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**B. Collections of Information Employing Statistical Methods**

**B.1. Respondent Universe and Sampling Methods**

The following table displays the number of individuals that will be invited to participate in the different information collection tasks:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Concept Mapping Participation Targets** | | | | | | |
| **Task** |  |  | Teens  (14-18) | Young Adults  (19-22) | Adults | Total task target |
| Brainstorming | 100 |  |  | 100 | 100 | 300 |
| Sorting | 50 |  |  | 50 | 50 | 150 |
| Rating | 125 |  |  | 125 | 125 | 375 |
| **Total group target** |  |  |  |  |  | **375** |
| **Facilitated Discussion Participation Targets** | | | | | | |
| **Suggested location** |  | Teens  (14-18) | | Young Adults  (19-22) | Adults | Total regional  target |
| Washington, DC |  | 10 |  | 10 | 20 | 40 |
| Atlanta |  | 10 |  | 10 | 20 | 40 |
| Chicago or Kansas  City |  | 10 |  | 10 | 20 | 40 |
| San Francisco |  | 10 |  | 10 | 20 | 40 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total group target** | **0 40** | **40** | **80** | **160** |

This information collection will not require purposefully sampling on the basis of any specific social demographics other than age, although every effort will be made to include youth representing various demographic groups (e.g., racial, ethnic, SES, religious, sexual minority). As such, the target numbers for each age-group were selected to allow for a range of views from youth and young adults of varying backgrounds and adults with a range of professional experiences.

**B.2. Procedures for the Collection of Information**

The information collection approach for this project will be to purposefully sample on the basis of heterogeneity, which is to non-randomly select a broad range of persons who are likely to reflect the full range of ideas as possible that are relevant to the topic under investigation. However, the adequacy of ideas captured is dependent upon whether there is a match between the focus and the participants selected to participate. We are not expecting that the results will be generalizable to the youth and adult populations at large; however, we will be looking for saturation of the topic, as bounded by the participant groups. Thus, we anticipate that in the brainstorming task, we will reach a point at which there will be a fair amount of redundancy and some homeostasis in the topic. The goal is to achieve a broad sampling of ideas rather than a representative sample of individuals. Youth respondents will be recruited through youth-serving organizations with collective access to a diverse group of youth ages 14-22 recommended by members of the project Planning and Advisory Groups. These groups will be selected in part through

a nomination process that solicited recommendations for organizations from the project’s Planning and Advisory Groups. Within this group of youth serving organizations, we are looking to purposefully stratify our sample by age across two age groups: 14-18 (teens) and 19-22 (young adult), to capture the variation of perspectives as they may be influenced by age. The organizations that will be used for recruitment purposes will be instructed by the research team to recruit a specific number of youth within

the specific age ranges for participation in each activity (see Appendices B1-B3). Inclusion of youth participants will be based on a first-come-first-serve criterion; those youth who are first to respond to the organizational representatives’ advertisements will have the opportunity to participate. In addition, adult participants will be selected from Planning and Advisory Group nominations, based on the relevance of their professional roles to the youth population and their relationships (e.g., practitioners, teachers, advocates, researchers).

In terms of quality control, the sorting, rating and demographic/background data will be gathered directly over the web, thus eliminating any concerns about mis-entering or mis-reading handwritten data. The software has some constraints built in that prevent errors in the data entry. For example, because this is an unstructured forced-choice sort method (Weller & Romney, 1988), the software does not allow a statement to be placed in more than one group simultaneously. For the ratings, the software only allows legitimate entries (e.g., the integers 1-to-5). Before any participant data can be used in data analysis, the

software requires that the concept map analyst visually inspect the data and indicate by checking a setting that the data are complete and useable. Without this check, the participant’s data will not appear in any subsequent screen that calls for data analysis. Because the Concept System® software was designed expressly to accomplish the concept mapping process and analysis, there is no danger that the statistical analysis procedure might be mis-specified by the analyst.

**B.3. Methods to Maximize Response Rates and Deal with Non-Response**

The brainstorming task will be conducted completely anonymously for all respondents. The number of statements elicited in response to the focus prompt will be measureable. However, there will be no way to determine the actual response rate, as respondents will be able to provide as many statements as they choose without any way to identify which respondents provided which statements. One limitation of the concept mapping method is that there is an inherent bias, such that the most motivated participants will provide the majority of the statements that the rest of the group will be asked to sort and rate.

The response rates for sorting and rating will be calculated over the course of the information collection, as the project website administrators will be able to monitor the progress of each participant according to their username. To maximize response rates for brainstorming, sorting and rating, a reminder notice will be e-mailed to all invited adult respondents at multiple points during the period for each task. Response rates for youth invited to participate in the sorting and rating also will be maximized by offering the incentives described in section A9 of this supporting statement, and by asking youth-serving organization representatives to remind youth participants to complete the activities. In addition, because the use of incentives to maximize completion of the sorting and rating tasks, we anticipate that our response rates will be higher than the estimates outlined in section B1 above.

The facilitated discussion response rate will be calculated based on how many invitees (10-14 per discussion) actually attend. Attendance rates will be maximized by sending invitees reminders of the discussions in advance of the sessions.

**B.4. Test of Procedures or Methods to be Undertaken**

Not applicable. No tests of procedures or methods will be undertaken.

**B.5. Individuals Consulted on Statistical Aspects and Individuals Collection and/or Analyzing Data**

Concept Systems, Inc. (CSI) is the contractor that will be consulted on statistical aspects of the design, and will collect and analyze the information for the agency. Individuals from CSI who will be contributing to the statistical design and analysis are as follows:

i. Mary Kane, Principal Consultant ii. Scott Rosas, Senior Consultant

iii. Alyssa Goldman, Project Manager iv. Jennifer Royer, Junior Consultant

These individuals can be reached by telephone at (607) 272-1206.

The NIJ staff listed below will be involved with statistical analysis or interpretation. All of them can be reached at (202) 307-2942.

i. Carrie Mulford, Social Science Analyst

ii. Dara Blachman-Demner, Social Science Analyst iii. Jaclyn Smith, Research Assistant
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