ESPAD'1999
HUNGARIAN COUNTRY REPORT I.

BY

ZSUZSANNA ELEKES, BORBÁLA PAKSI

SECTION I.: INTRODUCTION

A. INTRODUCTION

A1. Earlier National studies and comparability's with these. Summarize the results of earlier national studies

In Hungary there are information on drug consumers from the end of the sixties, meanwhile we do not have any reliable information about a twenty-year-long period before the nineties. Although there has been some epidemologic researches since the seventies but these were not representative or they represent only a small segment of the population, and certain drugs. Therefor they give only little information which is hard to interpret, on the extension of the national drug problem. These data are not adequate to draw a reliable picture about the changes in time.

Researches conducted in 1992-93 school-year and in 1995 can be considered as the antecedents of ESPAD99 and as a basis of comparison. In 1992-93 researches followed the suggested methodology, worked-out by the Pompidou Group, Council of Europe, and used the questionnaire developed by them, in Budapest and in Baranya, Tolna, Zala, Szabolcs-Szatmár counties. The survey made in 1995 was already part of ESPAD95 using a national representative sample. So the high number of elements made it possible

to divide the data according to each county.

Sum of the researches conducted in Hungary in the nineties which are comparable with the results of ESPAD99.

The characteristics of the sample in each survey:

Region	**Year of research**	**basic mass**	**size of the sample (students)**
Budapest	1992/93	representative of third year secondary school students	4518
Baranya county	1992/93	representative of all secondary school students	4531
Zalaegerszeg	1992/93	representative of all secondary school students	3918
Tolna county	1992/93	representative of all secondary school students	3475
Szabolcs county	1992/93	representative of town secondary school students	1165
Hungary	1995	all second year secondary school students	17085

Abstinence rate in 1992-93 and 1995

Sample	**never smoked (%)**	**never drunk (%)**	**never used licit drugs (%)**	**never used illicit drugs (%)**
1992-93	29-30	7-15	83-86	88-93
1995	31	9	85[1]	90[2]

[1] The number in the table shows the abuse of tranquillisers, sleeping pills, medicines containing opiats and the consumption of alcohol with medicines. The ESPAD result of tranquillisers and sedatives was 91,4% in 1995.

[2] The number in the table is based on the Hungarian index of illicit drugs' consumption which contains substances that are not mentioned in ESPAD (opiats, inhalants). The result based on ESPAD95 standards is 94,8%, the abstinence rate of inhalants is 97,4%.

Other characteristics of alcohol consumption:

Sample	**had not drunk last year %**	**had not drunk last month %**
1992/93	**11-21**	41-51
1995	**19**	50

Summarizing the data of drug consumption is as follows:

Whole life prevalence rate of licit drugs:

sample	tranquillisers	sleeping pills	medicines containing opiates	total %
1992/93	10-13	4-6	5-7	14-17
1995	9	4	10[3]	15

Whole life prevalence of illicit drugs:

sample	opiates %	marijuana %	LSD %	cocaine %	amph. %	inhalants %	ecstasy %	crack %	total %
1992/93	2-3	2-6	0-2	0-1	1-3	1-3	-	-	7-12
1995	2	5	1	1	1	5	1	1	10

According to the results of the survey conducted in Budapest and some of the counties in the 1992/93 school-year, and in 1995 on a national representative sample it can be stated that in the first half of the nineties in Hungary consumption of licit drugs (cigarette, alcohol, sleeping pills, tranquilizers) among sixteen-year-old secondary school students was rather high. It is true not only comparing national data of the drug groups but also in international context.

Seventy per cent of youngsters have already smoked in their lives. The scale of life prevalence rate in 1995 stayed below the level of 1992-93 but the rate of the regular smokers was higher than earlier.

Comparing the results of the surveys in 1992-93 and 1995 the rate of abstinent students was the same in Zala county, a bit higher in Budapest and in Szabolcs-Szatmár county, and lower in Baranya and Tolna county at the later period of time. The prevalence rate in the previous month, compared with the earlier results, showed reducing consumption of alcohol in every region except Baranya county.

Despite the decrease of alcohol consumption in 1995 the regularity of getting drunk was extremely high, its prevalence rate was 42,3%. But it must be mentioned that the results of Budapest show a moderately falling tendency (in the case of other places we do not

[3] Az 1995-ös érték a gyógyszer-alkohol együttes fogyasztásra vonatkozik.

have comparing data). The rate of getting drunk in Budapest was 21, 9% in 1993 and 20,7% in 1995. In 1995 the structure of alcohol consumption was the contrary of the national results according to the data of the last consumption. Only one quarter of the questioned drank beer (mostly boys), 42% hard spirit and 44,7% wine. Still using the data of last consumption and converted it into pure alcohol the boys and girls drank the largest quantity from spirit. Consumption of spirit of the girls was remarkably high which took the greater part of their consumption. It is also true in the case of regularity and the quantity of drunken alcohol on one occasion (counted to pure alcohol).

The life time prevalence rate of licit drugs was 15% in 1995. The students most frequently used alcohol with medicines. The rate of tranquilizers was lower in 1995 than before. Accessing sleeping pills stayed at about the same level in the first half of the nineties.

After filtering the accumulation of licit and illicit drugs the clean prevalence rate of licit drugs (the rate of those who used licit drugs only) was 10% in 1995. Earlier the accumulated scale of prevalence rate was higher in Budapest and about the same or lower in the other samples. But the clean prevalence rate was higher in each sample in 1993 than in 1995. It means that the overlapping between using licit and illicit drugs increased.

The prevalence rate of illicit drugs was 10% in 1995. It exceeded the earlier data in Budapest and Zala county and was less in Tolna and Baranya county. The prevalence rate per drug increased in the case of almost every illicit drug except opiates and amphetamines. Sniffing and cannabis showed the highest scale of prevalence rate.

The changing tendency of the prevalence rate of illicit drugs (both altogether and per drug) and the increases of overlapping between using licit and illicit drugs refer to the change in the way of consuming drug. In 1993 a wider group of the population used only one drug while in 1995 a smaller group tried more kinds of drug (both licit and illicit).

A2. Purposes of the survey

The epidemiologic researches conducted this far in Hungary refer to the fact that drug consumption – even if it means only trying or occasionally consuming – is wide spread in the country. This fact itself makes the permanent study of the extension of drug consumption, the endangered population, and the opinions regarding drugs very important. It has special importance in a country where – as we know from previous researches – the majority of the population is rather acceptive regarding drug consumption, where the "exodus" problem solving has deep roots, and where drug politics and institutions dealing with the problem are just forming. Researches are especially important when the estimating methods based on statistical data are wide spread in the developed world in order to measure the changes of alcohol and drug consumption but the data and statistics of institutions in Hungary are only limitedly capable of measuring. They rather reflect the changes in the drug politics and the statistical system than the real situation. Although the data of alcohol consumption were more reliable on a long term but they have recently shown such contrary tendencies which make it difficult to interpret the changes.

The methodological results of the survey in 1995 proved that by questioning secondary school students with questionnaires it is possible to gain trustworthy information on the characteristics of the national drug consumption, the drug attitudes, and the endangered groups. Researches conducted in 1992, in 1995 and in 1999 make it possible to present the changes in consuming habits of secondary school students after the political changes. The survey in 1995 gives us the possibility to analyze the changes in the capital and in several counties between 1992 and 1995. With the help of ESPAD99 we can follow the tendencies on the one hand in Budapest on the other hand in the whole country between 1995 and 1999.

The series of the surveys not only give us information about the changes in consuming habits of the Hungarian secondary school students in the decade after the political changes but as a part of ESPAD99 helps us to interpret them in an international comparison, as well.

A3.-A4. List of institutions, researches and other individuals whose support for the 1999 ESPAD survey

The ESPAD 1999 Hungarian survey was conducted by the Behavior Research Institution at the University of Economic Sciences Budapest.

The conductors of the survey in Hungary:
- Zsuzsanna Elekes (lecturer)
- Borbála Paksi (assistant lecturer)

Sponsoring Institutions:
- National Scientifical Research Fund
- Ministry of Youth and Sport
- National Health Service (Institution in Pest county)

Coordinator of the survey: Tünde Gyõri (PhD student in Sociology)

University students studying sociology, social politics and pedagogy and official questioners gathered the data.

B. POPULATION OF STUDENTS FROM WHICH SAMPLE WAS DRAWN

B1-B2 Geographical areas where survey was conducted. Explain for choosing a special region

The survey was conducted on the whole surface of Hungary, on a national representative sample. A special role was given to the capital. The reason for overrepresenting Budapest was the purpose of creating reliable, individual unit of analysis in order to examine the changes in the whole decade. As far as the survey in 1995 was also conducted on a national representative sample we can compare the results of 1995 and 1999. And the survey in 1992-93 also gathered data in the capital. So it becomes possible to follow the tendencies from the beginning of the decade to its end.

B3. Grade/levels surveyed

The measured educational levels have been determined according to the ESPAD standards. The sample included the young people born in 1983, currently studying in some secondary school.

According to the disposable statistical data of the 1997-98 school year 10% of the target population go to primary school (because of dropping-outs) and 89,3% go to some sort of secondary educational institution. Most of them (97,5%) are in the first and second grades. So the sample was taken from the first and second grades of the secondary schools which made it possible to question 87% of the target population.

B4. Approximate percent of children born in 1983 who were in school in March 1999

According to our estimates as written above 87% of the students born in 1983 could be questioned on the measured educational level, in the first and second grades of the secondary schools, in March 1999.

C. SAMPLE

C1. Number and types of schools in the country

In the Hungarian secondary level education there are four types of secondary schools. These are the following: Highschool, Specialized Secondary School, Skilled Worker Training School, Training School.

The highschools and specialized secondary schools usually give a certificate of secondary school final examination after the four years in school. Specialized secondary schools give a qualification in a profession as well. These are the two types of schools in Hungary which give out certificates enabling their students to apply to higher level of educational institutions (universities, colleges).

The skilled worker training schools have three years of educational programs, and at the end students receive a certificate of skilled training. The training schools have mostly two years of education and they give a lower type of certification. A good example is the

qualified nurse certificate. Those other schools, not giving a profession or secondary school final exam certification to young people who just finished the eighth grade of primary school, and last for about two years are in the same category with training schools, some examples are the housewife and housekeeping training, etc.

Sometimes the classification of the secondary schools is not that obvious, as there are highschools and specialized secondary schools or specialized secondary schools and skilled worker training schools under one administration, that means they are in the mixed school type. In these institutions though the different classes are separable. Therefor the typifying of the schools is less clear-cut than the typification of the classes.

Number and rate of the schools according to grade and school type

type of school	classes					
	1. grade		2. grade		total	
	number	%	number	%	number	%
highschool	1256	14,5	1208	13,9	2464	28,4
specialised secondary school	1474	17,0	1458	16,8	2932	33,8
skilled worker training school	1357	15,6	1410	16,3	2767	31,9
training school	242	2,8	269	3,1	511	5,9
total	4329	49,9	4345	50,1	8674	100,0

C2. Number and types of schools and classes chosen

Number of the chosen classes according to the types of schools in the whole sample

type of school	number of the chosen classes
highschool	76
specialised secondary school	89
skilled worker training school	79
training school	16
total	260

C3. Number and types of students chosen

We estimated the expectable number of the students in the chosen classes according to average number of students in a class based on the disposable macrostatistics of the 1997-98 school-year.

type of school	average number of students in a class	number of the chosen classes	**estimated number of the chosen students**
highschool	29.4	76	**2234**
specialised secondary school	30.6	89	**2724**
skilled worker training school	29.6	79	**2338**
training school	20.1	16	**322**
total average	29.3	260	**7618**

C4. Method of sampling. Step-by-step description of the sampling procedure

Framework of the sample and its validity

As we have already mentioned before sample consists of secondary school classes in first and second grade. We paid attention especially to the authenticity of the information used because the low level of validity in the case of selecting classes may cause a great loss in the sample. We worked on collecting actual and precise data. At the time of the survey in Hungary the actual yearly, namely the 1998/99 school-year statistics were not available, that is why during the selection of the sample different databases – such as statistics of the previous school-year, the Ministry of Education, Education Research Institution, SULINET – were collected and provided the basic mass for the starting point of the sample selection. We compared and controlled the quality of these data. In the case of finding the information missing or unreliable we personally contacted the schools.

The method of choosing the sample is as follows:

We utilized the proportionally layered, random group sampling method according to the types of schools and the grades. Then we defined the weights of the countryside and Budapest later.

Sampling unit: each class at schools (so we ensured the equal participation of the schools with different sizes)

As written above we divided the secondary schools into two groups: Budapest and countryside. Following that we ranged them according to the types of schools and separated the first and the second grade. We selected an random sample from these sixteen groups without putting any back.

Size of the sample

A.) While determining the size of the sample we followed the expectations of ESPAD99. So we needed minimum 2400 persons born in 1983. According to the statistics of 1997-98 in March 1999 40-42% of the students in the first and second grade were born in 1983. Which means that we had to question 5856 persons at least. The number of drop-outs also increased the size. As we constantly corrected the drop-outs of schools or classes from a substitute sample we counted with 1-2% of real drop-outs. We estimated the drop-outs of individuals 10%. All these data made it necessary to select 6500 persons into the sample in order to question the defined number of students born in 1983.

B.) While determining the size of the sample we also took into consideration the reliability of prevalence data.

Based on earlier experience we optimalised the sample on 15% occurrence. If we keep 95,5% reliability level with the error limit of maximum 1,5% the minimum size of the sample is 2267 persons. Adding the 11% drop-outs of the sample (explained above) 2516 persons are needed. So the size of 6500 persons is enough to analyze the sample divided by both sex and grade. But in order to obtain reliable information about Budapest we had to overrepresent the capital. As 21% of the basis mass can be found in Budapest only 1365 students take part in the planned sample of 6500 persons. We had to complete the sample of Budapest to 2500 students, which demanded another 38 classes. As a consequence of the above written thoughts we prepared a sample of 260 classes, altogether 7618 students.

C5. Estimating the representativeness of the sample

As written above we created three criteria of representation

1. type of school: there were four categories (see above)
2. grade: first and second

3. place of school: there were two categories (Budapest and countryside weighted)

We can see the division of the sample according to the criteria in the following tables.

Rates per type of school

National data

type of school	national rates (%)	number of the chosen classes	rate of the chosen classes (%)
highschool	28,4	63	28,4
specialised secondary school	33,8	75	33,8
skilled worker training school	31,9	71	32,0
training school	5,9	13	5,8
total	100,0	222	100

In Budapest

type of school	rates in Budapest (%)	number of the chosen classes	rate of the chosen classes (%)
highschool	35,2	30	35,3
specialised secondary school	38,6	33	38,8
skilled worker training school	20,3	17	20,0
training school	5,9	5	5,9
total	100	85	100

Rates per grade

National rates

grade	national rates (%)	number of the chosen classes	rate of the chosen classes (%)
1. grade	49.9	111	50,0
2. grade	50,1	111	50,0
total	100,0	222	100

In Budapest

grade	rates in Budapest (%)	number of the chosen classes	rate of the chosen classes (%)
1. grade	50,0	42	49,6
2. grade	50,0	43	50,4
total	100,0	85	100

The structure of the sample chosen in the view of place of schools differs from the national rates because of overrepresenting Budapest. While processing the data we have corrected the rates with weighting.

Rates according to place of school

place of school	**national rates (%)**	number of the chosen classes	rate of the chosen classes (%)	rate of the questioned classes (%)	**rates after weighting (%)**
Budapest	**20,8**	85	32,7	31,1	**21**
Countryside	**79,2**	175	67,3	67,0	**79**
total	**100,0**	260	100	100,0	**100,0**

D. FIELD PROCEDURE

D1. Step by step description of data collection procedure

Preparation

This phase included the following tasks:

- to notify the schools selected to the sample
- to prepare the questioners for their duty

To ensure the willingness of participation of the schools on the one hand the conductors of the survey wrote a letter to each chosen school and asked them to cooperate in the survey, on the other hand we drew the attention of the schools and the students to the survey in a tv programme for secondary school students. The necessity of the letter was due to the lack of popularization of the survey culture and it was necessary because of

the characteristics of the researched phenomena.[4]

In the preparation phase we paid a lot of attention to the information of questioners. Partially because the very important duties of sample description and substitute sample description had fallen on them or on the regional representatives instructing them. On the other hand our aim was to maximize the willingness to participate on the different levels besides the drug attitude conditions in the country.[5]

Data gathering:

Questioners independent from schools (description in part D2) gathered the data in March 1999. They followed the rules and instructions enclosed. They stayed in touch constantly with their regional instructors, and through the instructors with the conductors of the research. In Budapest the conductors of the research were directly instructing the questioners.

Controlling the questioners

In the period of questioning we randomly tested whether the questioners kept the questioning rules included in the instructions. If we noticed irregularity (e.g. they asked a wrong class) we excluded the wrong questionnaires and replaced the drop-outs.

Coding the questionnaire

The next phase was the coding and evaluating of the questionnaires. This part of work was done by a group of seven, trained persons who constantly kept in touch with the leaders of the research in order to solve the coming-up problems.[6]

Controlling the coding

During coding the work of coders was continuously controlled by the conductors of the research. (Besides controlling the coding we put the coders' identification number on every classroom report, that enabled us to detect the existence and measure of systematic distortion of the coder by calculating the correlation of each answers and coders.)

---

[4] The text of the letter can be found in appendix.

[5] The detailed description of the instructions can be found in appendix.

[6] The code instruction can be found in appendix.

D2. Number and types of people collecting the data

Data collecting was done by professional questioners and students of sociology, social politics and pedagogy at the University of Economic Sciences Budapest, so by people with no connection at all with the schools, altogether 70 persons. One questioner collected data from an average of 3-4 classes. During questioning according to our instructions only the students and the appointed questioner were present in the classroom. The employees of the school were present or helping only during the filling in of the classroom reports.

D3. Instructions given to the students

The students obtained the following general information about the survey and the questionnaire:

"By filling in the questionnaire you help us in an international survey sponsored by the European Council. In 1995 and in 1999 about 100,000 students at the age of yours take part in a research concerning alcohol- and drug consumption and smoking habits all over Europe.

The survey in Hungary is conducted by the Behavior Research Institution at the University of Economic Sciences Budapest.

We have randomly chosen your class to participate in data gathering. You are one of the 6000 students who take part in the survey.

The survey is anonymous, there is no identification number and nobody can access anybody's answer later on. The results will be published in a national and European summarized form. The questionnaires do not include data that may refer to particular schools, classes or students.

The questionnaire is voluntary. If you do not want to answer a question, just leave it blank !

The questionnaire is not a test, there are no right and wrong answers. If you do not find the proper answer mark the one you can accept mostly !

It is very important to the success of the survey that you answer as many questions and as sincerely as possible. Do not forget that we handle your answers with the strictest confidence !

We hope you will find the questionnaire interesting. If you have any problems do not hesitate to ask our colleague in your class !

Additional technical instructions can be found in the enclosed questioning instruction.

D4 Time period when data were collected

The data collection took place between 1 March, 1999 and 26 March, 1999. The replacement of the drop-out schools was done in this period of time continuously.
The questioners stayed in touch constantly with their regional instructors, and through the instructors with the conductors of the research. In Budapest the conductors of the research were directly instructing the questioners.

D5. Comments from the data collecting staff about the data collection procedure in the classrooms (classroom reports)

In 81% of the classes the questioners reported on no or little disorders. It happened only in 7 classes (3,3%) that the majority of the students disturbed the procedure. It meant laughing (48,3%), whispering (2,3%), remarks in no connection with the questionnaire (11%), remarks on drugs (4,6%), discussing the questions (1,4%), criticizing the questions (0,5%). (more details in table 3-4.).
The questioners mentioned special problems only in 5 classes (in one of them the teacher did not leave the class, in another one the students left without finishing the questionnaires, in three classes the students asked many questions during the procedure).

E. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

E1 Core, optional and module questions in the questionnaire

All the core questions were included in the Hungarian questionnaire except Q13 and Q14. We used only B3, C1a-j, C2a-f, C3a-f questions from the modules.

E2. Brief description (number and subjects) of non-ESPAD questions

Own questions in the questionnaire:
- we asked the type of place of living among the questions about family background
- deviancy in the family
We put altogether 9 own questions into the questionnaire. All of them is closed and their structure is similar to the ESPAD questions.

E3 Describe the translation process and its result

An outside translator translated the questionnaire into Hungarian and another translator translated it back from Hungarian into English (both can be found in the appendix).

E4. Describe the possible pre-testing of the questionnaire and its results

Before finishing the questionnaire we organised a pilot questioning in three different types of schools in January. The pilot questioning primarily influenced the length of the questionnaire. Answering the questions did not cause any problems for the students but we had to cut the number of the modular and own questions.

E5. Describe possible cultural adjustments of the questions

Based on some prestudies and the experience of pilot questioning and considering earlier research results and conventions we have modified, left out and put additional questions into the questionnaire.
Left out the questions: Q13, Q14. Consumption of these kinds of alcohol is not characteristic in Hungary which could have endangered the seriousness of the questionnaire.
Pasted the questions:Q48, Q49a-h. According to earlier research results the place of living and the deviancy of the parents are significantly in connection with drug consumption so we took them as background variables. For the same reason we have chosen some modular questions about culture and lifestyle. We used only 1-3 questions from module C because the 4th one is not characteristic in Hungary.

Modified questions: Q05. The marking system in Hungary has five grades where 1 is the worst and 5 is the best one. Averaging the marks of each subject gives the final result of the term We asked this average. Q39, Q40 - we asked the qualification due to the Hungarian category system.

E6. Attach a copy of the questionnaire, as well as English translation (appendix)

F. DATA PROCESSING

F1. Describe the quality check of the data entry

For data processing we used SPSS/PC Entry programme. We controlled the datafile with logical controlling programme and corrected the errors with check up of the questionnaires.

F2. Describe the weighting of the data

Because of overrepresenting the capital we had to weight the data according to the place of school when working on the national analysis. Originally the classes in Budapest had an overrepresentation of 81% which meant a weight of 0,55 (1:1,81). The data of the countryside were not weighted. But the number of the final drop-out was higher in the capital than in the countryside (7 schools in Budapest and 2 schools in the country) so overrepresentation decreased to 70% and to keep the real rates we gave it a weight of 0,59 (1:1,7).

The database did not demanded any other forms of weighting. We can see the rates of the sample after weighting along the representation criteria in the following tables:

ISKTIP * ÉVFAZ grade Crosstabulation

			ÉVFAZ grade		
			1	2	Total
ISKTIP	highschool	Count	32	30	62
		% of Total	14,6%	13,7%	28,3%
	spec. sec. school	Count	37	37	74
		% of Total	16,9%	16,9%	33,8%
	skilled w. t. school	Count	34	36	70
		% of Total	15,5%	16,4%	32,0%
	training school	Count	6	7	13
		% of Total	2,7%	3,2%	5,9%
Total		Count	109	110	219
		% of Total	49,8%	50,2%	100,0%

Bp-vidék

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Budapest	46	21,0	21,0	21,0
	countrys.	173	79,0	79,0	100,0
	Total	219	100,0	100,0	
Total		219	100,0		

F3. Data programme used

During processing we used SPSS 7.5 for Windows programme package.

SECTION II. METHODOLOGICAL RESULTS

A. SCHOOL CO-OPERATION

A1. Schools' and classes' willingness to participate in the study

Altogether 6,9% of the chosen classes(18 classes) refused co-operation and 5 classes fell out for other reasons (disabled children, the chosen class did not exist because of changing the structure of the institution).

The level of schools' willingness to participate was lower in Budapest than in the countryside and differed in each types of schools. Only 7 classes from 175 refused co-operation in the countryside and 16 classes from 85 did it in the capital.

Refusal of the classes and other drop-outs.

type of school	Countryside		Budapest	
	refusal	other reasons	refusal	other reasons
highschool	4	0	7	1
specialised secondary school	1	0	2	1
skilled worker training school	2	0	2	3
training school	0	0	0	0
total	7	0	11	5

These drop-outs however did not cause any considerable decrease of the sample due to the continuous replacement from the substitute sample. After replacing altogether 9 classes (7 in Budapest and 2 in the country) fell out of the sample.

A2. Refusals or other reasons for not participating. Proportion of classes not participating (1.table)

type of school	number of chosen classes	number of participating classes	participation rate of classes (%)	**drop-out rate of classes (%)**
highschool	76	73	96,1	**3,9**
specialised secondary school	89	87	97,8	**2,2**
skilled worker training school	79	76	96,2	**3,8**
training school	16	15	93,8	**6,2**
total	260	251	96,5	**3,5**

So the above drop-out rate of 3,5% is higher than the expected maximum of 1-2%. One reason for it was that schools independently decide the time of school holidays and one

part of them had Easter holiday at the end of March which made difficult even replacement.

A3. Number of classes replaced because of non-participation

At the same time of sampling we selected a 20%, layered substitute sample based on the same principles as the original sample. We chose a wider substitute sample than earlier assuming a greater rate of refusals and smaller participation of the institutions because on March 1st 1999 a new, stricter and scandalous drug act came into force. Reality proved that. The rate of refusals increased from 3,9% in 1995 to 6,9% in 1999. But the rate of drop-outs decreased because the change of the school structures became slower. So the rate of drop-outs fell back from 7,4% to 2%.

We replaced the drop-outs from the substitute sample according to the layers. We could only replace 14 schools from 23 (60%) due to shortage of time.

B. STUDENT CO-OPERATION

B1 Refusals (proportion of student refusing)

There were no remarks of open refusal on the classroom reports.

B2. Unusable data

We identified a questionnaire totally unusable if the sincerity of the questionnaire was given mark 3 (the qualification process and criteria is detailed above at the description of coding). But excluding a questionnaire was the right of the conductors only. If one of the coders found the questionnaire unusable he had to show it to the conductors and they made the final decision. It happened only in 7 cases (0,0011 %).

B3. Response rate

type of school	number of students in the participating classes			number of participating students			participation rate of the students (%)		
	boy	girl	total	boy	girl	total	boy	girl	total
highschool	821	1332	2153	739	1217	1957	90,0	91,4	90,9
specialised secondary school	1355	1199	2554	1249	1090	2339	92,2	90,9	91,6
skilled worker training school	1375	687	2062	1185	625	1810	86,2	91,0	87,8
training school	166	218	384	132	183	315	79,5	83,9	82,0
total	3717	3436	7153	3305	3115	6421	88,9	90,7	89,8

The above response numbers show the absence ratio because open refusal did not happen. Most of the students were ill (on the average 0,93 girl and 0,98 boy in a class). A smaller part of them was absent with permission (0,2 person) and some of them for unknown reasons (0,15 person). The response rate of the students differs in each school type. Absence because of illness or for unknown reason was higher than the average in skilled worker training and training schools.

B4 Overall assessment of student co-operation

During questioning open refusal did not happen. We received questionnaires qualified as unusable from 99.9% of the students present at the questioning. The 10,2 rate of drop-outs of individuals is mostly due to absence (0,00011% unusable questionnaire).

C. STUDENT COMPREHENSION

C1. Incomplete questionnaires (Number and proportion of finished and unfinished

questionnaires)

We regarded the questionnaires as unfinished where the last quarter or more of the questions were unanswered. The rate of these – not answered at least from ESP37 – in the national sample is 1,8%, among the students born in 1983 2,6%.
The number of students giving in unfinished questionnaires is diverse in the different school types. Students of training schools and especially in skilled worker schools could not finish the questionnaire or at least finished 3/4 of the questions (the rate of the unfinished questionnaires is twice of the average in these schools, 5,2%).

C2. Average time to complete questionnaire

The average time of completion was 46,37 minutes which is diverse in the different school types. It exceeded the time of one lecture in training schools and skilled worker training schools.

Report

IDÕT time of answering /min./

highschool		
	Mean	43,68
	N	59
	Std. Deviation	5,92
spec. sec. school	Mean	45,67
	N	72
	Std. Deviation	6,40
skilled worker t. school	Mean	49,07
	N	68
	Std. Deviation	9,18
training school	Mean	52,18
	N	13
	Std. Deviation	9,74
Total	Mean	46,60
	N	213
	Std. Deviation	7,88

C3. Data collection leaders comments about the interest and serious of the students

In 81% of the classes the questioners reported on no or little disorders. It happened only

in 7 classes (3,3%) that the majority of the students disturbed the procedure.

RENDZAV Disorders during questioning

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 no	97	44,3	44,9	44,9
	2 some students	80	36,6	37,1	81,9
	3 less than half of the students	19	8,8	8,9	90,8
	4 half of the students	13	5,8	5,9	96,7
	5 more than half of students	7	3,3	3,3	100,0
	Total	216	98,8	100,0	
Missing	System Missing	3	1,2		
	Total	3	1,2		
Total		219	100,0		

The occurring disorders meant laughing (48,3%), whispering (2,3%), remarks in no connection with the questionnaire (11%), remarks on drugs (4,6%), discussing the questions (1,4%), criticising the questions (0,5%).

type of disorder	number of the classes
Giggles or eye makings to the class mates	106
Loud comments	34
other kinds of comments	9

C4. Data collection leaders comments about interest and serious of the students

Almost each student in the majority of the classes (70%) was interested in the questionnaire and most of the showed interest in 16,5% of the classes. Only a tiny part of the classes showed disinterest.

ERDEKEL Did the questionnaire interest the students?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 all of them	118	53,9	54,3	54,3
	2 almost all of them	55	25,2	25,3	79,6
	3 great part of them	36	16,5	16,7	96,3
	4 half of them	6	2,5	2,5	98,8
	5 less than half of the students	2	,7	,7	99,5
	6 no one	1	,5	,5	100,0
	Total	217	99,3	100,0	
Missing	System Missing	2	,7		
	Total	2	,7		
Total		219	100,0		

The rate of seriousness was similar. The majority of the students took the questionnaire serious in 96% of the classes, in the questioners' opinion.

KOMOLY Did they took the questionnaire

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 everybody	115	52,3	52,7	52,7
	2 almost everybody	63	28,8	29,0	81,6
	3 greater part of them	31	14,3	14,4	96,1
	4 half of them	6	2,7	2,7	98,8
	5 less than half of them	2	,7	,7	99,5
	6 nobody	1	,5	,5	100,0
	Total	217	99,3	100,0	
Missing	System Missing	2	,7		
	Total	2	,7		
Total		219	100,0		

C5. Comments on any specific problems

The questioners did not report on any special problems in 97,7% of the classroom

reports. We found only 5 classes with special remarks. In three of them the students found it difficult to interpret the questions.
In skilled worker training schools and training schools questioning time lasted also in the break, because of the reading-understanding difficulties of the students.

C6. Overall assessment of student comprehension

In most of the questioned classes the students found the questionnaire interesting and took it seriously. We experienced criticising (1,9%) and understanding problems only in some cases. In 63% of the participating classes the questioning was completed in one lecture time (45 minutes). And just in 9% of the participating classes was the completion time more by 10 minutes (more than a break) than a lecture. In skilled worker training schools and training schools the rate of unfinished questionnaires was also higher. 97,4% of the students succeeded to complete more than 3/4 of the questions.

APPENDIX

1. Letter of request
2. Tables
3. Questionnaire
4. English translation of questionnaire
5. Instruction to the questioners
6. Coding instructions

Appendix 1.: Letter of request

"Dear Sir/Madam,

In 1995 the Council of Europe started a periodically repeating survey of drug and alcohol consumption and the spread of smoking among secondary school students all over Europe. The second survey among the secondary school students of the age group 16 will be conducted in March 1999.

The epidemologic surveys conducted this far in Hungary show that drug consumption – even if it is just on the trying and occasional consumption level – is wide spread all over the country. The spreading of heavy alcohol consumption and smoking is shown in numerous previous studies. These facts should be enough to make the regular survey of the spreading consumption, the endangered population and the opinions about drugs, alcohol and smoking extremely important.
Earlier national and international studies proved that authentic information can be gathered by questioning in questionnaires secondary school students about the characteristics and spreading of drug and alcohol consumption and smoking, the attitudes towards these substances, and about the endangered groups. Repeating these surveys with regular intervals makes it possible to measure the changes. And all this yet means essential information for prevention and to work out an effective health care policy and test its efficiency.

In Hungary this survey is conducted by the research fellows of the Behavior Research Institution at the University of Economic Sciences sponsored by the National Scientific Research Fund and the Ministry of Youth and Sport. Data gathering will take place between 1-31 of March. The questionnaires are anonymous and do not contain any information which allows later identification of the students. The data are processed by computers and will be published only in summarized form, therefor nobody can get information about individuals, classes or schools.

Your school is in the randomly selected sample. So in March our data collecting research assistants will visit you.

Please help our colleague in this very important work essential to moderate the drug problem.

We will inform the schools participating in the research about the out-come of the survey.

Thank you for the cooperation in advance.
Yours faithfully,
conductors of the survey

Budapest, 20th February, 1999."

Appendix 2.: Tables

Table 1/1. Sample size and response rates

Sampling frame and sample size				
Type of school	**Total number of such classes in the country**	**Total number of such classes in the sample**	**Total number of students from such classes in the sample**	
			Boys	Girls
School category 1	2464	76	821	1332
School category 2	2932	89	1355	1199
School category 3	2767	79	1375	678
School category 4	511	16	166	218
Total number of classes	8674	260	3717	3436

Sampling frame and sample size							
Type of school	**Number of participating classes**	**Number of participating students**			**Response rate %**		
		Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
School category 1	73	739	1217	1957	90,0	91,4	90,9
School category 2	87	1249	1090	2339	92,2	90,9	91,6
School category 3	76	1185	625	1810	86,2	91,0	87,8
School category 4	15	132	183	315	79,5	83,9	82,0
Total number of classes	251	3305	3115	6421	88,9	90,7	89,8

Table 1/3. Did you notice any disturbances during completion of the forms?

	Absolute numbers
No	97
Yes, from few students	80
Yes, from less than half of the students	19
Yes, from about half of the students	13
Yes, from more then half of the students	7

Table 1/4. What kind of disturbances?

	Absolute numbers
Giggles or eye makings to the class mates	106
Loud comments	34
Other kinds of comments	9

Table 1/5. Did you find the students interested in the survey?

	Absolute numbers
Yes, all of them	118
Nearly all of them	55
Majority of them	36
About half of them	6
Less than half of them	2
Nearly no one of them	1
No one	0

Table 1/6. Did you find that the students worked seriously?

	Absolute numbers
Yes, all of them	115
Nearly all of them	63
Majority of them	31
About half of them	6
Less than half of them	2
Nearly no one of them	1
No one	0

Table 1/7. Average time for the class to complete the questionnaires?

Average time:	**46,6**	**minutes**

Appendix 4.

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE QUESTIONERS

1. PREPARATION OF QUESTIONING, CONTACT WITH SCHOOLS

- Contact the headmaster of the school (or other competent person) and class teacher according to the data on the questioning card or based on latest information from the telephone book.
- Tell them that it is an international survey conducted in Hungary by the Behaviour Research Centre at the Budapest University of Economic Sciences. Refer to the letter of request written by the conductors of the survey (Zsuzsanna Elekes, Borbála Paksi). If they did not received it, tell them its content and show them your own copy.
- **Write on the questioning card whether contacting the school was successful or not.** If it was successful (1). If not because of missing school, school type, grade (2). If the headmaster (3), the class teacher (4) denied co-operating or there were any other problems (5) (e.g. the students had professional practice at the time of questioning)
- Before questioning try not to show the questionnaire to the teachers and do not leave it at the school for pre-studying. We do not want them to prepare the students for questioning. We ask not only information about consumption but also knowledge and attitude.
- **Do not go to a school** that you attended earlier or any relatives attend it now or teach there, so **where you are not an independent, outside person.**

2. CHOOSING THE CLASS TO BE QUESTIONED IN EACH SCHOOL, EACH GRADE:

- In the sample the classes of each school are marked with **serial numbers**. Apply the following procedure to identify the classes: If in the school there is a similar method of marking, namely they use serial numbers to mark classes, then question the class marked with the same number according to the sample. If the classes are not marked with numbers but with the alphabet then "A" is the first class, "B" is the second one and so on. If the classes have names – for example they are named by professions, then sort the classes in alphabetic order and choose the right ones.
- This selecting method should be used only for those set of classes of school type (highschool, specialized secondary school, skilled worker training school, training school) indicated in the sample. Do not apply the method in adult education or in the classes educated after the final examination. The first two numbers of the identification numbers show the type of school: 21=highschool, 22=special secondary school, 23=skilled worker training school, 24= training school.
- If we have to question the third class and there are only two classes in the chosen grade at the school then A=1, B=2, A=3 so we have to question class “A”.
- If a class or the entire school refuses to answer the questionnaire or there is no grade in the school marked in the sample (e.g. if it is a night school for adults) please turn to the instructor of the research.

3. THE QUESTIONING

/a. During the questioning **only the questioner is present**

- Ask the teacher to leave you alone with the class, as the presence of a person known by the students might alter the fill-in. And our duty is to guarantee the standard circumstances of surveying.

/b. The duty of the questioner in the class

- It is to tell them they were participating in a sociology study conducted all over Europe which is set to learn more about the habits of the younger generation. We are questioning 6000 students all over Hungary.
- **Ask them to help** our research.
- Underline that the questionnaire is **anonymous**, there is no identification number, so the students or classes cannot be identified. Nobody from the school can access the questionnaires. Only summarized results will be published at the completion of the survey.
- The questionnaire is not a test, there are no right and wrong answer.
- If somebody does not or cannot answer a question, the question should be left blank. **Filling in the questionnaires is voluntary, but it is important to us that they give answers to as many questions as they can.**
- Hand out the questionnaires and ask them not to talk to each other while filling in, because **we are interested in their own opinion**. Let them read the note on the first page.

Tell them:

- There might be some words or phrases they don't know. That is why we attached a defining dictionary (on the last page). **For those questions explained in the dictionary we cannot give further explanation.**
- If there are other questions, problems they should put their hand up and we will help them. (Let's not disturb each other with loudly asked questions.)
- If they marked the wrong answer ask them to cross it out (hatch it).
- Ask the students to fill in the questionnaire in ink.
- **The questioner should not walk in the class** but help the questioning with his behavior.
- **The questioner should not behave like a teacher.** Do not instruct the students but ask them to cooperate.

4. COLLECTING THE QUESTIONNAIRES

- **Put an envelope on the front table**. When the students are finished they should put the questionnaires into the envelope. When everybody finished staple the envelope in front of them to demonstrate nobody can look into it. **Do not read the questionnaires in front of the students.**
- **Do not show the questionnaires to anyone.**
- **If you go out of the class write the identification numbers, the grade and the number of the class on the envelope.** Do not write the name of the school on the envelope!

5. FILLING IN THE CLASSROOM REPORT

- **Fill in the classroom report with the help of the class teacher**, and ask them to sign it. This report must be signed by the questioner as well.

- Put the same **identification numbers** on the classroom report as on the envelop.
- It is important to find out the name of the prevention program!
- The questioner has to indicate the prevention program in Q6A if it is included in the timetable.
- Mark the profession of the outside expert e.g. policeman, psychologist.
- Indicate all the remarks in Q4, which was not, mentioned anywhere else e.g. someone left the class so denied cooperation).

Appendix 6.

CODING INSTRUCTIONS

GENERAL PREPARATIONS:

1. Check the number of the questionnaires in the envelope. *If it is not the same number as it is on the classroom report write it on the envelope in red ink.*
2. Check the identification numbers on the envelope and the classroom reports and look it up in the appendix of coding instructions. If they are the same write them on the questionnaires (1-9 code squares). *If any problems occur then turn to the conductors of the survey.*
3. Use a red pen for coding or marking anything in the questionnaires (if you made a mistake paint it over with corrector).

CONTENT OF THE CODE SQUARES

Serial number of the code square	**Coded information**
1-9	**IDENTIFICATION OF THE SCHOOL**: Identification numbers of the school written on the classroom report and the envelop. Content of the identification numbers of the school: 1-2 Type of school 3-4 Code of the settlement 5-9 Serial number of the school
10	**Grade**: *If the answer is invalid or the data are not the same on the envelope and the classroom report turn to the conductors of the survey.* 1 – first grade 2 – second grade 3 – third grade 4 – forth grade
11	**Serial number of the class**: Write the serial numbers according to the alphabet.: 1 "A" 2 "B" 3 "C" and so on *If the answer is invalid or there are any problems turn to the conductors of the survey.*
12-13	**Serial number of the students**: Simply number the questionnaires in the envelope. So the first serial number is always 1 in the case of each envelope.
14	Code of the settlement 2. - type of the settlement (**place of the school can be found in appendix I. list of the Hungarian towns in appendix II.)** 1. capital 2. chief town of the county 3. other town 4. village
15	**Church or secular school** Code the answer of Q7 on the classroom report.
16	**Has there been or is there a prevention programme at the school**:

	Code the answer of Q5 on the classroom report.
17	Type of the prevention programme I. Code the answer of Q6/A on the classroom report.
18	Type of the prevention programme II. Code the answer of Q6B on the classroom report if one answer is marked: 1 - teacher of the school 2 - outside expert 3 - drug user If several answers are marked apply the following codes: 4 - teacher of the school + outside expert 5 – teacher of the school + drug user 6 – outside expert + drug user 7 – all of them
19-20	Year of birth Code the answer of Q2 in the questionnaire, only the last two digits. In the case of lack of answer leave the code square blank
21-22	The school term average of the students **Code the answer of Q5 in the questionnaire. If 3,65 is written code 37 and use the general rules of rounding if necessary. If someone dropped out code 10.** In the case of lack of answer leave the code square blank
23	The opinion of the coder about the reliability and validity of the questionnaire. Use a scale of 3 levels to evaluate it 1 – reliable and valid 2 – partly reliable 3 – unreliable and invalid The criteria to evaluate the questionnaires can be found in appendix III.
24-25	**The identification numbers of the questioner:** appendix IV.
26-27	**Code of the district in Budapest - self-code**

In the case of lack of answer cross the code square with a red line.

In course of coding you not only have to fill in the code squares but also to check the whole questionnaire in order to clear-cut the answers.

If the students were allowed to mark several answers we always drew their attention to that at the given question.

If several answers are marked where it is not allowed follow the next procedure:

- If there are several answers for one question but it is obvious by the way of filling which one is right, circle the right answer with red.
- If you cannot decide which is the right answer apply the following method:

- If the student gave two answers following each other first code the higher then the lower number by turns.
- If the answer shows an interval mark the mean value.
- If the student marked two end values - e.g. agrees and does not agree at the same time - the answer is invalid.

EVALUATING THE RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Make sure that the students answered the questions about his sex and year of birth. If he did not do so the questionnaire is unreliable.
Try to guess the sex based on the classroom report.
2. Check if there are systematic answers e.g. he always marks the first column. This is a factor of unreliability.
3. Another factor of unreliability is the row of inconsistent answers especially in connection with

drugs. For example:
- he took something previous month but did not take anything last year or in his life
- took relevin
- knows relevin
- he marked life time prevalence in questions 24-27 but he did not mark anything in Q28 about the age of the first occasion, or he answers "never used anything" in Q29-31, or he never took marijuana but it was the first kind of drug in his life.

But you must not forget that the students might have been inattentive and given illogical answers even if they wanted to be sincere.

4. He might have given improbable answers which shows that he did not take the questioning seriously (e.g.: he took every kind of drug 40 times in the last 30 days). This is a factor of unreliability, too.
5. It is also a problem when the questionnaire is not completed.

If more than the half of the questions is unanswered it is invalid. If less than the half of the questions is unanswered (and there are no other signs of unreliability) it is valid

Before deciding about the validity we always have to check the structure of the unanswered questions. It can happen that he did not have enough time to fill in the questionnaire or he got tired meanwhile. Then the first part of the questionnaire is correctly answered but the last questions are left blank. In this case (if the given answers are consistent) the questionnaire is valid.

On evaluating the unanswered questions do not forget that we told them before if they did not want to answer a question leave it blank. So it might be a sign of sincerity.

6. On evaluating the questionnaire do not ignore the remarks, scribbles written in it. These also refer to unreliability.

So you should form your attitude about the reliability and validity of the questionnaires based on the above mentioned points and mark it on a scale of 3 levels. In the case of accumulated signs of inconsistency or shortcomings we give 3. If these signs occur in one or two questions accidentally we give 1 which means that the questionnaire is reliable. If there are problems in several cases we give 2. Pay attention not only to the quantity of inconsistency but also to the quality of it because their weight might be different.

If you find the questionnaire completely useless or it can be accepted according to the above written criteria but you doubt its sincerity show it to the conductors.