, sampling procedures, and theory construction that results from open data gathering and categorizing and dimensionalizing processes that clarify and confirm the conceptualization derived from the data. Thus, even the initial interview or observational guides are tentative and need to be adapted to the data. Rigid adherence to interview guides, or an a priori selection of conceptualizations imposed on the data will foreclose on the data possibilities inherent in the situation; limit the amount and type of data gathered; and prevent the researcher from achieving the density and variation of concepts so
necessary for developing a grounded theory (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, 180).

It is therefore very important to derive conceptualizations for a study rather than select them from journal articles with titles like, "Some Variables in the Study of Coalition Formation" (Hinckley, 1981, 51). As in this study, it is equally important that the conceptual terminology and framing be derived from the data and be constantly verified through the questioning and comparative data gathering done during field work.

**Reflexivity**

**My Background**

The perspective that I, as the researcher, bring to the research enterprise is important for the reader to understand at the outset. My family background gave me an early understanding of the dynamics of drug use and abuse. As a child of an alcoholic, I have some feeling for dysfunctional family dynamics, a well-researched part of drug use research. My education, including a Bachelor's degree in psychology (1971) and Masters degrees in public health (1976) and education (1986), had not focused on drug prevention research until the last seven years, when my interest in research on tobacco use prevention among youth drew me to an interest in other drug prevention research. My perspective is driven both by public health concerns about drug use consequences and by educational concerns that
children and adults learn best when free of drug use and drug use consequences in their social settings. I have authored several papers on tobacco use internationally, tobacco use in Hawaii, and tobacco use by women. My experience with program evaluation was very limited at the beginning of this research, but I have become knowledgeable about evaluation methods through attending seminars, reading books, and applying my new knowledge while working with an evaluation team. I expect that I will carry out future drug prevention evaluation and research.

Description

There is perhaps no greater difficulty for those who have been involved with science, even social science, than admitting that there is an interplay of facts, social actions and actors that requires a boldness of description, reflection and cognitive self-doubt in the process of qualitative field investigation. The reality is that, in dealing with the complexity of social actions, this knowledge requires an extraordinary sensitivity to the part you as well as others play in the social actions in which you participate. Fortunately, the emphasis is on getting as much as can be gotten from the selective focus developed in the field setting, not trying to do it all. The type of reflective narrative developed in constructing a grounded theory is unusually fluid in its process of going back and forth from inductive to deductive thinking. Being explicit
about this process exposes one to admitting disconfirmations (finding that you have been wrong in some of your initial perceptions) and adopting a sense of modesty as to what can be understood about the complexity of social actions. It also requires the integration of previous technical literature into the narrative so that the reader understands the comparative process that serves the researcher in building theory. All of these differences give one the opportunity "to regard our fellow humans as people instead of subjects, and to regard ourselves as humans who conduct our research among rather than on them" (Wolcott, 1990, 19). As this is the case, the narrative account that shall make up this dissertation will be stated in the first person, a match of the formality of the writing with the formality of the approach.
FIGURE 1.1
Levels of Social Interaction

SOURCE: Strauss and Corbin, 1990, 163
CHAPTER 2
THE FORMATIVE REINVENTION OF THE HAWAII COMMUNITY YOUTH ACTIVITY PROGRAM

The purpose of this chapter is to explain the transformation of the Hawaii Community Youth Activity Program (CYAP) through the process of responding to program context, stakeholder needs and skills, and the level of organizational readiness within the program community. This chapter deals with the first or formative stage of the CYAP and involves an assessment of the degree to which the program deviated from an initial standard or expectation (reinvention).

There are three parts: 1) The initial and evolving System Framework of the CYAP; 2) the fundamental and incremental changes of the Program; and 3) a mapping of the resulting processes established in the Program. The purpose of discussing these features of the CYAP is to establish the context for a further examination of program participants' statements about the meaning of the Program for them and their communities.

The Initial and Evolving System Framework for the CYAP.

The Community Youth Activity Program was initiated by the Office for Substance Abuse Prevention (OSAP) of the federal Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration. OSAP was created in the fall of 1986 and
funded by monies available for the national "War on Drugs." Some of these funds were directed at community-based drug prevention programs like the specially created CYAP. The Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 increased total federal spending for prevention from $24 million in fiscal year 1986 to $249 million in fiscal year 1987. In this context, OSAP sprang to life with a 1987 budget of $41.5 million. It was to provide national leadership in the development of model prevention/treatment demonstration programs for high-risk youth, deliver technical assistance in drug abuse programming at the state and local levels, and continue in a consolidated communications program the excellent work of information dissemination provided by the formerly separate clearinghouses for alcohol and for drug information (Bukoski, 1990, 108).

The current organization of OSAP includes the office of the director and three divisions: Communication Program, Prevention Implementation, and Demonstrations and Evaluation. Community Youth Activity Programs are administered by the Prevention Implementation Division of OSAP. Although initially funded by block grants, Community Youth Activity Programs, as discussed in this study, are funded in 31 states through competitive grant applications submitted to OSAP in 1988 and 1989. According to OSAP (1989) the goals of the Community Youth Activities Grant Program are:

The reduction in the level of alcohol and other drug use in the target geographic area;

Increased cooperation and formal linkages among alcohol and other drug abuse prevention, treatment and rehabilitation, juvenile justice, education, housing,
employment, social welfare, physical and mental health programs within the targeted geographic areas;

Development of on-going systems and programs which are self-sustaining and are not dependent on continuous Federal support;

Development of innovative, multifaceted, comprehensive and coordinated prevention programs within a select community;

Increased understanding that the use of alcohol and other drugs is a complex multiple determined activity involving the individual, family, school/peer group, the community and society; and that the prevention of this activity must address these various contributors to this undesirable behavior;

Improvement of the state-of-the-art in community prevention programming.

Those submitting competitive grant applications were instructed that they need not address all these program goals, but "proposed projects should be consonant with one or more of these goals" (OSAP, 1989). We shall return to this point later in this chapter.

Office for Substance Abuse Prevention Selection of Grantees

The stated goals of the CYAP indicate that the program was to have reflected a System Framework approach. According to OSAP this approach to prevention "views the community and the environment as interconnected parts, each affecting the others and all needing to work together" (OSAP, 1989). This System Framework is based on several assumptions: first, that the community level is the appropriate level for drug prevention work; second, that the community recognizes that there is a problem with drug use
and abuse in the community; and finally, "that the most successful prevention efforts are those that enable a community to solve its own problems" (USDHHS, 1989, 12).

These assumptions are expanded upon in the documents and presentations of The Circle, a national training agency contracted by OSAP, who presented a workshop in Honolulu entitled "The Future By Design: A Community Prevention System Framework." I attended this workshop as an International Center (IC) evaluator for the Hawaii CYAP in July 1991. According to The Circle, there are five major themes or threads interwoven throughout the System Framework. These are paradigm shift, community prevention system, cultural competency, inclusion and community empowerment. Paradigm shift refers to a shift of responsibility from agencies and professionals who have been expected to solve the alcohol and other drug problems to the community's responsibility for addressing and solving such problems. The community prevention system refers to responsibility being shared by interdependent community stakeholders involved at all levels of programming and decision making. Cultural competency refers to recognizing the diversity of ethnic and special population groups and their varied levels of knowledge and competencies and ensuring inclusion of the diverse cultural perspectives, as much as possible at all levels and in each decision making step of the process. This is to be realized in the
establishment of "coalitions, partnerships, and collaborative efforts." Lastly, community empowerment means that power resides with the community. There is shared responsibility with the community and accountability is to the community (The Circle, 1990).

These five themes of the community prevention system framework requires that "we shift our paradigm from a services delivery model to a community empowerment model" (The Circle, 1990). The empowerment process as presented in the community prevention workshop is viewed as moving from independent-dependent relationships to interdependent relationships and from initial simple communication through cooperation and coordination to true collaboration as partners in solving a mutual problem. Community empowerment as defined by The Circle is "the acquisition and use of the knowledge, skills and resources necessary to enable a community to develop and/or enhance an effective community prevention system" (The Circle, 1990).

It is important to interject that, although the first three assumptions above are fundamental to the CYAP, the System Framework design advocated by OSAP and described by The Circle is actually an "ideal type" developed from a composite of ideas and working principles it obtained from community participants in twenty-six successful community-based prevention programs surveyed or visited throughout the United States. The results of qualitative open-ended
surveys with one hundred and five community contacts from all segments of the twenty-six targeted communities resulted in "grass roots" reflections on the process of successful community-wide prevention efforts. These results were then used in developing the Community Prevention System Development Colloquium where diverse community participants synthesized the interview results into recommendations through a consensus process. These synthesized recommendations became the Framework just described. The Framework's purpose is to clearly identify the guidelines to assist any community with the development of an effective prevention system (The Circle, 1990).

The importance of this background will not only illustrate the assumptions and Framework chosen by the federal Office for Substance Abuse Prevention, but will explain how these assumptions and the System Framework conceptualization square with the granting process for the CYAP. Specifically, the CYAP is a demonstration program designed to enable grantees to show how, in diverse community circumstances, strategies and systems can be developed and work to further drug prevention. At the time of the first grantee meeting for the thirty-one states selected for funding, a matrix of CYAP characteristics was presented to illustrate each state program's population, environment, focus and types of partnerships. This matrix shown in Appendix 1 illustrates the proposed nature of each
Twenty-nine of thirty-one projects received administrative support from the state agency responsible for drug prevention activities. Of these, eleven received administrative support only from these state Agencies, while thirteen more received administrative support from only a state agency and local government. Twenty-four of thirty-one programs (77%) were not projected to get administrative support that was community based, service based, school based, or from the religious community. In addition, twenty-one of the thirty-one projects (68%) had projected one or two service provider partnerships for their projects (of the possible six in the matrix). Overall twenty of the thirty programs (67%) were categorized as top-down programs regarding the nature of the partnerships to be entered into for the Program. In contrast, the project focus categories as outlined in the Program matrix indicated that twenty-five of thirty-one programs (81%) would include high or moderate collaborative activities and thirty of thirty-one (97%) would promote youth involvement in school, community, employment and recreation (OSAP, 1989).

The programs were characterized by a high to moderate level of collaboration, top-down rather than bottom-up type of administration, and involved a very limited number of partners in the provision of services. Although it can not be definitively stated, it might be inferred from this grant categorization summary that OSAP wished to demonstrate that
centrally administered programs, involving a limited number of partners with high levels of involvement and collaboration, could be effective in diverse settings throughout the U.S., and that this CYAP approach would provide further evidence that a community System Framework approach might warrant widespread adoption. This is not only implied in the materials distributed at the first grantee meeting but is confirmed in the publication of a progress report on one community drug prevention project (OSAP, 1989). That report described the research project and mentioned ongoing community drug prevention programs which "extend this work into comprehensive community prevention projects across the nation" (USPHS, 1990, 543).

Although the funding and initial conceptualization of the CYAP comes from the federal level, the grantee responsible for administering the grant monies to service contractors is the State of Hawaii through its Alcohol and Drug Abuse Division (ADAD). ADAD wrote the grant that was selected for funding by OSAP. ADAD took the grant application goals specified by OSAP in the request for proposal (RFP) and developed eleven goals for the Hawaii CYAP (see Appendix 2). The Hawaii CYAP uses three mechanisms: intergenerational involvement in prevention activities, a media campaign to rouse the community to action, and educational curricula aimed at youth and adults to foster change and enlist supporters for community drug
prevention strategies. These mechanisms have as their ultimate aim the reduction of drug related arrests and drug use in the project area. The target population for this project is youth ten to seventeen years of age.

When the grant was initially written, the proposed site of the CYAP was the windward side of Oahu. This site was chosen because of its higher levels of alcohol and other drug use compared with other areas and because there already existed a Windward Drug Prevention Coalition which was in a position to assume the responsibility of implementing such a project.

In summary, I have described the CYAP context developed by OSAP with contracted assistance in the establishment of a System Framework approach by The Circle and to more specifically define mechanisms of achieving the drug prevention goals for Hawaii by ADAD. This brief overview does not yet include a description of the Hawaii Island YWCA (the contractor charged with directing the project from the city of Hilo); the external evaluation contractor, the International Center for Health Promotion and Disease Prevention Research (IC); or R.O.W. Sciences, the national evaluation contractor. These are the core agencies for funding and administering the Hawaii CYAP with their conceptual and theoretical frameworks for what type of program the CYAP was to become. A discussion of my
involvement with the incremental changes in the early stages of the Program follows.

Formative and Incremental Changes of the Hawaii CYAP

The discussion of the initial and evolving System Framework of the CYAP illustrates that some of the initial systems expectations for the Program as specified by The Circle were not incorporated into the RFP requirements at the time the grants were awarded (Fall 1989). This is clear since the System Framework presentations by The Circle were made following the first OSAP grantee meeting in December 1989. Although the grant application and selection process paralleled the process of developing the System Framework, the grant applicants only had general information (assumptions) specified to them which included some features of the System Framework.

Some of these assumptions were incorporated into the OSAP goals for the CYAP, but grant applicants were urged only to "be consonant with one or more" of OSAP's six CYAP goals. The integration of the System Framework into the thinking, administration, planning and implementation of the CYAP was therefore incremental. The only problem with this incremental approach is that new systems relationships and interactions minimally require processes of understanding, acceptance and integration which take time. In some cases, there is even an unfortunate synergism in which the
introduction of a new framework for community action (the System Framework), which involves organizational and multilevel innovations, and the nature of the problems and methods being considered to address them (prevention of drug use and abuse by youth, a technological innovation) result in a fundamental rejection of the new program which community actors view as representing both the recognition of a new and threatening problem, and some new and untested way of dealing with it. In short, the challenge to the status quo presented by a new problem and a new systems process is denied or rejected.

In addition to the incremental changes or processes suggested, but not necessarily adopted, by the CYAPs in the various states throughout the United States, there is also the matter of the contradictory purposes that seem to have been given to the CYAP by OSAP. Two of the OSAP goals for the CYAP cited previously are: 1) development of innovative, multifaceted, comprehensive and coordinated prevention programs within a selected community and 2) improvement of the state-of-the-art in community prevention programming (OSAP, 1989).

Both of these goals are consistent with a demonstration project in which "the effects of an efficacious program on public health when implemented in whole systems" is being studied. Demonstration projects are usually implemented at the end of a series of efficacy and effectiveness trials.
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They provide evidence through program evaluation that an innovative community program can be successful under conditions of nonstandardized program implementation and variable availability and acceptance within a real world setting (Flay, 1986, 457).

In examining this normal research progression to the demonstration project one must assume that 1) the cumulative evidence has shown the technique to be efficacious; 2) subsequent research has shown the effectiveness of the techniques under standardized program implementation conditions; and 3) the demonstration project "fits" or is appropriate as a research extension of efficacious and effective techniques and is understood as such by those implementing it. Irrespective of numbers one and two above, there is no evidence that the CYAP conforms to assumption three, that is, that it was chosen as such a research extension and made understandable as such to participants.

This is inexplicable at first glance. More careful examination shows that "demonstration" as used by OSAP is distinctly different than the understanding of demonstration given above. An OSAP monograph published in 1990 discusses demonstrations as occupying a point on the prevention research continuum just after etiological studies, that is, at the beginning of the research progression. In this view, demonstrations are seen as "preliminary feasibility studies on the implementation of innovations" (Swisher, 1990, 20).
Demonstrations are considered as effectiveness trials to get a quick indication of outcomes for some prevention technique. A demonstration project coming after efficacy as an initial test of implementation effectiveness, is substantially different than a demonstration as a refinement of an efficacious and effective prevention technique in a new setting. OSAP's specification of goals for the CYAP appears to be consistent with a demonstration project defined as a refinement and yet the OSAP monograph which defines a demonstration as a formative feasibility study specifies that seventy percent of OSAP grantees are performing demonstrations defined in this way. A Public Health Service article, indicating that comprehensive prevention programs are successful and mentioning "services demonstrations," makes these demonstrations sound like replications or refinements which "extend" the effective research projects already completed (USPHS, 1990, 543). In short, these are conflicting representations of what CYAP demonstration projects are intended to be. These different definitions are not necessarily problematic if administrators and implementors of the CYAP know what they are expected to do in relation to present day "state-of-the-art" prevention techniques. This will be considered in the discussion of the program administration and implementation below.
Administration of the CYAP by ADAD

The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Division is the Hawaii State agency that responded to OSAP's request for proposals for the Community Youth Activity grantee program. ADAD initially indicated that the CYAP would be implemented in Windward Oahu (ADAD, 1989). This location was later changed to East Hawaii for unspecified reasons. This shift in geographic location was accepted by OSAP since there was a need for a community-based alcohol and drug prevention program on the Island of Hawaii. Although there was a need for alcohol and other drug prevention programs at both locations, the change in geographic location represented a major change in administering and implementing the CYAP. First, the physical separation of the administrator (ADAD) and the external evaluator of the Program (IC) from the agency administering the program (Hawaii Island YWCA) makes the ongoing monitoring much more difficult. Second, the advantage of having the implementing agency at the Windward Oahu site was that there already was a developed community drug prevention coalition there. The East Hawaii location required a substantial new investment in coalition development in order to simply initiate a community-based program.

Finally, ADAD's administration of CYAP yearly contracts was plagued by staff changes, lack of continuity in program monitoring, and a redefinition of the intent of implementing
program objectives over the course of year to year contract negotiations with the CYAP Director. These elements, which created major problems for the implementation and evaluation of the Program, will be discussed in more detail below in a chronology of the ADAD contracts.

The Hawaii Island YWCA

ADAD chose the Hawaii Island YWCA as the contractor to implement the CYAP grant. This decision undoubtedly was based upon certain known characteristics of this agency, such as their 1) past experience in administering state grants for youth/community services, 2) past experience with family programs, 3) coordination and cooperation with local service agencies, and 4) strong administrative staff.

Although these factors are administratively important, the degree to which the non-administrative context and the community were prepared for an alcohol/drug prevention program with certain specified goals and objectives is not clear. It is certain that the level of community and organizational readiness in East Hawaii was significantly less than the readiness in Windward Oahu where a drug prevention coalition was already in existence. Organizational readiness is commonly expressed by examining 1) the support and/or demands impinging from the environment; 2) the awareness and acceptance of the problem by the host organization; 3) the attitudes, motivation, and practices
of organizational staff; and 4) the resources and organizational structures available to support the innovation (Heller, 1990, 151).

Although the awareness and acceptance of the problem by the host organization and the overall outlook of the staff (items 2 and 3 above) are seemingly under the control of the host organization, the other two factors are substantially affected by the community context of the organization. When the community context changes, the level of organizational readiness is likely to change. Because East Hawaii didn't have Windward Oahu's resources or level of support, it had a reduced readiness for undertaking the CYAP. Although this readiness factor was not systematically assessed, it is certain that the change of the Program location to the Island of Hawaii did in itself have a substantial detrimental effect on resources and support availability. Reduced organizational readiness and the fact that there was no community prevention initiative already underway indicate a need for reconsideration of the goals and objectives for the CYAP at its new location. Although it was recognized that the timelines for coalition formation and other community organizing features of the Program would have to be adjusted to give the Program more time, the initial goals and objectives did not change.

The Director of the Hawaii Island YWCA, Rowie Taylor, hired a director for the CYAP in February 1989. Jo Ann
Hongslo, a State-certified substance abuse counselor, was chosen to implement the Program. An organizational chart of the CYAP is shown in Appendix 3. This chart is a simplification of the real lines of accountability of the Program. Specifically, in addition to the CYAP Director taking orders from the Director of the YWCA, both OSAP and ADAD had expectations of the Program that required attendance at conferences, yearly budgets, and monthly and other reporting requirements. The evaluation contractor in Hawaii (IC) and the national evaluators (R.O.W. Sciences) also required input and gave input which required time from the director and program staff. Program staff consisted of a full-time secretary and three part-time coalition coordinators for each of the three coalition areas of the project.

I, as the primary field evaluator, monitored the Program by making frequent Program site visits which often coincided with Staff, Coalition and Council meetings or other Program trainings or seminars (see Appendix 6). In this way, I was able to attend and observe at least five monthly coalition meetings in each coalition area, at least six staff meetings between the director and the three coalition coordinators, and at least three quarterly meetings of the Coordinating Council.

The three area coalitions were observed by participating in area coalition and overall Program
activities as well as going to monthly coalition meetings. Staff activities were observed through attending staff and coalition meetings and through visiting the coalition coordinators in their work places. The Hilo coordinator worked out of the CYAP director's office in Hilo while the Puna and Hamakua coalition coordinators had small offices in Pahoa and Honokaa respectively.

Community participants were by far the bulk or core of the CYAP stakeholders. They consisted of about twenty coordinating council members who represented key leaders from all segments of the community and twenty-five or more coalition members from each coalition area who represented citizens with concerns about drug use and the well-being of adolescents in their communities. For example, Council participants included politicians (10%), school teachers and administrators (30%), law enforcement officers (10%), the religious community (10%), numerous for-profit and non-profit service providers (30%), and concerned citizens involved in community affairs (10%).

Another fundamental change of the CYAP was the change from an essentially top-down to a more bottom-up type of program. Although the community stakeholders mentioned above are the core actors through whom the director and staff of the CYAP were able to initiate community activities, the initial plan of the CYAP specified the Council as the main planning and activity-initiating body.
This was possible in the initial plan because the Council had an already organized, diverse body of community members who could get community activities underway. Without this pre-existing coalition in place, as on Windward Oahu, it was necessary to build a coalition and to establish a base of grassroots support for drug prevention in the three areas of East Hawaii. This required allowing the three area coalitions to develop, to assess the needs of their communities, and to start planning the activities and long-term strategies necessary to address the problem as they saw it. This work was necessary for a truly community-based program. Under this revised plan for the CYAP, the coalitions were to be the primary source of ideas and activities for community action, with the council giving constructive feedback and support to enhance the drug prevention efforts. The intent of this arrangement was to empower diverse community members before the weight of the existing power structure was brought to bear in the implementation of activities and strategies. This was clearly an attempt at a "shared power" formulation where the unique characteristics of each community were represented through the coalitions, and the information and long-term planning perspectives of the region (the Island of Hawaii) were transmitted through the council. This approach was particularly important on the Island of Hawaii since the degree of "connectedness" between persons and agencies on
this island with state resources is much more limited than on Oahu. A strong community-island base was therefore necessary for both accomplishment and sustainability, and was consistent with the System Framework proposed for the CYAP by The Circle.

The second section of this chapter has illustrated the incremental and fundamental changes which were chosen or imposed on the CYAP in its formative or beginning phase. These changes show that a "reinvention" of the Program did take place for numerous reasons. The third section of this chapter, the mapping of this reinvention, is shown in Figures 2.1 and 2.2 below to summarize and "frame" the formative assumptions and processes that will be followed and discussed as we look at various dynamics of the CYAP in the coming chapters.

Mapping of the Reinvention of the CYAP

Figure 2.1 shows the changes in five CYAP features due to the unanticipated change in Program location and an emphasis on local community participation in coalitions in three areas of East Hawaii. Figure 2.2 shows how different organizations at different levels contributed to Program processes. Note that several factors, including the shift in the Program's location and the selection of the System Framework, contributed to the community building emphasis of the CYAP.
FIGURE 2.1
The Formative Reinvention of the HI CYAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CYAP Feature</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Area</td>
<td>Windward Oahu</td>
<td>East Hawaii, state of HI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction of planning</td>
<td>Top Down</td>
<td>Bottom Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Plans Developed By</td>
<td>Consortium (Council)</td>
<td>Coalitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Service Agency Representatives (Macro)</td>
<td>Community Coalitions Concerned With Addressing Needs (Micro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Emphasis</td>
<td>Systems Analysis And Process Changes</td>
<td>Process Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As demonstration grant</td>
<td>Create new systems relations: which processes most useful?</td>
<td>Created distinctive coalitions: which processes most useful?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuation Focus</td>
<td>Continued Systems Collaboration</td>
<td>Continued Community Focus and Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs focus</td>
<td>Planning and coordination of service agency cooperation</td>
<td>Planning, implementation of community needs-based work plans using available resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 2.2
Mapping of the Formative Processes of the CYAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Level</th>
<th>Grant Guidelines, funding</th>
<th>Grant applic. w/pgm specs.</th>
<th>Spec of Pgm. Framework</th>
<th>Program Location Change</th>
<th>Community Building</th>
<th>Activities Implementation</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSAP</td>
<td>RIFP</td>
<td>Systems framework for CYAPs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAD</td>
<td>Grant submit, select.</td>
<td>Windward Oahu to E. HI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYAP</td>
<td></td>
<td>YW chosen to implem. Pgm.</td>
<td>Coalition formation</td>
<td>Funding, training &amp; coord.</td>
<td>Outreach to indiv &amp; orgs.</td>
<td>Process outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Coalitions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Results to sustain community development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

There was a time in the history of social science when methodology was a much simpler matter. This was due to a dominant and assumed epistemology based in the positivist tradition. Science was the model and measurement by quantification was the means to understanding. This has changed. A pluralistic methodology is now the norm for social science inquiry (Jessor, 1991, 314). Although some may claim a single best methodology for themselves, very few in the social sciences deny the utility of multiple methodologies in the social inquiry process. This multiplicity is further complicated by the variations that have developed for those using a qualitative methodology. In this chapter, the qualitative method used in this study is defined in the context of developments in qualitative methodology. Next, the reasons for choosing this methodology are given. Finally, how the methodology was applied in this research is described.

Definition of a Qualitative Method

The methodology of this study is qualitative--research that "predominantly or exclusively use words as data" (Tesch, 1990, 56). While words are the data collected, qualitative inquiry is "the capacity to learn from others" (Patton, 1990, 7). Qualitative research involves the
collection, analysis and interpretation of data, consisting of four main elements:

1) the qualitative evaluator must get close enough to the people and situation being studied to be able to understand the depth and details of what goes on;
2) the qualitative evaluator must aim at capturing what actually takes place and what people actually say: the perceived facts;
3) qualitative data consist of a great deal of pure description of people, activities and interactions;
4) qualitative data consist of direct quotations from people, both what they say and what they write down (Patton, 1984, 55).

Although collecting data in the field involves much more than these four essential elements suggest, the connecting with people and places to collect words that describe and that sometimes explain what is going on is the basic data collection method of my research. In the process of analysis and interpretation, one is forced to explain much more thoroughly the type of qualitative research undertaken. The qualitative analysis types discussed below present a context for understanding my analysis and interpretation.

Selection of Method

Certain fundamental facts must be kept in mind in establishing a clear picture of the qualitative methodology used in this study. First, this study was possible because I was working as a graduate research assistant with a Masters of Public Health, for the International Center,
University of Hawaii School of Public Health, evaluating the Community Youth Activity Program. I chose qualitative evaluation as a useful method to supplement the conventional outcome evaluation of such programs. It is a research method which "employs the tenets of naturalistic inquiry and emphasizes the process by which outcomes are produced rather than merely judging the outcomes" (Tesch, 1990, 51). Qualitative evaluation is a type of analysis in which "the identification of regularities is sought in the form of patterns" (Tesch, 1990, 89). It begins with a couple of initial categories that are part of every evaluative study, "program process and program impact" (Patton, 1980, 320).

**Application of Method**

I have deliberately chosen to limit my use of theory in this qualitative research.

The essence of qualitative methods is induction, that is, the development of theory from data. But the process of induction used varies with the amount known about the topic, the abstractness of the concepts involved, the type of qualitative method used, and the methods of verification inherent in the method used (Morse, 1992, 3).

Theory is used in this study in two limited ways. First, "as a theoretical basis for the research so that the research fits into a disciplinary paradigmatic perspective" and second, "as a link with the work of others so that the unique and common aspects of the inquiry may be identified"
and generalizability of the research facilitated" (Morse, 1992, 4).

In short, theory informs the context of this qualitative research and provides one interpretive reference point to which the data can later speak. This may seem confusing, but reflects the fact that qualitative research is an inductive-deductive system which doesn't just "go fishing" for facts.

Qualitative research types differ for sociology, psychology and education although there are some qualitative principles that are near universals. Tesch identified twenty-six qualitative research approaches (Tesch, 1990, 71). Of these twenty-six approaches, one shared by sociology and psychology, grounded theory, and two from education, qualitative evaluation and action/collaborative research, make up the main methodological tools of this study.

Grounded theory, as a qualitative method used in sociology and psychology, is based in the 1967 work of Glaser and Strauss who describe the grounded theory method as a process "to discover theory from data through the general method of constant comparison" (Glaser and Strauss, 1). This seminal work, outlining the logic of grounded theory, is entitled The Discovery of Grounded Theory and was followed by Theoretical Sensitivity (Glaser, 1987) and Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists (Strauss, 1987).
The later text, *Basics of Qualitative Research, Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques* describes the step by step process of grounded theory analysis and is used in doing the analysis of this research (Strauss and Corbin, 1990).

Qualitative evaluation has previously been defined as "evaluation that employs the tenets of naturalistic inquiry and emphasizes the process by which outcomes are produced rather than merely judging the outcomes" (Tesch, 1990, 51). This is a very broad definition of qualitative evaluation encompassing many types of qualitative program evaluation. There is a massive literature base in which the multiple dimensions of multiple qualitative evaluation models are discussed and debated. One need only review the journal series *New Directions for Program Evaluation* or books such as *Qualitative Research in Education, Focus and Methods* (Sherman and Webb, 1988), and *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*, (Patton, 1990) to realize that qualitative evaluation has come to include new models, approaches and techniques. Books like *Evaluation Models: Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services Evaluation* (Madaus, et al. 1983), and *Debates on Evaluation* (Alkin, 1990), plus articles like "A Numerically Developed Taxonomy of Evaluation Theory and Practice," (Williams, 1989) show the multiplicity of ways qualitative evaluation has been conceptualized and used. With this in mind, I wish to clarify qualitative evaluation as used in this research
through the consideration of three important dimensions. "Evaluation for whom, at what level and for what process?" are the questions that characterize these dimensions.

"Qualitative evaluation for whom?" addresses a central concern of evaluation today. In the history of evaluation practice, the trend is now toward evaluations that serve not only policy- or decision-makers but also a broader base of clients, stakeholders, and consumers. This trend has been fostered by forces inside and outside the field of evaluation. Evaluation has long served to maintain the accountability of social programs and to serve policy-makers concerned with improving social policy.

Two interrelated events in policy research have occurred in the past ten years:

1) the dissolution of the natural science model of inquiry as the pre-eminent model in policy studies and 2) the conceptual vacuum created by the retreat of quantitative methods... has been filled by a growing and vigorous interest in qualitative methods (Rist, 1984, 159).

This vigor of new qualitative methods developed from various failures of existing quantitative methods. Critiques and studies of existing, mostly quantitative evaluations, in the 1960s and 1970s called for alternative methods of evaluation (Madaus et al., 1983, 12-14). One summary article states,

Evaluator have learned over the past 20 years that many contextual factors such as social and political forces do influence programs and that true experimental designs are not so useful in detecting and studying these important extraneous factors as are other types of designs (Benson and Michael, 1987, 43-4).
The need to address social and political forces has resulted in evaluation types and processes directed at meeting the needs of those with a primary interest or stake in the evaluation. The emphasis on "making the methodology fit the needs of society, its institutions and its citizens" (Madaus et al., 1983, 18) has been translated into evaluation types with names like responsive evaluation (1975), democratic evaluation (1976), illuminative evaluation (1976), utilization-focused evaluation (1978), and stakeholder-based evaluation (1983) (Sirotnik and Oakes, 1990, 37). These evaluation types attempt to establish very clear linkages with primary users of evaluation so those evaluated can give input to and participate in the evaluation process. This kind of direct involvement in the evaluation process is also seen in the development of evaluation assessment, a pre-evaluation process to assess the guiding theory or framework of a program and the kinds of understandings and commitments participants have toward a program. Since its inception in the early 1970s "the process itself and one of its key components--stakeholder involvement in evaluations--have been continuously in the literature" (Smith, 1987, 1).

Who will be served by qualitative evaluation speaks to the relevance and utility of the evaluation. In the past, this utility was assumed. A shift in emphasis occurred when it became apparent that many evaluations either collected
and reported useless data or reported useful data in a form inappropriate to those with an interest in it. Now mainstream qualitative research has come to mean immersion in the everyday life of the setting chosen for study, that values participants perspectives on their worlds and seeks to discover those perspectives, that views inquiry as an interactive process between the researcher and the participants, and that is primarily descriptive and relies on people's words as the primary data (Marshall and Rossman, 1989, 11).

The role of evaluator as partner with program participants is one that is commonly expressed but less commonly possible since evaluation cannot serve all program participants equally well. Frequently, it is the funding agency and its evaluation needs that are served. Among the roles of evaluator-researchers, five are listed below:

1. Independent researcher-scholar
2. Information broker
3. Servant to the administrator
4. Educator of stakeholders
5. Consultant to consumers (Ciarlo and Windle, 1988, 105)

It is clear that both in internal and external evaluation there is often pressure on evaluators to provide data as required by administrators or funders (role three) and more infrequently there is the opportunity to act as an independent researcher or as an information broker (roles one and two) or to concentrate on the educator, consultant role (roles four and five). In the research reported here I played multiple roles (one through four), with primary emphasis on role one (this research study) and three (the
requirements of the contracted external evaluation for ADAD and OSAP).

Specifically, the evaluation was characterized as serving community-based drug prevention needs for the Island of Hawaii by providing a "management for decision-making" focus through facilitation of program planning and implementation feedback to the CYAP. This specific focus of serving the decision-making needs of management precluded serving those needs of stakeholders and I was therefore not able to carry out this research as true stakeholder-based evaluation.

Although I made a deliberate attempt to serve stakeholder interests, very limited activity in this regard was actually carried out. I kept open lines of communication, provided encouragement and resources, and involved staff and community stakeholders in evaluation training and planning; but the closest this qualitative evaluation came to serving stakeholder interests, as opposed to the "public" interest (ADAD and OSAP), was in my attempt to illuminate the multiple levels of interaction that play a part in the ongoing reinvention process that went on in the CYAP. The reported evaluation can be of use to participants who wish a continuation of the processes of a community-based drug prevention programs in East Hawaii.

Qualitative evaluation at what level? This question addresses how far the qualitative data collected in this
research will go to build theory. The answer is suggested in the nature of the research. This research concentrated on the formative period of the CYAP. Therefore, certain aspects of the findings are rather tentative and will be stated as such. Nonetheless certain patterns that indicate regularities will hopefully emerge from the data. I believe that one conclusion about the methodology of qualitative research might state that, although issues of methodology are issues of strategy, strategy follows purpose and context. Figure 3.1 illustrates this methodological reality (Marshall and Rossman, 1989, 78).

The research of the formative period of the CYAP and the search for patterns of meaning puts this study in the exploratory category shown above.

Another indication of what level of qualitative evaluation was performed in this study is illustrated by the vertical line in Figure 3.2, which shows the approach of this study along five observation dimensions (Marshall and Rossman, 1989, 80). Note my high levels of participant observation, overt observation, partial to full explanations to program participants, long-term, multiple observations with a narrow to mid-range observation focus. Figure 3.2 indicates that observation was open and extensive but that the observations were focused on elements of particular interest to this study.
For what process does one undertake qualitative evaluation? Generally qualitative research is undertaken to find out what is going on in the project, program, or setting under consideration. For the educator, the evaluation is a learning process. Thus, qualitative evaluation must serve an educational purpose for program participants. Evaluation which serves to conclude that something works or does not work is necessary but not sufficient to indicate what program participants have learned from their experience with the program. More importantly, the behaviors and understandings of these behaviors for program participants are key to whether programs work or not and what can be contributed to foster learning in other settings.

Qualitative evaluation is an empirical process.

The empirical basis of evaluation involves making assumptions and values implicit, testing the validity of assumptions, and carefully examining a program to find out what is actually occurring. The integrity of an evaluation depends on its empirical orientation. Likewise, the integrity of an evaluation group process depends on helping participants adopt an empirical perspective. A commitment must be engendered to really find out what is happening, at least as nearly as one can, given the limitations of research methods and scarce resources. Engendering this kind of commitment and helping task force participants adopt an empirical orientation involve the evaluator in the roles of teacher and trainer (Patton, 1987, 129-30).

Beyond the evaluator's role are the participants' roles as self-directed learners. Self-directed learners are autonomous learners who have an awareness of their
separateness and who are conscious of their personal power to choose their own direction beyond the obvious alternatives suggested in their present context. In the context of the OSAP "systems framework" and as a deliberate part of the evaluation process, there was an attempt to involve adult participants in a dialogical process that reflected the marriage of the continuous inquiry process and the reflection to further their pursuit of meaning (Brookfield, 1985, 15).

This kind of process can be characterized as transformative, emancipatory, as a critical inquiry process or in a number of other ways. The core issue here is the utilization of evaluation to address practical moral questions that face individuals and communities:

In this view, ethics is not about the nature of the good, but rather involves the study of how human actors settle moral disagreements and attempt to secure cherished values. Aesthetics is not about the nature of truth, but rather involves the study of the social practices by which communities develop a basis for warranted belief and action (Giarelli, 1988, 26).

In short, the qualitative evaluation process sought to portray program evaluation not "as a set of applied research technologies but rather as an ongoing, collaborative, value-driven project of organizational change and improvement" (Sirotnik and Oakes, 1990, 54).

The flexibility and responsiveness of the evaluator and participants set the process context. Methodology becomes
the strategy to serve the evolving purpose and context, in an attempt to avoid "methodolatry,"

the slavish and uncritical adherence to a particular research mode irrespective of the success of that mode in producing new knowledge or in suggesting new concepts and hypotheses (Gouldner, 1967, 337-8).

I believe the dual contribution of the empirical process and the responsive, dialogical and emancipatory moral process is what an educational approach to social action engenders. It is tempting to describe this methodology technically and leave it at that. In discussing qualitative evaluation for whom, at what level and for what process, I have shown that this research views qualitative evaluation as an educational and moral opportunity.

Action/collaborative research is the third defining element of the methodological approach of this study. This research method includes a number of elements that are now a part of qualitative evaluation just discussed. Tesch (1990, 50) specifies the purpose of action/collaborative research as "improving practices by or in cooperation with practitioners." Scriven (1991, 48) gives a more restricted educational definition of action research and an assessment of it: "More commonly today, [it is] the name for research by teachers on classroom or school phenomena. An excellent idea, but one with a very poor track record."

In contrast to these limited discussions of action research, Richard Winter's Action-Research and the Nature of
Social Inquiry: Professional Innovation and Educational Work (1987) includes a thorough discussion of action research in relation to social inquiry methods including such issues as reflexivity, rationality, validity and ideology. Through a discussion of reformulated practices of action-research, Winter (1987) illustrates and discusses six principles for a reflexive action-research. These include critique, dialectic, collaborative resource, risk, plural structure and theory and practice transformation (151-4). He includes social inquiry discussions from sociology, anthropology and the qualitative evaluation literature. That is, he is quite inclusive in the discussion of action-research and views it as a framework from which the social and political ideal of a self-educating community, where 'work' is not so oppressive that it precludes the energy and the resources for critical analysis, and where inquiry is not a segregated and specialized prerogative (viii) can be forwarded. In short, action research is not simply researching with others, but is the application of ongoing processes which transform discovery through action. Critique informs social meaning by questioning it, dialectics illuminate experience by examining its contradictions, collaborative resource pushes "to their here-and-now limits the inherent resources of interpersonal contextualized understanding" (152), risk involves one's recognition of the reflexive and contextual limits of one's interpretive judgements, and plural structure highlights the
relationship of elements of the action context without forcing a unified construction. Finally, the theory-practice transformation refers to a commitment to the continuation of action based on the five other reflexive principles described above (Winter, 1987, 151-154).

Why a Qualitative Methodology?

The purpose and context of this study dictated a qualitative methodology as a choice of strategy. How does one determine when to use qualitative versus quantitative ones?

First, it is important to emphasize that "the emergent consensus in evaluation...seems to be moving toward a position where both qualitative and quantitative data are valued and recognized as legitimate" (Patton, 1984, 56).

From some perspectives, the choice of quantitative or qualitative evaluation practices indicates a choice between a quantitative or qualitative view of the world. Others who choose between quantitative and qualitative practices do so within a positivist frame of reference with all that it assumes, while for others, the choice of quantitative or qualitative methods indicates a choice between a positivist or constructivist paradigm....But it must be clear that both quantitative and qualitative techniques can be used with either paradigm (Chambers et al., 1992, 291).

Patton (1986, 210-12) argues that the paradigm debate is now dead because of ten developments within evaluation:

1. Evaluation has emerged as a genuinely interdisciplinary field of professional practice.
2. The utilization crisis (in evaluation) focused attention on the need for methodological flexibility.

3. The articulation of professional standards by evaluation associations has emphasized methodological appropriateness rather than paradigm orthodoxy.

4. The accumulation of practical evaluation experience during the last fifteen years has reduced paradigms' polarization.

5. The strengths and weaknesses of both quantitative and experimental methods and qualitative and naturalistic methods are now better understood.

6. A broader conceptualization of evaluation, and of evaluator training, has reduced the centrality of methods in evaluation, and has therefore reduced the centrality of the methods debate.

7. Advances in methods approaches have strengthened diverse applications to evaluation problems.

8. Support for methodological eclecticism from major figures in evaluation has increased methodological tolerance.

9. Professional societies of evaluation have supported exchanges of views and high-quality professional practice in an environment of tolerance and eclecticism.

10. There is increased experience in combining qualitative and quantitative approaches.

Although some may feel the paradigm debate is dead, there are sufficient epistemological differences among scholars to insure a continued dialog. But it must be emphasized again that "the term qualitative is a methods-level term, not a paradigm level term" (Guba, 1990, 22). Since qualitative methods have come to be accepted across
paradigms, what situations or settings call for a qualitative approach? One checklist of evaluation situations for which qualitative methods are appropriate identifies sixteen situations for which qualitative methods would be useful. The setting and nature of this research includes seven of these sixteen evaluation situations including:

1. Emphasis on individualized client outcomes.
2. An interest in program processes.
3. Where information is sought on the details of program implementation.
4. An interest in information about the nuances of program quality.
5. Where the funder/administrator of the program is interested in the evaluator making site visits to monitor program implementation.
6. The possibility that the program may be affecting clients or participants in unanticipated ways and/or having unexpected side effects.
7. A need to personalize the evaluation process by using research methods that require personal, face to face contact (Patton, 1980, 88-9).

A more detailed list of appropriate inquiry applications of qualitative methods specifies thirty practical substantive, model and process applications for which qualitative methods would be useful. Of these applications, fifteen applications are consistent with the nature and intent of this research project. These add to the list above applications such as formative evaluations
for program improvement, prevention evaluations, participatory and empowering approaches to evaluation and rapid reconnaissance (Patton, 1990, 141).

The situations and applications just mentioned indicate that qualitative methods are appropriate where contextual sensitivity is important, where the assumptions of the research framework are consistent with a responsive, process investigation, and where the stage of inquiry of the research is appropriate. Because of the distinctive characteristics of the separate community settings of the three coalition areas and the diverse ethnic populations across several generations, there was a clear need for contextual sensitivity. The responsive, process-oriented systems framework of the CYAP was another clear indication of a need for a qualitative approach. Finally, the fact that this program was a demonstration program made qualitative methods most appropriate for this research. As a demonstration program typical of educational or prevention programs, the CYAP was "to demonstrate that a set of ideas or principles can be converted into an operational program and to learn what happens when moving from ideas to practice" (Bryk and Raudenbush, 1983, 100). The first of these purposes is program implementation success that involves what was delivered and how it was implemented. The second involves "who it reached (availability) and how the recipients responded to it (acceptance)" (Flay, 1986, 467).
As explained in Chapter Two, the aims of demonstration projects can vary because they target different phases of the research process. "Researchers and reviewers need to give greater attention to matching methodological requirements with phases of research, and phases of research with the current state of the art" (Flay, 1986, 467). Whether or not one regards this research as an early effectiveness trial or a refinement on proven effective techniques, qualitative methods are indicated to assess availability and acceptance in this drug prevention education research.

A description of qualitative methods, why qualitative methods are primarily used in this study, and which have been selected have thus far been addressed. It is finally important to lay out how qualitative methodology is employed in this research. I believe this is necessary since "whatever methods are used to make sense of data, in the end it turns out to be a very personal and individual process" (Marshall, 1981, 395).

The qualitative approach of this study is the "systematic observer" approach which is oriented to discovery and verification through a critical-realist epistemology which utilizes inductive strategies in the early phases but which directs later stages of the analysis process to deductive verification of findings. This approach strives for internal coherence and consistency and
external verification (Smith, 1987, 179-81). This study sought the ideal of more systematic and better described methods of data collection and analysis. What field settings allowed in terms of verification often fell short of this. Therefore, the degree to which various levels of verification from internal coherence and consistency to external verification is indicated within the qualitative report of findings.

This study utilized qualitative methods to explore and describe the contextual factors assumed to affect persons and organizations responding to prescribed opportunities for establishing community-based programs that address social needs. Particular attention was focused on antecedents, preferences for processes of change, readiness and accommodation to change, and perceptions of power relationships in certain stages of a community-based program.

Antecedents refer to both individual and organizational histories, past relations and operational styles. Preferences for processes of change refer to those preferences of individuals and organizations along a continuum going from constraining to permissive. Readiness refers to the present environmental support and demands, problem awareness and acceptance, staff attitudes and motivation, and available resources and organizational structures. Accommodation to change refers to the level of
individual and organizational openness to new external factors. Perceptions of power relationships refer to how persons view power and whether or not they feel shifts in power relationships are necessary.

Five general research areas will be examined in sequential phases through interviews, checklists and observations:

1. What are the initial individual and organizational assumptions and perceptions of the problem, purpose and power relationships of the CYAP?

2. What is the level of dissonance between individuals and between planning coalitions and directing and administrative agencies controlling resources? Is there a relationship between these levels of dissonance and the perceptions and organizational style of the three grassroots coalitions of the CYAP?

3. What anticipated and unanticipated patterns or regularities of individuals and organizations are uncovered and which, if any, seem to be related to contextual factors?

4. What individual and organizational skills and competencies are developed at the local planning and implementing level and what implications do these gains have for the viability of a community-based program?
5. What are the discernable relationships of the various educational strategies present to the distinctive contextual factors identified in the coalition areas?

Qualitative data were collected during more than a dozen visits and a three month residence in Hilo, Hawaii as part of the contracted evaluation of the CYAP. Since only one individual with two roles collected the data, specification of my role as researcher and the purpose of meeting with individual respondents were made clear. Methods of verification with respondents were used to insure the accuracy of the observations and statements made during the collection of field notes.

The systematic method used in this study included:

1. The specification of a conceptual framework of the research (see Figure 3.3).
2. The initial code list for field notes (marginal coding) included the basic concepts of context, actor, power, process, and impact.
3. Transcriptions of field notes were made with the addition of reflective and marginal remarks.
4. Translation of marginal and reflective remarks into pattern codes, interim memos and summaries.
5. End points for this study were streams or directions of influence among sets of variables. No causal network was developed but site-specific
patterns for each of three distinctive communities are described.

The process described above incorporates techniques outlined in Lofland and Lofland's *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis* and Miles and Huberman's *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods*. Although the major requirement of qualitative data collection is establishing a contextual interface with the setting of interest so that information that reflects "what is going on" can be described and given meaning, analysis following data collection can be a very lonely business. In the data to be described, an attempt is made to reflect both the strengths and weaknesses of the analysis employed in this study.

There are clearly many forms of bias that can be introduced in interpreting and analyzing data. For example, there is sometimes a tendency to assume that the researcher/evaluator has expertise in drug prevention education and evaluation. This common fallacy is recognized by evaluators as the fallacy of irrelevant expertise. Put simply, "it is common to suppose that experts in a field are qualified to be expert evaluators in that field" (Scriven, 1991, 163). This assumption when examined in light of numerous evaluations turns out to be quite flawed. The approach taken here is to make the descriptions and interpretations so explicit that the reader can examine the
data and its meaning through their own eyes as well as the logic of the study analysis. In this way, no assumption is made about the expertise of the data collector or the analyst.
# FIGURE 3.1
Matching Research Questions with Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of the Study</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Research Strategy</th>
<th>Examples of Data Collection Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPLORATORY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to investigate little-understood phenomena</td>
<td>What is happening in this social program?</td>
<td>case study</td>
<td>participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to identify/discover important variables</td>
<td>What are the salient themes, patterns, categories in participants' meaning structures?</td>
<td>field study</td>
<td>observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to generate hypotheses for further research</td>
<td>How are these patterns linked with one another?</td>
<td></td>
<td>in-depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPLANATORY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to explain the forces causing the phenomenon in question</td>
<td>What events, beliefs, attitudes, policies are shaping this phenomenon?</td>
<td>multisite</td>
<td>participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to identify plausible causal networks shaping the phenomenon</td>
<td>How do these forces interact to result in the phenomenon?</td>
<td>case study</td>
<td>observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>history</td>
<td>in-depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>field study</td>
<td>interviewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ethnography</td>
<td>survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>document analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DESCRIPTIVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to document the phenomenon of interest</td>
<td>What are the salient behaviors, events, beliefs, attitudes, structures, processes occurring in this phenomenon?</td>
<td>field study</td>
<td>participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>case study</td>
<td>observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ethnography</td>
<td>in-depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>interviewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>document analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unobtrusive measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PREDICTIVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to predict the outcomes of the phenomenon</td>
<td>What will occur as a result of this phenomenon? Who will be affected? In what ways?</td>
<td>experiment</td>
<td>survey questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to forecast the events and behaviors resulting from the phenomenon</td>
<td></td>
<td>quasi-experiment</td>
<td>large sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kinesics/proxemics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>content analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Marshall and Rossman (1989, 78)
FIGURE 3.2
Five Dimensions of Variations in Approaches to Observations

I. Role of the Evaluator-Observer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full participant observation</th>
<th>Partial observation</th>
<th>Onlooker observation as an outsider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Portrayal of the Evaluator Role to Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overt observations: Program staff and participants know that observations are being made and who the observer is.</th>
<th>Observer role is known by some, not by others.</th>
<th>Covert observation: Program staff and participants do not know that observations are being made or that there is an observer.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Portrayal of the Purpose of the Evaluation to Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full explanation of real purpose to everyone.</th>
<th>Partial explanations</th>
<th>Covert explanations: No explanation given to either staff or participants.</th>
<th>False explanations: Staff and/or participants are deceived about evaluation purpose.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Duration of the Evaluation Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single observation, limited duration (e.g., one hour)</th>
<th>Long-term, multiple observations (e.g., months, years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Focus of the Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrow focus: Single element or component in the program is observed.</th>
<th>Broad focus: Holistic view of the entire program and all of its elements is sought.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Patton (1980, 138)
EXISTING CONTEXT AND CONVENTIONAL COMMUNITY INTERVENTION MODEL
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CHAPTER 4
ANALYSIS

This chapter includes a presentation of the data collected during the fieldwork with the CYAP, an illustration of the qualitative analysis performed to make sense of the data and an initial statement of some of the study findings.

Data Collected for Analysis

Materials collected and used in this analysis include written documents produced by the CYAP director and staff, minutes of meetings, from February 1990 through September 1991, involving staff, coalitions and the Coordinating Council, and evaluation reports from the U.H.I.C. written by me, since I was directly responsible. These written materials were balanced by recorded data consisting primarily of thirty interviews of staff, coalition and council members and youth. These recorded interviews produced approximately three hundred pages of transcribed text (see Appendix 7) which were analyzed using a modified grounded-theory method. I refer to this analysis as modified grounded theory because this study began with several areas of interest, and several conceptual and categorical givens based on setting features, both discussed previously. These have, of necessity, imposed some ready-
made concepts and categories as starting points for the already completed analysis. It is recognized that these concepts and categories can "get in the way of discovery" (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, 49), but it is also important to recognize that they were not assumptions of some previously developed theory but were part of the setting and program studied; that is, they reflected what was going on and what was meaningful to those participants giving meaning to the Program. If the concepts and categories selected reflect unrecognized assumptions by this researcher, I expect these will be made clear as I illustrate the analysis process. I think the analysis and initial study findings will illustrate that the results follow the data rather than being imposed conceptual or categorical assumptions.

Before going on to illustrate the analysis process used to examine the data, it should be noted that my analysis starts with document coding and then narrows to a careful examination of selected material. Initially it was quite difficult to begin the open coding, which is the foundation of the grounded theory approach. Therefore, I utilized document coding as my initial open coding method for examining the data. This initial gross coding across documents progressed to a more careful examination using either line by line or sentence/paragraph analysis. The gross coding gave an overview which allowed me to more quickly focus in on the most productive data. This
technique may or may not be useful to others. For those like myself doing grounded theory analysis for the first time, this technique can be quite useful in giving the analyst some idea of the nature of the data at one's disposal.

There are both advantages and disadvantages to this approach. Because the analysis included data from many levels from distinctly different communities, the gross open coding proved useful in identifying certain initial similarities, contrasts and questions for a more detailed subsequent examination.

**Analysis Illustrated**

It is important to make clear that much of the most useful data came out of interviews conducted during the three month period when I resided in Hilo, September through November of 1991, and was involved with the evaluation monitoring of the CYAP. These were most valuable since they allowed me to observe and to get direct and candid information from participants in the program. Written reports for administrative and evaluation purposes were helpful in examining how the program represents itself to its East Hawaii supporters and those involved in monitoring the program externally.

These reports, however, can be misleading in both positive and negative ways. Characteristically, community
programs have much to report in the way of progress because of the difficulties and costs incurred in successfully launching any new human service program. However, even information reported in depth often does not give the full picture of the strengths and weaknesses of the program that one can obtain through interviews of informants and participants. The interviews conducted for this study were semi-structured interviews asking general open-ended questions about the involvement, commitment and meaning that those interviewed saw in the program. Three different interview formats were used (see Appendix 5). Each format will be discussed briefly before illustrating data analysis of interviews of staff and coalition members.

The most complete series of interviews were with the staff of the CYAP. These interviews followed an in-depth method perfected by Seidman (1991). Each of the three staff persons were interviewed using a sequence of three interviews. These interviews deal with the interviewee's life history, contemporary experience with the CYAP work, and present and projected meaning in working with the CYAP. No prepared set of interview questions was used. An explanation of the overall sequence of interviews and of each interview's theme was specified to the interviewee (see Appendix 5). An attempt was made to elicit clarification, confirmation or more information if I felt these would be useful in rounding out what the interviewee was saying. The
interviews were about an hour in length and spaced at least a week apart. In one case it was necessary to change this format when scheduling made it necessary to do the two initial interviews with one of the interviewees back to back in the same setting. Nonetheless, this interview method was very useful for providing "access to the context of people's behavior and thereby [providing] a way for researchers to understand the meaning of that behavior" (Seidman, 1991, 4). Once the interview was taped, it was transcribed and initial open coding done on the entire interview, followed by more extensive sentence or paragraph open coding. The nine interviews gathered in this way provided the richest contextual material about the program's operation. The collegial relationship between me and the staff of the Program resulted in frank and revealing interviews, more like thematic conversations, in which depth of feeling and extended illustration poured out. Interviewees knew that the material from these interviews would be included in the research but that anonymity would be maintained. Pseudonyms for Hilo, Puna, and Hamakua Coalition Coordinators are Mr. A, Mrs. B, and Ms. C, respectively.

The following excerpt is from the interview of the Hilo Coalition Coordinator ("Mr. A," 30 year old Caucasian), responding to my question on the meaning of "working as a staff person for the Program." Note that key concepts are underlined. An analysis illustration using a conceptual
outline (discrepancy model) is shown for this passage in Figure 4.1.

INTERVIEW

Mr. A: Well, in terms of the meaning involved in working with a community-based program. First of all I think that this whole concept of community-based, I guess I am biased by the fact that I think of participatory democracy in a kind of idealistic way. And even though that guy, George B. Shaw or somebody said that socialism takes too many evenings or something like that, especially nowadays people have two jobs and/or both people in the family are working so that there's not a lot of time left that people have to give, I still feel like true community participation arises out of an individual's desire to combine with a group ethos that contributing makes a difference for you and for the community. I find working in this community it is more a question of kind of like duty and responsibility, and reciprocity, in other words tit for tat, I do this for you, you owe me, and afterwards you do this for me. That's fine. There's a lot of societies in the world that are based entirely on that system so I am not trying to judge it, but I think if one means by community-based program that we have, or should have, true out and out idealistic voluntary participation, I don't think we do at any level. Not at the council level, not at the coalition level, and not at the community volunteer level. So it's very frustrating to continue to try to squeeze participation out of people, and interagency collaboration. Then you get into the fact that there's all these turf issues. And
people sometimes in other agencies you are trying to get to collaborate, and I can give a concrete example. Such as [at] Awareness House, [that guy] originally thought we were trying to cut in on his territory, [so] he doesn't do anything with us. I think he sees we are not trying to cut in on his territory, but originally that's how we were perceived. Castle Medical, I got certain comments back, well what were we gonna do that has to do with youth without cutting into what they are doing with youth. It's all these territorial issues, when you are new kids on the block or whatever you want to call it. So the meaning of it, look! in the late stages of a decaying capitalist society, I am pretty cynical, I don't think, I think the government was trying to get off cheap. I think basically what this grant was all about was trying to not pay people to do a bunch of things that paid people should be doing, like community planning. And secondly, as you pointed out to me, that I kinda suspected but never really had it clearly articulated that the certain branch of the government wants certain of their modus operandi confirmed. And therefore, they concoct this scheme whereby their own presuppositions will ultimately be confirmed. So I don't know, kinda like you can say, well compared to what? what other demo grant? How could it have been more tailored to Hawaii? How do you account for the fact that people don't have as many volunteer hours as they did 30 years ago or after World War Two when they were trying to get women out of their work force and getting back in the home and in the volunteer organizations. As compared to now when nobody has any time to
volunteer. I don't know. I just know that the meaning of it, to me, is Americans are not big on participation. Americans don't really believe in political participation, Americans don't really believe in political participation as I define it, in remaking their society. And the best that you see is in churches and in service organizations. And since some of that conflicts with my own political beliefs, for example, in the case of churches, who offer let's say feed the poor programs, to me, those are worse than they are good, in many cases. Because they're taking out of the hands of the state. What I think should be the state's role to redress severe social ills such as homelessness and poverty, and putting it in the hands of supposedly the thousand points of light that being the churches and the private sector. Well, I don't happen to agree with that. I don't think that's an accurate or comprehensive approach to serious problems. So what's the point? I guess the point is that I have had, I am even less enthusiastic about true community participatory democracy in America and in Hawaii as a result of participating in this program.
ANALYSIS OF A COALITION COORDINATOR INTERVIEW USING DISCREPANCY MODEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDEAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶Comm. based defined part. democracy</td>
<td>▶Comm. participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶idealistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶socialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶voluntary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶personal link w/group ethos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶Government 1. Trying to get off cheap</td>
<td>▶reciprocity &amp; agencies to participate</td>
<td>▶2 worker family frustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Confirm their presuppositions</td>
<td>▶turf issues</td>
<td>▶America not big on participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶Compared to: Other demo grant</td>
<td>▶Political participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶Tailored to HI</td>
<td>▶Best particip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶Without volunteer hours</td>
<td>▶Worst because politics against churches service org. redressing state problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSEQUENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶Neither participatory democracy of comm. or govt. interested in remaking society</td>
<td>▶Frustrated</td>
<td>▶Less enthusiastic part. democracy in US, HI as result this program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The second group of twelve interviews consisted of three interviews each among members of each of the three area coalitions and interviews of three coordinating council members. Each of these interviews consisted of five open-ended questions asking interviewees for information on their involvement, likes and dislikes, feelings about grassroots participation, and feeling about future needs of the program (see Appendix 5). This group of questions was much more structured and designed to get both primary community participant's reactions and hopes for the program. The time of the interview varied from less than thirty minutes to well over an hour depending on the interviewee. The interviewees were selected by convenience from coalition or council members who were active participants in supporting the program. All those interviewed knew me and I contacted them in advance by phone to schedule the interview. Before the interview began the interviewee was informed of the reason for and nature of the interview. This group of interviews was a more formal request for reactions and opinions than the staff interviews. Those who were interviewed generally reacted less personally and more according to their role as representatives of coalitions or the Council or in their capacities as service agency people with certain specific interests. Surprisingly, the level of engagement and depth of feeling in these single interviews was substantial, producing some very useful data for
analysis. Interviewees knew that the material from these interviews would be included in the research anonymously. No pseudonym or other individual identifier is used for these coalition and council members.

An analysis illustration of one Hilo coalition member, a 45 year old Caucasian female college counselor, who is discussing grassroots involvement, is given below. This analysis uses a setting by discrepancy comparison table. Key concepts in the text are underlined.

**INTERVIEW**

Member: It's another thing I continually struggle with, not just in this but in other things I do. It's kind of like, do you want a lot of people there, do you really want to work with all the people, OK? Because then it kind of leads back to where we were, because then you have people who are maybe uninformed in some areas, OK, trying to make policies. But at the same time we have got to reach the people, that's what this is for, OK. So its like, why set policy if it's not going to go anywhere? So then it's almost like I get caught in this conflict, should we really try to have a lot of people in the coalition, should we really try to have more parents, should we really try to get all these people. Then when I see that they have come to the meetings, you have come to one or two of the meetings when there have been people who have come from the community and we have spent a lot of time trying to deal with their personal problems rather than really going on dealing with prevention problems in the community so I question sometime how much work can get done, at least at
our meetings, I know there have been social changes that have taken place in some communities that have been fabulous that have been grassroots. But it does not seem like at the meetings that happen with this coalition that has happened real well. Most of the people that have brought about things are all in the field or professional people like with the schools or something of that sort. It hasn't really been the parents that help initiate that or someone outside of the prevention field. So that is what kind of concerns me about it. It makes me wonder sometimes, should we even try to do it this way. And I don't have an answer yet. I probably would have to have more history, another year, another year or two years, before I would have better feeling about how I really feel about that. I don't think you know I haven't even been with the coalition about a year and I don't think that's really long enough and especially with something that is just starting.

I interject: How do you feel about grassroots activities, I guess you would say theoretically?

Theoretically, I think it can be very valuable. I know of a lot of projects and I have read about a lot of it in the research about grassroots leadership and how effective and how they have gone into neighborhoods and completely revamped neighborhoods that were like ghetto areas and turned them around and made them thriving parts of their community and I know of other things. Overall, the concept you know I think is wonderful. It just hasn't seemed to work yet in this particular case.
I interject that when you look at those things they indicate it is a "labor intensive way of doing things."

Definitely, it is very labor intensive and I wonder if that's why it isn't working here. I don't know. Like you say, it's usually people who have somehow been very activated around a cause and they are really willing to give a lot of time. There is almost a fervor associated (with it) that's the way I see it. And that fervor we do not yet have in our community. It could come but I don't see the fervor there yet. Maybe that's part of the problem. We are kind of the beginners. We don't have the momentum yet, built up. That's why I am saying in less than a year that I have been associated with it, it hasn't had the time to build up the momentum for this kind of problem, so major like drugs. It's so serious a problem it's going to take over one year to get people rolling on it and I don't see that kind of fervor, that kind of energy around in our community yet. It's building, but it isn't there yet. So that's kind of a problem.
### FIGURE 4.2
Analysis Of Coalition Member Interview
Using Discrepancy Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IDEAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Valuable</td>
<td>- All?</td>
<td>- Struggle with 2 sides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Social changes</td>
<td>- Uninformed vs. All Affected</td>
<td>- Maybe why not working here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wonderful</td>
<td>- Labor intensive</td>
<td>- Requires activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Group</td>
<td>- No fervor our comm. (Maybe part of problem)</td>
<td>giving lot of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;leadership&quot; = success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other comm. have successful grp. pgm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fervor could come</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REALITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Not gr with our coalition, at our mtgs</td>
<td>- eg. mtngs: time on ind. personal prblms not comm. prevention problems</td>
<td>- Concerns one gr not working here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prof. people prev. field not parents, etc.</td>
<td>- Fervor, energy building but not in our comm. yet</td>
<td>- Raises questions - Should we do it this way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Answer in time, things just starting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(gr=grassroots)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Beginners: no momentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSEQUENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Resolve lacks to see if prgm really successful or not.</td>
<td>- Diverted to personal prblms from prev. work</td>
<td>- Lack of leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- No comm. fervor</td>
<td>- Activists devoting time to effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Limited amt. work done</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The last group of interviews consisted of nine short telephone interviews with youth who had been participants of one of the two events made available to area youth primarily through their area coalitions. These were a week-long Winners' Camp in Honolulu and a weekend intergenerational conference at Punaluu on the island of Hawaii. Youth were asked to give information about their knowledge of the CYAP, their feelings about their participation at the CYAP activity, and the kinds of things they see as important to help youth in their area (see Appendix 5). The interview consisted of six short questions. The questions which opened the interview asked for each youth's understanding of the CYAP and the events they attended. The last three questions asked for reactions and opinions about drug prevention activities that these youth had experienced and thought would be useful. Each interview lasted only about ten to fifteen minutes. These were relatively impersonal interviews since they were introduced as a means to get feedback on participation in the program. Interviewees were 6 females and 3 males, 15 to 17 years of age. The data from these community youth give some indication how the target population of the CYAP, the youth, viewed the program and its activities. These interviews were not coded as were the staff and Coalition and Council interviews since comparison and contrast was possible in a simple matrix table because of the shortness of the answers (see Appendix 8).
Study Findings

Staff Life History

The life history of those working as staff with a drug prevention program can be instructive because it brings one to understand present actions in terms of past experiences. It provides a linkage to patterns of lived experience that is particularly valuable in understanding cross-cultural, cross-generational, and cross-disciplinary connections. From the coding, three categories emerged which provided sufficient data for dimensionalization. They were social setting, relationships, consequences. "Social setting" refers both to the place and the feeling associated with the place as these are reflected in home, work and school settings of the interviewees. "Social relationships" refers to both intellectual understandings and feelings towards family, friends and colleagues as this is reflected in dyadic statements reflecting a certain level of closeness, intensity and importance about what is occurring between two or more persons. Both cross-generational and cross-cultural patterns are evident here. "Social consequences" refers to how the identity of a person at any given moment combines with the social setting and social relationships to register a memorable consequence. This refers primarily to how one sees a social consequence for him/herself but also may also be reflected in an objectified tale of an incident of social meaning.
Social Setting - The three staff interviewed expressed a considerable awareness of place in terms of their past home(s) and places of school and work. None expressed an attachment or bonding with a certain place which would preclude their living elsewhere. The importance of setting came from the relative level of comfort or demand that personally was reflected towards the referred to place. All reflected that in certain settings they were very happy or comfortable and found others very difficult or demanding. None mentioned all settings as comfortable or difficult, that is, giving a one-sided personal assessment of settings encountered. Mr. A and Ms. C grew up on the mainland, Ms. C on the East and Mr. A on the West coast. Mrs. B was local. Interestingly, both mainlanders expressed strong commitments to preserving the cultural and environmental features of East Hawaii. All three expressed setting awareness, different levels of setting feeling and importance, reflecting that setting had affected their moods and actions. Mr. A expressed setting awareness through his statements of appreciation of water sports and the tropical rain forests as well as in his description of the community setting of Hilo. Ms. C expressed these feelings in her statements of appreciation of the rural and community atmospheres of the Hamakua area. Mrs. B expressed setting importance in her statements describing family settings where she and her extended family came together for regular
special occasions. The coding indicated a very high level of setting response, indicating a belief that environmental conditions affect both individual and relational responses. Each discussed the level of stability of their coalition area setting, the level of difficulty of existing relational processes in the area and how the setting had affected them personally.

Social Relations -- All interviewees were asked about family friends and colleagues as part of their life-history interview. The closeness, intensity and importance of these relations varied among the interviewees. All interviewees were eldest sons or daughters of their respective families. The most prominent feature of the social relations of the three staff was the extent to which initial familial patterns of community interaction were reflected in the closeness, intensity and importance of later social relations. Mr. A and Mrs. B had been exposed to parent community relations that were quite open and valued as meaningful in the family. This pattern seems to have established a relational openness from which family, friend, and colleague relations were close, intense, and important. This relational openness also seemed to express itself in cross-cultural and cross-generational experiences of importance and long term significance. In short, Mr. A and Mrs. B expressed this relational openness in a kind of long-term consensual connectedness with other individuals.
and groups as opposed to more short term, limited, and momentary relationships.

Social Consequences -- The interview data indicated that Mrs. B chose the job because it was consistent with existing local community work. Mr. A chose the job because it involved working with youth through outdoor leisure activities. Ms. C chose the job because it provided an opportunity to support local youth and the local community in positive life alternatives. The consequences of the combination of setting and relations findings with the stated reasons for taking the staff positions shows commitments rooted in past work experiences and an expectancy that the processes and outcomes of working with youth would be enjoyable and fulfilling.

The Work of a CYAP Coordinator

If one observes the work of a staff coalition coordinator, one observes activities such as attending meetings; making or returning phone calls; writing or typing correspondence; meeting minutes or reports; and visits with community or coalition members. The interview data collected sometimes reflected the percentage of each of these activities for each of the coordinators interviewed. This is misleading since it reflects a self report of the approximate proportion of time spent doing these activities at a given moment, which may or may not accurately represent time on activities over the course of several months or a
whole year. Conceptually over twenty separate actions were identified from coordinators' descriptions of what they do. These actions were categorized in five main groupings. They include community facilitation, coalition coordination, liaison between persons or groups, program planning and education.

Community facilitation included actions such as contacting and inviting community members to activities and to participate in some official way as supporters of the CYAP. In addition to trying to enlist community support and recruit coalition members/workers, coordinators interacted with and participated with the community in activities to support community needs. These actions served to build relations with the community and a credibility of knowledge and action.

Coalition coordination, the primary descriptor of the job of staff persons interviewed, involves working with members of area coalitions and other community resources to assess community needs, to plan coalition and community activities, to foster implementation of activities forwarding coalition goals and objectives and to take on the responsibility for task completion of activities that impact youth. Finally, coordination included coalition self-evaluation of both the processes and outcomes resulting from supported activities.
Liaison between persons and groups involves keeping coalition participants and external supporting persons and agencies in touch with both limited activities and broad program directions. The purpose is to draw input from other individuals and groups that can benefit the program for both short- and long-term success. The primary liaison function is at the coalition area level. Program planning involves working with the director to establish short and long term plans for the contractual agreements with the State of Hawaii through ADAD. Finally, education involves education of the staff members and of the coalition members and community about the program's goals, objectives and activities. This involves attendance at trainings, conferences, workshops and meetings as well as giving presentations and providing information, organization and direction to group action as necessary.

So far I've described what I observed the staff doing in the central office in Hilo and in the two offices in Honokaa and Pahoa. Then I listed the five main categories of activities which developed from the coding of staff interviews. The coding shows some variation in which category(ies) are most often mentioned and are deemed most important. In addition, how staff approach the work in the five categories also varies. The variation among staff is discussed below.
Community facilitation by staff initially involved actions to make contact with community individuals and groups. This quickly transitioned to building community relations by being involved in other community activities and building credibility with groups and individuals. For Mrs. B, who was already working with many other community groups as a volunteer, this was the continuation of an existing modus operandi. For Mr. A and Ms. C, this transition was ongoing. Mr. A was working a second part-time job so involvement in other community organizations and activities was difficult. Ms. C had only been in the coordinator position for about six months and was concentrating on contact with the community at this point. Not surprisingly, Mrs. B, who had already established community facilitation as a modus operandi, mentioned and emphasized work undertaken in this area. She also expressed an involvement with other community organizations and activities which was beyond the scope and range of the other coordinators. An existing commitment to community facilitation, the time beyond the hours the CYAP part-time position provided, and experience with the local power structure and channels of influence, were observed as contributing to this emphasis.

Coalition coordination was a major function of all coordinators. Mr. A described it as "dancing a waltz where both people are the leader[s], back and forth, trading back
and forth the lead position." Mrs. B described it as starting with the education of coalition members and then working "to have people in place at different levels of power." Ms. C's description was as exercising "efficiency and human warmth" in forwarding coalition activities.

Staff differed in their approaches to the multiple requirements of coordination. Mr. A was very systematic in prioritizing time to meet temporal needs of the coalition work. A running list of urgent, upcoming and long range activities and plans was the working foundation from which project-specific tasks were addressed by him. The detailed accounting of daily activities and a description of projected work hours for a typical month illustrated that his hours were spent primarily on coalition coordination. The other two coordinators also described many coordination activities performed but were clearly less coalition task oriented and spent less of their time on coalition coordination. Past experience managing granted projects, a background in community leadership, limited work hours to perform the work and features of the coalition area which had a large number of service agencies involved with youth services were observed as contributing to this emphasis. Liaison between persons or groups, although seemingly a subfunction of community facilitation or coalition coordination, was an area emphasized by all coordinators as having a distinct importance for the success of their work.
Staff were very much persons in the middle of relationships between individuals and/or groups. And no matter which activity or activities each staff person emphasized or what personal skills or style of leadership they employed, each depended on personal connections to do coordination work. At the most basic level keeping all CYAP supporters in each area informed as to what was going on at coalition meetings and with upcoming events was required. Beyond this routine sharing of information, which was handled primarily by the secretary in the Hilo office with input from staff, there were various levels of networking among individuals and groups. From Mrs. B’s the list distribution of CYAP supporters to those supporters in the coalition area as a means of networking, to the more specific connection of persons and resources, there was a range of liaison complexity. Liaison complexity, revealed in the interviews, was primarily related to openness to extension of network range, that is, a willingness to maintain reciprocal lines of communication with a wider range of contacts.

The perception of the importance of liaison relations also varied. For example, the liaison efforts outside the Hilo area seemed to be prized more, especially when made at the personal level. Both Mrs. B and Ms. C expressed that informal liaison work was very important as compared to formal meetings. Not surprisingly, Mrs. B, who emphasized building community relationships to get coalition people in
positions where they could advocate for area needs, was most concerned with using both formal and informal means to provide liaisons between people and groups.

Program planning was not only a concern of staff for improving their effectiveness but was also important in terms of the program's direction into the future once the grant funds ran out. Through attending at least six staff meetings, I observed that these meetings were often the place where plans were discussed. At one point they were being held weekly. Staff members expressed the feeling that the many requirements of the program placed them in an uncomfortable position because they were trying to work with their coalitions to develop plans while, at the same time, being given or having to develop specific tasks or activities for meeting this or that requirement of the YWCA, ADAD, OSAP or others. In short, they came to feel that the process of planning activities was more an instrument of control rather than real community planning. This is clear in comments by Mr. A and Mrs. B who mentioned the too frequent staff meetings and that "based on my community, informal [power] is a far more accepted way to go than formal," which the director had "a hard time swallowing."

This was obvious in interview segments about staff planning and program organization. For Ms. C with just six months experience, this "stress" in doing the coordinator job was
not so clearly articulated in terms of contract requirements or inflexibilities.

Education was a final category of actions undertaken by staff. This involved staff being educated and educating or facilitating the education of others about drug use and problems, as well as personal development and leadership skills. Ms. C mentioned the education provided to staff and to many youth and community and coalition members as a distinctive feature of the program. Much of the community and coalition work was directed at assisting and supporting others to gain knowledge and skills for individual benefit as well as to enhance their ability to advocate CYAP goals and objectives. CYAP sponsored training sessions dealing with student assistance programs in the schools, providing self-esteem and leadership training to youth, and providing individuals with an understanding of Hawaiian culture through an intergenerational approach that gave staff and community educational opportunities to reinforce change efforts.

These and other funded trainings, off-island conferences and seminars were not the main thrust of the educational activities discussed by interviewed staff. Mostly, they were appreciative of the program's staff development efforts. Collaborative relations among staff were also quite important to them. Staff interviewed indicated that they felt there was a lack of community
readiness and skills which prevented many people playing fuller roles in meeting contract and other drug prevention requirements. Mr. A mentions that "it quickly became clear that they were looking for a little bit more leadership [from me]." Mrs. B stated that it was expected "that people who join the coalition have some sort of power to begin with, and that in reality people...don't really have that." Ms. C stated that "this program encourages others around to sort of articulate and to have some positive concepts that they might not have had" and "is generous in offering education about drugs or values education and other things through[out] the community area." In short, education needs were found to be more substantial than initially anticipated. All staff felt that the program had some part to play in this education, but that they were not equipped to provide the specialized and ongoing education needed for East Hawaii.

The Meaning of the CYAP for Staff

The staff expressed many doubts about the program's utility as it developed and its results up to the time of my interviews. The primary factors indicating program utility and result ratings of the program were program expectations and faith in the community processes suggested at the beginning of the program. For Mr. A with the highest expectations for the program, ratings of program utility and results were both very negative. For Mrs. B, in carrying
forward a continued commitment to community facilitation, the result was positive but the program organization and implementation were rated negatively. Only Ms. C, the newest staff member, rated the program's utility and result as positive. This appeared to derive from positive events in this staff person's coalition area, a number of program events that were valuable to the program as a whole, and the more limited expectations that were established in light of the advice of and consultation with other staff and program supporters.

Hilo Coalition interviews: Where Many Agencies Provide Services

Hilo is the hub of activity for East Hawaii. Existing agencies providing services from Hilo have established themselves because they find support and room to become established. New agencies may or may not be welcome depending on the existing equilibrium between agency services and needs. In addition, where multiple agencies provide a wide variety of different services to meet community needs, the narrow scope of the services provided and the existing mix of several services may result in a kind of niche isolation where agencies do not consider the relationship of their activities to those of other agencies. When new agencies with different services enter the equation they may upset the equilibrium of services and/or raise
questions not previously considered of a relationship between and among agencies.

The three persons interviewed from the Hilo coalition were all involved with providing services to the community. Two of the three were educators (see the coalition interview in this chapter and interview 3, Appendix 7). The educators had quite similar responses to the questions about involvement with the CYAP. They enjoyed the interaction with others who shared ideas about the difficult job of providing drug prevention and other positive alternatives to youth. They saw the CYAP providing relief and personal incentive for continuing the work. They found the consensual process of the program both useful and inefficient: while useful in bringing everyone into the process as a community process, it was inefficient in that various individual problems and different levels of thinking prevented the kind of focus on an action plan that they had hoped for. They both saw a need for additional support from agency heads and community leaders through the coordinating council for bringing about a collaborative system coordinated to help youth and families deal with drug-related problems. In discussing the Hilo coalition, they emphasized its needs as coinciding with a larger community responsibility for an open and coordinated system of services for youth. They were very positive about what the coalition had done so far, but felt the focus and intensity
needed to be heightened and that support was needed at a higher administrative level to see a community-wide coordination of services.

The third interviewee (interview 4, Appendix 7) worked with a church-based agency providing assistance to families in need. Although the coalition as a prevention program did not provide direct assistance to this program, it is important to note that the coalition was seen as a mechanism to get help to those who needed it the most through outreach to the public and as a vehicle for coordinating and supporting diverse agencies offering beneficial services to different segments of the community. The concern expressed was not so much that it was difficult to coordinate the existing agency elements, but that support was available across many diverse programs to better reach the wider public and provide a comprehensive umbrella of services.

The Hilo coalition members expressed concerns both internal to the functioning of the coalition and about external community systems that were important to impact. They were asking that the coalition become more focused and engaged in opening the existing agencies and systems of relationships to renegotiation so that various youth and family needs could be better met in the future. The educators were concerned about the system of service coordination, while the direct service provider was more concerned with the system of resource allocation. For all
coalition members interviewed, the program and its Hilo coalition were seen as providing a place to work through these community processes of cooperation and wider shared responsibility.

The Hilo Community – A Characterization

The description of the Hilo community plus the orientation of the interviewed coalition coordinator and coalition members gives one a picture of a community striving to bring about the cooperation of agencies and coordination of services in a tightly woven web of established services and interrelated arrangements. Realizing this, the active coalition members have settled on doing what is possible in the areas of interest and opportunity and have not concerned themselves with areas where they are shut out. At the same time, they are hoping and striving to get further recognition and support so that eventually more can be done. Coordination and planning characterize this community while its political nature make the prospects for rapid system-wide change unlikely. There is a hope that eventually enough separate community agencies will see the payoffs of involvement with the Coalition and come to support its innovations.

Puna Coalition Interviews: Rapid Growth and Limited Services

The Puna Coalition is a coalition trying to address the needs of an area growing faster than any other in Hawaii.
Because the cost of land is the most reasonable in this area of the island of Hawaii, it has been flooded with newcomers arriving to stake out their place in paradise.

Unfortunately, the area has not been able to keep up with the demand for services, such as roads, electrical lines, water supply and telephone services. Both those displaced by the high costs of living elsewhere in Hawaii and those who wish to live off the land and away from populated areas take refuge in this area. Marijuana use is common among some groups in the district since it grows readily in Hawaii's tropical climate. Characterized by both the old style hippie mentality of the '70s and the yuppie mentality of the '80s, Puna is a young community of diverse adults and many children.

The three coalition members interviewed were activists concerned for the welfare of the young. One (see interview 8, Appendix 7) saw the program of positive drug prevention program as one for reaching kids at an early age. The other two (interviews 9 and 10, Appendix 7) had some individual and professional stake in bringing ideas into action and saw the coalition as people who cared and with whom they could work to impact the drug problem in an area with many high risk kids. They stated they found it difficult to deal with both the bureaucracy and the lack of Program freedom and flexibility. The other interviewee (interview 8, Appendix 7) found the permissive attitude toward drug use in the Puna
area the major personal difficulty. All three thought that a grassroots approach was necessary to get to the root of the problems, but also emphasized the need for alternative role models for youth which were lacking in the Puna area. Two of the three (interviews 9 and 10, Appendix 7) were highly critical of the management of the CYAP. These two felt the consensus-based coalition method resulted in mediocrity, that simple—not complicated—solutions were called for where there as a need for understandable, recognizable alternatives to help youth. They viewed freedom of resource allocation and decision-making as necessary to release the potential of the coalition. The third coalition member (interview 8, Appendix 7) also saw a need for more financial resources, but also stated a need for better organization and leadership on the coalition's part to start impacting the drug-permissive norms of the community.

The Puna coalition members viewed the CYAP as a useful, but overcomplicated and overcontrolled, resource for providing some activities for youth. In an area of relative deprivation in terms of services to needs, leveraging as many actual activities from CYAP resources was seen as vital. Having many coalition meetings with consensus-based decisions on doing this or that limited project was seen as a BandAid approach. Although each coalition member had his or her own view of the most viable and useful project, none
seemed to have the answer as to how to free up the resources the coalitions were supposed to have to actually institute activities. In short, all saw some positive action of the program and its potential to do more, but were frustrated at organizational and decision-making bottlenecks that had little or no impact on area youth.

The Puna Community - A Characterization

The description of the Puna community plus the orientation of the interviewed coalition coordinator and coalition members gives a picture of a community attempting to find ways to respond to severe shortages of human and physical resources. The coalition coordinator has chosen to utilize the coalition framework to educate and bring new opportunities for advocacy to the coalition members. Coalition members are doing what they feel they can to get facilities and activities for youth. They feel constrained by the direction and funding provided to them by the YWCA. They feel the Program is being weakened by the organizational requirements which seem to overshadow enabling the community to go forward with youth activities. Both the actions of the coordinator and coalition members indicate that the coalition's view is more oriented to community activism than to a restricted focus on drug prevention activities.
Hamakua Coalition Interviews: Area with a Changing Face

The Hamakua coast coalition included persons from the coastal plantation communities like Laupahoehoe and Honokaa to the ranch country of Waimea. This coalition setting is much different from that in the other two areas. An existing agricultural dependence on sugar cane production is giving way to other uses of the land along the Hamakua coast. Some of the land will undoubtedly become real estate for tourist development. Other portions of the land may be shifted to other agricultural products. The small plantation communities along the Hamakua coast have been and will continue to be greatly affected by these changes. As the number of agricultural workers needed in this area declines, the vitality of the plantation communities is likely to decline as well. Families who have depended upon agricultural work may no longer have the stable employment base required to remain in this area. Others who work in the new occupations may bring a different ethnic mix and worldview. These changes will affect the needs of the families and youth in this area.

The Hamakua Coast Coalition is a small coalition, with a core group of five members that had developed around the idea of providing drug-free alternatives for youth and adults. Among the most active members of the coalition, two teachers and a retiree were selected to be interviewed. All of the coalition members found the coalition experience both
enjoyable and difficult in that it was a new vehicle for action, but it also seemed to get in the way of moving ideas into action. The teachers interviewed were the most concerned with the time estimated to generate enough grassroots involvement to affect a true community change. Concerns for the future were in moving coalition members to action, youth to involvement and trained people and directed resources to addressing identified needs. Unlike the other two coalitions, this coalition emphasized the need to get the people involved and directed to clear actions to bring improvements to the lives of youth needing constructive activities in an area where few opportunities are perceived as existing. The focus of attention was on the need of the coalition to marshal and set working the internal strength of the community for taking responsibility for the needs of youth in a time of transition. Coalition members did not center their views about the CYAP on the program's organization or management, about resource distribution through the program, or on the need for future external resources, whether from the coordinating council or elsewhere. Since the original view of the coalition was that it was an independent group set up to meet youth needs for constructive alternative activities, its inclusion as a CYAP coalition was not seen as a directing or controlling influence, since its direction had been set prior to its involvement as a CYAP coalition. The CYAP was seen as an
additional resource and vehicle of the coalition's work, but not as its only or primary source of support. This kind of loose coupling seemed to give the coalition an autonomy to act as well as a commitment and an opportunity to draw on the resources of the CYAP. This coalition's coordinator was seen more in a supportive role rather than as a prime mover of the group's organizational activities, such as planning and conducting meetings. Because of this kind of view, the coalition seemed to stay more focused on its community action objective rather than other CYAP organizational or contractual arrangements, which were viewed as peripheral to the main community concerns.

The Hamakua Community - A Characterization

The description of the Hamakua community plus the orientation of the interviewed coalition coordinator and coalition members gives a picture of a community that sees the shifting fortunes of "the way it's always been" as an opportunity to face the new challenges that will come to the area. The coalition coordinator saw her role as diplomacy and utilizing social skills to support the activities of the leaders within the community. Those most active in the coalition are teachers who had ideas and projects that they felt would serve youth; and retirees and other supporting members who recognize the need for more youth activities. Because the group that became the Hamakua Coalition existed because of a grassroots effort to provide enjoyable
alternative community events that were drug-free, the
Hamakua Coalition has a sense of autonomy from the CYAP.
This allows it a kind of freedom to draw on the useful
resources of the CYAP, while having an independence to act
on their own as a community to forward the goals they
choose.

Coordinating Council -- Finding a Supporting Role

The coordinating council of the CYAP is a selectively
chosen group of community leaders representing diverse
segments of the community like school, law enforcement, and
government officials, social service providers (including
mental health officials), business people, and the religious
community. When the initial CYAP grant was developed for
the island of Oahu, the coordinating council was to be the
central assessing, planning, coordinating, implementing, and
evaluating body for drug prevention activities of the CYAP.
It was to be the catalyst for change in the Windward Oahu
area. The existing Windward drug prevention coalition was
to work with it, providing information about community needs
and existing community resources. The Council, with the
input of the community coalition, was to set the direction
on the three main components of the CYAP--an
intergenerational component, a multi-media component and a
youth-adult curriculum component.

When the site for the CYAP was changed to East Hawaii,
there was a shift in resources to the establishment of area
coalitions since coalition-building was seen as taking substantial time and energy. The job of getting the Council up and running was left to the CYAP Director who, during an extended period when the ADAD funding was delayed, did extensive community outreach to bring community support for the program. While the coalition coordinators were having monthly meetings with area coalitions, the Council was meeting quarterly to review and coordinate coalition plans for youth activities. The purpose of the Council was to provide a sounding board for coalition plans so that activities and long range plans could be coordinated with other regional or island-wide initiatives as much as possible. The Council was to provide the leadership knowledge and regional connections to give constructive input to the plans of the coalitions and support for the ongoing and upcoming work.

The council members interviewed included school, mental health and law enforcement officials on the Council (see interviews 17 and 18, Appendix 7). Although the council members expressed appreciation of the local community nature of the CYAP, there was concern that an appropriate division of labor be established so that there would be a clearer understanding of coalition, council and other roles in meeting community needs. Although the members felt that the grassroots approach was necessary to tailor programs to local needs, it was also important to clearly determine who
had the skills and that they were in place to actually carry forward certain of the Program goals. Interestingly, there was support from all three for more involvement from the Council to move things forward. While it was clear that all three accepted the need for decentralized local participation in implementing the youth plans and activities, all felt that it was equally important for "top down" involvement and planning to insure that everyone in the community had a common understanding and expectation of how the shared responsibility of the program was to work. The council members were surprisingly candid about their frustration at not being brought more into the process of planning and implementing the activities of the program.

Nine Youth Interviews -- What is a CYAP?

The youth interviewed had participated in either the Winners' Camp on Oahu or the Intergenerational Training on Hawaiian culture at Punaluu. Those interviewed ranged in age from 15 to 17. Most of the youth were unsure about the central goal of CYAP. Only two suggested that it was to provide positive activities for youth. None understood that it was a drug prevention program. The students seemed to enjoy activities that challenged them with new things. They reported learning from the experience some moral or process for living. When asked about what drug prevention activities should be provided for youth, they mentioned outreach to youth through interesting and enjoyable
activities and means such as after school activities and peer counseling. They felt community and school drug education was important and useful but that other things would be useful too. Specific mention was made of school mediation, peer counseling, AIDS prevention information, and personal skills training as well as extending drug-prevention, gangs and violence-prevention activities to programs for younger children.

Conclusion

The analysis and findings just presented show that there are distinctive patterns which emerge from the different program participants' varied histories and present circumstances. The presentation of the interview findings of this study sets the stage for a more detailed discussion in Chapter 5 of these other complex dimensions of the CYAP.
CHAPTER 5
RESULTS

This chapter extends the initial findings of this study discussed in Chapter 4 by presenting the response of the participants to the formative understandings, processes and assumptions of the Program. These responses will be compared with current findings in studies of organizational behavior and management of human service programs. Key processes discussed will include identification of purpose and focus, assessment of program needs, and power and control issues in a community-based program. The discussion of these processes will provide results that address the initial research questions of this study, contrast these findings with the academic literature, and provide implications for both the CYAP and similar community-based programs. The implications presented for the CYAP will be further extended to a discussion in Chapter 6 of school reform in the form of School Community-Based Management.

Results presented here are not summative evaluation results. Standardized program evaluation usually considers various dimensions of utility, feasibility, propriety and accuracy (Stufflebeam, 1987, 125-43). Although some of these dimensions may be discussed, the purpose of this study is to examine the relationships between factors actually
present, not to discuss how what happened fits standardized evaluation criteria.

**Purpose and Focus**

A recurrent dimension throughout the formative period of the CYAP is its search for purpose and focus. The Program came into being through a State written and administered grant that was federally-funded, and contracted for implementation by a nationally recognized service agency with a local track record (the YWCA); why then the confusion about program purpose or focus? Several persons interviewed in this study felt that too little time and money were going to prevention activities as opposed to meetings, trainings and media events primarily intended for adults. They further expressed concerns that the service-based needs were directing the Program to intervention rather than prevention, and that not enough was being done to demonstrate to the larger community that there was a new coordinated commitment to drug prevention. A major problem of projects with multiple partners is that multiple purposes are being served for the various stakeholders at the Federal, state and local levels. Multiple partners and purposes is not a problem unique to East Hawaii (see Whitford, 1987 and Dluhy, 1990).
Federal Level

The federal mandate to fund community-based prevention programs was a political response to the U.S. drug crisis and the resulting war on drugs. Drug prevention programs were the demand-side answer to the high drug use by our youth, and interdiction programs, like the "Green Harvest" marijuana destruction, were the supply-side answer to illegal drug use. Community programs were seen as appropriate multipliers of government funded messages against drug usage. They utilized multiple points of leverage to bring about an alternative local message to those at highest risk of drug abuse.

At the federal level, community-based prevention programs were technically and politically correct. Once the grants were awarded, the federal government's responsibility was only to monitor the administration and implementation of the grants. Although some contracts for training and the national evaluation of all CYAPs were funded, the primary concern of federal project and fiscal officers was that programs were being implemented, had positive effects and used resources efficiently. If state administrative reports were complete enough to indicate that resource expenditure resulted in proposed grant outcomes, then funding was continued.
**State Level**

The grant was written by the State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Division (ADAD) which also carried out the year to year program monitoring to insure completion of program goals and objectives within the specified timeline. Since the grant was for three years, evaluation and renegotiation of any provision of the scope of services was possible after years one and two. These were, indeed, points of transition for the program's emphasis. However, delays by the State in getting the contract funds to the YWCA for implementing the Program in each of its three years and changes in ADAD program staff administrators caused major questions regarding program expectations.

**Local Level**

The CYAP Director had yearly meetings with ADAD and International Center (IC) program evaluation staff to discuss the meaning of the scope of services in the yearly contracts. Although the objectives remained the same throughout the grant, the contract requirements specified in the scope of services changed depending on ADAD and evaluator assessment of the program. In fact, this shifting of contract requirements was a natural part of projected phases of program start up, initial community youth activities, and more complex and ongoing youth activity plans.
The problem with this phased development was that there were no explicit criteria or guideposts to signal the completion of one phase and the beginning of the next. It was left to the frequently changing ADAD program staff (four in two years) monitoring the contract or the program evaluator to point out the need to move onto the next phase. This gave the whole process a very arbitrary appearance. It also gave those associated with the program, including staff and Coalition and Council members, the impression that a lack of consensus between the administering and implementing agencies resulted in the lack of focus about Program objectives. In fact, the yearly focus of the Program was agreed upon by the two agencies, at the beginning of each program year and whenever ADAD changed staff, primarily through the insistence of the CYAP Director who was concerned that the vagueness of the scope of services could place contract renewal in jeopardy. This specification served to commit the Program to very strict interpretations of what must be done to insure contract compliance. Although it was understood that flexibility of scope of service provisions was useful in allowing local coalitions discretion, it was also clear to the CYAP Director that meeting the requirements of the granting agency was of primary concern to the YWCA and was also useful in keeping the Program true to its core goals and objectives. In short, the CYAP Director found the job of providing contract
services easier when, in consultation with ADAD, the scope of services for each yearly contract was spelled out. In this way, feasible activities, acceptable to the Director and ADAD, could be proposed and agreed upon for implementation in the each contract year.

Assessment of Program Needs

As with many programs with different organizational levels for funding, administration, and implementation, the program purposes at each level may differ substantially while a general unitary goal is common to all levels. Here, the federal purpose was primarily political, the state purpose was primarily oriented to documentable impacts and the local purpose was primarily expediting service provision.

While each organizational level was comfortable with its own purpose, the communities involved (the coalitions and Council) were distressed that a community development drug prevention program did not reflect the purposes which they felt held the greatest importance to the program. The initial individual and organizational assumptions and perceptions or "base assumptions" were that the CYAP was a community program which utilized the community's understanding of the problem, focusing on purposes with which the community agreed, and utilizing cooperative power sharing relationships. These base assumptions, while
reflecting a bottom-up approach sought by the Hawaii CYAP, were not reflected in some of the formative activities and processes of the Program. This is illustrated in a discussion of needs assessment, the community development process, community and coalition processes, and collective power relationships which follow.

**Needs Assessment**

A needs assessment is often required by program planners before a community can agree on a purpose or plan of action. Needs assessments used for community-based prevention services or activities can vary as to purpose and rationale. Human service needs assessment is a complex task.

Identification and assessment of human services needs are complicated by the facts that needs are relative to the perceiver, that they are diffuse and interrelated and in a state of constant flux, and that they cannot be translated into community programs without taking into consideration the technology, characteristics of human resources, and considerations of finance (Witkin, 1984, 16-17).

Because human services needs assessment often focuses on resource assessment, or planning for services, there is a danger that services with "lives of their own" will displace the flexibility of assessment to meet human service needs. It has been advocated that the traditional approach of planning for services be replaced by a rational approach to problem analysis and assessment of need. The focus, which would then be on the needs of people rather than on the existing network of human services.
programs, would thus stimulate independence from the status quo (Witkin, 1984, 22).

Still another type of needs assessment is the community assessment which often focuses on "one or more specific problems that have high visibility in the community and have aroused anxiety and concern; such problems include drug or alcohol abuse or vandalism among the school-age population" (Witkin, 1984, 23). The major purpose of community assessments is usually to enlist support or set priorities where the cooperation of many agencies and voluntary groups is desired. Community assessments are also sometimes conducted "to define the scope of a problem" or by "community action groups to serve a variety of social, economic, or political ends" (Witkin, 1984, 23-24).

Human services needs assessments and community assessments are examples of two types of assessments that serve different purposes. While the funding, administering, and implementing agencies may feel that a human services needs assessment to justify prevention services is sufficient, community members may be expecting a community assessment because they are interested in getting a better idea of the scope of the problem in their community or in galvanizing community members to a greater knowledge and involvement with the program. The initial statement of need in the ADAD grant, the CYAP director's service needs assessment, and a coalition coordinator's interview statement about wanting to take a "critical approach" where
"needs assessment would be one of the earliest things you would do," all indicate that these different views of needs assessment were in fact present in the CYAP.

**Processes of Community Development**

The CYAP as reinvented through the process of relocation and restructuring to include coalition formation and community building is a community development program. This is not only reflected in the grantee information provided by OSAP and the System Framework information from The Circle, but is reflected in Program participants' understandings that community development was crucial to the CYAP in order to insure the viability of the grassroots coalitions once the grant money ran out. What community development involves and what implications it has for a demonstration project where communities are to innovate drug prevention activities in a coordinated manner were not made explicit in the formative stages of the CYAP. Program participants had various views of community development that were acted upon in dealing with the CYAP. The implications of these different community development views are highlighted below in a discussion of what community development programs have historically come to represent.

Community development has been characterized as a process of "growth in social sensitivity and competence," as a method of planned social change involving "democratic procedures, voluntary cooperation, self help, and
development of indigenous leadership and educational objectives," and as a movement or "cause to which people become committed" (Dixon, 1989, 87). These are alluded to when those interviewed refer to community readiness, the need for voluntary participation, cooperation, and leadership, and to a lack of commitment or fervor. Among the more activist Program supporters there were also expressions of concern about the authoritarian style of the Program Director, a lack of control of resources and decision-making by the community, and a displeasure with the use of consensual strategies which detracted from forceful alternative value positions. Indeed, one coalition coordinator, in an interview given in October of 1991 during the second program year, expressed awareness of the lack of local control:

...this is cockamamie. There are just too many cockamamie things going on, a thing written in Oahu for East Hawaii, a demonstration grant dealing on a national scale that doesn't exactly take into account certain features of the local community, a difficult community to work in....this is one humbug....

It's like the society is sick and we are all trying to provide safety nets for real fundamental things that are wrong. And maybe I'm just at a point in my life where I'm tired of applying Band-aids, I'm tired of cleaning up other people's messes so my own personal [feeling] where I'm at is, it just makes this seem so ridiculous. So much, and I can run down what we've done and spent money on, and so much of it seems absolutely ridiculous.

The activist position representing a social action posture included those either unaware of or rejecting the
traditional community development approach "widely used by
governments, when the national interest is at stake and for
the introduction of innovatory [sic] ideas, practices and
technologies" (Dixon, 1989, 87). Community development is
not an approach which involves "the shifting of power
relationships and resources characteristic of social action"
(Dixon, 1989, 87). Although characterized by an egalitarian
philosophy, an emphasis on process, and with control of the
pace and nature of any outside intervention by indigenous
leadership, the reality of community development is that
government funded workers are not non-directed servants of
the people. "Needs-based funding determined by central
bureaucracies has largely replaced citizen determined
projects" (Dixon, 1989, 88). Initial accountability is to
the funder. In addition, the cooperative-collaborative
process does not challenge but accepts existing local power
relations. "In its very strength for responsiveness to
local needs, that is parochialism and starting where people
are at, lies the weakness for fundamental social change"
(Dixon, 1989, 89). The "besetting limitation of community
development as a strategy for social change is its
psychological rather than socio-economic approach to social
problems" (Dixon, 1989, 89). The implications of different
assumptions about what type and degree of social change this
community development program sought resulted in
difficulties which could have been resolved early in the
process of contact dialogue among participants. Because some of these factors were not discussed or weren't commonly understood, misunderstandings and conflicts sometimes arose.

Community and Coalition Processes

The problem in a program with various organizational levels is that the different individuals or groups do not understand nor negotiate enough to facilitate the multiplicity of purposes and focuses to bring about the desired actions of the stakeholders. An understanding of contradictions like those between government-sponsored community development programs and social action programs that aim for a local redistribution of power are fundamental to working through the barriers and hindrances to program accomplishments. At each organizational level, there can be many actual contradictions that must be worked through. For example, at the coalition level,

the nature of the coalition membership is always critical to its ability to achieve its objectives. In general, agency-based coalitions appear to be more interested in preserving the status quo, surviving or protecting their funding base. Professionally based coalitions, in general, appear to be most interested in the development of new programs, especially programs that professionals will be involved in implementing. Community-based coalitions appear to be the most supportive of proactive social change, especially social change that is responsive to a crisis or some dramatic event. Many coalitions have mixed bases of membership, and this characteristic often contributes to the development of factionalism within the coalition (Dluhy, 1990, 23).

The area coalitions of the CYAP exhibited just such a mixture of membership with professional and community
members predominating. Some of the initial agency membership appeared to dissipate as agency members assessed the role of their agency in coalition participation. Although some factionalism was evident, the main result of mixed membership was that each coalition chose a focus consistent with membership orientation. That is, coalitions with active school counselors and educators tended to support school-based efforts to impact drug use. For example, one coalition focused on Student Assistance Programs as a means to reach and impact youth. The value orientations of the coalition members, rather than the expediency of each area coalition situation, seemed to dictate the focus and mechanism chosen for drug prevention activities (Kumar and Thibodeaux, 1990, 360).

System Framework Processes

In the formative phases of the CYAP some initial contradictions or incongruities emerge. One area that had both the potential for strengthening the CYAP and yet provided contradictions for the Program was the System Framework presented by The Circle on behalf of OSAP. The System Framework approach promised "parameters to guide any community with the development of an effective prevention system" (The Circle, 1990). Unfortunately, the framework presented philosophical assumptions and preconditions which were very difficult to achieve. But it was not the high expectations nor the initial idealistic preconditions that
were the main problems. The framework promised to introduce a process to guide communities to an effective prevention system, but did not deliver such guidance. In truth, it was primarily a listing of useful organizational and prevention techniques that other communities have found useful or viable. Neither the identification of core elements nor core processes were specified within the systems framework.

Since systems involve relationships between people at different organizational levels, one anticipates that a process of building collaborative relationships might have been described and illustrated. And since systems include family, civic, voluntary, recreational and religious organizations; law and media groups; alcohol and other drug programs; health and medical agencies; educational, business and labor, and governmental interests; and alcohol and drug distribution channels, it would have been useful to suggest processes to deal with these systems. In short, it is not enough to suggest one is going to guide any community to an effective prevention system when the relationships between systems are discussed only as lending themselves to processes of cooperation, coordination, and collaboration. While the System Framework prescription to communities warned against a "quick fix," the list of things to do and not do was an inadequate representation of systems' processes. The System Framework had the potential to guide stakeholders to a vision of the systems' characteristics of
a complete collaborative program, but it failed to deliver enough process detail to aid program participants when relational contradictions emerged.

One speaker at the System Framework presentation in Honolulu during July of 1991 spoke of the process of "learning to think in a systemic way" (Lew, 1991). Perhaps learning about systemic thinking is important, but it is also vital to remember that different organizational types operate with different systems assumptions and base their cooperation with others on those assumptions. Private businesses, for whom much of this literature is written, are not the same as public or third sector organizations. Strategic management of organizational relations, beyond a single organizational level, involves serious complications.

Publicness [sic] stems from markets that are made of authority networks, constraints that limit autonomy and flexibility, the prospect of political interference, coercive means that can be used to fund or force the use of services, many externalities that cue action possibilities, the prospect of scrutiny by outsiders, ubiquitous accountability, vague and argumentative goals, authority limits, shifting performance expectations, and ambiguous incentives to coax desirable behavior. The presence of just one of these factors makes an organization take on characteristics that can render private sector approaches to strategic management misleading or ineffective (Nutt and Backoff, 1992, 51).
Power and Control Issues

Beyond the important private-public split in systems assumptions that complicates the relational processes between organizational or functional levels is the absence of a discussion of power and control systems. Since the System Framework establishes the community as the expert in choosing an appropriate prevention focus and activities and is to be involved at all levels of decision-making, it is logical to ask what "shared power" position the community has in deciding on funding various aspects of the program and in selecting its paid personnel. Because of the reality of community development programs as programs of planned social change, the primary funding and personnel decisions are predetermined by funders, through contract, or at the implementation level. Although the community is sometimes given a voice in these decisions, much of this voice is hollow tokenism. A November 1991 interview of one Council member describes the community's attempt at capturing some of the control by insisting on a voice in one of the decisions:

I think you see [power/control issues] happening between the coalitions and the Council. Internally I see that happening. [They] want to keep control and the coalitions want to take control and I'm not sure what they want to control but they have this thing about who gets the say and who doesn't. I read some of the minutes sometimes and I hear in the minutes a tone that is not necessarily clear when the sentence comes out but it appears to be there nonetheless. In that last minutes I read where they want a post office box out there and it's like it's a big issue in
the minutes. And it really is about control over
information and it doesn't really necessarily
affect control, 'cause probably information is
getting where it needs to get. Folks get into a
little corner and all of a sudden their turf
becomes smaller and smaller and no one else can
get in. And often times that backfires and I've
seen it backfire on a grassroots programs and blow
them right out of the water. Because
personalities get in the way.

In the case of the CYAP, these decisions were made at
the implementation level through consultation of the
Director with the YWCA Executive Director and ADAD during
discussions of the yearly contract. While not uncommon, it
is not community empowerment involving local leadership as
the System Framework suggests.

Another level of input is at the planning and
evaluation phase. Usually there is a control system
established to assess progress on various aspects of program
plans. "Control is achieved by comparing where one is with
where one is supposed to be, then taking corrective action
to resolve any discrepancies which exist" (Lewis, 1991, 16).
The use of a control system involving the community is
another way to share responsibility for prevention
activities.

No community-based control system was established nor
was any committee or sub-committee involved which included
Coalition or Council members in program planning. The main
concern was a lack of involvement by community members in
aspects of problem identification, determining options for
action, decision-making, implementation, assessment, and
evaluation. This kind of concern could have been discussed prior to the introduction of the System Framework or in the material on the Framework when it was brought to the attention of the already operating CYAPs. Vertical hierarchies of input and decision-making, although useful in establishing divisions of labor, can cause certain barriers and feelings of disaffection. The feelings of separation and non-support by the Coalition and Council members illustrate consequences of program level divisions becoming barriers to community cohesion.

Contradictory assumptions and needs at the initiation of the building of a community-based drug prevention program place formidable obstacles to program construction and implementation. When these contradictions are clear and can be addressed, there is some chance that the community-based process can be successful. When contradictions remain hidden, are not understood and not addressed, then problems between organizational levels are likely to occur.

Community Empowerment and Power

Power relationships in community based programs can sometimes mean the difference between no progress and great success. In the CYAP, power relationships sometimes caused problems even between people at the same organizational level. Between individuals and organizations at different levels the potential for and consequences of conflict were even more pronounced. CYAP participant interviews indicated
that assumptions about the Program administering and implementing agency, the persons chosen to direct and staff the Program, the community structure and processes utilized in the Program, and how community members were selected and placed in the Program structure to represent the community, all had a bearing on individual/organizational involvement with the Program. The power relationships most discussed were the reciprocal nature of community relationships, the nature of volunteerism, and the process of community empowerment. These relationships will be discussed next beginning with a discussion of community empowerment as a backdrop against which collective power relationships will further be discussed.

Community empowerment is a confusing term which is used by The Circle to describe an alternative paradigm to community delivery of services as the framework for community prevention programs. Although community empowerment can be contrasted along multiple dimensions to delivery of services, it is in fact a part of community development programs which has been around for some time. The transformation from dependence to independence implied in the term is hardly a new idea that will replace service delivery in communities.

Empowerment literally means the process of giving power or authority to an individual or group. However, used as an action metaphor, the term can be misleading. It suggests that power can be given to some group, when in actuality, meaningful power must be taken (Heller, 1989, 8).
Another discussion of empowerment from a public health perspective states,

Empower means 'the ability to choose' or 'to increase one's capability to define, analyze and act on one's problems.' We cannot 'empower' anyone; to presume so strips people of their capability for choice. Empower is a reflexive verb; groups and individuals can only empower themselves. Our role may be to nurture this process and remove obstacles, the first being our own need to define health problems for the community. The power of defining health belongs to those experiencing it (Canadian Journal of Public Health, 1989, 87).

The misuse of "empowerment" is perhaps only eclipsed by the misuse and connotations given to "community." Again from a public health perspective,

As public health rediscovers that social conditions can make one sick, "community" has become an essential adjective to every health program. But we tend to define it in the static vocabulary of data: the poor community, the women's community, a particular ethnocultural community, or we define it by geography: the neighborhood, the small town, a particular housing project. Community has both elements - affinity and geography - but it encompasses more.

Community derives from the Latin communitas, meaning "common or shared." Sharing is not some demographic datum, it is the dynamic act of people being together. Community is, in effect, organization. There is no "poor community" save poor persons coming together to share their experience and act to transform it. There is no "women's community" save two or more women sharing their reality, empowering themselves to act more effectively (Canadian Journal of Public Health, 1989, 87).

The purpose of bringing out the inadequacies of "community empowerment" is to emphasize my belief that although it may have some use in the context of community
psychology, its common misuse to represent everything from individual self-help to organizational service planning gives it limited utility in discussing this research. I side with one community psychologist who emphasized, Notice that I said collective power, not empowerment. There are important distinctions between the two. I recognize the value of empowerment as a professional metaphor; however I argue that community building and coalition formation are more realistic approaches to collective power (Heller, 1989, 8). Although the CYAP staff refer to their empowerment efforts in the coalition areas, the support, networking and brokering of opportunities of community cohesion and influence are dealt with here as ways of establishing collective power. These issues of power relations illustrate the faces of power commonly discussed as influence, covert manipulation, and control of the conceptual framework for thinking and dealing with conflict (Scaff and Ingram, 1987, 237).

Individual Power

Within the data collected for this study there are many power issues raised. Many have to do with the freedom to exercise power given program constraints. Others have to do with power relations from the individual (micro) level all the way to the Federal Government (macro) level. At the most personal level, only about one in ten individuals involved with the CYAP expressed feelings of powerlessness and that they joined the CYAP to draw from the collective
power of the group. This is not to say that they felt the collective power of the CYAP did not offer them anything—quite the opposite. Their joining with the CYAP to enhance drug prevention among youth was primarily due to an existing commitment to youth activities or services and/or drug prevention. The interviews of this study reflected views of some of the active members of the Coalitions and the Council. This selection bias resulted in a predominance of powerful and "giving" Program participants, those who contributed more than they received. There is an indication that those who may have come initially to show support, but did not wish to be actively involved in a regular formal group to learn, discuss, plan and be involved supporting youth activities, quickly disappeared from the active core of each coalition and the Council. When contacted by mail about their interest in continuing to receive minutes and announcements, many wished to continue an informational relationship with the CYAP. Some dropped even this relationship while others, who were participants beyond those initially contacted and found an interest in the shared concerns of the group, were added. While CYAP supporters indicated a personal commitment and a feeling that they could contribute to efforts to assist youth, it was the collective sharing of commitment, knowledge, and resources that was rewarding to those involved.
Staff Power Relations

Staff of the program, as coordinators of the coalitions, reflected satisfaction with their roles and freedom to exercise power based on the level and type of support they received from their coalition program. Two of the three staff members were dissatisfied with the organizational design and/or implementation of the program. Similar dissatisfaction was expressed by several Coalition members from the coalitions where these staff worked. In short, staff dissatisfaction with power relations seemed to reflect both Coalition and individual staff members' feelings toward the program. Although mutual respect, trust and a team feeling were present among staff, these feelings were not reflected toward the Director by at least one staff coalition coordinator. The distrust that had developed between them undercut the communication and decision-making between this area coalition and the Director. In fact, control issues between the YWCA and the coalitions became such an impediment that the coalitions were soon devising strategies to separate themselves from the YWCA in certain areas of implementation. Interestingly, in the Coordinating Council, as well as in the coalitions, lack of power sharing was a problem. In this case, some members of the Coordinating Council felt they were being denied a meaningful role in setting the direction of the program. This was evident in interview comments which indicated that
they felt their professional expertise, knowledge of Island and State services planning, and the potential of their coordinated leadership and advocacy were being ignored. In addition, coalition members expressed some negative feelings toward the Council due to its lack of support of the Program. Both Council and coalition members were concerned that the role of the Council was still unclear and its potential underutilized. Thus, the common concern with the Council's underutilization came because of the concern that the Program would not be effective unless community at all levels was involved and supported common objectives and activities. Therefore, this concern was positive in that it tried to forward program support and effectiveness.

Managing Power Relations

The point of division in power relations in the CYAP occurred at the implementation level. The CYAP Director and YWCA Executive Director were the persons who decided and/or negotiated program relationships among those on the island of Hawaii (community stakeholders including the coalitions and Council) and with those monitoring and evaluating the Program from a distance (U.H. Evaluation, ADAD, OSAP). Although the person in the middle with the responsibility to carry out the objectives and activities of a contracted program may seem to be sandwiched between program funders and community groups, each with their own ideas about how the Program should be implemented, the middle is the center
of the action and the person in that position has considerable leverage in determining what will and will not happen. The CYAP Director and the YWCA Executive Director were most involved in deciding or negotiating how the money would be spent. This was negotiated with agencies funding or monitoring the Program and decided for the Council, coalitions and communities of the program.

Power Processes -- Small Successes or Small Failures?

The thrust and emphasis of the YWCA through its Director was the enhancement of drug prevention services. The Director was very clearly concerned with the initial establishment of credibility for the Program and also that the Program establish a record of community successes. This was accomplished by the Director negotiating with ADAD what the activities of the yearly scope of services would be in the yearly contract with the YWCA and then passing these plans on to staff who were to work with the coalitions to carry out drug prevention activities. The Director was consulting the YWCA Executive Director and me (as UH Evaluator) to develop possible scope of service plans and activities before each contract negotiation with ADAD. This was an attempt to insure that the terms of the contract scope of services were mutually understood and feasible according to the Director's assessment and expectation of the Program's community activities. Unfortunately this way of operating put the Director in a position which might be
described as a variant of the dilemma of the "trapped administrator," a dilemma wherein administrators are so committed to the project that a rigorous program evaluation which might point to failure cannot be risked (Stevenson and Burke, 1990, 9). In this case, the Director became locked into a failsafe system which insured a high degree of probability that contract requirements with ADAD would be met, but which also undercut many of the fundamental assumptions of doing community-based programs. The CYAP was a demonstration project which involved three major innovations, a community-based approach, a prevention technology, and a System Framework strategic management style. These three innovations required a nonauthoritarian style of leadership, openness, and flexibility which allow for innovation, small failures, and reformulated activities. The situation that developed within the CYAP was one where providing predictable results led in fact to a lack of results in providing drug prevention innovations. In short, success, defined as task completions, led to persistence at the expense of adaptability (Sitkin, 1992, 243).

Although no one seeks failure for its own sake, some failure situations have been found to facilitate learning. These failure situations have five key characteristics: 1) they result from thoughtfully planned actions, 2) have uncertain outcomes, 3) are of modest scale, 4) are executed and responded to with alacrity, and 5) take place in domains
that are familiar enough to permit effective learning (Sitkin, 1992, 243).

This notion of intelligent failure is important because it addresses the need for community experimentation in programs concerned with innovation. As described above, the conflict with the YWCA's implementation of the CYAP among staff, the Coalitions, and the Council, was a matter of sharing power. This concern was evident in the interview data with staff and Coalition and Council members. Further, conflict was handled privately with those most vocal in raising questions either about the Director's management of the Program or the overall organizational arrangement of the Program. Handling conflict privately often involves avoidance and/or accommodation. Unfortunately when this is the case, the organizational nature of these conflicts is often masked by an overemphasis on "interpersonal and group conflict to the neglect of the structural and societal bases in which these interpersonal and group differences are embedded" (Bartunek et al., 1992, 222-223).

Conflict Management as a Power Relationship

Conflict resolution has implications for organizational change.

To the degree that conflict avoidance and toleration predominate as modes of conflict handling, they lead to reinforcement and replication of existing modes of operating rather than to evaluation, modification, or replacement of those structures (Bartunek et al., 1992, 223).
In programs of innovation that involve second order change, that is, shifts in the way organizational members understand significant dimensions of the organization and its work, "the processes by which conflicts between perspectives are surfaced and handled has a significant impact on the outcomes of second order change processes" (Bartunek and Reid, 1992, 117).

Although the conflicts were evident to anyone participating in the CYAP, the conflicts were either hidden behind labels as personnel or personal problems, or orchestrated in such a way that they were minimized or quickly passed over. For these reasons certain misunderstandings and fundamental disagreements about the nature of the processes of innovation in the Program were never resolved. These unresolved conflicts served to undermine the work of coalition formation and community building that was necessary to a program that was seeking to bring new cooperative ideas and activities to drug prevention in East Hawaii.

Implications for the CYAP

Any body of knowledge or educational system that is not open to change eventually stands in need of reform. Unfortunately reform has often meant rearranging the same old regularities or asking the same old questions. There is nothing wrong with repeating what is useful, that is, making
new and/or better use of fundamental regularities or questions. However, such tinkering should not be mistaken for or stand in the way of innovation. "Prevention," as an innovation, is being used more and more to serve people in need in the areas of both health and education. It has been decided only recently that the community level, and not other levels of human organization, should be the level for the use of this innovation. Unfortunately, who the community is and what prevention techniques are to be applied is often not specified. Unspecified community prevention programs of any type can become a problem. I believe this study of the Hawaii CYAP demonstrates that community building and coalition formation should not be taken for granted and that this must be a priority which involves careful consideration of features such as timing, place, cultural and ethnic mores and aspirations as well as social, economic and political realities. The OSAP System Framework document makes a wise suggestion when, as part of the planning and implementation process, it recommends that, in addition to a needs assessment, a community and program capability assessment be performed which identifies "strengths and limits of community organizations in financial and material resources, staff skills and commitments, community ties and access, and unique opportunities" (The Circle, 1990). Unfortunately it is
buried in the literature review, Appendix C of the document, and was not used in the Hawaii CYAP.

Although there were many guidelines for planning and implementing community prevention programs, there was also a lack of information and process expertise in launching the Program. I believe that this was particularly detrimental for several reasons:

1. The Program simultaneously presented the community with three innovations which were not made explicit nor discussed in the community. These were an organizational innovation (a community coalition-based initiative in three areas of East Hawaii), a technological innovation (drug prevention) and a multilevel innovation (utilizing a systems approach to program efforts).

2. When the initial state funding contract was delayed and the YWCA did not receive its first funding until nearly the end of the first funding year, the Program tried to catch up by taking short cuts on program start up.

3. Service-based assessments of need were made but no community assessments were made of the coalition communities.

4. The Program Director was dealing with the processes of community building and coalition formation while expectations were that several
program activities would be completed by the end of year two. The expert with the most community-based experience was on Oahu and was not willing or able to provide very much help on a program of unfamiliar design/organization located on the island of Hawaii.

As was the case here, lack of process information and management can detract from critical areas of a program and affect success of outcomes.

People and process are the main components necessary for getting a program up and running. The most important recommendations of this study address these two aspects:

1. Complex multi-level programs should be dissected as to actual or projected concerns, assumptions, purposes, expectations and focuses to identify the processes implied. This should be done prior to community forums and assessments to prepare for contact dialogues with those who "own" or have a stake in the problem the program is addressing. Since a program community is created and is not simply a matter of geography or preexisting common interest, it is important to identify key community persons like those with the problem, innovators, and administrators (or other sources of authority) and involve these persons in problem exploration and early planning stages in order to
identify their understanding of the problem and its resolution. Community building needs to be done bottom to top so that those living the problem, those with authority to resolve the problem in specific community settings (line administrators), and those who set policy in systems that deal with the problem feel connected with the program and support its work concurrently and cooperatively.

2. Partnerships have to be examined carefully and developed creatively. Although the ideal is to involve everyone in addressing the problem, in reality this is very unlikely. Similarly there is not likely to be an equality of collective power among groups where there are limits to the amount of power favored groups are likely to give up. Therefore, it is important to approach prospective program partners with an understanding of the political dynamics of past agency relations and present social exchange processes. Reciprocal relationships may be built on general social exchange (sharing resources indirectly through a chain of cooperating individuals within a network) versus restricted social exchange (a direct one-to-one sharing of resources). In this way solidarity may be built within a community through
reciprocity between organizational members of a collective network as well as by restricted direct exchanges of resources or information between single organizational members. The history, organization, goals and/or needs of prospective partners may suggest similarities and possible levels of cooperation. Since diverse organizations will be contacted, a wide range of participation opportunities should be offered and thought given to how similar organizations might be grouped to address one or more parts of the problem.

3. Program staff need well-developed community intervention skills since, ideally, they will be involved in a continuous contact dialogue with community leaders and members. In addition to skills and resources, they need clear objectives, a personal plan on how to achieve the objectives, feedback directly from the work in progress on attaining the objectives, and a clear definition of authority to take corrective action when there is a deviation from the program plan (Lewis, 1991, 165).

Human resource needs may vary depending on the program's objectives and developmental stage. However, it
is important that the skills required for the job and the processes to be used in the work are clearly understood.

It is clear that processes such as community development, social action planning and drug treatment services coordination are different. Which processes are central should be specified so staff know what is expected of them, which processes others will handle and where program capabilities are lacking. Since they will have to advocate program processes to the community, it is essential that the level of understanding and commitment to drug prevention techniques is ascertained and that a control mechanism is in place to identify and correct any deficits in personnel skills or processes.
CHAPTER 6
IMPLICATIONS

In the previous chapter results about key processes identified in the study of the CYAP were discussed with implications for the CYAP as a community-based program. This chapter discusses the implications of those results for School-Community Based Management (SCBM). This will be done in three sections covering the connections between the CYAP and SCBM, the points of comparison between study results and SCBM concerns and potential problems, and a discussion of how these comparisons should be viewed in light of the similarities and differences of CYAP and SCBM as community-based innovations.

CYAP and SCBM -- Connections

In the introductory chapter of this research I lay out the social dimensions that are the focus of this study. These dimensions are control and power issues involved in the processes of community-based innovations which seek structural or second-order change. I believe that these dimensions are real within the CYAP and SCBM. Let me be very clear that this research does more than examine management practices, but investigates how communities mobilize around a social need and address it through coalition formation. It is about the curriculum and
processes of social competencies within community settings. Education has formal institutional dimensions through schools and has non-schooling dimensions. Within both the CYAP and SCBM there is a realization that both dimensions must be involved if structural change is to occur. Both are explicitly educative at the community level.

Other connections

The fact that both the CYAP and SCBM are educative is the central commonality which links the two. Another similarity is that they both are innovations involving processes of social negotiation among stakeholders. Neither are exact reproductions of what others have done (although one could say they are reproductions of types of innovations [drug prevention programs and school-based management]). This is important in that it points to the particularity of what is being done and that both innovations can change very quickly when elements change. When fundamental elements change the innovation is said to be "reinvented."

A third similarity is that they are both supported by public money, the CYAP by Federal money and SCBM by State money. This public funding is the result of public support for addressing social needs these innovations address (drug use among youth, the poor performance of public school students).

A fourth similarity is that both are being examined very critically because they may or may not have the
intended consequences or be effective enough to warrant the level of structural change they require.

Points of Comparison

In the points of comparison between the CYAP and SCBM that follow I will discuss the implications of the CYAP findings based on these similarities but at the same time pointing out the limitations of the comparisons based on specific differences. In short, I hope to provide evidence to support the implications for SCBM, while indicating compromising differences.

School-Community Based Management

While excellence was the main emphasis of the first initiative of contemporary education reform, restructuring is the main emphasis of the second wave of reform (Cistone, 1989, 363). School-based management or School Community-Based Management, as it is referred to in Hawaii, is restructuring which is a system of institutional arrangements and organizational structures that (a) devolves greater authority and responsibility in educational decision-making from the district level to the school-site level and, (b) enhances the effective participation of administrators, teachers, parents, community members, and, in some cases, students in school policy development and implementation (Cistone, 1989, 363-4).

In Hawaii, SCBM was approved in the State Legislature in the spring of 1989 in the belief that the State of Hawaii's single district school system needed
decentralization so that school governance would take place at the school site, not at the State district level. SCBM was the restructuring reform through which "the creative force of educators could be unleashed and the responsibility of parents could be tapped so that education could be tailored to suit the needs of each community" (Berman and Stone, 1991, 7). The 1991 version of The Hawaii Business Roundtable's Hawaii Plan for Educational Excellence is The Next Steps: Hard Decisions. It emphasizes that SCBM is still in its initial stages. Policy guidelines developed in 1989 provided $2,000 for a planning grant and $9,000 for implementation. While only a few schools have actually planned curriculum or school organization reforms, many problems similar to those encountered in the CYAP have occurred with SCBM (Berman and Stone, 1991, 8-11). These similarities are shown in Figure 6.1.

The comparison in Figure 6.1 illustrates a number of similar organizational problems within the Community Youth Activity Program and Hawaii School Community-Based Management in terms of the formative implementation of these two innovations. These will be further discussed as points of comparison below.
FIGURE 6.1
Similarity of Organizational Problems Between CYAP and SCBM

**CYAP Problem Areas**

**Whose Program?**

- Funding at Fed./State level
- Control of where resources go at centralized implementation level

**Recommended**

1. Hired local staff engage community through contact dialogues about problems, needs, resources, plans, activities, long and short-term outcomes, accountability.
2. "Created community" of interested partners has a say into resource allocation and a variety of opportunities for participation.

**Purpose, Focus**

- Common, general goal but different purposes served.
- Purposes at each organizational level clear, but not understood by all.
- Programmatic focuses can serve overlapping goals of community partners.

**Initial SCBM Problem Areas**

**Whose Program?**

- Funding at State level with business community supporting the plan with their resources
- What level of discretion in deciding how money is spent? Who has ultimate authority to decide?

**Question?**

1. What kind of relational process should guide community assessment, input, school decision making.
2. What are breadth of partnership and incentives to participate and innovate within that partnership?

**Purpose, Focus**

- Confusion and lack of clarity on the purpose.
- Initial focuses on school organization & curriculum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CYAP Problem Areas</th>
<th>Initial SCBM Problem Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended</strong></td>
<td><strong>Question?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Evaluation should be integrated into relational processes to know if/how programmatic focuses are working &amp; that the purpose of eval. is longterm success &amp; not shortterm blame.</td>
<td>▶ What relational process will forward acceptance of multiple purposes and identify core educational focuses that will best serve student/teacher performance at each school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power, Control</strong></td>
<td><strong>Power, control</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Begun with a bottom up approach assuming individual power.</td>
<td>▶ Assumption that shared power results from a common public interest in improving student performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ The social network of power is narrow.</td>
<td>▶ No specification of where time, knowledge, incentives for shared power understandings will come from so the system, bottom to top, can learn to function in a new way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Context and management emphasize control factors to varying degrees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Service-based needs and building on small successes limit risk taking and extension of collective power.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Power/control disputes handled privately or tolerated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended**

1. Assessment of historical and existing contextual power relations among individuals/organizations to broaden social network of power.
2. Provide shared power training which incorporates "small failure" approach to allow risk taking and result in extension of collective power.
3. Utilize a cooperative control system to address developing power disputes.
Whose Program?

The CYAP results showed that who the community is and how the community is served by the Program depends on the contextual assumptions and initial processes used to define community needs. In this case, a service-based assessment of needs and the existing reputation of the implementing service agency were the bases upon which the extension of the Program to the community was made. Initial outreach to prospective Coalition and Council members was done by the Director prior to the hiring of coalition coordinators. No community or capability assessment of needs was made. The area coalitions were to develop activity plans based on local needs. The Coordinating Council was to review these plans to insure their consistency with other regional and State plans and to provide support at this level. In fact, the direction of the Program was largely set by the Director in negotiation with the State. The Director then delegated the implementation at the community level to the coalition coordinators. Frustration with this arrangement was expressed by coalition members who saw the contradiction in being given free reign to come up with community activity plans but little or no authority to see that they are implemented.

SCBM involves multiple partners in bringing about school restructuring (Whitford, 1987, 116). Although there is an understanding that a balance between school
administrators, teachers and community members is important in making school management participatory at the school level, questions remain as to the incentives for each of the partners to participate and to work collaboratively to innovate school level changes. If these incentives are not clear and the relational processes are not established to enable and reward participation by all partners, then it is logical to conclude that full support is lacking for SCBM by the State of Hawaii Board of Education (BOE). An alternative conclusion might be that the BOE is inexperienced at providing mechanisms and opportunities for shared power in the schools. These two conclusions suggest that the BOE might look to previous school-based management efforts for what technical assistance and training would be useful, what readiness assessments might be used for school-based management candidates, and what time and resources are needed in instituting SCBM (Cistone et al., 1989, 401).

Restructuring involves changing people's behavior and processes of relationship in the context of past experience. Schools have organizational histories which have resulted in a high degree of responsiveness to institutional demands, but a much more limited response to the need for technical innovations that reach to the performance level (Meyer et al., 1992, 49). This has implications for SCBM in terms of preparing the partners of restructuring for an understanding of their influence and authority. Unfortunately proponents
of school-based management changes "have for the most part ignored central tenets of organizational theory that deal with such fundamental organizational concepts as authority and influence" (Conley, 1989, 376). This suggests that partners might be left with confused notions of their part in school decision-making. Schools are constantly negotiating relationships of influence and authority between school stakeholders (Conley, 1989, 376). The decentralization of school management means that new understandings, relationships and structures of authority and influence must be negotiated at all levels (Conley and Bacharach, 1990, 543). This will mean that both new and old partners must learn their new roles and relationships in the decision-making process.

Purpose and Focus

The CYAP results showed that programs with multiple stakeholders at multiple levels will serve multiple purposes. A lack of understanding of multiple purposes can result in confusion about some presumed single purpose the program is to serve. This problem can be confronted through the recognition that, despite the fact that multiple purposes are being served, a focus (or focuses) can be selected which gives partners opportunities to support program activities. Not everyone has to support everyone else's purposes in order to act to serve their own. As focuses are selected, an evaluation approach must be devised
to monitor if and how the plans and activities are having their intended effects.

SCBM also serves different purposes for different groups. Nonetheless, schools must have a focus (or focuses) to be a means for change in the school. "Without a reason for switching to school-based management...this change in planning and reporting arrangements is likely to be only a cosmetic attempt to improve the school" (Taylor and Levine, 1991, 394).

Power and Control

The CYAP results show a generally narrow social network of power relations at the coalition level. Administrative and control requirements at the implementation level seemed to restrict coalition coordinators' time and prevented building more extensive collective power networks. Risk-taking and delegation of authority were also administratively restricted. Power or control disputes were handled privately or tolerated. Control issues were a concern both among coalitions and the Council, each one feeling that their ideas, plans and expertise were underutilized or disregarded.

It was difficult to assess the nature and extent of relations to build collective power. One coalition coordinator mentioned that it was difficult to work in the coalition community because of the nature of the reciprocal relations, turf issues, and level of general acceptance of a
new program. Other coordinators had other assessments of their experience with coalition formation. The coalition coordinator with the most success in building coalition support was the one who was a long-time resident of the Island of Hawaii and who had an existing network of relations based on residence and extensive volunteer work in the community. Features of the working relationship with coalition members that served coalition support included open communication about Program and other community activities; utilization of existing social networks to obtain information and gain support for activities; a view of community development which involved the coalition in serving the community's needs across several dimensions; and an emphasis on putting individual coalition members in positions where they could serve political and nonpolitical needs of the community.

Unfortunately, CYAP community building did not proceed in such a way that relations between the area coalitions and the Coordinating Council developed together. Although team building was part of CYAP staff functioning, coalition functioning and Council functioning, these were separate processes. This was particularly a problem since the Program Director worked most closely on the formation of the Coordinating Council while the coalition coordinators worked most closely on the formation and functioning of the community coalitions. This division resulted in hard
feelings between the coalitions and the Council, based on
the perception on the coalitions' part that the Council was
under the control of the Director. In fact, both the
ccoalitions and the Council felt hampered in their
responsibilities by the authoritarian leadership of the
Director. As previously mentioned, the Director negotiated
directly with other monitoring and administrative levels
(U.H. Evaluator, ADAD, OSAP) but was highly focused on task
completion in directing the work of the coordinators and
coalitions, based on the ADAD contract negotiations for the
Program. This lack of bottom-to-top negotiation resulted in
power conflicts which were handled privately or simply
tolerated. No cooperative mechanism for conflict resolution
was established and these conflicts thus remained
unresolved.

SCBM faces similar problems in terms of power
relations. In other localities where school-based
management has been implemented, power and control conflicts
have arisen and recommendations made that "conflict
resolution should be provided" (Cistone et al., 1989, 401;
Lindquist and Mauriel, 1989, 414).

SCBM faces problems of negotiation at several levels
since two very important stakeholders in the negotiation
process, teachers and school administration, have a
substantial stake in the new shared power relations being
negotiated. The budget, personnel, and curriculum decisions
which will be determined in new power sharing bodies through SCBM, directly affect the status and day-to-day work of these stakeholders. Establishing a participatory negotiation style will be a new experience for teachers and administrators who have previously left negotiations to unions or others. Based on the CYAP results and other examples from school-based management experiences, it is clear that a new relationship of trust and collegiality must be developed so that new cooperative power sharing processes can succeed (Conley and Bacharach, 1990, 540). Those school stakeholders, who view the new restructuring as not affecting them, must be identified and will have to learn the necessity of their involvement in this partnership.

It is clear that power relations involve changes in both authority and influence. And although power defined as influence is not a zero-sum situation and can be expanded, authority is limited and must be clearly specified in order to give those with authority an understanding of where they fit into the authority formula under SCBM (Conely, 1989, 375).

SCBM Implications

The comparisons just made illustrate that broadening the base of partners in a community enterprise is difficult yet possible. It must be kept in mind that "decisions about who must be involved in exploring problems and solutions
cannot be made any less consciously than those concerning plans for implementing any particular solution" (Whitford, 1987, 117).

The process of developing a new cooperative community structure must include the recognition that the old structure does not necessarily disappear from the behavior of persons who have established patterns of understanding and acting, nor can it be assumed that existing skills and relational processes are sufficient to serve the new cooperative structure. Innovation is an educative experience where there is room for small failures which can lead to later successes.

The opportunity of School Community-Based Management is not only that there will be some temporary lifting of rules and regulations so that the schools have room to innovate, but that a fundamental change in structure and power relations will be coupled with new learning strategies which reach to student-teacher relations, the most fundamental level of satisfaction and performance in the schools.

SCBM is an opportunity to integrate setting regularities with new learning and problem-solving methods in schools for the long run. Innovative projects in schools that have not considered these regularities or that have not been given time to be integrated with them (often simply by being labelled or funded "short-term") have had limited success or impact. It is appropriate to stop the practice
of "quitting early" and, instead, begin the process of integrating the organizational structures of schools with the learning strategies of schools.

This process, like the relations of multi-level transactions in the CYAP, will not be easy to track. The qualitative approach with its greater sensitivity to setting contexts and some chance of tracking the relational processes among individuals and across organizational levels will be necessary to sort out the effect of new structure-learning strategies that are developed in different distinctive contexts. The starting place should be in demonstrating effects in specific, well described settings before generalization to other settings is attempted.

The implications of the CYAP for SCBM are that underlying purposes and assumptions of individuals and organizations must be examined and resolved on an ongoing basis in a process of continual management. Additionally, it is important to be clear which are the means and which are the ends of any attempt to restructure individual and community relations. Establishing and focusing on the ends so that the means and ends are developed simultaneously and consistently can raise the probability that the innovation will succeed. Finally, it is naive to assume that the process of adopting SCBM coupled with new learning strategies will automatically go well. A qualitative analysis of these relations of change should be undertaken.
This analysis should include advocation of capability-building strategies like small failure risk-taking approaches which encourage learning among all school stakeholders who are engaged in shifting the regularities of the school.
CHAPTER 7
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

A Federally-funded community-based drug prevention program located in the State of Hawaii was studied during its initial two years of funding in 1990 and 1991. A qualitative methodology which incorporated elements from grounded theory, qualitative evaluation, and action research provided the research tools for collecting and analysing the field data. The written and interview data collected reflected the purposes and meanings of the program at four organizational levels. Analysis of these data was performed to examine how individual and organizational assumptions and perceptions affect processes of coalition formation and community action. The influence of initial and formative meanings on program processes is examined as an indication of predisposing factors important to the success of community-based innovations. The results of the study were found to have implications for School Community-Based Management efforts presently underway in State of Hawaii.

The study showed that purpose, focus, and power and control relationships, assumed at the initiation of a multi-level program of community development, are often unclear and remain unresolved. This lack of understanding of both program means and ends and their relational features
exacerbate the conflicts which develop between individuals and organizations over fundamental definitions and approaches to community action.

Suggestions are made for overcoming these problems and implications of both study findings and recommendations are given for school-based management efforts now at the formative stage in Hawaii. It is asserted that educational restructuring must serve long term capability-building purposes at all levels to impact the individual and institutional regularities of school systems. Processes which serve that purpose are suggested from this Hawaii drug prevention education program.

Conclusions

The conclusion of this study will address two primary questions: 1) What new knowledge has been added by this study to the body of knowledge in the field of education; and, 2) what does this study imply for restructuring reform in this field?

New knowledge

I believe that the need for a qualitative examination of the CYAP, coupled with my role as an evaluator of the Program, allowed for the development of a distinctive qualitative style incorporating three elements.

First, the grounded theory method addresses theory-building concerns of qualitative research. Qualitative
evaluation addresses the practical concerns of purpose and utility which focus on how qualitative analysis serves the persons and organizations for whom it is being conducted. The action research method extends the participant or stakeholder approach of qualitative evaluation to an educative level by introducing and advocating processes of self-examination and self-learning that can generate a more thorough and critical understanding of the work undertaken. The mix of these three elements both serves this study and points the way to those trying to define "qualitative" in more than just a one-dimensional fashion.

Second, I believe the findings about the initial assumptions, perceptions and processes of program formation lend support to other studies of relations among community and organizational members. More important, there were distinctive community conditions, individual attitudes to community development, and Coalition attitudes to organizations relations which affected program satisfaction and acceptance of drug prevention innovations. These findings suggest what variables play a role in these settings under given conditions. The objection that these distinctive findings are not generalizable stands in contradiction to the results of some studies with like features. The point is that identifying distinctive differences and patterns in specific innovations is useful to the degree to which similarities exist across studies.
The particularity of this study may limit its generalizability, but it may also add new specificity to a little studied area like coalition formation, or it may disconfirm previous studies which examined programs at a more macro level of examination. In fact, certain findings of the Rand Change Agent Study about affecting planned change in education were disconfirmed based on a reanalysis of micro-level realities (McLaughlin, 1990, 14). I believe this is particularly important since macro level studies often miss the process or relational importance of the inclusion of certain contextual variables.

Third, I believe that this study presents an important lesson about evaluation as an educational tool. Evaluation is coming to have utility beyond assessing whether or not a program "worked." With a more careful examination of predisposing factors and processes, evaluation is an element that is nearly as important to "where one is to go" (feedforward) as to "where one has been" (feedback). With the recent introduction of theory-driven evaluation, evaluation is becoming more and more rigorous for the audience it serves and the techniques it uses.

In this case, I am reflecting not only an observation about the field of evaluation but my own feeling that evaluation has given me an opportunity to observe what is going on in an educational program, and to see how it might be improved. I believe that a more extensive use of
educational evaluation is a pregnant opportunity and that it can be of tremendous use when integrated into the existing learning techniques of day to day school practice.

Restructuring the Schools

School reform is in a phase of restructuring as a method of improving American education. In the 1980s, "the most successful movement of ritual solidarity...has been the antidrug crusade" (Collins, 1991, 115). I can't help but wonder if in the 1990s, Hawaii's movement of ritual solidarity might not lie in restructuring the schools through SCBM. Preparing Hawaii's youth for the competitive challenge of the 21st century sounds like an important goal calling for a vast ritual mobilization and all the fanfare of ritual politics. Will the challenge of improving education be met by funding forty-five schools long enough to say that restructuring works in Hawaii and then withdrawing the money, the administrative support, and an ongoing commitment to having SCBM serve classroom innovation and improvement?

From the discussions I have had with school teachers on the island of Hawaii, I think the success of SCBM is far from assured. I am waiting to see what assessment of communities will be undertaken in preparation for SCBM. If local school communities are assessed as to their readiness for new responsibilities as partners in the improvement of learning processes, and if that assessment is considered in
bringing these communities to readiness, then I believe SCBM could bring important innovations and improvements to local schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NE</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>MO</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>ME</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>HI</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/89</td>
<td>4-17</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Drop Out Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion of Youth Involvement in School, Community, Employment and/or Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>After School, Summer Program &amp; Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative Activities/Projects With Schools, Criminal Justice System, Community Orgs., Community Action, Religious Institutions, Recreation Dep't., and Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outreach to High Risk Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family Focused Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnicity Key: W = White, B = Black, NA = Native American, M = Mixed

Target Population:
- Age
- Grade
- Ethnicity
- Urban
- Suburban
- Rural
- Reservation
- Region

Target Project Environment:
- School Dropout Program
- Promotion of Youth Involvement in School, Community, Employment and/or Recreation
- After School, Summer Program & Recreation
- Collaborative Activities/Projects With Schools, Criminal Justice System, Community Orgs., Community Action, Religious Institutions, Recreation Dep't., and Business
- Outreach to High Risk Youth
- Family Focused Programs
(0)

~

- .._-

•

s

~

m

z
IT"

en
m

~

Region
SChoo: Dropout
Program
Premotlon of Y~h

•

InvotYemlnt in

•
•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

~t

RlseNation

z
m

•

a

~

SctlooI. Community.

IQ
IQ

EmplOymll'll and/or
Recfeation
Aft. School'
Surrvner P~am
& Recreation

to:!

!Z:

o
I-l

>:

1:1

Colleborattve
Activit.. &IProjects

i...
lb

I I

%

r5
;r

a>

S

<t

•

It

•

S

~.

ial

~

I

%

i

8.
~

Community AclIon,
Rellgioul !r.stlMion..
Recrel!lOl'l 0 1ptS..
andBusineu

~

~

•

•

~

ICommuntty Orgl..

i•

'i

•
e

•
•

•
•

•
•

•
•

•
•
•

•

•

•
•

•
•

•
•

~_.~.

•
•
•
•
•

•

o

~

~
I-l

YOUth

en

Famity FooJsed

I-l

~

oen

Programs

aWl; Pr... enllOft

o

•-

Izj

Boctom Up

•
......

..

I<

~

In4oiouse
eonll.llantl'Contrldj

•

CIvIc QrpI .• Aaac.

•
•

•
•
•

...........,..".

.

Comml.nly Suld

s.w:.ISaMd
~

ReIIgIaUIll'IItUIOnl

SUite Agenc.y

CommunlIY I&Md
~,

:-td

ScnooI-&MC
1

•

•

Itf

m

• ...-. ...... •

•
•

•

o

Top Down

~''''''~'

•

•
•
•
•

•

t

en

If

I

I.

II
I

R~ inan.1Or tf,

I

E
to:!

Program.

•
•

o
~

OUtreech to High Risk

•

•

WIth SchOOls. Cnninal

IJustiet System,

...

~~.

:~!

--'-....0..-


OBJECTIVE 1: By March 31, 1990, the coalitions will be formed and will have had the first official meeting.

OBJECTIVE 2: By June 30, 1990, strategies for intergenerational family involvement will be implemented.

OBJECTIVE 3: By June 30, 1990, the Big Island Consortium will be formed and will have its 1st official meeting.

OBJECTIVE 4: By September 1, 1990, a plan for a community youth activity and service program will be completed and implementation will begin.

OBJECTIVE 5: By December 31, 1990, a community wide multimedia campaign will be developed and implemented utilizing the resources of businesses in the community.

OBJECTIVE 6: By March 31, 1991, a curriculum will be implemented to increase knowledge of the parents/adults on the Big Island that alcohol and drug abuse is a multidimensional and complex problem; it is a treatable disease; and the solution is achieved by the joint efforts of the youth, family and community resources.

OBJECTIVE 7: By September 30, 1991, drug use by Big Island youth will decrease by 10% from the baseline level reported in the 1989 Student School Survey, Department of Education.

OBJECTIVE 8: By September 30, 1991, alcohol use by Big Island youth will decrease by 10% from the baseline level reported in the 1989 Student School Survey, Department of Education.

OBJECTIVE 9: The incidence of substance-related arrests of adolescents during the period of April 1 to September 30, 1992 will decrease by 10% when compared to the period of April 1 to September 30, 1989.

OBJECTIVE 10: By September 10, 1992, a training curriculum will be developed and implemented to effect a change in attitudes of the adults and youths on the Big Island relative to the perceived risks, dangers and consequences of alcohol and drug use.

OBJECTIVE 11: By September 30, 1992, a manual describing the methodology and outcomes of organizing a multi-level, multi-cultural, and multi-interest community around substance abuse prevention will be completed.
APPENDIX 3 - PROGRAM AREA OF EAST HAWAII

PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE HAWAII SCHOOL DISTRICT

APPENDIX 5 - INTERVIEW FORMATS FOR CYAP RESEARCH

Coalition Coordinator Interview Format

Three separate interviews were conducted with each coalition coordinator. The first was a life history interview. The interviewee was asked to discuss his/her life from birth to just prior to working with the CYAP with emphasis on factors such as family, schooling, friends, influential life events, work experiences and philosophy of life. The second was an interview of the present work experience which centered on what the person did in the CYAP position. The interviewee was asked to put his/her experience in the context of the social setting, that is, to reflect on experiences with other staff, community members and organizations, schools and school personnel, health professionals, police, mental health, and other social workers. The third interview asked the interviewee to reflect on the meaning of the CYAP work for him/her with particular attention to the connections of the interviewee's work with his/her emotional and intellectual life and implications the job may have in the future. The interviews were totally open-ended since the interviewer didn't ask specific questions but simply attempted to guide the interviewee's discussion to the general focus of the interview. Probing, or the asking of specific questions,
was utilized to expand on or clarify points the interviewee had brought up. No time limit was set for the interview and they were held in private in a location where the interviewee was most comfortable. Each interview was at least forty-five minutes in length.

**Coalition and Council Member Interview Format**

After permission to conduct an interview was granted, the following open-ended questions were asked of all those interviewed. Probing was done to get expansion or clarification of interviewee answers.

Three interviewees were randomly selected from the core group of each coalition and the Coordinating Council (a total of 12 persons from 4 groups). Most were interviewed during the day at their regular worksites. There was no time limit on the interviews which ranged in length from twenty minutes to more than one hour. The interview questions were:

1. How did you become involved with the Coordinating Council (___________ Coalition) of the CYAP?

2. What is the most enjoyable part in working with a community-based coalition to prevent drug use?

3. What is the most difficult part in working with a community-based coalition to prevent drug use?

4. How do you feel about community-based efforts that try to bring a grassroots approach to dealing with drug use, crime or education?
5. What more do you see being required for success in providing improved services and opportunities to people in your/this (coalition) area?

**Student Interview Format**

The student interview was a short telephone interview consisting of eight questions. Students who had participated in one of two CYAP sponsored and funded events were randomly selected. Interviews took place in the afternoon or early evening. After permission was granted to conduct the survey, interviews usually took no more than ten minutes to conduct:

1. In what CYAP sponsored activity(ies) did you participate?
2. What is the central purpose or goal of the CYAP in East Hawaii?
3. What did you enjoy most in participating in a CYAP youth activity?
4. What new thing(s) did you learn in participating in a CYAP youth activity?
5. What drug prevention activities for youth would you like the CYAP to undertake?
6. Do you believe community and school-based drug prevention information and programs are valuable to you personally? If yes/no, how so?
7. What one community or school service do you think would be most valuable to you in dealing with life's demands?
8. What is your age and grade in school?
Interviewee Anonymity

Interviewee anonymity was maintained in the coalition coordinator interviews through the use of pseudonyms; pseudonyms or other individual identifiers for coalition and council members were removed. Student interviewees were identified by demographic characteristics only.
APPENDIX 6 - CHRONOLOGY OF CYAP EVENTS

Sep 89  OSAP awards grant to Hawaii
Dec 89  First CYAP grantee meeting--Program and System Framework outlined
Mar 90  First System Framework training by The Circle on the mainland (no Hawaii CYAP participants)
June 90  Written confirmation of OSAP approval of location change to E. Hawaii
July 90  System Framework training materials made available to Hawaii CYAP
June 91  System Framework training by The Circle for OSAP; attended by Honolulu, HI CYAP Director and Evaluator

Evaluation Activities

Feb 90  Contract negotiation with ADAD
        Evaluation staff hired
Mar 90  Developed framework for program evaluation
Apr 90  Developed evaluation plans (GOAMS)
May 90  Met with YWCA to establish evaluation framework
Jun 90  Met with OSAP, YWCA to review evaluation plan
        Continuation Application on evaluation plan for 2nd year submitted to ADAD
Jul 90  Evaluator, YWCA, ADAD established reporting and record keeping systems
Aug 90  Submitted 2 quarterly reports
        [End of first program year]
Sep 90  Submitted first program year evaluation report
Oct 90  Evaluation meeting with YWCA, ADAD
Nov 90  OSAP conference, Washington DC
Dec 90  Evaluation meeting with YWCA
Feb 91  Evaluation site visit  
Submitted supplemental evaluation plan

Mar 91  Submitted midyear evaluation report to ADAD on 
evaluation activities

Apr 91  Evaluation conference, Conn.  
Submitted additional information on supplemental 
evaluation  
Evaluation site visit

May 91  Meeting with OSAP project monitor, ADAD, YWCA

Jun 91  OSAP two day conference, "What Works in Community 
Prevention," Honolulu  
Evaluation site visit

Aug 91  Evaluation site visit  
[End of second program year]

Sep-Nov 91  Submitted second program year evaluation report  
Relocation to Hilo, Hawaii for research activities  
Attended 9 Coalition meetings and 1 Council  
meeting  
Interviewed program participants

Source: Evaluation Reports of the East Hawaii Community  
Youth Activity Program, A Program of the YWCA, Hilo,  
Hawaii. September 1990 and September 1991
APPENDIX 7 - PARTICIPANT INTERVIEWS

Interview 1. About the Hilo Coalition Coordinator's life history

Mr. A - 30 year old Caucasian

SH: You can start with recent experiences that got you to this job and go back, or you can go back and move forward.

I think I'll go back and move forward. Well, you know, at the risk of saying something too specific at the beginning, you have to understand that when you grow up with your father as rabbi of a congregation of a thousand families, where your father is a real project person and loves putting together things like a community group of ministers and rabbis and priests who met on social action issues, etc. It's kind of like the seeds are all there. I just noted as a child I was always the one organizing everybody, the cousins, the friends. I wasn't always the leader, but I was always putting together. We had this backpacking trip, I was putting together the backpacking trip. So from very early on, most of our family life was surrounded with what you do for the community, it wasn't just our own temple community that my father was very active in, it was the wider community. Being the Human Right Commissioner and various other jobs in the community. So community meetings took place in our house weekly. I was used to people getting together, I knew what the board of directors does for a nonprofit organization probably before I knew how to play basketball. So it's all there.

SH: Maybe you can talk a little bit about your parents. You're talking about your relationship to your folks clearly, and what they did. ...Specifically, each of your parents, can you talk about what they were involved with, and how it affected you, and describe to me what they were doing in relation to your growing up.

Both of my parents are very social beings in their own ways, they enjoy being with lots of people. They cross a lot of different sectors of society in terms of who their relationships are with. My mother was primarily the homemaker, but nonetheless played a role in different women's organizations and played a role by virtue of being the rabbi's wife, etc. Just her grace with people, having people in the home, providing cooking, having big dinners, holiday dinners and so on, always welcoming strangers to the table, etc. etc.; my father bringing home guests from the office from the last appointment that ran late. Her grace and ease and enjoyment of those kinds of situations, as a
little child, gave me the idea that people are great and
everyday can be kind of like a social party and that just
being really open, really open to people. I think I've
already touched a little bit about what my father's work
was, but I also say that his life philosophy, which I think
affected my mother, but I will have to give him credit for
it was that. In the bottom of his soul, he believes that
people have the solutions together and that something very
incredible happens when people work together. It's beyond
even the products of what you produce, beyond the ends, even
the process itself is fulfilling in and of itself, that
there is something rightly human about coming together to do
work, especially social work. Those influences were very
deep, and then of course I have to say one negative thing is
that there is also a side that was like the quest on my
behalf to perform up to snuff, you know. I am sure the fact
that I was the youth group president in junior high school,
I really enjoyed that role and sometimes remind myself of
that role, as I am in this role, that is the CYAP role. I
still have to recognize a good piece of that was trying to
live up to the expectations of what was kind of expected of
me as the rabbi's only son. I think, making a slight
digression, there was a time in my life when I retreated
from social involvement because I thought that that would be
a way to "find more of myself," but in fact I think what
I've learned is that regardless of who I am doing it for, at
this point, I enjoy community work. I enjoy community
organization. I also have been inculcated into that
philosophy that my father lived. So that's family life
primarily.

SH: Where did you grow up?

Primarily in the [San Francisco] Bay area. The first half
of my life was in Lafayette which at that time was a bedroom
community for Berkeley and San Francisco. Then subsequently
in San Jose which grew from two hundred thousand people to a
million people in the ten years that I spent there.

SH: Is there any other thing in terms of your family that
you can think of in terms of the context of the place
that you grew up? You mentioned already that your home
was always open, just thinking about the community that
you lived in, was it a kind of community that was
suburban? Was there a lot of family interchange
between people who knew each other, or was it more
urban and more anonymous?

Before I answer that--it was definitely suburban, and I want
to say something about that--but before I do I just want to
emphasize again that, although it's taken a lot of years to
be comfortable talking about this kind of ethnic issue, but
I just want to emphasize again, it's really important to bring out the Jewish cultural values on group and society. I have heard my whole life long expressions like, the Talmudic expression, it is not for you to complete the task but neither is it for you to desist from it. In other words everybody plays their part. All of my relatives, in one way, form or another, and many, many Jewish people who I have grown up around are very civic, community-minded, sadly in my opinion, sometimes too much on the Jewish group itself, but usually, or sometimes anyway, more widely interested, like my own father. So that's an important thing. I have a best friend of mine who's Italian, it's the same thing, that's why I'm so comfortable in his family, because the values are so similar, group, community, and so on, it's the same kind of culture. So I just wanted to underline that the suburban community I grew up in, in both cases is middle class to upper middle class, and although there was a lot of interchange in the sense of like our block, we had a block Fourth of July party, we had a block swimming pool, that everybody built, etc. So right there we had cooperation, everybody knows each other, everybody practically bought their house at the same time and four guys across the street are all engineers at IBM, so they knew each other from work, their kids grew up together, and so on and so forth. But then also we had the dual life of not only being involved in the block, and in fact that was secondary to the life at the temple, which was primary because that was my father's job. I have to say in all candor I have since come to feel that the community that we grew up in was an extremely ill community, a very, very sick community in the sense of how often communities are, that are in such transition, growing from two hundred thousand people to a million people, the kind of people that you get moving into those kinds of communities very often have no roots, may have no loyalties, a lot of people who are after the development buck, a lot of divorce, a lot of messed up families. Then there was a number of incidents that occurred late, when I was already in college, that involved my father losing his job despite the fact that he had life tenure. This left a very, very bitter taste in my mouth about community and about trusting people who were, so called, your community. These were people who supposedly were intimate enough to be at all of my family's, and us at their life rituals, deaths, weddings, etc., etc. So by the same token, when push comes to shove, a lot of ugliness went down, a lot of real abandonment of our family, and a lot of isolation. And I retreated very definitely from group endeavors for a number of years following those very painful experiences. I am still skeptical, a willing and enthusiastic but nonetheless skeptical participant.
SH: You said you were away when this happened but you still were enough in touch with it that it impacted you, is that right?

Very definitely, yea. Part of it was because I was always my father's confidante, that he would call to say what was going on and sometimes seeking advice but then there is somewhat of a tradition, I don't know how widespread it is, where the rabbi, in some cases, shouldn't defend himself. By that time I was back in the area going to school about thirty miles away in Santa Cruz. So I became the spokesperson and a negotiator; and think that that was definitely a sick role that I put myself in, and was thrust in, almost as kind of the rescuer type of role, but nonetheless I was intimately involved in the events that precipitated a divorce, is the only way I can put it, between my parents and the community that they had served for fourteen years.... Even here, organizing in this community level, I oscillate between faith and despair. The faith part is that you get in there and fight and you can make a difference and it doesn't matter whether you achieve the ends you want, the means itself is what counts and it's very exciting when community people come together and win a few and solve a few and so on, but on the other hand, because I am a good American, and I'm raised in this culture, the individualistic side is always there to rear its ugly head and say, "Screw all this, I'm going off to my cabin in Puna and I'm going to forget the world. I'm going to forget the corrupt politicians, I'm going to forget the bureaucracy, the red tape." And that is a dynamic that really informs my life. And I'll have to say with all candor that it is likely due to the early traumas that went on in our temple and in my sort of skeptical participation in social life, that people really can burn each other bad and that happened to my family and I'll always carry a little bit of a distrust. I think it's distrust of the pettiness of human social interaction, that rumors can destroy community projects, gossip can destroy community projects. There's a lot of superficial pettiness that is destructive and there is also "me first." And I've been around the block enough to know that sometimes this Joe Blow who looks like Mr. Community Activist turns out, and he's telling us we shouldn't go for such and such an action because out of the goodness of his heart he has x, y, and z reasons; it turns out, of course, he's on the payroll of a, b, and c reasons. So I'm a pessimistic optimist.
Interview 1. Analysis

Personal

Program

› Back-ground, family
  › Always been organizing person following father, rabbi of 1000-family congregation in San. Fran. area
  › Father community activist
  › Mother active as rabbi's wife, social grace, openness
  › Father's philosophy: people have solution together; process itself is fulfilling
  › My role: socially active as rabbi's only son
  › Enjoys community organizing, comm. work

› Cultural values
  › Jewish cultural values: everybody takes part; very civic, community-minded

Comm.

› Attitudes
  › Block was community that did things together
  › Community of childhood in transition, sick—no roots, loyalties
  › Father rejected by community he served, left me bitter about community abandonment
  › Now skeptical participant in community
  › As father's confidante, was negotiator in divorce between parents & comm. they had served: a sick role

› Process
  › Oscillate between faith and despair; faith community process; despair individualistic side of superficial pettiness and "me first"
  › Is pessimistic optimist
Interview 2. With Hilo Coalition Coordinator, about the job
Mr. A - 30 year old Caucasian

SH: Describe your relationship with [the] CYAP, how you first got the job.

Sure. It's really simple for me because I had a long-range interest in youth at-risk work as its relates to environmental education. So when I saw the job advertised in the newspaper, coalition coordinator related to drug abuse prevention and at-risk youth issues. I already felt that I needed to supplement my income anyway, and I was already involved in the environmental education side of things, so I said, Hey, this job has got my name on it. So I just applied for it and went through the whole interview process and was offered the position and started about a week after the interview. So it was the matter of being really clear that it was something I wanted to do and then I guess I sufficiently passed the review process that they offered me the position. The nuts and bolts of the job, in terms of describing the work itself, I sent in a report recently that coordinating a coalition is like dancing a waltz where both people are the leader, back and forth trading back and forth the lead position and, for example when I first started in October '90, I read the grant and the way I interpreted it, that here's the coalition and the way I interpreted it is, I am not an agency person, I don't have a background in youth at-risk issues, I don't have a background in alcohol and drug abuse. These are the experts 'cause in the coalition that was formed already in Hilo, there were a lot of agency people and education people. So I came in like with my tail between my legs thinking, these are the experts, I am just here to help facilitate these meetings, get some minutes out, figure out what they want to do and help make it happen. Well, it quickly became clear that they were looking for a little bit more leadership than that regardless of my or anyone's background or expertise. And in fact, all these people weren't as trained as I had assumed. Then I started adopting the role when a couple people came to the coalition with the idea of doing what we are now doing next month, the student support group trainings, I kinda picked up the ball and ran with it in the sense that it was the coalition people's idea, but I made sure I went to the Y and found out that in the budget, we had the budget to do it, and then started pushing to find out if the high school would send people and so on. Because the coalition was really saying, We need a project, or we are not going to keep coming. Coalition members were saying, We don't want to just sit around and philosophically debate what should happen. We want to work on things, or we are not going to keep coming around. So the reason I say that is that that really in a way describes this back and forth role of lead, follow,
lead, follow, taking cues from the coalition about the directions that they want to move in that they feel that the community needs and then myself defining projects and getting people roped in and bought in and push them through and get them going. So that's just as a general comment about the manner in which I operate with the coalition. In terms of staff, staff is really good, it's neat because with three different coalitions, there are three different people, three different ways of operating, three different geographic areas. Like we come together and compare notes, and that's a really helpful process. Joanne kinda directing everything but also a real colleagueship kinda atmosphere, I feel at staff meetings in terms of exchanging ideas and ways of operating and so on. The meetings take a lot of time, they're worth the time, I'm not saying they're not. But the meetings, especially when we were having weekly staff meetings, that was a little crazy for a twenty hour a week position, to be having weekly staff meetings that lasted about three to four hours, it was just nuts. So we've cut that down to every other two weeks, that seems to be effective, we're communicating enough, and yet it's not taking too much time. Frankly,... this whole issue of how having only half-time positions, given that there are so many meetings, coalition meetings, staff meetings, sub-committee meetings, community meetings, conferences, and so on. When do you get time to write your reports, write your correspondence, write your flyers, etc, etc. So the design of the hours is not pragmatic and has not been working. Hopefully that will be redressed. But in general I think the staff is neat because everybody is really operating on their own in a sense and really is working directly with their own coalition and yet we really can come together. There are things that obviously you have to cooperate on, like when we are sending kids to the Winners' Camp, or now we're putting together this intergenerational training for September, there are a lot of staff coordination that we do. But on the other hand, each coordinator is really very independent in terms of how they work with the coalition, what projects the coalition gets into and so on, communicating with Joanne, and up to the Y, about all that.

SH: .... How do you feel about Hilo and the surrounding area as [the] setting in which you are working.

Well, Hilo is an interesting situation. Because if you think of a town of about the size of forty thousand people, there's somewhat limited social services. I mean better than any third world community this size, but not, by the same token, up to a town like Santa Barbara of seventy thousand population. I thought that there would be a lot of cooperation, everybody would be aware of what everybody else is doing in their programs. A lot of team work in the
community around social service agency type of stuff. That is categorically not true. People don't know a lot about what other people are doing. The town tends to be very turfy. The agencies tend to be very turfy and exclusive. We really, in the coalition, the people who have participated are, don't fit the mold, I would say. That's why they stayed. Some of the agency people who came initially and brought their turf issues into the coalition, they are not around any more. Whereas I thought they were very valuable and I tried to court and woo them with individual meetings, it turns out they are not really that valuable. When there is something that we're doing that's really important to them, important to the community, they participate anyway. But we don't really need their ego dynamics to be brought into the coalition meeting. But behind that I think you get the flavor for the fact that this is not your typical, or maybe this is your typical. I haven't experienced a town of this size with as many kinda like "don't step on my toes, stay out of my corner" type feeling in the social service non-profit realm. Also that's by nature of the fact that I work with a lot of, with professional people, with educators, and with agency people. If I had worked primarily with church people, family people, retirees, it might be a totally different thing. Now whether we would get cooperation from the schools and the agencies for the kind of the projects that we are taking on, if we had that other group that I just described, I rather doubt [it]. Because you need to have some people on the inside in order to make things move. This is a funny community, in a sense it's a very closed community, it's a very in-group community. It's a very hierarchical community, the longer you've been here, the more connected you are, the more you can move things. And the less long you've been here, the less you know people at higher and higher levels, the more you have to push. Sometimes the pushing works, sometimes the pushing don't [sic] work.

... The positive side is that in a town like this, where there are two major high schools, and one private high school, a number of feeder schools to that system, churches where all the ministers know of each other, know each other, and so on. The potential to do a neat comprehensive townwide thing is really, really there. It's not going to be hard, already a year into it, we've put so much together. A year from now when we do projects, people are gonna know the name of the program, they'll have attended this, attended that. It's gonna be a lot easier to pull people together on it. So it grows and the potential is really there for every single high school student to go get trained in x-y-z alternative way, because of the size of the community. So all the negative things I've said, I still stand behind. But there are a lot of positives too because of the size of the community.
SH: Some of the setting variables are really of interest.

Let me say one other thing about the setting thing that relates to how the coalition operates. What is weird in this town is here we've got, let's say, we have in our coalition, we have school counselors, teachers, agency people, and so on. And we all get together and we get x-y-z idea. Well, then supposedly that x-y-z idea is supposed to go to the coordinating council, and they give their mana hou [approval] on it. That's great to the extent that they interpret their role, where I feel to the extent that they interpret their role as one of supporting, aiding, and advising, and not one of slam-dunking, putting in the garbage people's ideas who are ipso facto, by definition, not experts. Then in a sense it gets complicated because then you get a situation where like there's another group in this town that is made up of non-profit social service agency heads that meet and they have their committee, and then there's some kind of a committee that works on juveniles, delinquency type of stuff that includes the prosecutor, the family, judge, and so on. In a sense sometimes what you get into is that we start with an idea and we realize that, well, we are gonna have to sell it to these other committees before we can actually do something with it. But then it's also like, that gets in some of that territoriality stuff too; you know, whose idea is it? Even in my case, make it more concrete, in the Hilo coalition, I have had and I will have, in my next meeting, an agency head come to the coalition meeting. But those agency heads also sit on this other agency head committee. Which is in and of itself kind of a coalition even if it doesn't focus on substance abuse specifically. Then some of those agency heads are kinda equal in rank and status with the coordinating council, then it's kind of offensive in a way that they would participate in this Hilo coalition thing and then that idea would go to the coordinating council and they would kinda like have their ideas reviewed by people who are fundamentally their peers. So there is inherent in the organization of this town and inherent of the organization of this program, some weird checks and balance features that do ruffle peoples ego feathers. That's been a little bit of a problem. But it's the nature of the way it's set up.
## Interview 2. Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Coalition coord. like dancing: shift back &amp; forth betw. lead/follow</td>
<td>- Coalition members won't attend addtl. meetings w/o specified project</td>
<td>- Interest in at-risk youth work &amp; environ. education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Job= recognize comm. needs, define projects, get people involved</td>
<td>- Mtgs lengthy but valuable</td>
<td>- Initially facilitated, later need for leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - Staff mtgs too frequent for half time position | - Work hrs. not enough for amt to be done | - Adopted coalition idea of student support group mtgs  
- Staff good in 3 different areas: compare notes, learn from each other |
| - Staff coordination, staff independence | - Coalition members don't fit agency person mold--ego dynamics not beneficial to Program | - Hilo coalition area, limited coop. & teamwork; very turfy among agency people |
| - Agency people involvement not important at meetings BUT must have some for movement in this community | - More connected = more movement  
- Potential for comp. town wide pgm. bec. of size of community | - Pushing for things doesn't always work |
| - Pgm. relation dynamics:  
  - Ideally, support from coord. council  
  - Other coord. orgs. need convincing for true coop.  
  - Existing positions at proper authority levels  
  - Egos ruffled bec. of checks/balances, other program features | | - Coord. Coun. too critical of coalitions, should support, assist, advise  
- Difficult to place people in correct authority levels  
- Members offended by low level placement, advice by peers |
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Interview 3. With Hilo Coalition Member
School teacher/counselor, 37 year old Japanese female

SH: What is the most enjoyable and most difficult parts in working with a community-based coalition to prevent drug use?

Meeting people from the community is the most enjoyable. That is the most beneficial. By meeting people you can get to know what is out in the community. The most difficult and frustrating is that there are so many needs. Trying to prioritize what the coalition is going to try and focus on is the most frustrating and most difficult. Because I don't think we've really gotten off the ground, to tell the truth. We've tried and I know Mike has really tried. But either in getting people together or getting them to agree or making them feel this is really important has been difficult, is difficult. I don't blame anybody, I think that is part of coalitions.

SH: You don't think things have gotten off the ground?

I think they've gotten off the ground in the sense that it's pulled us together and it's provided us with an organization we can turn to when we have needs and we know that we are going to work toward something in the community at large. Maybe the part that I got involved in really didn't get off the ground. So that's why I feel I haven't really accomplished anything myself in this coalition.

SH: How do you feel about community-based efforts that try to bring a grassroots approach to dealing with drug use, crime or education?

It's a part, it's more than a part. I think it's the way to go because the schools reflect the community. Whatever you're going to get in the schools is what you have in the community. Unless we have some kind of support system from the community, the schools can not do it by themselves. So I think it's important.

SH: What more do you see being required for success in providing improved services and opportunities to people in your coalition area?

That's a difficult question. We have to continue to keep people in the community coming to the coalition meetings. I don't know about yearly, but on a continual basis we have to reassess where we are and maybe redirect our goals. If things are not working out, if the original priorities or goals that we have set, if it's not working out, we have to
be wise enough to just drop it and reassess and head in a new direction.

SH: So there is a need for self-assessment. What about other things?

I think, like Diane said, we have to get more of the key people involved in the coalition. She mentioned X of the Department of Health. Sometimes the difficulty in the coalition is that we have a lot of good ideas and when we try to bring them back, in trying to implement them, we don't have the backing of, let us say, an administrator. In fact, there is no way we implement anything. It's important that the steering committee give us approval and make it known to whoever they represent that they have approved it and that they, whoever, whether an agency or a school, the school or the agency should feel free. I don't think it should be the coalition members' responsibility to go back to your organization and get approval, if your district representative is sitting on that steering committee. There needs to be more communication with the steering committee. That's why I asked you, What is the purpose of the steering committee? I think I know what it is but I don't see it working.

SH: What about the school level?

Those of us at the school level are so frustrated because of the lack of resources and because our numbers of students are so big and, like Diane says, we have to take them all, we take them all, we see them all at the public school level. And we know we can't do it all by ourselves, we just can't. And a lot of times we work with students during the day, but as soon as that student goes home, whatever you've done during the day falls apart because the family is dysfunctional. And they come back the next day and you have to do it all over again. And it gets to be tiresome and not just one, it's too many. And everybody is looking to the schools to solve their problem. We have to solve the family problems, we have to solve the community problems. Okay, fine, perhaps part of that is education's role. But we can not do it alone. So when you have something like this, community-based, people in the school level who are anxious to get, see improvement are going to jump at it. Here at least, there is some hope of help. If we wait for the district, if we wait for the State, once you're in the system long enough, you know you're going to wait till doomsday. So you end up doing a lot of things on your own. You go out and look for those resources. You go out and do your own thing. You create your own group counseling or whatever it is. Because if you wait for others, it's not going to get done. And you only hit a few, and what happens
to the rest? So when you have a coalition like this people are going to jump at it. Because it offers some ray of hope that there might be somebody out there who can give you a little more help than you're not really getting right now or that you are getting right now. And perhaps pull together those people who are in power who can really do something to help the people who are really working day to day with these kids and what not. So that is what my concern and question is for that committee. What's their role? They have to be a little stronger I think in helping us out.
Theoretical

Interview 3. Analysis

Supports grassroots, reflects community. School-based pgms. must have community support.

Comm. resources must continue to assess priorities & shift goals as needed.

School resources too limited for task; others willing to help via community. Line workers of comm.-based pgm. never pulled people together & provided base for action.

Need steady attendance of flexible, committed people. Need coal. support of key people. School resources too limited for task; cannot succeed alone.

Program

Council should get org. approvals, not coalition. Everyone looking to schools for solution.

In getting all together, agreeing on pulled people together & provided base for action. Needed activity that didn't get off ground. Accomplished nothing personally in coalition.

Enjoyed meeting people, learning community activities. Didn't get off ground personally in coalition.

Personal
Interview 4. With a Hilo Coalition Member
Social service provider, 60 year old Caucasian female

SH: What is the most enjoyable and most difficult part in working with a community-based coalition to prevent drug use?

The most enjoyable or rewarding is when you see a life changed, when you see someone come off any of these substances to make a new start. The most difficult part is to reach the ones who really need it and to bring them to the point where they realize they need the help.

SH: How do you feel about community-based efforts that try to bring a grassroots approach to dealing with drug use, crime or education?

I think you need to get everybody involved to realize the depth of the problem that we do have in our community in our area. It's very heavy in drug use and extremely heavy in alcohol use. But to get the general public to realize how great it is, is a very difficult situation because so many are involved and they don't want to admit it until they get into trouble. So to bring everybody [together], now this would include churches, individuals, other agencies that are equipped. But that is the difficult part, to get people to realize the need and that there is help.

SH: What more do you see being required for success in providing improved services and opportunities to people in your coalition area?

First, we need to be creative in finding ways to reach the people, the general public. Then we need to continue to aid the agencies who are working, for example, Teen Challenge is reaching out now and they're going to acquire eighteen acres out in the Puna area to build a new center for Teen Challenge on this island. They're going to work with family units, not just with individuals, because of our ohana [extended family] here. If you take a youngster out of their ohana and put them out someplace else for treatment and then they go back to the same situation and it's easy to slip back. The difficulty, once you get them through it, is to keep them there. This we hope we can do because we can reach the family as well as the individual. And that is a new approach that will be taken and that is one thing I can see coming to pass. And the people who work with Teen Challenge are also in the coalition. Because we are all working for the same thing. I am encouraged to see that the schools, police and social service organizations are beginning to work together. This is a new step forward and the
coalition is a part of this, we're all in that. In this way we can all work together, and reach out to more people, and reach everybody.

SH: Any other upcoming needs that you see?

I suppose that one thing that is going to be needed is financial assistance to these different groups. That is one way to get the general public into it and get them to realize that there is a need and they can help meet it. Service clubs and so on always have some little thing they're doing, sponsoring, but I think they need to realize that there is this other side too that they could help out with financially. Also there is volunteerism. I think the churches, the service organizations and so forth perhaps will come to this and realize they do have a part in it. Maybe the coalition gradually can make this known to them.

SH: I know that you are a regular attendee at the CYAP meetings and I wonder if you have any personal motivation that brings you to participate?

I might say that in my own office here, my agency, we see so much of the downtrodden. We have so many coming in for food, but you know they are spending money or food stamps for booze that should go for food. Sometimes you wonder why you should even give them food because you're only aiding and abetting perhaps. But you do have to see that they live. And serve the needs of the family. Perhaps the man has gone, the father is gone or the mother is gone and they're into drugs or alcohol and children are left with one parent. We have many single parent families. That is one thing, because of drugs and alcohol, that is going on. Because I see this all the time, I want to see it corrected as much as possible. I realize the break up of homes, the needy children, you just wonder what their future is going to be if this isn't corrected or something isn't done about it. And because I see this day after day, I'm really interested in trying to get out of it, you see. You know every family is touched with something of this. And because I've seen it in my own family relationship. Not my immediate maybe, but other. And you know how hard it is to get them out of it, if you can. So seeing the needs, I'm interested in trying to correct some of these things.
### Interview 4. Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▶ First is awareness of prob.</td>
<td>▶ Drug problem severity: mandatory as #1</td>
<td>▶ Most rewarding is seeing a life changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Need creative &amp; coop. ways of dealing w/the prob.</td>
<td>▶ Need creative ways to reach public, cont'd aid to orgs. doing work, eg, Teen Challenge</td>
<td>▶ Encouraged by new approach involving families, not just individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Need fin. support &amp; volunteers &amp; support</td>
<td>▶ Coalition can convey needs to comm. groups</td>
<td>▶ Encouraged by coop. bet. schools, police, soc.svc. orgs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Gen. public, svc. clubs, churches can assist with $, volunteers, if need is known
- Motivation: meet survival needs of individuals, families to address underlying drug problem
Interview 5. About the Puna Coalition Coordinator's life history
Mrs. B, 35 year old Part-Hawaiian

SH: [You can] go from way back or just more recently, right before you started with CYAP program.

Let me go way back, to let you know who I am. I was born and raised here, local. I am Hawaiian, Portuguese, from a large family. I went to private school, here in Hilo. I come from a large family, I've got three brothers and three sisters. I am the oldest. I did go away for school for a short period... on the mainland. I went to a private girls school in California.

SH: When was that?

Right after I graduated from high school. So that was '79 to '81. My background? What kind of details would you like?

SH: Well, you gave me some background in terms of your family but in terms of what your parents do.

My mom stayed home and raised 7 kids, my dad works in medical insurance. So his job took him all over the island and all over the state. He is pretty well known. So for me in this town, he is very active in community organizations, specific organizations. So I knew a lot of people that way. He was in Rotary. He was in the Boy's Club, he did Sea Scouts. He did a wide range of things. So at the early age, I was exposed to community involvement. And he took us to a lot of those things, to a lot of events. Every year to the County Fair. The Jaycees sponsored the County Fair. And if there were annual activities like there was family night and then all weekend they would go and set up for the fair.... Doing various things, you know. He introduced us to a wide range of people.

SH: So he was really a very social kind of person because of his business and so on.

Socially active and politically active. My mom was active, but in her own way. Her focus is on education. She really put a lot of effort into making sure that we got what she considered a good education in a private school. Even though it was hard, all seven of us graduated from private school. She managed to see to that.

SH: What school was that?

We went to St. Joseph.
SH: That's why you know Laura.

That's why I know Laura. Exactly, her brother and I were classmates. Laura and my sister played volleyball. I knew a lot of people that way. Simply because our family is so large. Yeah, that's a part of it. My mom was also involved socially, but not to the same extreme as my dad.

SH: I wanted to ask you a little about your work experience.

My work experience starts when I was in high school, my mom also taught us the standard too, that when you work you put your paycheck in the bank and take a few dollars for your pocket. Like the Japanese that save a high percentage of their income as compared to Americans. My mom taught us at a young age the value of the money and working for it. We never had allowance, so if we wanted something we have to work for it. I started babysitting when I was twelve to thirteen years old. She made sure we had babysitting courses. We took that at the YWCA. And after that I worked odd jobs for different people, I worked at the Catholic church one summer, I had a job at a hotel and used that to save up for college. I worked on the weekend. In a way I kinda restricted my social life too. I worked in a hotel, definitely blue collar. And my mother would say, Hey, you are tired now, but this is only a stepping stone, you are not going to do this for the rest of your life. So she taught us the value of using things as stepping stones. So I went to work, and even on half days, school was half time and we would get out about 12:15, I would also work on Wednesdays when the tourist season was up. I worked a lot.

SH: You said school was out at 12:15, half a day?

On half days, not regular school days. I'd come in if they asked, my goal was to go to college, to get out of this place was my goal.

SH: Were you oriented to wanting to get away from this area?

Oh, definitely. And then I made the stupid mistake of marrying someone whose lifetime goal was to live in Hawaii.

SH: The reason I asked is, sometimes people who [are] trying to get away from a certain place have more orientation to, I guess you would say, external concerns, or they want to be more cosmopolitan in their thinking.
Definitely, that was always sort of built in 'cause my mom always was interested in operas and symphonies and she would take us to these things, to plays, to cultural things. My orientation was to go. But, obviously I married a man who wanted to stay.... My husband's brother is the CEO for a very large company with five locations, Dallas, Denver, LA, New York and some other places, he's got a big company. I tell my husband, if I went to work with his company, at that time I felt like I'd have some great opportunities. My husband said if you want go, you go, I am not going, I am staying here. So that never worked out. So then I realized that I was going to be here for good. So if I was going to be here, the things I wanted, I wanted to see come to pass. I already knew how, my dad and mother had showed me growing up. It's not that hard. That's what brings me to this point here. I do a lot of volunteer work, my husband makes enough money so we did alright. Money was not the driving force of our lives.... I worked with Joanne on the pregnant parent thing and then I started getting invited to this thing and that. It's very nice. If I look back on my childhood and being exposed to a wide network, my dad actually did me a favor in creating a good network cause now they're all up in their 50's and 60's, those guys, and those guys are the ones that are in control now. When I meet up with my dad's friends they all know me as Paul's daughter which I never liked, but it does, it's very helpful. But it's a good tactic, we exchange information, I tell them what I am doing, and they make their own connections, this is very good. So community stuff is definitely in my background. It's been easy for me to do my job, because it is easy for me to make connections. I have got them, whether I like it or not, I've got them.

SH: .... I know you have been involved with many organizations. Have they all been very much social service kinds of related thing?

Health and education, and community-based stuff, not strictly social. Let me work backwards now. Some of the things I have been involved with over the last two to three years, actually I've been pretty successful doing the multilevel stuff, whether it'd be working in the community or in the political area. I've been working with the Governor's Committee on Health Promotion and Disease Prevention. That kind of experience. A lot of that came out of the Decisions ['91] process, which was on Oahu. That gave me a really broader based networking system. I have been working with the Mental Health Association. I am now doing some work with retarded citizens, [through] United Way. One reason I took the volunteer position at United Way is to increase my knowledge of the businesses in this area. When my son was in Easter seals, I worked with Easter seals. After E.S. my
son went to Head Start and I worked with that program. I sat on the policy board for three years, no, six years, even after my son went through the program, I stayed with them. So I learned a lot, I learned a lot about federal guidelines, and delegation, especially since I was at the policy level, was exposed to working with budgets and personnel and bylaws, and right down the line. Head Start is island wide, so I chaired their policy council for two years. From there I went into the Decisions ['91] process. The director, the present director, was very much involved in bringing the Decisions process to this island, so I did that. It just all blossomed all at one time. This all happened before this job. So largely my network was in place before I even came to this job. I was able to take this job. I enjoyed doing what I was doing, I had no one telling me what to do. I kinda did it, because one of the guys dared me, "Why don't you take this job? They need you over there." You know how things work over here. I couldn't see myself having to report in all the time. Then I realized that I could use the background that I had to really do something for this community. I think it's going to work. Like yesterday I was sharing with you my long-term goal in these areas, it's a long-term thing. Community work is a long-term thing. I should share other things I do. I do traffic safety for both Hilo, South Hilo, and Puna.
### Interview 5. Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Back-ground</td>
<td>Local, private school, some mainland schooling; oldest in large family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Father active in comm. organizations; early exposure to comm. involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother emphasized good education in private school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother taught value of 1) money, 2) using things as stepping stones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future comm. goals</td>
<td>Life goal to attend mainland college, married man who refused to leave, now resigned to staying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future ambitions: determined to bring about certain goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing local power network</td>
<td>Coord. job easy bec. familiar w/existing network thru father, familiar with how to work with community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took</td>
<td>Work/volunteer experience related to health, education (Gov's Health Promotion Cmte., United Way, Easter Seals, Head Start, Pregnant Parent Program) could be used to benefit community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview 6. With Puna Coalition Coordinator, about the job
Mrs. B, 35 year old Part-Hawaiian

SH: Describe the things that you do in your job as coalition coordinator.

I think the last time we talked that I was telling you that I got involved in all of these different things. One of my strategies now is to involve different coalition members in the groups that I am working with. So that if they get in they make their own relationship with the people either in the agency service, in the community service, or whatever, they, too, have influence. And that's my idea of empowering the community because whether our program exists or not in a year or two years or whatever, at least they'll know how to go about doing the process that needs to be done in order to develop our community. Because it so raw out there. But if you know who to go to, where to go to them, how to go to them, that's it right? So I got one guy named Ralph, I was on the phone with his wife this morning. He is disabled but he is very active. He is the president of this, and has been the sec. for that. He's been involved in a number of things. So what I asked him to do is, especially since he is involved in health care, has an interest in health care, I invite him to participate with the Bay clinics and doing that in Pahoa. They want to have this primary health care clinic going. Ralph goes, "this is good for a start, but we need to go beyond this," so I said that's why I am inviting you to come on because he's got that long-term vision thing. But what we like to see is for the first year they are funded to do the primary health care, but then down the line they are gonna need outreach workers for, not only substance abuse, but mental health, voc. rehab, and other areas too. So I am going, this is what, Ralph, that I can see you can do to bring it in. Because if we put it out, if you let all these guys together, come up with the funding from all those guys together, find the office because his office stays in the back, we'll have a mini-comprehensive health care. We'll have health balanced with the social service side, and we have got it. That would cover at least, in lower Puna, we are looking at about between 16 to 19 thousand people. That can be really exciting because even if the families, they are so poorly dysfunctional. Even if they are dysfunctional, at least there are something there for them should they need it. There will be an immediate referral.

SH: I wonder if you could give me some kind of description of a "typical day" working on the program. I know there is no "typical day," but the point is if you just describe...
What I do is, spend a lot of time talking with people, and coordinating them and finding out what other events they do have and then letting other people know or having them call other people. There is a lot of time writing up what I do. The thing that really bothers me about this, and I'll be honest about this, is that this thing is really political. And what happens in the coalition, people are coming from, they're not ignorant or stupid, they are just unaware of the politics behind it, within the human service providers or what have you in the State. They are real unaware of processes and stuff so they, what was the question you asked me?

SH: I was going to ask you about the typical period of time, what you do, you were talking about spending a lot of time talking with people and documenting.

In writing it up, I find that I have myself, I spend a lot of time thinking how I can do it without offending anyone. Even when I put things out that seem not to offend anyone, I get complaints on it. So it's like on the one hand we're supposed to be encouraging these people to go out, because they are unaware of the background politics behind, the interaction between some of the agencies in town, and of course, the agencies with the department, and the departments with the rest of the state. It seems the answer is so simplistic, they really are very simple. But living them, making them real is very difficult. There is actually cases of people, blackballing, but that's not a very nice word, targeting the work of other agencies. How can you accomplish anything when you are spending so much time backstabbing. That's really disappointing, a lot of people out in Puna are unaware of that. Because they live in Puna, they don't even come in to Hilo, except when they go to see the doctor, pick someone up from the airport, every now and then go shop for groceries.

SH: So do you think then, in terms of the process that you are going through, that you are educating them as to the realities of collaboration within a kind of political setting?

Well, that's a part of it, but also encouraging them to figure out a different collaboration method and style. I see that Puna is going to have to be independent from Hilo in order to make anything go. The thing is that Hilo is so, I don't know what word to use, that they are going to edge everyone else out. It's bad enough that there is a Hilo-Kona thing, but if they have to deal with someone on their own part of the island, it's hard. A good example is that clinic that's going right next door to us. She's getting federal money and all of a sudden, all of a sudden people
are going, do we have to go to you to get money in order to be part of this? People are threatened. Where the community is coming from, they don't care which agency is going to do it, why not, we need it. They could care less about all that. So how can you bring about much needed changes, how can you counter dysfunction when the providers themselves are part of their own tangle. Then we have to go back and define what is dysfunctional because, I was having a discussion with one of my coalition members and someone else and we were talking about diet. I was saying, I was talking to my mother actually about diet that the Hawaiians have these days. You have heard of the Waianae Coast diet? That's different from what is considered Hawaiian diet today. So we were talking about this, and I said but what's right? If you think about it, if you were a Hawaiian, and this applies beyond just Hawaiians, but the food that Hawaiians eat now is rice, hotdog, and Spam, and they take beans, and then they take traditional luau food. But how many of the Hawaiians can afford to buy that kind of food, or even grow it now. Whatever they make, they have to buy what they can afford, so they buy a case of Spam, a case of saimin, and they will eat like that. That's not just Hawaiians. The original diet was really healthy. Talking to my husband about this diet too. And he said sounds like a lot of starch. I said, it's not starch, it's complex carbohydrates. And that's what makes your body go. Very little protein, a lot of carbo. Where do we land with all of that? It's like what's happening in Hilo is different from what's happening in Puna. Where are we going to stand with this? We want to have traditional type of services that can't even decide what they are doing can help us, or do we want to do other things. They are opting, now, to do other things.

SH: That's alright.

So they are going, Hey! Violence comes from substance abuse, substance abuse comes from depression, and depression is a medical model. You're based on medical, not everybody subscribes to that medical model.

SH: You can use any kind of model you want to use, really. The only thing is that you have to realize some of the assumptions that other people are coming from sometimes.

If only those other assumptions would recognize that there are other assumptions out in the community too, that's the problem. They don't want to communicate. Some people think they're it. They don't care that you can conquer this another way. They just want to handle it their way. So to me that is totally intervention, what I'd like to focus on is the boys and girls club, they put in some money to bring
an outreach program out. So my next coalition meeting. I've already put in a phone call, I am going to get a report, I'll give out the report, say, Hey! We have had these guys come in and talk about it a couple months ago. Here is the follow up. I have to call him.

SH: The only thing I am thinking about in relation to what you are talking about the medical model is just what I was mentioning about the fact that some programs have developed a level of legitimacy and they are not based so much on the medical model and they are funded by ADAD and other kinds of agencies. So if you are trying to do some kinds of alternative kind of model, then you want to be associated with model that perhaps already has a legitimacy. It's sometimes useful to know which non-medical model....

Legitimacy is one thing, the attitude of those who are in legitimised program is something very bad. And they have just alienated a lot of folks. It really depends on the attitude of the provider too. You don't want to hook up with people who are going to alienate the people that really need help. That's what has happened. So how can we be effective? And they don't think that they have alienated anyone. A lot of denial even within the helpers. So I am looking if the boys and girls club had a program, let's see what they are going to do, how we can support them. We tried to help them get the location, there's no follow up on their part. We did have communication between different members and other people in the community finding space for them. One thing that we really are lacking out in Puna is facilities. If we're going to have anything come out or plan to do something, it's hard, because where are we going to go. Facilities are either too small or they are non-existent, they are not up to standard. Like I'll give an example, pre-school out there, there is no more place to put a pre-school. Not in any of the county buildings that are available, or any of the private facilities there. Then they lack enough open space to do it, so what do they do? One agency in town approached the county for the land and the state for the money to build a facility. And the county goes, Great! We want you out there, it will reduce vandalism and will save us a lot of money to have you sit on this. And they won't need very much space, just enough to help about 40-60 kids, 100 mats, and then have some green space around it, to accommodate them. We are not talking about a lot of space, but it would save the community a lot of money in the long run. You see, that's the kind of efforts that I would like to see happen. And of course, if we advocate for something like that, prevention happens at that level. It starts happening earlier, 'cause like I said, kids are going to grow up, ... they are going to be in Pahoa school, then
what? If you don't catch them down there, you are going to end up with them in the two institutions ... But for me, it's kind of fun to see people hook up together, and have their ideas together, and they help one another. That's exciting for me.
### Interview 6. Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▶ Action=knowing: who to go to; where to go to them; how to go to them</td>
<td>▶ Will know process of comm.dev, program or not</td>
<td>▶ Strategy: involve coal. members in gps to influence policy, &quot;empower&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Clinic will serve needs of lower Puna</td>
<td></td>
<td>▶ e.g. member RS w/Bay Clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Very political prog. environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Talking w/people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Individuals adapt to setting requirements; &quot;dysfunction&quot; as situational definition</td>
<td>▶ Puna needs independence from Hilo</td>
<td>▶ Adopting inoffensive report style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Hilo too competitive</td>
<td>▶ Providers part of prob., threatened by others' actions</td>
<td>▶ Inc. coal. awareness of underlying politics (blackballing, backstab)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Medical v. alternative model</td>
<td>▶ Puna diff. than Hilo, people opting for alt. perspective &amp; model</td>
<td>▶ Encourage own collaboration &amp; style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Local initiative best serves local interests</td>
<td>▶ Can't work with those w/bad attitudes, alienates those in need</td>
<td>▶ No consideration of others' assumptions of different approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▶ Local advocacy &amp; initiative serves prevention efforts, avoids future problems</td>
<td>▶ e.g. no follow up from Hilo on Boys/Girls Club; locals can arrange land and $ for club: worthwhile exciting project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Interview 7. With Puna Coalition Coordinator, about the meaning of working in the Program
Mrs. B - 35 year old Part-Hawaiian

SH: Describe your reaction to the Program in terms of its meaning for you... presently [and] implication for what [you] may be doing in the future.

I see that there is value in the program, I really do. It's brought a whole lot more awareness. I've had people come up to me and say, thank you for sending me something in the mail. Now I know what's going on, and they can actually tap in to things that are happening. But that is only scratching the surface. I feel like we've done really well in one year to bring more people together from different parts of the region. Hilo is a lot easier, everybody has done a complex of stuff, it's a lot easier. And they see each other regularly. This is one vehicle for people to see each other regularly out in Puna. They have opportunity to see each other regularly. The other thing I have done was to distribute membership lists, if you did meet someone. To me, it's empowering 'cause if you have a need, you've met them in one context, the freedom is there to call them up if you need something in another context. And to me that is part of empowering the community. Now when we get all the way down to how to measure impact, I really don't know how to answer that, because I know that what we have done is advocate, educate, and train people, and the effects will not be felt for a long time. I don't know how to go about measuring that, except that people feel a lot better now. The people I know that have been involved in the program feel a lot better, feel a lot more confident than they had before. But how to measure that in terms of effectiveness and efficiency, I don't know how to do that. Except to conduct interviews with them personally to see what they have gained over the last year. The response I've gotten from them, wow, you're doing a good job. One of the counselors over at Pahoa school said, "I am really glad you sent these things out to me." 'Cause she can't be at all the places, at all the services and activities we promote through the minutes, but she certainly notes what's going on and she can recommend that other people go. Which is totally her job to do. I know that we helped the DOE staff and faculty just by having one workshop. They all have a common interest and that's in working on a drug-free schools team. But they never had an opportunity to come together before and actually share what's going on. And in our district alone, we have two brand new programs starting up. So here we've got one that's been in place for a year and have had, in their eyes, success 'cause they not only put together budgets and held activities, they are doing it a second year, and now this State and the training we had with Jan
Marie gave them the opportunity to share the process with two new people who are starting up. There were actually more, more people starting up like in Hilo, people came to the training, so that they would know what other people have done, how much money to ask for. I know initially that the Pahoa team which originated from Honakaa only asked for between three to seven thousand. And they didn't realize that they could ask for twenty thousand, and now they are asking for sums of twenty thousand or more. And they are realizing what they can actually do with it and how they can make an impact. And having the opportunity, I think they were very grateful for the opportunity to be able to share that with other people. And people who were on the receiving end went, thank you for saving us a whole lot of time. So that's an impact which will filter down to the kids within the next year, but how do you measure that unless you are actually sitting on top of that program monitoring everything they do. And then again it's based on teachers who are committed, but don't necessarily have a lot of time, so the time that they do give to the program is not as much as they would probably like to give, they'd love to give more time. But the reality of balancing home and professional life is two different things. So and then what filters down to the kids may only filter down to some of the kids. And while there are programs in place that help at risk youth, the ones that we are really concerned about in prevention, there has not been time so far to totally network with all the people working in prevention. It's an ongoing process. It is going to take far more than one year or two years. When we say a pilot project, to be truly successful, we may need more than 3 years.

... I see the CYAP, the way it was intentionally set up, it's a grand idea. The whole concept of CYAP program is a grand idea. The reality of it, we have too much to do in too short a period of time. We are expected, I can look at it realistically now and say that the communities, two of the communities that were chosen for this pilot project did not have in place what is presumed in the program. We did not have a wide variety of active agencies in Honakaa or Puna. So that already put these two communities at a disadvantage compared to Hilo. This means we have to work twice as hard or even 3 times as hard to accomplish what Hilo can do. I see that we should not be compared to one another. Honakaa is rather stable, the Hamakua District is rather stable. They've been declining whereas Puna has been accelerating in population growth and needs for services and a whole bunch of other things. We've also got some major problems that directly impact this like the vog ["volcanic fog"], like geothermal, like lack of employment and lack of infrastructure. So right there, if the basic assumption was that everybody is starting at the same level, not a problem we can do the same--no problem. But the three districts
were not starting at the same footing. I think we've done a good job, may be not the best job, the most excellent job. But we have done a good job in starting to put together the community to recognize that. I personally have gotten feedback, not just from people in Puna, but people in Hilo who see my name all the time. They hear my name on the radio, going, Wow! You guys are really doing something out there. I think the media publicity helps a great deal. So what I started to do now is take my name out of the ads, out of the publicity that goes in because I don't want to be recognized as being the only one. It basically leaves a false impression. When I started getting this feedback, "I see [your] name in the paper all the time." That's not the goal of the program. So I started to take my name out of the publicity because I don't feel that I am totally responsible for what's happening. I wanted it to be "we are responsible" for what's happening. But Puna has been in the paper. I've also discovered that we are being mentioned at other places too, which is really nice. Like PCC [Puna Community Council] has also given us a little bit of publicity, mostly because the secretary is a member of the Coalition and she has included on occasion before, what we have done in their minutes. And that goes to a whole 'nother circle of people. So that's really nice. That, to me is what it's all about, is promoting what we are. I see this program as a dynamic, as a potential, in that we are, as the longer that we go on, the more we're living out our potential. My personal goal as a coordinator was to start with the education, the activist level as a place to start. I feel in this last year we've done beaucoup. I'm satisfied personally for the first year. Now I am looking to the second year before the money runs out 'cause technically I only have eleven months to do it in, is to have people in place at different levels of power. Like on the board of directors for the Bay Clinic or Hui Malama, which is the Governor's Committee for health promotion and disease prevention. So that we've got many more voices coming from, as a result of understanding the same goals going out this way and they're at different levels. So that in the Hawaiian community they're saying the same thing that we are saying at the Puna coalition. At the Bay Clinic, they're saying the same thing that we're saying at the Coalition. At the Governor's level, they're saying the same thing. To me, that's empowerment. That may not be empowerment to anyone else, but to me, that is empowering the individual to advocate for the same goals. We started at the same place, but we are now expanding out this way. How you measure impact, I am not very sure, we may not be able to measure impact for another five or ten years. I do realize that getting this clinic in Pahoa was a major step, a major step in raising the health care. I realize we still have substance abuse, but substance abuse has a lot of implications. Like, people
getting beat up or people ODing or people having medical emergencies. This is a place to go to take care of that. So we are not preventing them. I guess it's more intervention. One thing I thought about is that I left the meeting this morning as I was coming here, the planning phase can really happen this year for our coalition. So even if, say, my position were terminated in a year's time, they'd already have some idea of where they are going beyond me. It kinda correlates to what we did last night, long-term and short-term planning. The short-term planning is to get people into this position, for long-term is for them to keep the same base, keep going the same direction, but that's not what I was going to say. Oh, yes, yes, in terms of prevention and intervention, our program is funded to do prevention. But I think the immediate need is in the intervention right now. And that we have the opportunity to plan for both so that we get more people out of intervention into prevention.

... Again I think the premise goes back to the contract or the way the program was written. I guess it expected, without saying so or saying so in roundabout way that people who join the Coalition have some sort of power to begin with. And that in reality people who do turn out and come out to these coalition meetings don't really have that. That's why I was, I chose to be instrumental in giving these people, some of them who are capable and willing and committed to doing this, powers of position. Putting them in a place where they can actually put forth their ideas to be heard and have some action taken on it. The literature that I've read out of OSAP, the stuff that I've chosen, duplicated, and carried with me--I've been carrying it with me over the last year--[has] a lot to do with leadership, motivation, commitment, ownership. I think all those things covered in the OSAP materials absolutely wonderfully apply to Puna. Making it a reality is a little bit different because people coming from different SES, health, and I think it isn't recognized the difference between formal and informal power. And based on my community, informal is a far more accepted way to go than formal. And while it's recognized at the Federal level, I think the state's requirements and objectives have a hard time swallowing that, including the director. So that comes from the knowledge of my own community. And what may look good on paper doesn't always translate to good reality here. Knowing the people from the community who choose to be part of CYAP and how they operate, I am a lot more forgiving when they don't show up. 'Cause I know where they are. But in terms of keeping track for evaluation purposes to judge success of the program, it doesn't look very good. But I know in my heart and in their heart, they are committed to it. And if I need them all I have to do is call them. I've done that, I've picked up the phone and asked for favors. Even though they
may not have shown up for two months at a meeting. If I need info or if I need a favor, I know that's available. That's informal and that's not always documented. When I talk to people it's not the amount of time, how much time, 'cause sometimes I get on the phone, and I'll be on the phone with them for 45 minutes or a lot longer with them. But I choose to do that because it brings us into understanding. To me, having an understanding, the understanding will exist far beyond the program. So to me that's of value, yea? It's having an agreement or a relationship with people. I know I've been instrumental and successful in creating relationship with the coalition that will exist far beyond any paid period of time. Relationships are long-term unless there's some kind of barriers that come in between people and the relationship. But when we're talking at the community level, that doesn't happen too often. You know people, you get accepted by them, you're kinda in that, whether you are in there really tight or really loosely, you are accepted by different groups of people. I think we've been successful at that level. And that's what matters to the community. I've brought in a variety of different people who speak. A really good example of knowing where they are but not insisting that they show up every time is the police. Asked the Captain to show up at the beginning, and she didn't show up. But I went and got the info from her and shared it with the rest of the coalition. The info about our district in terms of, especially like DUIs that were occurring in the district, burglaries that were definitely linked to substance abuse.
### Interview 7. Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevention involves ongoing</td>
<td>Success because: public feedback; helped</td>
<td>Coalition member list distributed for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>network</td>
<td>with school prog. thru networking, training;</td>
<td>networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>future networking to others</td>
<td>Difficult to measure these except thru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CYAP is a grand idea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Readiness of 2 of the 3 comms. limited: no</td>
<td>Reality: too much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agencies w/resources as assumed</td>
<td>in too short time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Success in 1st program year: publicity, prog</td>
<td>Puna &amp; Hamakua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>awareness; education (activist level)</td>
<td>must work 3x harder than Hilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Success in 2nd year: people in diff. levels</td>
<td>Puna rising pop., major problems,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of power</td>
<td>need for services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact of comm. empowerment not seen for 5 -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People can set course in planning phase this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term: into</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Long term: keep same direction
CYAP (incorrect) premise that comm. people already have power
Need for leadership, motivation, commitment, ownership
Informal power of coal. not accepted by State, Program Director
Informal power hard to document but commitment, support present

Immediate need is intervention, not prevention
I work to get people in positions of power
OSAP Framework
State, YWCA want formal power structure, will not accept anything less
Comm. values long term agreement or relationship
Interview 8. With a Puna Coalition Member
Housewife, 32 year old Caucasian

SH: How do you feel about community-based efforts that try to bring a grassroots approach to dealing with drug use, crime or education?

I like the fact that it gives a place for all of us folks to get together, professional or non-professional, as community-based grassroots. And the people who show up are the people who really do care and probably can make a difference. Either with their contacts and their energy. And I'm probably one with the latter, with more energy or the time to put energy into doing something actually working with the kids. I think it's a great idea. I guess what I get out of the Coalition is just the opportunity to meet folks with the same interest and find out where I can help and how I can help be directed through them with the people I need. Otherwise I'd sit here at home with all my great ideas but not knowing where to take them. So that gives me a chance to contact people to start somewhere.

SH: So this networking brings you out from a kind of social isolation in Puna?

I'd think that that would be more a personal limitation rather than a community problem. We can all be as isolated as we choose, I suppose. I don't know, you know I could sit and harp on all the things that are wrong but I don't have the time 'cause I'm going to do something that's right. I'm going to take action. I'm not going to leave the drug prevention for my son up to his teachers, the knowledge of drug prevention, I'm not going to leave that up to somebody else. I'm going to go into his classroom as I did last year armed with the books from the Johnson Institute and voluntarily tell the kids what I've learned or out of this book do sessions with them. I'm not going to sit back and expect somebody else to do that and just hope it gets done. I'm going to do it myself. And I think it's real individual, how much you choose to get involved or how much you choose to isolate. I could sit and say, Poor me, what a terrible drug problem, what am I going to do? Or I can actually go, this is what I can do, I join J in her classroom talk with kids, take them out in the community and at least have dreams and goals and ideas and take the first step by showing up. And that's what I'm doing today. I'm showing up. And whether I'm realizing those dreams or goals, I'll find out tomorrow. But I'm going to show up today.

SH: What more do you see being required for success in providing improved services and opportunities to people in your coalition area?
More money. I would like to see a student activity center, a youth activity center. I heard it brought up in that meeting and I don't know what happened to that idea. I haven't heard it talked about lately. I guess it comes down to money. It all comes down to money and then it seems we get into the bureaucratic red tape stuff and I shut down then. I don't understand a lot of it, I don't want to understand a lot of it. I get so frustrated behind it, that I just do what I can today. I would love to get involved in a level of having a youth activity center, but I don't know what is required for success for providing improved services. Probably what is required is more money and probably better organization on our part.

SH: I'm just trying to get your ideas on needs. I know Puna is different than Hilo.

We're very, very spread out. And we've got an incredible drug problem out here--and an incredible availability of drugs. And a big message from a lot of adults who think it's okay to smoke marijuana. And I think it's a real unique problem. And we need to change that message. We need to say it's illegal, it's not okay. Drugs are for losers and so forth. Puna is unique, very unique in that area because the messages are so one sided. We got a big job. Like what I find is that there are only a handful of people that show up at these meetings, show up to actually do the leg work and they're being asked to do the work of thousands of parents and thousands of teachers. These people, these few caring [people] who really want to change things are asked to do an incredible job to change the way we're headed. There are a whole bunch of damaged parents and damaged youth and I myself am one. But I choose recovery today and that allows me the help I've gotten, allows me to make a difference in my own personal life and how I raise my children and that they get the message that it's not okay to do drugs, it's very unhealthy to do drugs. And I have to take that message out in public too, to all the kids I happen to meet. And it's real hard when I see parents smoking at birthday parties for their kids. I don't go to those birthday parties anymore, because I can't, as a parent, a conscientious parent of today. And these are the yuppies in paradise park here. You go to a children's birthday party and you'll see a bunch of them standing in a group smoking marijuana and I'm just looking at when are their teenage sons and daughters going to start joining that circle. Pretty soon, they are already doing it, but not with their parents. And I can't let my son think that that is okay, normal, or acceptable. I think that is very unique to Puna because it's so available, drugs are. I think I got off on a tangent there. I don't know what that has to do with this question.

SH: It does, you are talking about norms.
It's frightening to me. That puts children at high risk, from what I learned at the Safety Action Seminar of last year. Just seeing mom and dad smoke joints immediately puts kids at high risk. I got into this conversation with one of my husband's friends and him and his wife don't smoke marijuana but they think it's okay for kids to do it. I go, I can't, it's not okay with me at all. It's damaging [the] emotional, spiritual, physical growth of children. So it's not okay. And this is an intelligent person. But they've been around it too long out here. It's so isolated, they've actually convinced themselves it's okay and they reinforce it with all their other friends who have drug problems. So they've convinced themselves it's normal, acceptable and it's a way of life and it should be legalized. And it's bizarre. It's like, Get real, folks. This is going to damage your children. Jails, institutions and death is the outcome of what you are saying is okay for your child today. It might just be a little joint, but I know where it heads.

SH: What about how the schools are dealing with it here?

I think it comes down to, I truly believe that the higher ups in schools really want a program that works for their kids. They really want their schools drug-free and they want this message out to children that users are losers or whatever their particular choice of message is. But their resources and money are probably limited to the point where it all sounds really great but it's going to take people like me who just take the time to go into the classroom if the teachers are open and spend time on what I've learned with the children. I would hope, the school was real receptive to me last year when I started up. And the vice-principal heard of me without me ever introducing myself or telling her what I was doing. She saw me on Oahu and knew who I was and what I was doing. Word gets around. They seem to be real open for help. I wish there was a magical program that would work that would be adopted. It seems unorganized to me with all these, with DARE, and McGruff and Target. It seems that there are so many different programs. If we could bring them together and make a workable one in all the schools, that would be a sort of a goal or dream.

SH: Any other thoughts on the work of the Coalition?

I see the Coalition right now as a place where we all come to meet to tell each other what we are learning and what our goals and dreams and experiences are. And from that, I just see that as a place that we all, from different walks of life, just say what's happening, what we're individually doing, what our group or our individual self is doing. I see it as a place to get new ideas and hopefully take them out into the community.
SH: Do you see the kind of networking you're hoping for through the Coalition?

On a personal level, I'm doing something. As far as the community, I don't know how effective, I guess so. Our community needs to be educated. Then again, we have this unique problem being so spread out from Volcano to ... with a bunch of people whose children never even make it to public school because they are being home studied in Fern Acres where weird things happen and people are growing marijuana and living a totally strange lifestyle. I don't know how to reach those people in this community. Except by walking my talk. And it comes down to educating these people in our community to the fact that it might be a harmless joint but your setting your children up for a high-risk situation when they see you smoke that harmless joint and that this is what is going to happen to these children. Statistically this is what I've learned at a seminar, but it's real hard to tell folks that they don't want to hear it and they justify it. So I think what I continue to do is just be heard on what I've learned. And the Puna Coalition has allowed me to attend. This is my second seminar at which I learned a great deal. And I tell people whether they want to hear it or not. I tell them what I'm learning from experts. This isn't [my] view, this is what the experts say. This is statistically what is going to happen to the children in this high-risk situation your setting up for them. And I see that as the goal for our Puna Coalition—to educate our community.

We need to educate our community that, Hey, there might be something incorrect about this. The message that you're giving kindergarten children [is] that it's okay to smoke, just by you doing it. I remember hearing people say—and I used to be reminded of this myself several years ago—that 'I'm only hurting myself when I drink or take drugs.' And that is not true for me today, because anytime a child sees a person high on drugs, loaded with drink or smoking a cigarette, hurting themselves with cigarettes is a message to them that it is okay to do it. And as a responsible adult today I cannot do that in front of children. For myself too, but especially in front of the children, because I'm not just hurting myself with those actions, I'm giving a message to children that may look up to me that it's okay. And hopefully the Puna Coalition is allowing me, it's given me, actually, the most I've gotten out of it is going to the safety action seminar. They're some great folks and I learned some great ideas. I think I'm pretty intelligent and can assimilate what I've heard and assimilate it and put it into words and then take it out to the community. And I think that's great to be able to do that and it has offered me that. And maybe educate a few more friends you know, or at least be heard on it. I can't be quiet about it anymore, especially when I see children being damaged.
Theoretical

- Provides place for prof's & non-profs to make diff. thru contacts, energy
- Isolation is a matter of choice
- Need more $ & organization on our part
- Only handful of people show up to do drug prev. educ.: acting for thousands
- Drug use hurts individu-als, sends wrong message to next generation
- Children at high risk because they see their parents using drug free schools
- Bec. of limited resources, need volun-teers like me to get message across to Existing school drug prevention programs
- One workable pgm. in all schools is a goal
- Place to share experiences, goals, dreams, get new ideas to take to community
- Need for educ. of public is a Puna Coalition goal
- Trainings thru coal. allowed me to educate others

Program

- Program a vehicle for involvement
- Schools really want drug free schools
- Beca. of limited resources, need volun-teers like me to get message across to existing school drug prevention programs
- One workable pgm. in all schools is a goal
- Place to share experiences, goals, dreams, get new ideas to take to community
- Need for educ. of public is a Puna Coalition goal
- Trainings thru coal. allowed me to educate others

Personal

- Grassroots=meet those with same interests and find out where I can help
- I give my energy to the Program
- Showing up is first step, then take action and self-responsibility. Won't leave son's drug prevention education to teachers
- I'd like to see a youth activity center
- I shut down to bureaucratic red tape
- Puna has incredible drug problem: Availability high and message--OK to smoke marijuana--must be changed & taken to public
- I have chosen recovery for myself and a prevention message for others
- Social norm: kids' marijuana use OK, people convinced thru social influ-ences
- Schools open to me
- Many drug prevention pro-grams
- Reinforces our commitment
- Puna difficulties: Covers large area, many kids home schooled
- Example is the only way to reach all these people
- My goal to be heard and educate those I can
Interview 9. With a Puna Coalition Member
Drug counselor, 37 year old male of mixed ethnicity

SH: What is the most enjoyable and most difficult parts in working with a community-based coalition to prevent drug use?

The most enjoyable is that you have an opportunity to do something with positive ideas. It gives you a vehicle for doing something with them. The most difficult is that the program doesn't give us enough freedom to do what we want to do. Things are still under lock and key in a sense. There are a lot of control issues with the management of the program, whatever you want to say.

SH: How do you feel about community-based efforts that try to bring a grassroots approach to dealing with drug use, crime, education?

I think it's good 'cause you got to focus on where the problems are starting from, which is the grassroots, family, parents, friends and peers if you want to use that terminology. Kids start using through these influences and their peers. Experimentation starts through peers.

SH: You like the grassroots approach?

Yes and no. I think grassroots works to a point with the kids. Then what the kids have to do is have a role model. So they can see, hey, you know what, they don't have to stay stuck in what they're doing. If they see kids who came from where they were, that are doing positive stuff like sports figures, particularly like sports figures, surfers, entertainers and stuff like that, that they can really get out, that they can exert themselves to be whatever they want in life.

SH: What more do you see being required for success in providing improved services and opportunities to people in your coalition area?

Basically you're looking at geographies. That's the big stumbling block right there. I've seen a lot of community-based associations have facilities that they can do something with the kids that are not fully utilizing the facilities for what they should be using it for. And talking about community associations, they got basketball courts, they got all this and that stuff. Getting the kids involved in more sports, arts and crafts, whatever. [Getting kids to existing resources] is not happening [now].
SH: What more do you see required for Puna?

That's a real tough question you know. We went to this thing that they had in Honolulu. And the Puna Coalition decided we are going to have a poster contest. I don't know if Diane told you what we are going to do. We decided that we are going to do a poster contest for elementary and junior high schools. And from there, the seniors of the high school students will be the judges of this poster contest. It'll be a kid oriented type of situation. And as a spin off of that we are going to do a video. It's just doing something, getting the kids involved. We took something that's realistic.

SH: When you talk to kids like the Hamakua Coalition did recently, you sometimes find they want simple kinds of help.

But see, the people don't think of it as enough. They think only of complicated things that kids can do. This is something that we're trying to do to get the kids involved. We have to start something 'cause we've been doing this for over a year already. As far as I'm concerned, I'm frustrated because the YWCA is not really giving us the freedom to do what we need to do.

SH: When you try to go from top down to bottom up, there are often many such control issues.

I'm not real comfortable with this, that there is a budget that we can use, that we have access to use, for what we want, a small budget of money. My personal opinion is that you're better off splitting the money up between the three coalitions and saying you have x amount of money to work with rather than everybody just [reaching] for the pie. That is just my opinion, and I'm not comfortable with that. I'm more comfortable with, okay, you have $5,000 you can spend for the year or whatever. So now go ahead and spend the $5,000 with approval 'cause we think it is a worthy cause. But this way we got a big pot and everybody can just pull what they want. Somebody is going to get short changed in the end, when you have an aggressive thing. You got to look at human nature. People know what they got to work with really. And they'll go out and implement it. As it stands now, nobody wants to exert themselves because they don't want to fall flat on their face, if they come up with something that will throw the $5,000 in one shot.

SH: But the change to coalitions doesn't mean a change to bottom up budgeting.
I'm not comfortable with the management part of it. Because I don't think the lady that is running it, and that's my opinion, is capable of doing what she wants really to do. Because she is very, it's a controlling issue. When I hear stuff like, I don't think salary should be a part of it. Hey, you know what, this is a State grant and you know what, that's all public knowledge. We're paying for whatever through our taxes. So don't try and hide this shit. Be up front with the people. If you're up front with the people, then the people will be up front with you. There is too much secret shit 'cause I'm actually involved with these awards. So you can't pull the wool over my eyes. And I'll challenge them to the point where I make them accountable.

SH: The CYAP is mostly expending money for staffing. That's the reality of how it was proposed as a State grant.

If you have a person who is running the program, that doesn't have any kids, so how can a person with no kids really rationalize what the kids really want, unless you're a parent. Do you understand what I'm saying? You may have the substance abuse credibility or whatever, that's fine. But you know what, we're dealing with substance abuse prevention, that's all we're dealing with, not using, we're trying to stop these kids from getting started. If you don't have a parent running it, this is my opinion now, how do you know what the kids really want? Unless you're a parent.

SH: Or unless you ask the kids.

That's why I like Diane, Diane's real open, Mike's real open with the kids. And I see that they are committed to what they are doing. But you are committed so far, to try and make a difference in the community. But then you have like this other faction that controls these guys. And sits there at her desk, and doesn't know diddly-squat, really what's going on in the community. She thinks she knows, but she is not out there. If you're a parent, you're out in the community. I don't care what you say, you got kids in school. The kids will bring friends home, they'll talk to friends and stuff. I'm not real happy how this grant was selected for the position. I didn't see it in the paper, as a posted position. As far as I'm concerned, any non-profit or any position, coordinator or whatever is supposed to be posted in the newspaper. And it was never posted, it was just given to her, handed to her. And that's bullshit. I know about non-profits, you know.

SH: There were positive changes to the original grant to give the coalitions a bigger role.
And that's the only way this thing is going to get implemented, is that the coalition has to get more involved. Right now I'm frustrated as hell, I tell you. I keep going to these meetings every month and we're still talking, the typical bureaucracy. Hey, you want ... X amount of money, you have x amount of money and what do you want to spend it on? And lets start it. Instead we're spinning our wheels by just having these meetings and we can't really implement something 'cause we really don't know what we can spend.
### Interview 9. Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address prob. at most basic level</td>
<td>Grassroots good 'cause focus is where problem starts, w/family, parents, friends</td>
<td>Grassroots works to a point. Need role models for kids as well to give them hope of success in life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide lots of alternatives to kids</td>
<td>Community-based assns not using facilities to get kids involved in sports, crafts</td>
<td>Geography of utilization of services big stumbling block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut thru red tape and those blocking local action</td>
<td>No motivation to exert oneself due to fear of failure w/large amount of money from Program</td>
<td>I'm frustrated 'cause Y not giving us freedom to do what we want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions Director's budgeting, &amp; ability to do prevention program</td>
<td>Coalitio needs more involvement bec. Program mgt. is typical bureaucracy. Need to cut through that and do something</td>
<td>E.G., budget competition for use of funds not good. Should be split between Coalitions so none short changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not comfortable with director's mgt. She is not up front on how money spent, was handed her job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Like Diane &amp; Mike (coordinators), work well with kids and are open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview 10. With a Puna Coalition Member

Social service provider, 52 year old male, mixed ethnicity

SH: How do you feel about community-based efforts that try to bring a grassroots approach to dealing with drug use, crime or education?

Well I think they're necessary. And I think that the community has to be involved. But as the community becomes less educated and becomes more inarticulate its focus is not on its health and well being. Its focus is on just its existence. If we could do anything it would be to understand that the primary basis of our country has always been on the citizen participating in the process that required him to think things through, although there has always been gut reaction. But basically it was that we have the right of choice. We could choose bad, but if we made the wrong choice, then we had to pay for it. Right now, our choices are being limited to us, real or imagined. So let me just take off on that. Specifically the community is looking to other people to solve their problems, because they themselves are not willing to accept the responsibility of their actions, okay. We can say that every one is moving into Puna for any number of reasons. But the first thing they want to do is have somebody else bring in all the services that they think they should have. If that was the case one hundred years ago there would have been no pioneers. So we maybe have lost a little of our pioneering spirit. And yet on the other hand, we have become so technology reliant, that we're expecting that to be the panacea. As I've jumped around I'm thinking specifically, people create problems, people have to solve them. But we've become system-oriented and we've seen men on the moon and all these marvelous wonders and yet we can't cure the ills of society because we're looking for systems to do it instead of personal interaction. I go back to that one man, if one person, one woman, one man, one child, wants to get involved, they can make a difference. And society is changing to the point where that is almost being negated. And if we lose that then it will be a sad day for us all. But I think that the whole concept is that Americans have always said, Hey, we can take care of our own problems. And I think as society we operate in a global situation. And the problems we have in America today don't seem to be any different from the problems the Australians are having or the Europeans or the Japanese. I don't think it's isolated to ethnicity. And it seems that there are people in all those other parts of the world are also recognizing that they have to participate. The simple answer is yes. People can make a difference and that's why people have to get involved, should get involved.
Because they're talking about the opportunity to interact with other people, get involved and make a better world.

SH: How do you view SCBM?

I think it's a good concept but it's a double edged sword now. If the central hierarchy of the DOE, through pressure being applied through the BOE, who is supposed to be the people's representative, determines that they want to see greater participation by people in the community to impact on those schools in their community, there is a possibility it could work—only if the people are given all of the ammunition they need to go into this battle. Specifically we're talking about money. Large amounts of money. First of all, perceptions aside, it doesn't appear to me that the way the system is now, although it talks about school community-based management, but in fact, they are going to effectuate this transfer so people will have the right to use the monies that schools get to determine the curricula. They talk a good story, but it's never going to happen. If you talk to the executive director of the Hawaii State Teachers Association or the Hawaii Federation of Teachers, they all have their concept and they'll tell you quite frankly that there is no way that they want lay people involved 'cause lay people are not educators. The primary reason is that there is no way that they are going to tell us how we're going to spend our money, even though it is the people's money. The other prospect is that the Superintendent of Schools, Charles Toguchi, who is a good man. He used to be my neighbor when I lived on Oahu. And we've had some good solid discussions about this. It might be his dream, but the bureaucracy that is in place and is entrenched and has cast in stone, I think is overwhelming. It is said that Nero burned Rome, but why? Because he went to the Senate and asked them to build new sewers. They said, No way Nero. So he said okay, well then I'll burn down the damn town and then we'll have to build new sewers. And it's not recorded whether they built new sewer systems. They might just have rebuilt the city with the existing sewer system. I don't know if someone like Charles Toguchi is going to be that drastic. People in the community decry the lack in quality of education, but education begins at home. There has to be a recognition that when you send a child to school, he is properly prepared to learn. And as society becomes more disenfranchised with what it sees as its ability to cope with the problems that are presented to it, it becomes more dysfunctional. The school system, and this is something that is probably not that well known, but before we became a State we were in the top twenty-five schools systems across the United States. Statehood, they did away with the Hawaiian English Standard. On Oahu that was Roosevelt High School, because they said it was prejudicial towards
Orientals 'cause they couldn't get in there, 'cause it was in English and you had to be well spoken and take an English Standard test. Other communities like San Francisco that I know of, do have schools that you have to "test" to go into. Galileo and Balboa, those are two. And their waiting list is growing bigger and bigger and bigger to get into these schools. Because people are wanting their children to have a better education and surprisingly they are comprised of mostly minority groups that want to be in the better quality school. Now do I feel that community-based management is worthwhile? Absolutely, but again it takes an enlightened populace, intelligent enough to understand that you can't have instant gratification; that it's taken a few years to get to the place we are, and it is going to take us a few years to get out. But it is the desire to have an educated group of young people coming up, people coming up who are capable of meeting the technological changes that are upon us every day. Then it's that same group of parents talking out of both sides of their mouth saying, Hey, we want to be able to act stupid because we're on drugs or we're making drugs or we're selling drugs, yet at the same time, we don't want that for our young people. You can't have it both ways and I think that that is what is happening now. Kids go to school not to learn but to be in a social interaction. Parents send their kids not for them to learn, but because they don't know what else to do with them during the day 'cause they're both working. It seemed to me that during the depression, or as I used to think about it, families that were poor, if they needed someone to work, the kids went to work but the moms stayed home. There was someone at home to be the primary care giver. We don't do that now. Now the kids stay home and both parents go out and the kids are at home watching TV or doing whatever. And with so many single parents, both males and females, I can understand why there is this desire for this. But the crux of it is, more than anything else, money. If the State is really willing to let the people have the ability to determine their own future by application of money then it'll work. But I don't think the State by what I know here in Hawaii, is going to let the people determine how they're going to spend their money. Because they're not about to do it, even as we do it in the normal political process.

[On consensus] Consensus to me means mediocrity. We don't want the best, we don't want the worst, we're sort of settling for consensus and there is that mediocrity. It sort of cancels out things. We get into consensus and we're right in the middle of the line. The Bible calls that, it's like a warm pitcher of spit. I refuse to be like a warm pitcher of spit. That gets me into a lot of trouble. I've always been unafraid to put out an idea, even as I've gotten older now, put it out on the table and just have it macerated, just chewed up. And people say, You're really stupid.
And I'll say, Why? And they'll give me all the reasons it was a dumb idea and I've learned from that. We don't want to do that now. We go into meetings and we say don't look left, don't look right, don't say anything that'll upset people, you know. And I don't think that that brings out the best in people. Particularly with our American lifestyle. Because other people in the world are now beginning to question why they are the way they are. I think that is the one thing I enjoy about the Puna Coalition. The blending of the various people. And when I go to various other community meetings, I see how people are treated, how they're cut off because they're on the verge of not saying the correct thing. I've tried to indicate if I do anything its to make it a place where you can come and exchange your ideas. Communication is the art by which you understand what I'm saying. But you have the right to disagree. And I have the right to disagree with you. But at least we understand we disagree and we can say hey, this is how I feel. I'm passionate about my viewpoint. But consensus takes away that passion. Consensus says well we feel it would be in the best interests of everybody that we not take an aggressive stand, so we took a weak one. And I think there is no middle ground on this topic of drugs. There is no middle ground. You can't be against drugs and say, Well, we need to let people do all the things that they are capable of doing.
### Interview 10. Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country based on citizen participation</td>
<td>People have to get involved to solve problems. People create problems, must solve them</td>
<td>Community looking to others to solve their problems &amp; depend on systems instead of addressing personal interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will those in control give power to those they believe have inferior skills, knowledge?</td>
<td>SCBM—double edged sword: could work if comm. given resources, but not likely by existing system</td>
<td>Education begins at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't see State letting people decide how they will spend education money</td>
<td>Society more disenfranchised, more dysfunctional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Puna Coalition open to all ideas, people. People able to come to mtgs w/their passions</td>
<td>Need enlightened populace who don't demand instant gratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With an issue like drugs no middle ground—worth knowing where people stand</td>
<td>Consensus=mediocrity; believes in airing ideas openly—learned by doing that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education begins at home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Society more disenfranchised, more dysfunctional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need enlightened populace who don't demand instant gratification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consensus=mediocrity; believes in airing ideas openly—learned by doing that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview 11. About the Hamakua Coalition Coordinator's 
life history
Ms. C - 45 year old Caucasian

SH: ... [Can you give me some] details about your ... 
background, specifically as they relate to how ... your 
family and your previous work experience brought you to 
working with CYAP.

I come from a middle class family with old fashion parents 
who were quite strict with me, certainly till the time I 
grew away to college. I had a very happy younger childhood 
because I spend a lot of time outdoors. I grew up in Vir­
ginia so we were outdoors, my brother and I. We lived in 
New Jersey when I went to high school and I had a kind of 
unhappy adolescence because I got good grades. It was real 
unfashionable to do that in my school. I don't know, I was 
indoors a lot, watched TV and moped around so it was nice to 
go to college. In general, my parents were rather involved 
with their own lives. So I particularly have come to real­
ize this more lately. I always did very well in various 
schools. And I think probably one reason was to get some 
reinforcement and so forth.

SH: How many others in your family do you have?

I have one brother, he is almost three years younger. I am 
the oldest, there are two [children] in my family. My 
father was an electrical engineer. He worked for a company 
that did high tension insulation work.... In Virginia, I am 
not sure what he did, it was kind of an awkward situation 
for him. He was in the Navy for a while. He may have been 
involved as a supervisor of some kinds of construction 
company for a while before he went back to his New York job. 
My mother did not work. She was a very intelligent person 
who wanted more stimulation in her life, and had an old 
fashioned husband.

SH: In terms of their involvement with things. You said 
they were pretty much involved with their work most of 
the time.

Well, it was more of the adult world, like an old fashioned 
family with kids, the kids are outdoors or something like 
that.

SH: ... Were they active in any organizations or community 
involve... or actively involved in religious 
activities or any kind of other social activities? Or 
were they pretty much oriented to home and work?
My father was not involved in community things and periodically, my mother was. We were sort of brought up as Protestants, and she was very interested in Christian Science for a while.

SH: ... You grew up in a kind of small town atmosphere and you then you go to the big city [New York City] to work for 10 years. I just wonder how you enjoyed that.

I am real unrealistic economically, so it wasn't good economically for me since I never learned much about money and one thing or another. I would say New York, it was real stimulating. I got into a lot of artsy groups. You know, my friends were artists or writers. And I ended up somewhat overworking at one of the publishing companies, which is kind of a tendency of mine, kind of bite off more than I can chew. I always approach things rather too intensely, everything. And so it's hard for me to say this is a good or bad period.

SH: It seems to me quite a big difference from the kind of upbringing you had, ... living in a suburban community, going to college, and then going off to the city to work in normally what is pretty high stress, a demanding situation. And then after New York?

My brother was living in Hawaii. I came to Hawaii in '71 or '72. And here I've had a sequence of jobs, not too many were appropriate for my background or my favorite thing. One of my approaches, which wasn't true in New York, but has been true in Hawaii, is to take a job that is not very demanding and then do writing on the side. In other words, you walk out of the job and you are finished. I like that kind of job. So in Hawaii I've had some jobs like that, but this job I think is not like that. I was first working ... on Maunakea. Then I went to UH Manoa to get a Masters degree for two years, and I taught English there and did some research. Then I came back here and I taught night school mostly to vets all around the island on the GI bill. That was nice because it brought me in touch with a whole bunch of local men that I'd never have been normally talking to, shift workers, and stuff. And I also at that time was working part time for a library in Kona, just a small library, one person in the library, myself. And I got discouraged with that after a while because the library was a dwindling library. And then so I went to work for an adoption agency starting with secretary and ended up with a lot of responsibility where I stayed for six years. A friend of mine started in Kohala and actually placed more children than in any other area of the state, I think. I ended up doing some home studies, some court papers, doing immigration papers, I used to go out and meet a lot of families.
So I'm kind of used to the kind of customs families share here. And I liked that a lot, that job. It paid well at the time and it was a half-time job. So again, I just kind of worked lickety split in the morning, which is when I work the best and then I could do writing, be outside, do gardening or whatever for the rest of the day. After a little while my boss and I didn't get along too great and also I moved. So I got a new job ... running a book store, ordering their textbooks, ordering their sportswear, around the mail room and like that for a year. And then I did a little substitute teaching for the job training program [but] for not too long, it was a state program. And then for three years I was a secretary at Waikahe Development, which in a curious way relates to this program more than anything else in the sense that my particular boss was completely community oriented. He was on [the board of] about nine organizations, treasured about four of them, and he was always out hustling up prizes for events or one thing or another. And so, through him, I still have some contacts that relate a little bit to this job. And then I took the job he had left and I had a new supervisor, and then I took this job. So I feel like a lot of my work, I feel like it has either been here, state or non-profit work, except for this development company job.

SH: So the thing that most relates to the CYAP [is] the last job you had before this one?

No, I wouldn't say that. I would say in the library job, greeting the people walking in from this rural community, you are helping them, you are trying to coax them to come to your evening program. In the adoption job, you are kinda explaining the paper work so they can get what they want, go visit their houses. I definitely wouldn't say it was that job.... So in this job, it seems to be talking to an awful lot of people.

SH: ... Is there anything else that [is] crucial ... [about what brought you to] working with a program like the CYAP?

I guess I've been real interested in funding issues for more than ten years. And I am aware that the DOE is underfunded and in my understanding it is going to get worse. The idea of creating kind of beneficial stuff for the kids. One of my hopes was that it would emphasize higher education more. I thought that might be related to this job.

SH: ... In terms of how you view education, is how this job related to your vision about the needs in education for communities?
Right. I mean it seems to me that I could do the job because it requires coordination, which I've done in the adoption [field], and also at the development company, and so on and so on; and also at the book store. And then I am very concerned about the future of the local people, I guess you could put, on this island. But I was a little worried about the "just say no" approach, I wasn't quite sure whether that was going to be the approach. But as I interpreted it, I decided, Well, I'll interpret it positively.... I have done community work and I'm always dragging people after me. You know, trying to make them do. And I thought that this is going to be an opportunity to really facilitate what they want to do. Actually I notice my same old tendency keeps appearing. But, [it's] so good that I think of this. So, for example, ... to support [C.] in something he wants to do. That's something I need to learn.
## Interview 11. Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Middle class family with old fashion parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Happy childhood, unhappy adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents involved in own lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My reinforcement through doing well in school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father—electrical engineer, not community involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mother—intelligent, wanted more stimulation in life, periodic comm. involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Worked in NY 10 years after college. Very stimulating—friends were artists, writers; ended up overworked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To HI in '71 or '72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYAP not that kind of job</td>
<td>Approach to work: non-demanding job w/writing as sideline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters in English, UH Manoa. Taught on Oahu, then to vets on Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used to the kind of customs families share here</td>
<td>Worked at small library, at adoption agency for 6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ran bookstore, did substitute teaching, worked as secretary for development company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library job where you deal w/public is most like CYAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss was community involved—still has contacts for CYAP</td>
<td>Creating beneficial outlets in higher education for kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Coordination, concern about future of local population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about &quot;just say no&quot; approach, interpret drug prevention more positively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Interview 12. With Hamakua Coalition Coordinator, about the job
Ms. C, 45 year old Caucasian

SH: I want to get some input from you about [your] working relationship with the coalition.

It's worth thinking of a coalition as a network of people who care, you can call. And that I think I've gotten and have in the address book at the present time. It's another thing to have people come to meetings. In our community where so many are working 2 jobs and I am finding it difficult to get people out for meetings. I increasingly see the virtues of the steady five who do come to the meetings. And it is my belief that although there's a structure around the community, the natural base needs to be the teachers who have the most investment in kids. In other words, in terms of the strength that has occurred in our coalition, has been through the Honakaa school drug-free team, or some members came from Kohala school drug team. It does seem to me that these courses have to be school-related or perhaps, a flip side to that might be we have two retired people in our coalition. Of course they have time to come, actually I think we have two more (maybe five or six total) who are not retired. And I am getting an increasing feeling, that although the returns during my job tenure have not been particularly great for these people who are coming to these meetings, they are kind of steadfast. They are still coming. So that's good. And besides, some of them speak of our work or letting the community know of our work. I myself am thinking, Well gosh! what have they got that they have such a sense of mission. Which is very good.

SH: ... Those are the core group, and because communities are so diverse or whatever, there's a lot of differences between who ends up going to the meetings and who ends up supporting in other ways, etc. That's why I raise the discussion of the dynamic that you have here in what you're doing.

I put it in a memo to Joanne about something else. We send out these minutes but we don't see these people at the meetings. But I was real surprised when I made calls on some of these people. HPA, the Police Department, and recently the ... center, I made calls on some of these people. And bing, they just whip out the folder and there are the minutes right there. They are receiving the minutes and are paying attention. But yet in truth, I have never been in touch with them for four months. So they seem to be interested in a way, but they are not coming to meetings. ... They sound very supportive, encouraging, and it may be a fault of mine maybe. I am not successful in inviting them.
I mean I invite them but not in such a way so that they come, I don't know. But they all seem to be supporting the program.

SH: In terms of....

And you know when I said about my time, it feels like I waste twenty per cent of my time in person community contacts. That doesn't mean including phone calls. But actually if you took the time, it isn't quite that much, but still it feels like that, easily. I mean the whole yesterday afternoon was making community contacts.

SH: Any other kind of dynamic that relates to those groups that I mentioned, that comes to mind, that you can think of that relates to your everyday job here?

Well, especially with the health fair, in the course of inviting a number of agencies to the health fair one presents this program to them 'cause it is something they will participate in. So particularly in that, three of the mental health people will be participating. In terms of the schools, I've now called on Laupahoehoe school twice, Honokaa school a number of times. HPA, I met with the Waimea school counselor out of the school ... and got to know her. The police, I have pursued a bit. We are sponsoring one police person ... to the Attorney General's seminar and we have a retired minister in our coalition. Actually, that's interesting, I have only tried to reach out to [one] other church group ... I didn't get much of a response, that's in Waimea. So I haven't really tried to reach out to the church groups. I did attend one Mormon church group meeting with some of our coalition members which focused on youth gangs. I think because of that there was a turn around request from Laupahoehoe school in which they got the youth gang material that I saw. But I should have followed up more with the Mormons because they were very warm and nice to me because I knew them from before from the Maunakea Beach Hotel when I worked there as a bus girl. And I have in a formal way contacted the business association here in Honokaa, I spoke to one businessman in person, I spoke to him for about forty minutes. He is a rather a knowledgeable person, and discussed what he thought this community really needs in the context of our program. I could perhaps pursue this in this community more, and I was disappointed that this particular important business organization I went to and made a presentation to didn't pick up on it. Again in terms of coming to our meetings or appointing a person to attend our meetings: there was one lady said she might come, but I do receive questions, more in the line of, can you get direct services for the kids. And I was not well
versed enough to answer that question as I should have, but I offered to research it and to try to find out more. So based on our present discussion, I could perhaps pursue the church groups a bit more and probably I should pursue the unions. But one of our coalition members is a strong union member so that is good. And the children, I really want to pursue the children more. So we are having some teenagers join our next coalition meeting.

SH: Anything you want to say about what you are presently doing, any kind of insights or feelings about the work as it's presently construed?

Well this is an honest reaction, this program gives things to every part of our community. I am kind of patriotic to my community. And I feel lucky to be in a position to say, hey, maybe we can send your kids to Winners' Camp. I feel that I am giving them something through this program, so I am really fortunate in that way. I had that same feeling when I worked in adoption because perhaps, through my efforts, they could adopt a child that they wanted. So it does seem to me that this program is generous in offering education about drugs or values education, and other things through the community area. And also the this program has offered things to me: seminars, computer education, and so forth. I can't count the number of people that participate. We sent eleven to the Hawaiian values training, so that is quantifiable, ... so I think that eleven people have definitely benefitted, I mean from our region. I do have this feeling for our region ....
Interview 12. Analysis

Program

- Difficult to involve people since so many work two jobs
- Teachers w/investment in kids are natural base for community program
- Retired people in coalition are staunch supporters
- Those not attending mtgs are keeping minutes & paying attn
- Participants include mental health, school, police. Others sought are church, business assn's & organizations; teens next at coalition mtg.
- Gives things to community: seminars, trainings, youth camps
- Program has educated me and offered educ. to the public

Personal

- Coalition=network of people who care
- Surprised that people follow Program's activities & sound so supportive
- Receive questions about provision of services
- I am committed to my community & can offer them something
Interview 13. With Hamakua Coalition Coordinator, about the meaning of working in the Program
Ms. C, 45 year old Caucasian

SH: [Describe your reaction to the Program in terms of its meaning for you.]

It has provided me with an education in drug prevention through various seminars, the best one for me was the one on alcoholism. And I thought I was very knowledgeable about that. There is a good educational component in this program, plus, I have become aware as a person of other related programs in the schools, like Dare or other programs which I was not aware of before. This program gives me the opportunity to exercise some idealism; ... here I feel there is a positive in the sense that I think the community will be benefitted, plus I was thinking, in this job, I sort of have to ask, as in Jo Ann's visioning process, What do you think would be a good idea for us to do? What do you think the kids would like? and these are both to the adults and the kids as far as drug prevention. So I feel that this program encourages others around to sort of articulate and to have some positive concepts that they might not have had, just simply because someone is simply asking them for them.

Whether they favor implementing this program or that program or whatever. I feel that maybe because I've become involved in the program, even in just six months, I definitely feel that there is a really strong antidrug ambiance on the island. It could be just because I am involved. But I feel that it is growing because I was not aware of it before. Now I am quite aware of it. I have maybe a five percent reservation that it will go too far also. In other words, I've heard some expressions that are a little more militaristic than I am comfortable with as a person. But I definitely feel that it's the thing, its very much in the air. And I am not sure, but I think it has grown in the five or six months I've worked for the program. So, it feels that this among other programs are having an effect. I definitely feel that that is the case.... It's caused me to relate to community people outside those that I would normally relate to. .... People of different educational levels, with different jobs, and so forth. So it's very nice for me. Also I've come to realize, and I think it is this part that holds up, because of the kind of economy we have, in terms of coalitions, volunteerism by people who do not work directly with kids as a part of their job, or really don't have a specific problem, they don't have kids who get really hyper or whatever, don't join coalitions. In other words, I have found that turning more toward the schools, I can get committed effort from people whose professions deal with kids. And I think that has to do with the economy where people work 2 jobs and so forth. So I've felt that part of
the meaning of this job for me lately is an emphasis on diplomacy because people are coming from such different places and some are hot heads, or too quick to jump to conclusions or overstate and I just need to continually be aware of diplomacy. Also in terms of the staff, I feel that the staff are intellectual peers of mine, I mean I feel they are intellectual peers. And that's really nice for me because in my previous job the people were very nice but not so educated and so forth, so that is very stimulating for me. At the same time the job is a little stressful for me because the boundaries are not clear cut. And that is part of the meaning, so I really have to learn that and I'm moving toward that. Setting real clear cut hours and trying not to think about the tasks after work. Also, ... it has been nice for me, it is wholesome for me to be working in a country district. For example, this morning, I didn't feel so cheerful but somehow being in this office, looking out the window, enjoying a peaceful lokahi [harmony], that has been a personal benefit for me for drug prevention. Then I have also noticed, the work as coordinator, to me, has low intellectual content and so that has bothered me, not bothered me, but it's like, in other words, getting waivers, driving people here and there, introducing people, all those social skills, but not very many mental skills. I just happen to be kind of a more mental person, so I guess that's right. Aspects to the work seem to me not to involve too much professionalism, I don't have a professional feeling about it. Now I feel that Mike has got being a coordinator down to being a professional, professional coordinator. Where for myself, I just do it more in a human way. Even though I was a coordinator before, I'm not so professional and I don't have a feeling of exercising professional skills in making things happen, I just feel I'm exercising a little bit, some efficiency and human warmth... Also I think I got a fair bit of happy, happy time. To see people outside of the coalition, you know, I feel quite happy that there is some happy time for the health fair, so that's been nice. Other things I've noticed or just became aware of and I mentioned this the last time. I became aware that the county's success in eradicating marijuana is definitely a detriment 'cause the kids are going to harder drugs that are more dangerous and harmful to them, like crack and ice. So, I don't know, I feel like I have a problem. It would be nice if we had some completely harmless thing that kids could experiment with, 'cause they want to experiment with something. Also this morning I was thinking, I hadn't been aware of it in the past, and I just became aware of it more this morning. I was over at Parker School, the private school, and I've been aware on a theoretical basis that our schools are going to become increasingly segregated as tourism grows and ... as labor immigration comes here. But I forget that from time to time. For example, when I went
to Parker School this morning, not a high priced private school, it was almost all Caucasians, and I walk over to Honokaa school quite a bit, it's a part of my job. And it's almost all local. So I don't know what the implications are for that, ... for the drug prevention effort on that. But I would certainly like a little knowledge if that's the situation.

SH: How do you see where these kinds of experiences are going to take you in the future, ... [continuing] to work with this field or with this program?

Yeah. I don't know. I feel that my work is more in coordination and not in drug prevention, a number of other people are doing drug prevention and I'm doing the coordinating and bringing it together. So that in the future I could, I've kinda had a little feeling that maybe the program is not going to continue in '92 or something. So it might be that I would seek work as a coordinator, which will be nice for me as opposed to getting stuck within the administrator system, in secretarial type work, which is not really the proper slot for me. So it's offered me an opportunity in that sense. I suggested to Jo Ann that maybe the program itself could go more into ... more in the direction of family wellbeing or family balance.... seems to feel that's the cause of the drug problem. I would also say that it was also probably economic, but anyway, as for the program I could see it going a little more in that direction. I presume that I will become increasingly knowledgeable about the medical effects of drugs, how much use there is in my area. Because I am all the time alert now to ask, pushing the opportunity a little. Oh, What are they using at your school? So I am kinda picking up the feeling from more of what's going on so I guess that will increase although, right, and my guess is assuming that if this program did go on, it would help shape a more intelligent response: what to focus on, for example.

SH: Do you think that your skills in coordinating and facilitating have been enhanced by what you've experienced in the program thus far?

Yeah, ... in two ways. One is the practical way of doing it so you learn by doing. And the second one is, and I think I have a high regard for Mike's professionalism, and I kinda noticed how he does things and how he approaches things. So I feel at the staff meeting, or even sometimes in phone conversation, that I'm learning a more clear cut way and perhaps quicker way sometimes of arriving at objectives with groups. Based on Mike as a model. I would say. I've learned also, however, yeah, since I've lived here twenty years
that's invaluable to know, how to deal with the range of people that are here.
Program

▶ See Program as educ.: drug prev., awareness of existing pgms, oppor. to exercise idealism, encourage others to articulate needs & ideas for change

▶ Made me relate to more community people
▶ Base in professionals that deal with kids
▶ Job requires diplomacy, ppl coming from diff. places

▶ Staff: intellectual peers
▶ Job stressful since boundaries are not clear cut

▶ Coordination work mostly social skills, low intellectual skills

▶ I'm functioning in human way, efficiency, warmth

▶ Problem: Program's emphasis against all drugs
▶ Implications for drug prevention?

▶ Program might shift more to family issues & econ. concerns as cause of drug use

▶ If Program continues I expect to learn more about drug effects, drug prev.

▶ My skills enhanced thru learning by doing w/Mike as example of a professional

Personal

▶ In only six months feel a strong anti-drug sentiment that has been growing

▶ Limited number of volunteers because people work so much

▶ Enjoy staff relations
▶ Must set clear cut hours
▶ Enjoy wholesome country setting
▶ Not much professionalism, but trying to learn

▶ Job permits happy time

▶ Awareness of local problem-kids using harder drugs bec. marijuana less available

▶ Awareness of social segregation as tourism impacts area

▶ I feel my work is coord., not so much drug prevention

▶ Learning personal skills: quicker ways of reaching objectives with groups

▶ My 20 years in HI invaluable in dealing with people
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Interview 14. With Hamakua Coalition Member
Retiree, 63 year old Japanese female

SH: How do you feel about community-based efforts that try to bring a grass-roots approach to dealing with areas like drug use or education?

It should be grassroots, but I don't know why more people aren't interested. In church we made some announcements that we have this drug-free fair and all this, and we need your help but nothing is formed now, for the church people or the neighborhood. But when something is formed they can come and volunteer and help. I am sure some of them will come. But right now we're trying to advertise Aloha Keiki O Ka Aina (Hamakua Coalition). So that people will be aware of it, so that they would want to join.

SH: ... if there was a specific thing to help with, then you might have gotten some volunteers, as opposed to just saying we need some help, right?

Right. We ourselves didn't know what's involved. For the three of us, it was the first experience. So we couldn't project how much help we needed or what type of help we needed. The next time we will know... It went really well. Even if it didn't turn out good, you wouldn't feel bad. If the effort is good, somehow it comes out good. When the spirit is good, many times things just build so it is very positive. You look at it negatively or whatever, it's not good. I knew it was going to be good because I felt good about it.

SH: I think this is really important, in terms of expectations, that things are going to go well and you are going to make some progress; [but,] if expectations are low [then people] become limited or even negative that anything can get done.

Even if it didn't turn out good, I knew that I had done my best. I wouldn't feel bad, even if it turned out not so good, since I tried to help those who really contributed a lot. Judy worked so hard. When somebody is trying so hard, then you want to help make it good.

SH: What more do you see being required for success in providing improved services and opportunities for people in your coalition area?

I don't know how we are going to serve the community, but one thing is the Target program. I think it is going to be good. The thing is the way he set it, it was so good.
Something will come out of that and the community should get involved.

SH: Are there any other things that come to mind in relation to what the coalition has been doing here?

I am not much of the initiator, I am more a supporter. So if there is a good program, I'll be there. But right now I don't have any idea of what we can do.

SH: ... maybe in terms of the activities that you've been involved with, more can be done in terms of promoting and assisting activities like 4-H clubs. The CYAP is interacting more with existing youth clubs [to] forward some positive alternatives to drug use.

... 4-H was in operation in this area for a long time but somehow the kids get busy with school and other things. But even until recently [they] had about 4 or 5 members, ... but somehow the kids are not interested in homemaking or whatever.

SH: ... in terms of providing improved services and opportunity for youth, I think this area may be useful.

Oh! 4-H would be so good. You learn how to get up in front of people and make a report on what you did.

SH: I was in 4-H for 8 yrs, so I remember it as a positive experience.

Oh!, well you know.... but how we can gather the kids and get them interested any more is the question.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities not organized yet, still at awareness level</td>
<td>Program is successful because commitment and positive effort there</td>
<td>Frustrated that more people aren't involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive effort brings positive result</td>
<td>Target program as part of CYAP has positive potential, the community should support it</td>
<td>As first experience, don't know what tangible things required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsure what will serve community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four-H as a youth club would be good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview 15. With Hamakua Coalition Member
Private high school teacher, 50 year old
Caucasian male

SH: How do you feel about community-based efforts that try to bring a grassroots approach to dealing with drug use, crime or education?

I think what my point was that I'm very much in favor of them. And I very much support them because, particularly in the area of education. Education is misplaced in the hands of the government. Education is not a government function, never was in the beginning. And it's become that and so what has happened is that schools and those types of things, all those organizations, have become kind of dumping grounds for kids and not really educational systems. Parents are kind of out of it. You've got PTAs and all that, but they are barely tolerated, they don't really change anything. And now they've got this movement to what, SCBM. And all this is, is a return to where the educational system came from in the first place. Education is the responsibility of parents first, not the schools. It never was the responsibility of schools. When it became a government thing, it just lost its whole meaning, going back to family-based, community-based, education systems, information systems, activity groups, what you call grassroots, is the right direction. It's precisely where it should be. It's not a novelty, it's just things going back to their right place. And everybody feels this nostalgia. Everybody sees that the system is breaking down by the numbers. We spend more and more money on education. What is it, the National Association of Teachers is the largest, most powerful union in the United States and they're the least productive and they're losing ground by leaps and bounds. And it is because the government is not going to solve the problem of education. Groups like home schools, groups like the Y, putting money into the hands of community to solve their own local problems, where you have like thinking people getting together to solve common problems. I mean, we may have a drug problem in Hawaii and they may have a drug problem in California and they may have a drug problem in New York. But they may be completely different drug problems, from different sources. And in Hawaii, besides substance abuse, in terms of hard drugs, drinking is probably a much, much bigger problem because it's not recognized, the social drinking here is not recognized as substance abuse. It's a second tier, culturally accepted pastime to sit around the park and drink beer. The relevance of what's done is based on what the community concern is. And how the community comes together to address that, [is] exactly what we're doing. The problem here is beginning to crystallize, very, very simply. Kids have nothing to do and time on their hands. And even if, there aren't facilities, period, for kids. There isn't a movie theater in
Kamuela. You got to go to Kona for that. I mean, there is just the absence of a lot of things. It's a problem, it's a real problem. That's what these kids are starting to address. They're starting to address the gaps between the schools, private school/public school, which I think they've done rather successfully, I think. They've been talking about things they would like to do locally, and they seem to have a tremendous amount of agreement. And I think the reason it is going to succeed is because, you know, kids from basically the same type of community, same community with the same problems. And I think they'll be able to address it effectively. But I think the ideal direction is from the large to the small and not from the smaller turning everything over to the larger, because that's where all the problems are.

The people giving their responsibility and authority for education and control of their communities to the government is misplaced. It should come back. And all the things that are successful work that way.

SH: What more do you see being required for success in providing improved services and opportunities to people in your coalition area?

... My feeling is that the only limitation in the context working now is the imagination of individual people who are doing this and people to actually do it. The biggest fear about the group as it is now, is the amount of talking we do. We seem to have a satisfaction level that stops short of actually acting. In other words, if we come up with a good idea, it seems to be a good end point, and everybody is happy with that, and it dies at that. We don't have enough people who say OK, that's a good idea, now let's see it in action.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Theoretical</strong></th>
<th><strong>Program</strong></th>
<th><strong>Personal</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education is not a govt. function</td>
<td>SCMB: return of education to where it came from, its family, comm. base</td>
<td>Favor grassroots taking control of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home schools, YWCA putting money into hands of community to solve local problems will work</td>
<td>Govt.-controlled educ. breaking down, won't solve education problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaii's drug problem is different than NY or CA</td>
<td>Union controlled educ. breaking down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance of action based on community concern and collective comm. response as illustrated in the CYAP</td>
<td>Drinking bigger problem here as culturally accepted pastime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth are focused on the local problem because they experience it</td>
<td>Youth identifying and addressing the problems can be effective</td>
<td>People giving their responsibility &amp; authority to govt. is misplaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralization is the ideal direction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

236
Interview 16. With Hamakua Coalition Member (paraphrased)

Public high school drug prevention counselor, 42 year old Caucasian male

SH: How did you become involved with the Hamakua Coalition of the CYAP?

I knew about it through the Honokaa drug team, and I saw the coalition having tangible contributions.

SH: What is the most enjoyable part in working with a coalition to prevent drug use? What is the most difficult?

Those people are well meaning and do have patience with me, and once you get people motivated, everyone can be a part of it. As to the difficulty, having patience to let people catch up, and they're not engaged with the youth.

SH: How do you feel about community-based efforts that try to bring a grassroots approach to dealing with drug use, crime or education?

I really do believe that that's where it takes place. The problem is that people don't have time to deal with it. It's double edged though: red neck attitude versus a caring, building attitude, for example, drugs and gangs. This can result in vigilantes. Filtering down? No, it must be bottom up.

SH: What more do you see being required for success in providing improved services and opportunities to people in your coalition area?

In the schools the need is not money but directed resources, more in servicing to get directed resources for people taking charge. We need to focus on decision-making, the grassroots taking charge, self esteem and wellness, looking at what makes people well with room for trial and error and mistakes.

SH: What about SCBM?

I was initially opposed, reluctant to get involved, I wanted to sit back and watch what happened. But I was encouraged by the administration to take a proactive approach. The union's saying, Let's make it happen rather than let it happen to us.... The concept of SCBM makes sense but with the pendulum of education, there's no stability for anyone. Many positive or negative things could happen. The answer is to get positive on it and take ownership of it and get on
The drawback is that it takes away from what we are already working very hard at. Maybe it goes back to what we said about grassroots stuff. Teachers need in-service training on this. Give time, spend some resources so that teachers really do understand what's happening, have hands on input, understand how to make it really happen in a positive way. It requires partnerships, prolonged partnerships with all six or seven elements, students, administration, teachers, business, community, parents, all working together. If I'm working sixteen hours already, I can't get involved in a partnership that takes another eight hours of my day. There is no time. It's critical when we start things like this and we just throw them to the wind. The only people who benefit are those that are not working that hard at it, say business and administrators. They already have the time, they are just doing the job a little differently. The rest, when are they given the time? Look at the business and parent partnership. Business should pay parents to be involved.... A lot of money's been spent on SCBM, but the quality of education won't go up that much. What would be better would be alternative forms of education for students. We need better student-based education experiences.

Teachers are not aware of what is going on and they're right in the system. Teachers have no idea what SCBM means. Parents don't have any idea about it either. All the partners that play are not engaged. Business, I don't think business clearly understands what it is. All the partners are out in limbo about this and nobody really is realizing and coming together as grassroots, cohesive people. The legislature and DOE have agreed, the legislature sold us a bill of goods. All the rest of the partners are asleep. The union is acting as policeman with DOE, legislature, etc. The union is saying to teachers, You better wake up and better wake up the partners.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▶ Involvement due to tangible contributions</td>
<td>▶ Involvement through Honokaa drug team</td>
<td>▶ Enjoyable: well-meaning people who have patience w/me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Problem w/grass-roots: double edged, both caring and &quot;red neck&quot; attitudes from participants</td>
<td>▶ Difficult: having patience to let people catch up</td>
<td>▶ Community efforts must be bottom up, that is where efforts take place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Need is for directed resources, not just money</td>
<td>▶ Focus should be on decision-making, grassroots taking charge with room for mistakes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ SCBM: Positive and negative potential</td>
<td>▶ Immediate problems: Takes away from present activities, teachers need training and time to understand it, requires partnership of multiple partners, teachers, parents, business who are asleep on what is required</td>
<td>▶ Get positive on it, take ownership of it, get on it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▶ SCBM won't affect quality of education, better student-based educational experience is needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview 17. With a Council Member
Policeman, 52 year old Filipino male

SH: What is the most enjoyable and most difficult part in working with a community-based program to prevent drug use?

The best part of working with a group of course, is the successes that the group may have. Endorsing or helping groups formulate programs that are eventually successful are such a need, especially in this community for youth programs.

When you come across enthusiastic individuals who want to do something about the problem who don't sit back on their hands and expect everybody else to do it, it gives you a feeling that maybe you're not working by yourself, that there are people out there that want to help, you just need to locate them. I think the most frustrating part is the lack of resources to help fund programs like this. It seems sometimes that the legislative branch of our government, be it Federal, state, or county, have their priorities mixed up. I grant they have major problems with funding, but if you look at some of the things that are being funded as compared to those programs that aren't being funded, you wonder what is really going through their heads. So I think if you try to drum up support for these programs that you feel will work but come up empty handed, in a lot of cases it is probably the most frustrating part of the whole thing.

SH: How do you feel about community-based efforts that try to bring a grassroots approach to dealing with drug use, crime, or education?

I think if we're going to be successful then that's the only way we can go. I've been involved in police work for twenty-two years now and nothing has changed since I've joined the department. We, for the most part, are approaching crime and some of the other social issues the same way we did twenty-two years ago. And it hasn't worked and it's still not working. If there isn't a partnership between the government agencies and the community and the community doesn't see or recognize the stake that they have in the problems of the community then we are never going to be successful. The community has to take an active role. I'm a firm believer in community involvement, especially at the program level. You have a lot of people who are educated and who have expertise in given areas and can provide a lot of consultation and direction to government. I think that a strong coalition of these community members, service providers and various government entities would make for a better program. A lot of times, the government agencies have access to funding that these community agencies don't have.
or vice versa. But by pooling your efforts and your thoughts, I think that that is the only way that you're going to solve these problems. We're beginning to see this. There are programs in our community now, but particularly across the nation where some of the government agencies are realizing this and going back to basics. I think that if the community realized the government is them, we're just employees, we're just custodians of what they've asked us to do in that regard. And if the government employee looks at it in the same way, he's just their representative. Then I think barriers would break down and I think you'd see a lot more cooperation and success.

SH: I've generally gotten a positive response to this question on a grassroots approach. Do you think it is practical?

[Regarding a plan for a community coalition using lower level government agencies and personnel with interested community members].... Have that group solve the community's problems as the community sees it as versus how the government sees it. I'm a firm believer in addressing that. Take law enforcement. If a community's concern is abandoned vehicles, to take an example, no matter how successful you are in the area of traffic enforcement, the fact that you haven't solved their concern of abandoned vehicles. All the good programs you have, is not going to matter to them. Therefore, their fear or their concern is a particular issue then that is the one you should be addressing. And by involving the lowest level of the echelon they're not at that level where they feel constrained by the bureaucracy or the red tape. They have that idea that they can get things done. And if you give them the authority to do it, then I think we'd be surprised as to what is going to happen. So, we're trying something like that and hopefully we'll get it off the ground early next year and let them go and see what they can accomplish. If we can get this thing off the ground and running properly, I think it is going to change the way government operates here on this island. The mayor is behind it so we're really looking at it.

SH: What more do you see being required for success in providing improved services and opportunities to people in East Hawaii?

I think training, some autonomy, a major decentralization of government as we see it today and then, of course, the support. The philosophy of what is trying to be accomplished has to be from the top down. It has to be a program or programs accepted, has to have total support of everybody involved, and it's got to become a philosophy of the particular agency, it's got to become a way of life. Which means
a lot of changes have to be made in terms of thinking, expectations. You're essentially reshaping everything as we know it, all the rules we're operating under today. Decentralizing in the sense that we're essentially giving everything back to the community to decide and for some people it's going to be very difficult. Having all the power of the office, all the employees at their beckon call. But I think if we're ever going to be successful that's the only way we can go. It's obviously not worked in the past, the way we're going now. I see that, the support, the training and the mentality of what we're trying to get across.

[Regarding SCBM and why all segments of society must be involved with schools] ... and parents, too, in a lot of respects. To me, and I've mentioned this to parents that I've talked to when their kids are in trouble, their children are their contribution to this island, State, world's future. Their involvement therefore is critical as to the legacy that they leave. It's either going to be a positive one where they are going to contribute hard working citizens who will see to the positive growth of our environment, our world or they are going to leave criminals, deadbeats, and welfare recipients. It really rests in their hands because the amount of their involvement in their children's lives has a direct relationship to how these kids come out. So I think the parents have to take stock in that statement and really seriously invest some time and effort, it's not money, it's an investment in time. When you look at your children over their life span, the investment you spend in the first eighteen years of their life when they're with you is very small as compared to everything that is going to occur after they've gone. By investing that time early, you're really investing in your own life after. You have a problem child that grows up to be a problem adult and he is still going to be your son or daughter and they will forever cause you worry till you die. Parenthood does not stop when they leave the home. You're constantly worried about them.

SH: I hear teachers talk about parental responsibility a lot and there is a parent-teacher tension there.

I think if each group recognized the problems and limitations of each other, there would be a lot more respect and a little more cooperation. You have some very dedicated teachers. But their ability to teach and get their messages across are constantly being diverted because of the disruptions by some of their students. So that's a problem that has to be addressed partly at home and that is where the parent comes in. And the same goes with the parent. The teacher has got to understand that out of survival, a lot of the time two of them have to work which means unsupervised children. So when they understand each other's limitations and problems and work towards solving them together then it
makes a big difference. And you sit down in counseling sessions between teachers and parents and you get this, "Oh I didn't know that", or "I wasn't aware of that." The lights start going on and that's all it's going to take really. Not the expectation that that's your problem and you deal with it or that's your problem, that's what you are getting paid for. As long as they have that attitude, the parent maintains, You got my kid for six hours, that's your problem. It doesn't work that way and vice versa with the teachers.
### Interview 17. Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need for persons to help community formulate programs</td>
<td>Grassroots partnership: only way to have successful community program</td>
<td>Enjoyable: group success, gp support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization of interdependence of coop. parties necessary for community development</td>
<td>Govt &amp; community must pool resources, efforts</td>
<td>Difficult: lack funding resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community assessment of problems allows community to see problems as manageable</td>
<td>Must be understood government is the comm. that serves all interests</td>
<td>Experience: w/o partnership, recog. what's at stake—no success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community assessment of problems helps community see problems as manageable</td>
<td>Top down philosophy needed. Support by everyone, change in thinking, decisions given back to comm</td>
<td>Realization of common purpose needed for success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success depends on training, autonomy, govt decentralization and support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community must take active role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental involvement is investment in future</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comm. concerns must drive comm. actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-parent cooperation needed to positively affect youth</td>
<td></td>
<td>Children are parent's contribution to future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interview 18. With Council Member

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mental health services provider, 43 year old Caucasian female

SH: How do you feel about community-based efforts that try to bring a grassroots approach to dealing with drug use, crime or education?

That's two sides of a coin also. From the creative end, my experience with it and when I look from Honolulu to the Big Island, from island to island, what works in Honolulu, nine times out of ten does not work for the Big Island. And under contract we're all supposed to be doing the same thing often times. And I'll use residential as an example. Well we'll do this statewide and it might work great in Honolulu but with the population here it just does not. So I think when you're talking about prevention programs, Student Assistance Programs [SAPs] and those kinds of things, the same thing comes to mind to me. I think we need to tailor our programs to be sensitive to the local population that we're treating. My concern is that a lot of times when you do that, you often times have folks providing services who are not trained to provide the service. So I have reservations about how many folks you get involved who are not trained. For example, sometimes you hear me at the Council asking, How many hours did they have and what are they going to do? To train somebody for eight hours to do peer education and expect them to go out there and do it on their own really concerns me. That all of a sudden, they think they are an expert because we've empowered them somewhat. We've given them training and they feel good about the training. They should, all the classes and things, but then they often times step beyond the area that they have been trained in and start doing counseling and things that they really should not be doing. So I get a little concerned and I don't think I'd be as concerned if we were providing lots of training to folks, if we were bringing in the police and the school and all the other significant folks that were going to be a part of that system and doing extensive training for all of them. We have a tendency in prevention programs to do pocket training—six hours here, four hours there, eight hours there and everybody is an expert after four or eight hours. So that is what worries me. I think with adequate training that that works the best, to train your own folks, the community, to train them to get everybody involved instead of substance abuse providers being the only ones that can provide that service. I disagree with that. I personally think schools should be providing student assistance services. Certified teachers should be trained in substance abuse so their own system is working their own system. It's a lot easier for a teacher to get a program to work in a system than for me, as a substance abuse provider from the outside, to try to go in and do that. It just is.
I've worked with SAPs all over the east coast and our most successful programs were the ones where we trained teachers, certified teachers, to understand substance abuse so that they could go in there and move through their system, light years faster than we could at that time.

SH: What more do you see being required for success in providing improved services and opportunities to people in East Hawaii?

I clearly believe in alcohol and drug programs across the board, whether it's prevention or treatment or anything else. But it's particularly in prevention that we're twenty years behind. We have no idea of the big picture at all. I feel very strongly that DOE, the Department of Health, Corrections, all those folks who have substance abuse money, because they all have it all over the place. Some are funding this prevention program, some that. They need to come together, tally up their dollar amounts, do a real needs assessment and pilot some real strong projects. If it takes half the money in one little school district for two years, well, do it. Because at the end of two years, the school's budget will have it. The schools district, if it's done well, will put it into their budget. We did, we implemented twelve different individual school districts in our town, implemented this program and at the end of two years every single one of those schools had a line item in their budgets to pick up the program. It toots its own horn if it's done right. It becomes so much a part of the system, they couldn't operate at all without it. So it just becomes a natural transition for those folks to looking at allocating the money. If they do that, take the time to pilot here and pilot there, and then move the money, it might take five or ten years to do it across the board. But schools don't wait. There were a lot of schools who saw the success we were having in one area and didn't want to wait to be the next pilot. They said, Tell us how much it is going to cost, we want to do this too. And other schools started picking up on their own. Comprehensive SAPs just do not exist in this State in my opinion. Haphazard prevention and hit or miss student assistance pieces are being implemented, but I have not seen any comprehensive SAP anywhere in this State. It's not that, you don't have to reinvent the wheel, there is enough stuff out there, good quality stuff that has been done all across the country that we could easily tailor to meet our needs. But you can't do a comprehensive SAP and not have the curriculum component and not have the counseling, education component and not having the EAP [employee assistance program]—it won't work. It's like [he] said, the Honokaa folks are doing a great job, but the rest of the system doesn't get it. Their piece works
real well but it doesn't have any impact on the rest of the system.

SH: What do you think the prospects are that Honokaa and Hilo, [in] pointing out the fragmentation, will get the system to recognize there is enough of a problem to act to bring about a more systematic approach?

I don't think it'll happen unless others are brought in to take an advocacy position. For example, involve the teacher's association, unions, all the heavy hitters you can find. For example, right here with the CYAP Council, somebody from [the school district] office should be there. Somebody who can go back to the powers that be and say, Hey, these people got something here. Because if they get enough pressure from the group, then they'll do that. Somebody that represents the teacher's union on this island should be involved. Especially going for SAPs as a priority and I don't think they have even determined that. But that's the direction that we had and the Council, CYAP says, Okay, our next move is to coordinate comprehensive student assistance on the Big Island. Some of those key positions on the Council need to be shifted to those folks who can make those kind of impacts. I don't know how it is set up out here, if there is an island liaison for the union, the head honcho. So they're the folks you need to impact. Like principal D.S., she is real willing to do stuff, but how can she really impact the whole system?
### Interview 18. Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;Prevention programs must address local needs &amp; use processes that fit the setting</td>
<td>&gt;SAP needs tailoring to local pgm.</td>
<td>&gt;Experience shows what works in Honolulu does not on Big Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;Reservations abt. #, quality of comm. prevention workers</td>
<td>&gt;Concern that comm. untrained in prev.; training leads people beyond level of competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;Prev. workers need adequate trng. with roles based on levels of trng.</td>
<td>&gt;Fastest, best way is adequate trng. of teachers working in system for SAPs</td>
<td>&gt;Easier to train those in system, not bring in outside prof's; pocket trng. not adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;Need adequate funding for successful, integrated program</td>
<td>&gt;Prev. 20 yrs. behind in HI; $ should be pooled for real system impact</td>
<td>&gt;Past prev. experience: supported pilot w/good tech. has systemwide support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;Comp. prevention pgm. adopted only when enough power brokers support it</td>
<td>&gt;Isolated success of selected elements of SAPs do not result in institutionalized adoption of comp. pgm.</td>
<td>&gt;Comp. SAPs nonexistent in HI; Honokaa's pgm. not having systemwide effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;CYAP Council needs more power brokers to get policy support changes</td>
<td>&gt;Need heavy hitters to back pgm. to get it systemwide; e.g. for SAP, Teachers Assn, unions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 8 - STUDENT INTERVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#/sex/age/grade</th>
<th>CYAP central goal</th>
<th>Enjoy most</th>
<th>New things learned?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1/F/17/SR</td>
<td>help youth, involve with other things so stay out of trouble</td>
<td>learned a lot, did a lot with family, was fun</td>
<td>how to help w/ your daily life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2/F/17/SR</td>
<td>get more young people involved in activities</td>
<td>ropes course</td>
<td>self-confid., working w/team &amp; others, have patience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3/F/17/JR</td>
<td>didn’t know, mom wanted me to go; all accepted me as I was; it was fun</td>
<td>The aloha &amp; studies to help with school</td>
<td>School can be fun, not torture; gave me goal for after schooling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4/F/17/SR</td>
<td>no, don’t know</td>
<td>the activities w/ropes</td>
<td>step out of comfort zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5/M/15/S-OPH</td>
<td>don’t know; Hawn culture</td>
<td>the games</td>
<td>talking with new people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6/M/17/SR</td>
<td>to gain self esteem</td>
<td>group activities, singing</td>
<td>ok to be open; working together better than alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7/F/16/JR</td>
<td>don’t know</td>
<td>trust activities</td>
<td>do everything 100%, it’ll be better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8/F/17/SR</td>
<td>family relationship &amp; about the land</td>
<td>about the land</td>
<td>the words, how people are diff., how to take from land &amp; not destroy it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9/M/16/JR</td>
<td>help teens</td>
<td>make new friends, have more self-confidence</td>
<td>shouldn’t pre judge, everyone has same problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 8, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#/sex/age/grade</th>
<th>Drug Prev. Activities</th>
<th>Comm/School Drug</th>
<th>Most valuable Comm. svc.?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1/F/17/SR</td>
<td>seminars, activities (games), teach abt. drugs</td>
<td>tell you things, warn about drugs</td>
<td>[nothing specific indicated]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2/F/17/SR</td>
<td>talk in more schools, give more presentations</td>
<td>valuable abt. drugs: what it does, affects, get off, stay off</td>
<td>Mediation &amp; helping others with problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3/F/17/JR</td>
<td>I really don't know</td>
<td>lots of help avail. to young people to stay out of trouble</td>
<td>More like Winners' Camp; more activ. locally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4/F/17/SR</td>
<td>after-school activities, safe place to go when in doubt</td>
<td>help me &amp; my friends turn from drugs, stay off sta &amp; off drugs</td>
<td>place to help w/goal setting, w/future &amp; what they want out of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5/M/15/S-OPH</td>
<td>stop people f/doing drugs, those busted must go to youth program</td>
<td>by telling me abt. not doing it</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6/M/17/SR</td>
<td>programs to warn students how dangerous it is</td>
<td>yes, we need to know about it before its too late</td>
<td>At, any pgm dealing w/drug, gang, violence problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7/F/16/JR</td>
<td>smoking prevention among teens</td>
<td>yes, there's so much; smokers bothering nonsmokers</td>
<td>help w/job search, job outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8/F/17/SR</td>
<td>drug-free fair; school outreach</td>
<td>learn, then teach mom and boyfriend</td>
<td>drug prevention, AIDS prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9/M/16/JR</td>
<td>General &amp; peer counseling</td>
<td>yes, informs that drugs not good</td>
<td>peer counseling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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