

96083

**ICPSR**

**Inter—university Consortium for  
Political and Social Research**

96083

**Monitoring the Future:  
A Continuing Study of the  
Lifestyles and Values of  
Youth, 1979**

**Lloyd D. Johnston,  
Jerald G. Bachman,  
and Patrick M. O'Malley**

ICPSR 7930

Monitoring the Future:  
A Continuing Study of the Lifestyles and Values of Youth, 1979

(ICPSR 7930)

Principal Investigators

Lloyd D. Johnston, Jerald G. Bachman,  
and Patrick M. O'Malley

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Public Domain/NIJ

U.S. Dept. of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research  
P.O. Box 1248  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

First ICPSR Printing, 1983

96083

## Acknowledgement of Assistance

All manuscripts utilizing data made available through the Consortium should acknowledge that fact as well as identify the original collector of the data. The ICPSR Council urges all users of the ICPSR Data facilities to follow some adaptation of this statement with the parentheses indicating items to be filled in appropriately or deleted by the individual user.

The data (and tabulations) utilized in this (publication) were made available (in part) by the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research. The data for MONITORING THE FUTURE, 1979 were originally collected by Lloyd D. Johnston, Jerald G. Bachman, and Patrick M. O'Malley of the Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. Neither the collector of the original data nor the Consortium bear any responsibility for the analyses or interpretations presented here.

In order to provide funding agencies with essential information about the use of archival resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about ICPSR participants' research activities, each user of the ICPSR data facilities is expected to send two copies of each completed manuscript or thesis abstract to the Consortium. Please indicate in the cover letter which data were used.

It is further requested that one copy of each completed manuscript or thesis abstract based on the Monitoring the Future data be sent directly to the Monitoring the Future Project, Institute for Social Research, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI 48106. ICPSR participants are also invited to contact the principal investigators at earlier stages of analysis to discuss analysis strategies and/or to learn of any relevant analyses already completed using these data.

## INTRODUCTION

### Study Description

Monitoring the Future, which is conducted by the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research and receives its core funding from the National Institute on Drug Abuse, is an unusually comprehensive research project in several respects: surveys are conducted annually on an ongoing basis; the samples are large and nationally representative; and the subject matter is very broad, encompassing some 1300 variables per year.

The Monitoring the Future Project is designed to explore changes in many important values, behaviors, and lifestyle orientations of contemporary American youth. Two general types of tasks may be distinguished. The first is to provide a systematic and accurate description of the youth population of interest in a given year, and to quantify the direction and rate of the changes taking place among them over time. The second task, more analytic than descriptive, involves the explanation of the relationships and trends observed to exist.

### Research Design and Procedures

The basic research design involves annual data collections from high school seniors during the spring of each year, beginning with the class of 1975. Each data collection takes place in approximately 125 public and private high schools selected to provide an accurate cross-section of high school seniors throughout the United States.

One limitation in the design is that it does not include in the target population those young men and women who drop out of high school before graduation (or before the last few months of the senior year, to be more precise). This excludes a relatively small proportion of each age cohort -- between 15 and 20 percent -- though not an unimportant segment, since certain behaviors, such as drug usage and delinquency tend to be higher than average in this group. However, the addition of a representative sample of dropouts would increase the cost of the present research enormously, because of their dispersion and generally higher level of resistance to being located and interviewed.

For the purposes of estimating characteristics of the entire age group, the omission of high school dropouts does introduce certain biases; however, their small proportion sets outer limits on the bias. For the purposes of estimating changes from one cohort of high school seniors to another, the omission of dropouts represents a problem only if different cohorts have considerably different proportions who drop out. There is no reason to expect dramatic changes in those rates for the foreseeable future, and recently published government statistics indicate a great deal of stability in dropout rates since 1970.

Some may use this high school data to draw conclusions about changes for the entire age group. While the investigators do not encourage such extrapolation, they suspect that the conclusions reached often would be valid, since over 80 percent of the age group is in the surveyed segment of the population and changes among those

not in school are likely to parallel the changes among those who are. Nevertheless, for purposes of characterizing the entire age group the investigators would urge the user to check the results emanating from the present monitoring system against those emerging from other data collection systems using different methods, such as household interviews.

Sampling Procedures

The procedure for securing a nationwide sample of high school seniors is a multistage one. Stage 1 is the selection of particular geographic areas, Stage 2 is the selection of one or more high schools in each area, and Stage 3 is the selection of seniors within each high school.

Stage 1: Geographic Areas. The geographic areas used in this study are the primary sampling units (PSUs) developed by the Sampling Section of the Survey Research Center for use in the Center's nationwide interview studies. These consist of 74 primary areas throughout the contiguous United States - including the 12 largest metropolitan areas, which contain about 30 percent of the nation's population. Of the 62 other primary areas, 10 are in the Northeast, 18 in the North Central area, 24 in the South, and 10 in the West. Because these same PSUs are used for personal interview studies by the Survey Research Center (SRC), local field representatives can be assigned to administer the data collections in practically all schools.

Stage 2: Schools. In the major metropolitan areas more than one high school is often included in the sampling design; in most other sampling areas a single high school is sampled. In all cases, the selections of high schools are made such that the probability of drawing a school is proportionate to the size of its senior class. The larger the senior class (according to recent records), the higher the selection probability assigned to the high school. When a sampled school is unwilling to participate, a replacement school as similar to it as possible is selected from the same geographic area.

Stage 3: Students. Within each selected school, up to about 400 seniors may be included in the data collection. In schools with fewer than 400 seniors, the usual procedure is to include all of them in the data collection. In larger schools, a subset of seniors is selected either by randomly sampling classrooms or by some other random method that is convenient for the school and judged to be unbiased. Sample weights are assigned to each respondent so as to take account of variations in the sizes of samples from one school to another, as well as the (smaller) variations in selection probabilities occurring at the earlier stages of sampling.

The three-stage sampling procedure described above yielded the following number of participating schools and students:

	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981
Number of Public Schools	111	108	108	111	111	107	109
Number of Private Schools	14	15	16	20	20	20	19
Total Number of Schools	125	123	124	131	131	127	128
Actual Number of Participating Students	15792	16678	18438	18924	16662	16524	18267
Number of Weighted Cases*	15104	15299	15839	18924	16654	16524	18267
Student Response Rate(%)**	78	77	79	83	82	82	81

\*Sample weights are assigned to each respondent to correct for unequal probabilities of selection which arise in the multi-stage sampling procedure. These weights are prior to revision of the weight variable noted below.

\*\*The student response rate is derived by dividing the attained sample by the target sample (both based on weighted numbers of cases). The target sample is based upon listings provided by schools. Since such listings may fail to take account of recent student attrition, the actual response rate may be slightly underestimated.

One other important feature of the base-year sampling procedure should be noted here. All schools (except for half of the initial 1975 sample) are asked to participate in two data collections, thereby permitting replacement of half of the total sample of schools each year. One motivation for requesting that schools participate for two years is administrative efficiency; it is a costly and time-consuming procedure to secure the cooperation of schools, and a two-year period of participation cuts down that effort substantially. Another important advantage is that whenever an appreciable shift in scores from one graduating class to the next is observed, it is possible to check whether the shift might be attributable to some differences in the newly sampled schools. This is done simply by repeating the analysis using only the 60 or so schools which participated both years. Thus far, the half-sample approach has worked quite well and examination of drug prevalence data from the "matched half-samples" showed that the half samples of repeat schools yielded drug prevalence trends which were virtually identical to trends based on all schools.

School Recruiting Procedures. Early during the fall semester an initial contact is made with each sampled school. First a letter is sent to the principal describing the study and requesting permission

to survey seniors. The letter is followed by a telephone call from a project staff member, who attempts to deal with any questions or problems and (when necessary) makes arrangements to contact and seek permission from other school district officials. Basically the same procedures are followed for schools asked to participate for the second year.

Once the school's agreement to participate is obtained, arrangements are made by phone for administering the questionnaires. A specific date for the survey is mutually agreed upon and a local SRC representative is assigned to carry out the administration.

Advance Contact with Teachers and Students. The local SRC representative is instructed to visit the school two weeks ahead of the actual date of administration. This visit serves as an occasion to meet the teachers whose classes will be affected and to provide them with a brochure describing the study, a brief set of guidelines about the questionnaire administration, and a supply of flyers to be distributed to the students a week to 10 days in advance of the questionnaire administration. The guidelines to the teachers include a suggested announcement to students at the time the flyers are distributed.

From the students' standpoint, the first information about the study usually consists of the teacher's announcement and the short descriptive flyer. In announcing the study, the teachers are asked to stress that the questionnaires used in the survey are not tests, and that there are no right or wrong answers. The flyer tells the students that they will be invited to participate in the study, points out that their participation is strictly voluntary, and stresses confidentiality (including a reference to the fact that the Monitoring the Future project has a special government grant of confidentiality which allows their answers to be protected). The flyer also serves as an informative document which the students can show to their parents.

Questionnaire Administration. The questionnaire administration in each school is carried out by the local SRC representatives and their assistants, following standardized procedures detailed in a project instruction manual. The questionnaires are administered in classrooms during normal class periods whenever possible, although circumstances in some schools require the use of larger group administrations. Teachers are not asked to do anything more than introduce the SRC staff members and (in most cases) remain in the classroom to help guarantee an orderly atmosphere for the survey. Teachers are urged to avoid walking around the room, so that students may feel free to write their answers without fear of being observed.

The actual process of completing the questionnaires is quite straightforward. Respondents are given sharpened pencils and asked to use them because the questionnaires are designed for automatic scanning. Most respondents can finish within a 45-minute class period; for those who cannot, an effort is made to provide a few minutes of additional time.

Procedures for Protecting Confidentiality. In any study that relies on voluntary reporting of drug use or other illegal acts, it is essential to develop procedures which guarantee the confidentiality of

such reports. It is also desirable that these procedures be described adequately to respondents so that they are comfortable about providing honest answers.

The first information given to students about the survey consists of a descriptive flyer stressing the confidentiality and voluntary participation. This theme is repeated at the start of the questionnaire administration. Each participating student is instructed to read the message on the cover of the questionnaire, which stresses the importance and value of the study, notes that answers will be kept strictly confidential, states that the study is completely voluntary, and tells the student "If there is any question you or your parents would find objectionable for any reason, just leave it blank." The instructions then point out that in a few months a summary of nationwide results will be mailed to all participants and also that a follow-up questionnaire will be sent to some students after a year. The cover message explains that these are the reasons for asking that name and address be written on a special form which will be removed from the questionnaire and handed in separately. The message also points out that the two different code numbers (one on the questionnaire and one on the tear-out form) cannot be matched except by a special computer tape at the University of Michigan.

In order to protect the confidentiality of responses and the identity of respondents, a number of alterations have been made in the original dataset to prepare it for public release; these alterations are described below under "Processing Information."

#### Content Areas and Questionnaire Design

Drug use and related attitudes are the topics which receive the most extensive coverage in the Monitoring the Future project; but the questionnaires also deal with a wide range of other subject areas, including attitudes about government, social institutions, race relations, changing roles for women, educational aspirations, occupational aims, and marital and family plans, as well as a variety of background and demographic factors.

#### Measurement Content Areas

A. Drugs. Drug use and related attitudes and beliefs, drug availability and exposure, surrounding conditions and social meaning of drug use. Views of significant others regarding drugs.

B. Education. Educational lifestyle, values, experiences, and environments. Media usage.

C. Work and Leisure. Vocational values, meaning of work and leisure, work and leisure activities, preferences regarding occupational characteristics and type of work setting.

D. Sex Roles and Family. Values, attitudes, and expectations about marriage, family structure, sex roles, and sex discrimination.

E. Family Plans and Population Concerns. Values, attitudes, and expectations about personal family plans. Views on sexual mores and concerns about overpopulation.

F. Conservation, Materialism, Equity, etc. Values, attitudes, and expectations related to conservation, pollution, materialism, equity, and the sharing of resources. Preferences regarding type of dwelling and urbanicity.

G. Religion. Religious affiliation, practices, and views.

H. Politics. Political affiliation, activities, and views.

I. Social Change. Values, attitudes, and expectations about social change.

J. Social Problems. Concern with various social problems facing the nation and the world.

K. Major Social Institutions. Confidence in and commitment to various major social institutions (business, unions, branches of government, press, organized religion, military, etc.).

L. Military. Views about the armed services and the use of military force. Personal plans for military service.

M. Interpersonal Relationships. Qualitative and quantitative characteristics of cross-age and peer relationships. Interpersonal conflict.

N. Race Relations. Attitudes toward and experiences with other racial groups.

O. Concern for Others. Radius of concern for others; voluntary and charitable activities.

P. Happiness. Happiness and life satisfaction, overall and in specific life domains.

Q. Other Personality Variables. Attitudes about self (including self-esteem), locus of control, loneliness, optimism, trust in others, somatic symptoms, importance placed on various life goals, counter-culture orientation.

R. Background and School. Demographic and family background characteristics, curriculum and grades in high school, victimization in school.

S. Deviant Behavior and Victimization. Delinquent behaviors, driving violations and accidents, violations and accidents under the influence of drugs, victimization experiences.

Given this breadth of content, the study is not presented to respondents as a "drug use study," nor do they tend to view it as such.

Because many questions are needed to cover all of these topic areas, much of the questionnaire content is divided into five different questionnaire forms which are distributed to participants in an ordered sequence that produced five virtually identical subsamples. About one-third of each questionnaire form consists of key or "core" variables which are common to all forms. All demographic variables and some measures of drug use are included in this "core" set of measures. This use of the full sample for drug and demographic measures provides a more accurate estimation on these dimensions and also makes it possible to link them statistically to all the other measures which are included in a single form only.

#### Representativeness and Validity

The samples for this study are intended to be representative of high school seniors throughout the 48 contiguous states. We have already discussed the fact that this definition of the sample excludes one important portion of the age cohort: those who have dropped out of high school before nearing the end of the senior year. But given the aim of representing high school seniors, it will now be useful to consider the extent to which the obtained samples of schools and students are likely to be representative of all seniors and the degree to which the data obtained are likely to be valid.

It is possible to distinguish at least four ways in which survey data of this sort might fall short of being fully representative. First, some sampled schools refuse to participate, which could introduce some bias. Second, the failure to obtain questionnaire data from 100 percent of the students sampled in participating schools would also introduce bias. Third, the answers provided by participating students are open to both conscious and unconscious distortions which could reduce validity. Finally, limitations in sample size and/or design could place limits on the accuracy of estimates.

School Participation. As noted in the description of the sampling design, schools are invited to participate in the study for a two-year period. With very few exceptions, each school which has participated for one data collection has agreed to participate for a second. Thus far, from 66 percent to 80 percent of the schools initially invited to participate have agreed to do so each year; for each school refusal, a similar school (in terms of size, geographic area, urbanicity, etc.) was recruited as a replacement. The selection of replacement schools almost entirely removes problems of bias in region, urbanicity, and the like that might result from certain schools refusing to participate. Other potential biases are more subtle, however. For example, if it turned out that most schools with "drug problems" refused to participate, that would seriously bias the drug estimates derived from the sample. And if any other single factor were dominant in most refusals, that also might suggest a source of serious bias. In fact, however, the reasons for schools' refusals to participate are varied and largely a function of happenstance events of the particular



year. Thus, the investigators feel fairly confident that school refusals have not seriously biased the surveys.

Student Participation. Completed questionnaires are obtained from three-fourths to four-fifths of all students sampled. The single most important reason that students are missed is that they are absent from class at the time of data collection, and in most cases it is not workable to schedule a special follow-up data collection for them. Students with fairly high rates of absenteeism also report above-average rates of drug use; therefore, there is some degree of bias introduced by missing the absentees. That bias could be corrected through the use of special weighting; however, this course was not chosen because the bias in estimates (in drug use, where the potential effect was hypothesized to be largest) was determined to be quite small and because the necessary weighting procedures would have introduced undesirable complications. In addition to absenteeism, student nonparticipation occurs because of schedule conflicts with school trips and other activities which tend to be more frequent than usual during the final months of the senior year. Of course, some students refuse to complete or turn in a questionnaire. However, SRC representatives in the field estimate this proportion to be only about one percent.

Validity of Self-Report Data. Survey measures of delinquency and of drug use depend upon respondents reporting what are, in many cases, illegal acts. Thus, a critical question is whether such self-reports are likely to be valid. Like most studies dealing with these areas, the present study does not include direct, objective validation of the present measures; however, the considerable amount of inferential evidence which exists strongly suggests that the self-report questions produce largely valid data. A number of factors have given the investigators reasonable confidence about the validity of the responses to what are presumably among the most sensitive questions in the study: a low non-response rate on the drug questions; a large proportion admitting to some illicit drug use; the consistency of findings across several years of the present study; strong evidence of construct validity (based on relationships observed between variables); a close match between these data and the findings from other studies using other methods; and the findings from several methodological studies which have used objective validation methods.

As for others of the measures, a few have a long and venerable history -- as scholars of the relevant literature will recognize -- though some of these measures have been modified to fit the present questionnaire format. Many questions, however, have been developed specifically for this project through a process of question writing, pilot testing, pretesting, and question revision or elimination. Some have already been included in other publications from the study, but many have not; therefore, there exists little empirical evidence of their validity and reliability.

Accuracy of the Sample. A sample survey never can provide the same level of accuracy as would be obtained if the entire target population were to participate in the survey -- in the case of the present study, about three million seniors per year. But perfect

accuracy of this sort would be extremely expensive and certainly not worthwhile considering the fact that a high level of accuracy can be provided by a carefully designed probability sample. The accuracy of the sample in this study is affected both by the size of the student sample and by the number of schools in which they were clustered. For the purposes of this introduction, it is sufficient to note that virtually all estimates based on the total sample have confidence intervals of plus or minus 1.5 percentage points or smaller -- sometimes considerably smaller. This means that, had the project been able to invite all schools and all seniors in the 48 contiguous states to participate, the results from such a massive survey would be within an estimated 1.5 percentage points from the present sample findings 95 times out of 100. This is a quite high level of accuracy, and one that permits the detection of fairly small trends from one year to the next.

Because of the complex sampling design, standard means of assessing confidence intervals are not appropriate. The annual volumes from the project can provide information which allow the analyst to determine the confidence intervals around means and percentages for both the total sample and various subgroups. They also provide tables and guidelines for testing the statistical significance of differences between subgroups, and the significance of year-to-year changes.

Consistency and the Measurement of Trends. One other point is worth noting in a discussion of the validity of the findings. The Monitoring the Future project is, by intention, a study designed to be sensitive to changes from one time to another. Accordingly, the measures and procedures have been standardized and applied consistently across each data collection. To the extent that any biases remain because of limits in school and/or student participation, and to the extent that there are distortions (lack of validity) in the responses of some students, it seems very likely that such problems will exist in much the same way from one year to the next. In other words, biases in the survey estimates should tend to be consistent from one year to another, which means that the measurement of trends should be affected very little by such biases.

Interpreting Racial Differences. Ethnic identification is provided for the two largest racial/ethnic subgroups in the population -- those who identify themselves as white or Caucasian and those who identify themselves as black or Afro-American. Identification is not given for the other ethnic categories (American Indians, Asian Americans, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, or other Latin Americans) since each of these groups comprises less than three percent of the sample in any given year, which means that their small Ns (in combination with their clustered groupings in a limited number of schools) would yield estimates which would be too unreliable. In fact, even blacks -- who constitute approximately 12 percent of each year's sample -- are represented by only 350 to 425 respondents per year on any single questionnaire form. Further, because our sample is a stratified clustered sample, it yields less accuracy than would be yielded by a pure random sample of equal size (see Appendix B of the annual volumes for details). Therefore, because of the limited number

of cases, the margin of sampling error around any statistic describing blacks is larger than for most other subgroups.

There exists, however, a way to determine the replicability of any finding involving racial comparisons. Since most questions are repeated from year to year, one can readily establish the degree to which a finding is replicated by looking at the results in prior and subsequent years. Given the relatively small Ns for blacks, the analyst is urged to seek such replication before putting much faith in the reliability of any particular racial comparison.

There are factors in addition to reliability, however, which could be misleading in the interpretation of racial differences. Given the social importance which has been placed on various racial differences reported in the social science literature, the investigators would like to caution the analyst to consider the various factors which could account for differences. These factors fall into three categories: differential representation in the sample, differential response tendencies, and the confounding of race with a number of other background and demographic characteristics.

**Differential Representation.** Census data characterizing American young people in the approximate age range of those in this sample show somewhat lower proportions of blacks than whites remain in school through the end of the twelfth grade. Therefore, a slightly different segment of the black population than of the white population resides in the target population of high school seniors. Further, the samples appear to under-represent slightly those black males who, according to census figures, are in high school at the twelfth grade level. Identified black males comprise about 6 percent of the sample, whereas census data suggest that they should comprise around 7 percent. Therefore it appears that more black males are lost from the target population than white males or females of either race. This may be due to generally poorer attendance rates on the part of some black males and/or an unwillingness on the part of some to participate in data collections of this sort.

In sum, a smaller segment of the black population than of the white population of high school age is represented by the data contained here. Insofar as any characteristic is associated with being a school dropout or absentee, it is somewhat disproportionately under-represented among blacks in the sample.

**Differential Response Tendencies.** In examining the full range of variables, racial differences in response tendencies have been noted. First, the tendency to state agreement in response to agree-disagree questions is generally somewhat greater among blacks than among whites. For example, blacks tend to agree more with the positively worded items in the index of self-esteem, but they also tend to agree more with the negatively worded items. As it happens, that particular index has an equal number of positively and negatively worded items, so that any overall "agreement bias" should be self-cancelling when the index score is computed. However, group differences in agreement bias are likely to affect results on questions employing the agree-disagree format. Fortunately, most of the questions are not of that type.

There has also been observed a somewhat greater than average

tendency for black respondents to select extreme answer categories on attitudinal scales. For example, even if the same proportion of blacks as whites felt positively (or negatively) about some subject, fewer of the whites are likely to say they feel very positively (or negatively). The analyst should be aware that differences in responses to particular questions may be related to these more general tendencies.

A somewhat separate issue in response tendency is a respondent's willingness to answer particular questions. The missing data rate may reflect willingness to answer particular questions. If a particular question or set of questions has a missing data rate higher than is true for the prior set of questions, then presumably more respondents than usual were unwilling (or perhaps unable) to answer it. Such an exaggerated missing data rate exists for black males on the set of questions dealing with the respondent's own use of illicit drugs. Clearly a respondent's willingness to be candid on such questions depends on his or her trust of the research process and of the researchers themselves. The exaggerated missing data rates for black males in these sections may reflect, at least in part, less trust. The analyst is advised to check for exceptional levels of missing data when making comparisons on any variable in which candor is likely to be reduced by lower system trust. One bit of additional evidence related to trust in the research process is that higher proportions of blacks than whites reported that if they had used marijuana or heroin they would not have been willing to report it in the survey.

**Covariance with Other Factors.** Some characteristics such as race are highly confounded (correlated) with other variables -- variables which may in fact explain some observed racial differences. Put another way, at the aggregate level we might observe a considerable racial difference on some characteristic, but once we control for some background characteristic such as socio-economic level or region of the country -- that is, once we compare the black respondents with whites who come from similar backgrounds -- there may be no racial difference at all.

Race is correlated with important background and demographic variables. A higher proportion of blacks live in the South and a higher proportion grew up in families with the mother and/or father absent, and more had mothers who worked while they were growing up. A substantially higher proportion of blacks are Baptists, and blacks tend to attribute more importance to religion than do whites. Fewer are enrolled in a college-preparatory curriculum (though a higher proportion say they plan to attend some type of college). A slightly higher proportion of black respondents are married and have children, and on the average they are slightly older than the white sample. As was mentioned earlier, black males are more under-represented in the sample than black females, with the result that each year roughly 58 percent of the black sample is female versus roughly 51 percent of the white sample.

These differences in background, demographic, and ascriptive characteristics are noted because, in any attempt to understand why a racial difference exists, one would want to be able to examine the role of these covarying characteristics.

#### Codebook Information

The codebook available for this study is not of the usual sort created by ICPSR. Rather, it is an edited version of the frequency tabulations presented in the annual ISR volumes. Consequently, the user should note that the N sizes and percentage distributions in it are for non-missing data only, and that no information at all is provided regarding the code values or frequencies of missing data codes.

#### Processing Information

In order to protect the confidentiality of responses and the identity of respondents, a number of alterations and omissions have been made in the original dataset to prepare it for public release. Some questions have been eliminated from the dataset altogether (e.g., birth month and school, city, state, and student i.d. numbers, previously Ref. Nos. 2, 6-12, 14-15, and 149). Two other items have been left in the dataset but altered to "collapsed" or "bracketed" forms. Race (Ref. No. 151) is now grouped as white/non-white/missing data. Sampling weight (Ref. No. 5), which originally had a distinct value for each school, now is assigned one of six grouped values. Users interested in analyses involving these items in their original form should contact the investigators.

#### Weighting Information

The change in the values of the weight variable (Ref. No. 5) noted above has, of course, consequences for the N sizes and percentage distributions in the Codebook and dataset. The codebook distributions were generated using the old, full weight values, and therefore do NOT reflect what a user can find in the dataset available for public distribution, however, ICPSR spot-checks indicate that the effects of the sampling weight change are minor, nearly always below .2 percent.

#### File Structure

The data are available from ICPSR as six OSIRIS III logical record length, or as card-image, datasets. Each dataset consists of a dictionary containing all technical information for each variable in the corresponding datafile, and the datafile itself. The datasets are organized by the form number (questionnaire version) used:

form	#variables	logical record length	unweighted N	weighted N
Core	116	129	16662	16654
1	614	627	3365	3374
2	328	341	3347	3348
3	353	366	3305	3295
4	293	307	3329	3330
5	322	335	3316	3308

The OSIRIS datafile can be accessed directly by software packages which do not use the OSIRIS dictionary by specifying the tape locations of the desired variables, which are indicated by the column headed "LOC" in the dictionaries.

#### Additional Information

More detailed information on the methodology of the Monitoring the Future Project may be found in the annual ISR volumes on the project. The 1979 volume is:

Lloyd D. Johnston, Jerald G. Bachman, and Patrick M. O'Malley, Monitoring the Future: Questionnaire Responses from the Nation's High School Seniors, 1979, Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, 1980.

The same authors have published similar volumes, with the same title, for the years 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1980 and 1981. In addition, the project has published the following Occasional Papers:

1. J.G. Bachman and L.D. Johnston, The Monitoring the Future Project: Design and Procedures, 1978
2. A.R. Herzog, J.G. Bachman, and L.D. Johnston, Concern for Others and Its Relationship to Specific Attitudes on Race Relations, Sex Roles, Ecology, and Population Control, 1978
3. A.R. Herzog, J.G. Bachman, and L.D. Johnston, High School Seniors' Preferences for Sharing Work and Family Responsibilities Between Husband and Wife, 1979
4. J.G. Bachman and L.D. Johnston, Fewer Rebels, Fewer Causes: A Profile of Today's College Freshmen, 1979
5. J.G. Bachman, P.M. O'Malley, and L.D. Johnston, Developing Composite Measures of Drug Use: Comparisons Among Lifetime, Annual, and Prevalence Reports for Thirteen Classes of Drugs, 1979



6. A.R. Herzog and J.G. Bachman, Description of a Special Survey Using a Single Combined Form of the Monitoring the Future Questionnaires, 1979

7. J.D. Miller and J.G. Bachman, Ecological Concerns among High School Seniors: 1976-1979, 1980

8. J.G. Bachman, P.M. O'Malley, and L.D. Johnston, Correlates of Drug Use, Part I: Selected Measures of Background, Recent Experience, and Lifestyle Orientations, 1980

Information on these volumes can be obtained from ISR Publications Sales, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI 48106.

The National Clearinghouse for Drug Abuse Information has also published several summaries of the drug use information from the project:

L.D. Johnston, J.G. Bachman, and P.M. O'Malley, Drug Use among American High School Students, 1975-1980 (DHEW Publication No. ADM 82-1208), 1981

\_\_\_\_\_, Highlights from Drug Use among American High School Students, 1975-1977 (DHEW Publication No. ADM 78-621), 1978

\_\_\_\_\_, Drugs and the Class of 1978: Behaviors, Attitudes, and Recent National Trends (DHEW Publication ADM 79-877), 1979

\_\_\_\_\_, Highlights from Drugs and the Class of 1978: Behaviors, Attitudes, and Recent National Trends (DHEW Publication No. ADM 79-878), 1979

\_\_\_\_\_, 1979 Highlights: Drugs and the Nation's High School Students, Five Year National Trends (DHEW Publication No. ADM 80-930), 1980

Single copies of these studies can be obtained at no charge from National Clearinghouse for Drug Abuse Information, NIDA, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857.

**END**