

This entry reproduces with minor amendments the original abstract or equivalent of a document collected by Drug and Alcohol Findings. Findings collects any scientific or UK policy document relating to evaluations of drug or alcohol interventions or to the interpretation and use of their findings. Unlike documents selected for fuller analysis, its citation here does not imply that this document is particularly relevant to Britain and of particular merit (though it may well be both) and no attempt has been made to validate the facts or interpretations given by the authors or to offer a critical commentary. The original document was not published by Findings; click on the [Title](#) to obtain copies. Free reprints may also be available from the authors – click [Request reprint](#) to send or adapt the pre-prepared e-mail message. Links to source documents are in [blue](#). Hover mouse over [orange](#) text for explanatory notes.

Click [HERE](#) and enter e-mail address to be alerted to new studies and reviews

---

► [A meta-analytic review of school-based prevention for cannabis use.](#)

**Porath-Waller A.J., Beasley E, Beirness D.J.** [Request reprint](#)  
**Health Education and Behavior: 2010, 37(5), p. 709–723.**

Taking in studies up to the end of 2007, this synthesis of research concludes that secondary school cannabis prevention lessons are most effective when delivered by outside experts who teach in an interactive manner and deliver comprehensive content which goes beyond resisting peer and other social influences.

**Original abstract** This investigation used meta-analytic techniques to evaluate the effectiveness of school-based prevention programming in reducing cannabis use among youth aged 12 to 19. It summarised the results from 15 studies published in peer-reviewed journals since 1999 and identified features that influenced programme effectiveness. The results from the set of 15 studies indicated that these school-based programmes had a positive impact on reducing students' cannabis use ( $d = 0.58$ , CI: 0.55, 0.62) compared to control conditions. Findings revealed that programmes incorporating elements of several prevention models were significantly more effective than were those based on only a social influence model. Programmes that were longer in duration (at least 15 sessions) and facilitated by individuals other than teachers in an interactive manner also yielded stronger effects. The results also suggested that programmes targeting high school pupils of at least 14 years of age were more effective than those aimed at younger pupils. Implications for school-based prevention programming are discussed.

Last revised 11 January 2011

► [Comment on this entry](#) ► [Give us your feedback on the site \(one-minute survey\)](#)

---

**Top 10 most closely related documents on this site. For more try a [subject or free text search](#)**

[Drug prevention best done by school's own teachers not outside specialists](#) NUGGETTE 2005

[The effectiveness of a school-based substance abuse prevention program: 18-month follow-up of the EU-Dap cluster randomized controlled trial](#) STUDY 2010

[Education's uncertain saviour](#) KEY STUDY 2000

[Prevention is a two-way process](#) KEY STUDY 2001

[Confident kids ... like to party](#) NASTY SURPRISES 2004

[Drug education: inspections show that tick box returns are no guarantee of quality](#) NUGGETTE 2003

[Substance use outcomes 5½ years past baseline for partnership-based, family-school preventive interventions](#) STUDY 2008

[High-risk youngsters respond to coherent, consistent and interactive after-school activities](#) NUGGET 2005

[Growth in youth drinking curbed by correcting 'normative' beliefs](#) NUGGET 2002

[Secondary school DARE ineffective without interactive extensions](#) NUGGET 2003