

# **National Study of Delinquency Prevention in Schools**

## **Appendix B Additional Information on Response Rates**

Final Report, Grant No. 96-MU-MU-0008

July 2000

Gary D. Gottfredson, Denise C. Gottfredson, Ellen R. Czeh  
Gottfredson Associates, Inc.

David Cantor, Scott B. Crosse, Irene Hantman  
Westat

**GOTTFREDSON ASSOCIATES, INC.**  
3239 B Corporate Court @Ellicott City, Maryland 21042  
(410) 461-5530 @<http://www.gottfredson.com>

Copyright © 2000 Gottfredson Associates, Inc. All rights reserved. Not to be reproduced in whole or in part by any process without written permission of Gottfredson Associates, Inc.

## **B. Additional Information on Response Rates**

Information about response rates for the phase 1 and 2 principal surveys, teacher and student surveys, and activity coordinator surveys is provided in Chapter 1. Tables in the present Appendix supplement information provided in the text of the report by providing information about school and community characteristics correlated with participation in surveys, tabulating the reasons articulated by principals for refusing to participate in the phase 1 survey (the gateway survey for all other surveys), and by providing details on the discretionary prevention activity survey. This appendix also provides information about the location of schools in the sample according to the file used to draw the sample and the actual location of the schools when we determined that the initial classification was incorrect.

In this and subsequent appendices, tables are numbered by indicating the appendix letter, the text chapter first making reference to the appendix Table, and a sequential number within that chapter. For example, the first table in this appendix is identified as Table B1.1, which means that this table was the first appendix table mentioned in Chapter 1. Tables not mentioned in any text chapter follow tables mentioned in the text and are numbered as if first mentioned in (the nonexistent) Chapter 8.

Correlations between characteristics of the school or of the community within which the school is located (based on zip code level aggregations of 1990 census data) and participation in the study's various survey components are displayed in Table B1.1. Proportion of population urban and urban location are seen to be robust negative correlates of participation. School auspices (public, Catholic, or private sectarian or nonsectarian) is also strongly associated with participation rates, as was shown in text Table 1.7.

The reasons given by principals for refusing to participate in the phase 1 principal survey are tabulated in Table B1.2. This information is based on the reports only of principals who affirmatively refused, as we did not seek this information from principals who passively refused participation (i.e., simply did not participate without ever indicating refusal).

In preparation for the phase 2 surveys we sought an indication from principals about the current status of discretionary prevention activities identified in the phase 1 survey. In phase 2, we sought a description only of activities actually in existence in the schools at the time of the survey. We were unable to determine the current status of all of the sampled activities prior to survey time, but of those whose continued existence could be verified, 86% were still in existence. The first pair of columns in Table B4.1 shows details according to activity type. We sought completed questionnaires from sampled activities which we determined still to exist and from activities whose current status could not be determined. The second pair of columns in Table B4.1 shows that the overall completion rate was 52% and shows that the completion rate did not differ much by type of activity.

As noted in the text, a very small number of the 1287 entities sampled turned out not to be a

school, to be closed, or to be a school serving a different span of grade levels than expected. At least 5% of the schools did not have the metropolitan status expected. The urbanicity strata are based on a classification of locale codes assigned by the National Center for Education Statistics (undated). NCES assigned these codes based on the school's mailing address. The locale definitions and their relation to the present urban/suburban/rural designation are as follows:

### Urban

**Large City:** Central city of a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) with a population greater than or equal to 400,000 or population density greater than or equal to 6,000 people per square mile.

**Mid-size City:** Central City of an MSA with a population less than 400,000 and a population density less than 6,000 people per square mile.

### Suburban

**Urban Fringe of Large City:** Place within an MSA of a Large Central City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau.

**Urban Fringe of Mid-size City:** Place within an MSA of a Mid-size Central City and defined as urban by the Census Bureau.

### Rural

**Large Town:** Town not within an MSA, with a population greater than or equal to 25,000.

**Small Town:** Town not within an MSA and with a population less than 25,000 and greater than or equal to 2,500 people.

**Rural:** A place with less than 2,500 people and coded rural by the Census Bureau.

We fortuitously discovered a school which was obviously misclassified as to location. In investigating this problem we discovered additional schools misclassified according to location. Suspecting a general problem with the CCD locale classification, we merged census data on percentage urban for the zip code area with the school file to identify schools where the percentage urban according to the Census Bureau did not match the CCD locale classification. When we discovered a locale misclassification, we reclassified it. This resulted in a change of the metropolitan classification for 5% of the schools. Because we explicitly examined only those schools flagged by a percent urban-locale mismatch, it is possible that we failed to identify some misclassified schools, although it is unlikely that we failed to detect gross misclassifications.

Table B8.1 shows the result of the reclassification of school location.

Because the CCD is used in a great deal of school research, it is possible that errors in the locale codes may have non-trivial effects on that research. NCES personnel are aware of classification errors in earlier versions of the CCD and indicate that these are being or have been corrected in newer releases of the CCD.

Response rate tables presented in Chapter 1 and results shown throughout the report are based on the corrected school locations.

Table B1.1

*Correlations of School and Community Characteristics With Participation in Principal, Teacher, and Student Surveys*

School or community characteristic	Elementary			Middle/Junior					High, vocational, comprehensive				
	PQ1	PQ2	AD	PQ1	PQ2	AD	TQ	SQ	PQ1	PQ2	AD	TQ	SQ
Enrollment according to mailing list vendor	-02	01	-01	-11*	-01	-08	00	01	-06	-03	-06	-01	03
% Free lunch calculated from CCD, much missing data	-06	-01	01	-03	02	00	02	-01	06	13	02	18*	14
Percent students Black, CCD	02	03	04	-10	-09	-11*	-07	-10	-12	-03	-11	03	04
Percent students Hispanic, CCD	-13*	-06	-10	-04	-08	00	-08	-07	00	01	03	04	01
Location <sup>a</sup>	12*	10*	09	06	10*	04	11*	12*	12*	16**	14**	12*	14**
Percent population Black, 1990 census	-03	01	01	-12*	-09	-13**	-09	-08	02	06	02	07	06
Proportion of population with some college	-09	-11*	-09	06	-03	04	-04	-06	-10*	-16**	-15**	-14**	-14**
Proportion housing units owner occupied	16**	11*	09	14**	13**	16**	16**	16**	06	08	08	04	00
Male unemployment rate	-04	01	-02	-11*	-04	-10*	-06	-04	05	06	06	10*	03
Households with public assistance income	-03	-01	00	-12*	-08	-12*	-10*	-07	04	08	06	13**	09
Proportion of population urban	-16**	-12*	-13**	-08	-08	-06	-09	-11*	-12*	-17**	-15**	-15**	-11*
Female headed households with children	-11*	-04	-06	-09	-09	-10*	-11*	-10*	01	01	01	04	01

*Note.* 1990 census variables are based on school zip code area. Decimal points are omitted. PQ1 = Phase 1 Principal Questionnaire. PQ2 = Phase 2 Principal Questionnaire. AD = Activity Detail Booklet. TQ = Teacher Questionnaire. SQ = Student Questionnaire. CCD = Common Core of Data. For TQ and SQ, a school participated if a usable number of teacher or student questionnaires were completed.

<sup>a</sup> Location coded 1 = large central city, 2 = mid-size central city, 3 = urban fringe of large city, 4 = urban fringe of mid-size city, 5 = large town, 6 = small town, 7 = rural.

\*  $p < .05$

\*\*  $p < .01$

Table B1.2

*Reasons for Refusals in Phase 1 Principal Survey*

Reason articulated	Frequency
Too busy/no time	95
No reason/doesn't want to	89
Not interested	41
Survey too lengthy	30
No support staff	28
Personnel changes	20
District/School Board refuses to allow participation	15
Too many surveys	13
Doesn't apply to their school	9
School/personal policy not to participate in surveys	4
Not mandatory	3
Bad timing of receipt of surveys	3
Doesn't want to give out names	3
Invasion of privacy	1
Bad experience with previous surveys	1
Having surgery	1
Pick another school	1
Inappropriate and beyond the scope of the needs of the study	1

*Note.*  $N = 302$  refusals. Total adds to more than 302 because refusers sometimes gave more than one reason for refusal.

Table B4.1

*Percentage of Activities Still in Existence at Phase 2 Survey Time and Response Rate, by Activity Category*

Activity category	Of activities whose existence could be determined:		Of activities for which a response was sought:	
	% existing	<i>n</i>	% responding	<i>n</i>
Activity type				
Prevention curriculum, instruction or training	87	566	55	670
Behavior programming or behavior modification	82	435	55	484
Counseling, social work, psychological or therapeutic activity	92	510	56	654
Mentoring, tutoring, coaching, apprenticeship	89	401	52	496
Recreation, enrichment, or leisure activity	88	418	49	500
Improvement to instructional practices/methods	87	407	51	493
Classroom organization and management	84	370	51	434
Culture, climate or expectations	89	461	54	567
Intergroup relations and school-community interaction	86	393	47	494
Planning structure or management of change	87	381	50	476
Security & surveillance	89	382	55	479
Services/programs for family members	83	342	49	405
External personnel resources for classroom	84	484	51	565
Youth participation in discipline	79	313	48	357
Part of a multi-component activity	88	1108	53	1323
Celebrity program	88	631	56	753
Total	86	5863	52	7104

*Note* — Left columns show activities still in existence as a percentage of those activities whose existence could be verified (total  $N = 5863$ ). Existence could not be verified for 27% of activities. Right columns show responses as a percentage of those activities (total  $N = 7104$ ) for which descriptions were sought. This includes activities whose continuing existence could not be verified.

Table B8.1

*Metropolitan Status of Schools in the Sample According to the Mailing List Vendor and As Revised*

Metropolitan status coded at time of sampling	Revised metropolitan status		
	Urban	Suburban	Rural
Urban	411	13	5
Suburban	10	404	15
Rural	7	14	408

*Note.* The source of mailing list vendor's classification was the Common Core of Data. Reclassification is based on urbanicity as determined by an inspection of 1990 census information for the zip code in which the school is located.