

The Behaviours Expected From The Principals To Avoid The Student Habits That Are Not Endorsed By The Society In Ankara*

*Aylanur ATAKLI***

Özet

Bu araştırmanın amacı lise öğrencileri arasında uyuşturucu kullanımının yaygınlık derecesini ve okul müdürlerinin, gençlerin bu maddelere sığınmasını engelleyebilmeleri için neler yapmaları gerektiğini ortaya koymaktır. Araştırma, ailelerin dışında okul müdürlerine sorumluluk yüklemeleri nedeni ile önemli olmaktadır. Araştırma anketi 40 lise müdürü, 125 öğretmen ve 125 öğrenciye uygulanmış, verilerin analizinde X2 testi kullanılmıştır. Sonuçta, sigara kullanımının yaygın olduğu, diğerlerinin yaygın olmadığı, okul müdürlerinden öğrencilere sorumluluk vermesi, riskli öğrencileri ön plana çıkarması, öğrencileri anlamaya yönelik programlar düzenlenmesi, konunun uzmanlarınca öğrencileri ve ailelerin aydınlatılmasını sağlaması gerektiği bulunmuş, bu doğrultuda öneriler getirilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Lise öğrencisi, okul müdürü, sigara, alkol, uyuşturucu.

Abstract

The object of this study is to bring out prevalence of drug addiction among high school students and in particular to investigate the measures that the principals have to take

* It was presented at the 2. National Education Symposium at Marmara University in September 18-20, 1996.

** Assoc. Prof. Hacettepe University, Vocational School of Health Services.

in order to prevent the substance abuse and habituation among students. The study is of significance due to it conveyed responsibilities to school principals, apart from families. The questionnaire used in this study was administered to 40 principals, 125 teachers and 125 students. Data were analysed using χ^2 test. As a result, the study concluded that tobacco habituation was widespread while other forms of addiction were not. It was necessary for principals to provide students with responsibilities, to bring forward the students who risk to addiction, to arrange programs in order to understand better the problems with which the students face, to make aware both the students and the families on the issue by specialists in this field, and suggestions in line with above, have been put forward.

Key Words: Student of high school, principal, tobacco, alcohol, drugs.

1-Introduction

Rapid technological developments affect the educational system. To make the community an information community in the 21st century, education, that is one of the most influential tools in the development of countries, is required to be regarded as the most significant problem. In Turkey, secondary education seems to be one of the most problematic educational areas. At this level, students are prepared both to the university education and to their future careers. In Turkey there are many secondary schools with numerous types (more than 50 types) that provide general, technical and vocational education attached to the Ministry of National Education and to other Ministries. The highschools providing general education form the majority of the secondary education institutions and such highschools usually prepare the students for their university education. The young people with general academical ability must be educated in accordance with their ability and then they must enter into the qualified work force of the country. Youth is the future of a nation, its driving power and mirror. It is quite feasible to gain information on and about community problems by probing questions and about communities have (Yılmaz, 1998: 3). It is widespread among students in countries of Western Civilization to employ substances such as tobacco, alcohol, drugs and this fact is being deemed of importance by respective communities. As regards to our country, it is a fact that drug use stepped up particularly over the last years. Research made in Turkey as well as in other countries revealed the age of starting use of such substances is approximately 15 years. It is of interest that these years fall within years of juvenility, which is supposed to last between years 12 and 21, in the years that effect by school environment and peer group is deemed to be the highest.

Family plays an important role in the development and education of children. Family is defined as “an economic and a social unity consisting of parents, their children and their relatives” (Gökçe, 1991: 202). Family is defined as “a human community consisting of

related people through marriage, kinship who live in the same house and who share the same income and who influence each other through various social roles they play” (Şahinkaya, 1991: 38). This role in the industrial societies appears to be more extensive and more common than that in the traditional societies. Approaching to the industrial societies, knowledge and culture have been rapidly accumulated and the number of occupations has been increased. Therefore, knowledge and skills necessary to this increased amount of occupations have been left to the specialists of the related fields; and it leads to the fact that family has left the education of the children to the educational institutions. As education is a major means of nation’s development, today’s societies attempt to increase the educational and cultural levels of masses to reach at a certain development stage. The focal point in an educational system is the student. When school environment element is considered, the concept of mental health is a subject of importance and these are being taken as measures and conditions to lead students for these to attain psychological maturity (Kılıçcı, 1989: 9). Schools spend time and energy to correct “the wrongs” which children bring from their families to the schools (Sağlamer, 1994: 26). The children who cannot succeed in school are the children of families who are not interested in the school activities and the educational goals (Finders and Levis, 1994: 50-54). The students who do not read books due to familial reasons and who come to school without having breakfast constitute a major problem for teachers (Legotlo and Westhuizen, 1996: 405). The person who has the first rate responsibility for school system is the school principal (Kusum, 1998: 229-238 ., Foskett, 1998: 197-210, Webb and Vulliamy, 1996: 301-315). Under these conditions, important tasks are assigned to school principals (O’Donoghue and Dimmock, 1997: 35-49 ., Plucker, 1998: 240-245). It is beyond possibility to solve the problems at school, only by the efforts to be exerted by school teachers, without the support of the principal. On the other hand, principals have to bring solution to too many problems. The major problems which to principals have to solve, are the emotional requirements of the students, demand for success which the public exhibits, increasing the financial resources and requirement for developing the financial funds and requirement for developing the staff skills. Besides the task itself being difficult, in order to make nation’s future safe, it is obligatory to research and discover with which values should the young people of the future be provided and to do what is necessary on exact time. Youngsters, due to the conflicts which emerge from the periods, they live in, and also due to the behaviours taken by their environment against such conflicts, find themselves pushed towards tobacco, alcohol and drug addiction (Cirit, 1986). In providing protection against such substances, generally families are being considered and examined. However, students actually spend most of their times at schools and are among their peers. Under these conditions, it comes to the agenda in which way can the principals be of assistance to youngsters and the study is deemed of importance as it brings forward what behaviors are expected to be taken by school principals.

2. Purpose

The study intends to answer the following questions: 1-What is the extent of employing tobacco, alcohol and drugs among students of highschools? 2-What behaviours expected from the principals to take in delaying addiction to such substances and in reducing such use? 3-What are the views of high school principals, teachers and students? Is there any significant difference between their views?

3. Method

3.1.Range and Sample

The universe of the study includes principals, teachers, students in 71 general high schools in Ankara's 8 central districts. The study was conducted in 1996. Private highschools and vocational highschools are not included in the study universe. 40 schools were randomly selected and these schools formed the sample of the study. While developing the sample, the following criteria were taken into consideration: The number of schools in the districts, and socio-economic level of the districts. The number of the schools selected and their districts are as follows; 10 schools from Çankaya, 9 from Keçiören, 8 from Altindag, 6 from Yenimahalle, 2 from Mamak, Sincan, Etimesgut and 1 from Gölbaşı. Then the teachers and the students were selected from these schools randomly. The number of the teachers and the students are; 4 teachers and students from each school in Çankaya, 3 from each school in Keçiören, Altindag, Yenimahalle, Etimesgut and 2 from each school in Mamak, Sincan, Gölbaşı. Total sample includes 290 individuals composing of 40 principals, 125 teachers, 125 students.

3.2.Collecting and Analysing of Data

The data were gathered through a questionnaire developed by the researcher herself. Before developing such questionnaire, the related literature was scanned and the people being authority in this field were contacted. After this preliminary trial was realized, the questionnaire was administered to the experiment group consisting of principals, teachers, students and some revisions were made based on their views about the questionnaire. Data were analysed using descriptive statistical methods and techniques which are frequency (f), percentage (%), chi square (χ^2). The level of .05 was used as an indicator of difference in the subjects' views.

4. Findings and Implications

4.1 Findings as to level of extent of using tobacco, alcohol and drugs are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Extent of Using Tobacco, Alcohol, Drugs

	Not %	Less %	Mean %	Very %	Most %	
Tobacco						
Principals	0.00	2.50	27.50	65.00	5.00	x ² = 12.718, p= 0.122
Teachers	0.00	3.20	22.40	62.40	12.00	
Students	1.60	0.80	12.80	76.00	8.80	
Alcohol						
Principals	2.50	55.00	42.50	0.00	0.00	x ² = 26.321, p= 0.001
Teachers	2.40	56.00	38.40	3.20	0.00	
Students	4.00	33.60	46.40	11.20	4.80	
Drugs						
Principals	32.50	62.50	5.00	0.00	0.00	x ² = 18.351, p= 0.005
Teachers	88.80	64.00	5.60	1.60	0.00	
Students	30.40	46.40	19.20	4.00	0.00	

Extent of tobacco use among students has been answered as “very” by 65 % of by principals, 62.40 % of teachers and 76 % of students.

In another survey conducted with youth attending universities, an identical result was obtained, and it was indicated that tobacco threatened the university youth (Baykan ve Bulduk, 1990). On the extent of alcohol addiction, while 55% of principals and 56% of teachers that is more than the half, concentrated on “less”, 33,60 % of the students joined on “less” and 46,40 % joined on “mean” options. When the whole 46,40% joined on “mean” options. When the whole of the group has been considered, use of tobacco is prevalent, event if this is estimated as less (46,21%) and mean (42,41%). Results are in compliance with the findings obtained from another survey conducted. In the above mentioned survey, it was identified that 32.9 % of the sample population had started to take tobacco before they attended higher education (Bulduk, 1992: 19). As regards to drug addiction, while 62,50 % of the principals and 64% of the teachers used “less” option, 30,40% of the students answered this as “not” and 46,40% of them answered this as “less”. A substance currently of little use among youngsters, may be used in excess by time in future. Under such circumstances, it is necessary to take due precautions and thwart tobacco taking inception. Students participated in tobacco and drug addiction in less ratios and indicated that they have different views than teachers and principals (p<.05).

4.2. From the findings related with the behaviors which school principals are expected to take in reducing the use of substances mentioned above, those deemed of importance have been given in Table 2.

Assigning responsibility to students: Majority of the participants with markings as “mean”, “very”, “most”, principals (90 % for tobacco habituation, 95 % for alcohol and drug addiction), teachers (89.6 % for tobacco habituation, 85.6 % for alcohol and drug taking), students (67.2 % for tobacco habituation, 61.6 % for alcohol and drug addiction) expressed their views that this would be of help. However, the students shared the view with rates lower and difference between views expressed by groups is significant ($p < .05$). The result is sad in that it shows unwillingness by students to take on responsibility. As known, asocial behaviours adopted by youngsters cause their removing away from their homes and further cause their committing disciplinary offenses. In these circumstance to assign them responsibility, would quite likely remove their adoption of asocial attitudes (New York State, 1994: 28).

Trying to know addiction prone students: Principals (with 57.50 % for tobacco habituation, 77.50% for drug and alcohol addiction), teachers (76 % for tobacco habituation, 83.2 % for alcohol and drug addiction) students (48 % for tobacco habituation, 53.60 % for alcohol and drug addiction) expressed their views by marking “very” and “most” options that this would be of assistance to them. While teachers think that to emphasize on this point would lessen to use of all the above mentioned substances. Principals and students are of the opinion that laying stress upon this point, would be much more effective in thwarting use of drugs and alcohol. The views by the groups differ significantly ($p < .05$). Visits to be made to classes with training purposes, are deemed to be effective in knowing students better (Mendez, 1994: 47).

Arranging programs directed to hearing and better understanding students in a better way: Principals (80 % for tobacco habituation, 80 % for drug and alcohol addiction), teachers (86.4% for tobacco habituation, 88% for drug and alcohol addiction), students (72% for tobacco habituation, 69,60 % alcohol and drug addiction) contemplated the view that this would be effective “very” and “most”. However, the views of the groups differ significantly ($p < .05$). This difference, gets its source from the students, through lesser participation, contrary to what is expected. The result may be taken participation, contrary to what is expected. The result may be contemplated as a reaction displayed by students. It is necessary for school principals to be ready for these kinds of events or for events that may develop in future (Gaustad, 1992: 57).

Table 2. The Behaviors Expected From the Principals To Avoid The Students Habits That Are Not Endorsed.

	Not %	Less %	Mean %	Very %	Most %	
1. To give responsibility to the students						
Tobacco						
Principals	2.50	7.50	32.50	40.00	17.50	
Teachers	1.60	8.80	33.60	43.20	12.80	
Students	8.00	24.80	29.60	26.40	11.20	$\chi^2 = 24.847, p = 0,002$
Alcohol and drug						
Principals	2.50	2.50	25.00	47.50	22.50	
Teachers	3.20	11.20	23.20	43.20	19.20	
Students	16.00	22.40	23.20	24.80	13.60	$\chi^2 = 33.519, p = 0,000$
2-Knowing addiction prone students						
Tobacco						
Principals	2.50	10.00	30.00	37.50	20.00	
Teachers	0.00	4.00	20.00	57.60	18.40	
Students	0.80	20.00	31.20	32.8	15.20	$\chi^2 = 29,544, p = 0,000$
Alcohol and drug						
Principals	0.00	5.00	17.50	42.50	35.00	
Teachers	0.80	2.40	13.60	54.40	28.80	
Students	5.60	18.40	22.40	33.60	20.00	$\chi^2 = 36,379, p = 0,000$
3-Arranging programs to better understanding students						
Tobacco						
Principals	0.00	2.50	17.50	62.50	17.50	
Teachers	0.00	2.40	11.20	52.80	33.60	
Students	2.40	12.00	13.60	34.40	37.60	$\chi^2 = 25.833, p = 0,001$
Alcohol and drug						
Principals	0.00	5.00	15.00	55.00	25.00	
Teachers	0.00	4.00	8.00	37.60	50.40	
Students	1.60	14.40	14.40	28.00	41.60	$\chi^2 = 24.791, p = 0,002$
4-Conferring meeting with families in above respects						
Tobacco						
Principals	0.00	5.00	32.50	40.00	22.50	
Teachers	0.00	4.00	18.40	43.20	34.40	
Students	8.80	12.80	15.20	34.40	28.80	$\chi^2 = 28.786, p = 0,000$
Alcohol and drug						
Principals	0.00	0.00	25.00	42.50	32.50	
Teachers	0.00	3.20	16.80	34.40	45.60	
Students	5.60	12.80	12.00	34.40	35.20	$\chi^2 = 27.047, p = 0,001$
5- Ensuring arrangement of conferences at schools by specialists						
Tobacco						
Principals	0.00	0.00	30.00	42.50	27.50	
Teachers	0.00	0.00	12.00	42.40	45.60	
Students	0.80	2.40	3.20	32.80	60.80	$\chi^2 = 35,210, p = 0,000$
Alcohol and drug						
Principals	0.00	0.00	32.50	30.00	37.50	
Teachers	0.00	0.00	5.60	28.80	65.60	
Students	0.80	1.60	1.60	28.00	68.00	$\chi^2 = 48.061, p = 0,00$

Furthermore coordination should be ensured with the students acting undisciplinatory. Because student power acting as a treat to managerial power, encourages other students to join in such uprising (Johnson,1992: 52).

Meeting with families on tobacco and alcohol and/or drug addiction issues: With marking “very” and “most” option, principals (62.50 % for tobacco habituation, 75% for alcohol and drug addiction) teachers (77,60 % for tobacco habituation, 80% for tobacco drug addiction), students (63,21 % for tobacco, 69.60% for tobacco and drug addiction) joined in this view. However, some of the students showing a significant variation (10,80% for tobacco habituation, 5,60% for tobacco and drug addiction) for which a large portion of students remained unresponsive, may be contemplated to their being uncomfortable with the idea of their parents coming together ($p<.05$). Anyhow, it is necessary for the school management to come in contact with families whose youngsters are under the threat of drug and tobacco addiction (Folz, 1992: 58). It would be difficult to bring up children without bringing up the family itself and principals are to be trained to have the capacity to resolve these difficulties (Başar, 1992: 131). On the other hand, families require courses in various fields be opened for them by the schools to provide assistance to their own children (Akyıldız, 1992: 196 . , Bilgin,1997:31-40. , Fege, 1997: 76-79. , Belter, 1997: 84-86).

Inviting specialists on the issue to schools to give conferences: While teachers was nobody who chose “not” and “less” options among teachers and school principals. A small group from the students preferred “not” and “less” options (3,20% for tobacco habituation, 2,40% tobacco and drug addiction). ($p<.059$). This result may be stemmed from a few number of students would not perceive the importance of the issue or they did not answer carefully. As Empey (1994:41) says, providing information to students on coming against laws, explaining them means to thwart and treat such acts, lessen the effect on using these substances.

5.Conclusion And Suggestions

The secondary education institutions in the age of information must prepare the students for their lives. The culture of organization which is created by school principal and other staff together indicates the quality of the school. School principal’s leadership and his/her sharing the responsibility with others in the school are two important elements of any culture of organization. It is commonly agreed that school principals play an important role both in the high quality of school and students’ high achievement levels (Placier, 1996: 236-270 . , Legotlo and Westhuizen, 1996: 401-410. , Harchar and Hyle, 1996: 20. , Casonova 1996: 31).

In this study, it is aimed to put forward the extend of tobacco habituation and alcohol and drug addiction among highschool students and the behaviors which school principals are expected to take in beginning and lessening the usage of these substances. The following findings have been reached; it is found that the extend of tobacco habituation was “very”, alcohol and drug addiction was less among highschool students. It has been found out that as the behaviours which principals are expected to take in beginning and lessening the usage of these substances; assigning responsibility to students, trying to know addiction prove students, arranging programs directed to understanding the students, having the specialists on the issue give informative conferences to the families and to the students, will have an effect.

In view of the findings obtained the following suggestions have been made: To become familiar with passive and aggressive students, to take measures to make the former active, to give importance to social activities such as chess play, trips, drawing competitions; to hold meetings to enable parents to understand their children’s problems and assist the same; to hold informative programs for students on the reasons for using these substances, their damages, ways of quitting such addictions (Levin, 1992: 49) ; decisions to be taken on students should be taken by the participation of principal, teachers and families (Roguemore, 1992: 49) ; it is necessary to realize an open communication system between students and school administration.

REFERENCES

- Akyıldız, Hayrettin (1992): “Öğretmen Açısından Okul - Toplum Etkileşimi”, **H. Ü. Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi**, Sayı 8, s. 196.
- Başar, Hüseyin. (1992): “İlköğretim Yönetimindeki Yetki ve Sorumluluk”, **H. Ü. Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi**, sayı: 8, s.131.
- Baykan, Suna. ve Bulduk, Sıdıka. (1990): “Yüksek Öğretim Gençliğinde Sigara İçme Alışkanlığı”, **Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi**, Cilt 14, sayı 75 .
- Belter, A. Catherine. (1997). “Parental Rights Legislation: A Bad Idea”, **Educational Leadership**, 95 (3) : 84-89.
- Bilgin, Asude. (1997). “Ana-Babaların Çocuklarının Yetenek, İlgi ve Değerlerini Algılamaları”, **Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi**, 21, (1049. S. 31-40.
- Bulduk, Sıdıka. (1992): “Ankara’da Öğretmen Yetiştiren Fakültelerdeki Son Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Alkol Kullanma Alışkanlıkları” **Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi**, Cilt 16, Sayı 83, s.19.

- Casonova, Ursula. (1996). "Parent Involvement; A Call for Prudence", **Educational Researcher**, 25 (8): 31.
- Cirit, Ayşe. (1986): "Ankara Devlet Konservatuarında Öğrenim Gören Adölsen Grubu Öğrencilerinin Ruhsal Uyum Problemlerinin İncelenmesi", **Yüksek Lisans Tezi**, Ankara Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
- Empey, Donald. W. (1994): "Comprehensive Substance Abuse Prevention Education Program", **ERIC**, 29 (1): 41.
- Fege, F. Arnold. (1997). "Parental Rights: Yes! Parental Rights Legislation. No!", **Educational Leadership**, 95 (3): 76-79.
- Finders, Margaret and Cynhia, Lewis. (1994). "Why Some Parent's Don't Come to School", **Educational Leadership**, 51 (8) : 50-54.
- Folz, Claite. M. (1992): "Effect of Fetal Cacaing Exposure and Implications for Teachers of Exposed Children", **ERIC**, 27(8): 58.
- Foskett, H. Nicholas. (1998). "School and Marketization", **Educational Management and Administration**, 26 (2) :197-210.
- Gaustad, Joan. (1992): "Schools Respond to Gangs and Violence", **ERIC**, 27(8): 57.
- Gökçe, Birsen.(1991). "Aile ve Aile Tipleri Üzerine Bir İnceleme", **Aile Yazıları 1. Temel Kavramlar Yapı ve Tarihi Süreç içinde** (205-224). (der) Beylü Dileçligil ve Ahmet Çiğdem. Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Aile Araştırma Kurumu, p.202.
- Harchar, L. Rayma and Adrienne, E. Hyle. (1996). "Collaborative Power: A Grounded Theory of Administrative Instructional Leadership is the Elementary School", **Journal of Educational Administration**, 34 (3) : 20.
- Johnson, James. (1992): "Student Voice Motivating Students Through Empoverment", **ERIC**, 27(8):52.
- Kılıççı, Yadigar. (1989): *Okulda Ruh Sağlığı*, Ankara, Tipo Matbaacılık, s.9.
- Kusum, Singh. (1998). "Professional Support and Its Effects on Teachers' Commitment" **The Journal of Educational Research**, 91 (4) :229-238.
- Legotlo, Marekwa and Philip C. Van der Westhuizen. (1996). "Problems Facing New Principals in Developing Countries", **Educational Management and Administration**, 24 (4) : 401-410.

- Levin, Henry. M. (1992): "Building School Capacity for Effective Teacher Empowerment: Applications to Elementary School with At-Risk Students", **ERIC**, 27 (8): 49.
- Mendez, Morse. Sylvia. (1994): "The Principal's Role in the Instructional Process: Implications for At-Risk Students, **ERIC**, 29 (4): 47.
- New York State Office of the Comptroller (1994): "Division for Youth: Counseling Efforts Should be Improved Report 93", **ERIC**, 29 (4):28.
- O'Donoghue, Thomas and Clive, A. J. Dimmock.(1997). "The Principal's Contribution To School Restructuring Initiatives Aimed At Improving Teaching and Learning", **Educational Management and Administration**, 25 (1) : 35-49.
- Placier, Margaret. (1996). "The Cycle of Student Labels in Education: The cases of Culturally deprived Disadvantaged and at Risk", **Educational Administration Quarterly**, 32 (2) :236-270.
- Plucker, A: Jonathan. (1998). " The Relationship Between School Climate Canditions and Student Aspirations", **The Journal of Educational Research**, 91 (4) : 240-245.
- Roguemore, Barbara. C. (1992): "The Academic Motivations of Students Who Are Discipline Problems", **ERIC** , 27(4): 49.
- Sağlam, Emin. (1994). "Bir Eğitim Kurumu Olarak Aile", **Çağdaş Eğitim Dergisi**, 199, p. 26.
- Şahinkaya, Rezan. (1991)."Türk Aileleri Hangi Yönlerden Birbirlerinden farklılıklar Gösterirler", **Aile Yazıları 1. Temel Kavramlar Yapı ve Tarihi Süreç içinde** (39-42) (der). Beylü Dileçligil ve Ahmet Çiğdem, T. C Başbakanlık Aile Araştırma Kurumu, p.38
- Yılman, Mustafa. (1998): "Gençlik ve Gelecek" **Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi**, sayı 74, s. 3
- Webb, Rosemary and Graham, Vulliamy. (1996). "The Changing Role of The Primary-School Headteacher", **Educational Management and Administration**, 24 (3) : 301-315.