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The 2012 Update field test was designed to be a brief survey conducted between the first and second follow-ups to learn about students' plans after high school. In this summary of the field test, results are provided for data collection, the use of the Mahalanobis distance function to minimize nonresponse bias, and the validation study conducted to test the reliability of parent and student responses to the questionnaire. Field test results will be included as an appendix in the 2013 Update/Transcript Data File Documentation (DFD).

## Data Collection Results

The purpose of the 2012 Update field test was to test procedures for having either the student or parent complete a 20-minute questionnaire about the student's plans for the fall of 2012 and beyond. Data collection was conducted in three phases:

- Phase 1 consisted of a two week web-only period.
- Phase 2 was a three week period (weeks 3 through 5) with telephone prompting and outbound interviewing added to web data collection.
- Phase 3 comprised the remainder of data collection (weeks 6 through 15) with the introduction of incentives for high-distance cases based on a Mahalanobis distance score calculation at the start of the phase.
For 69 percent of nonresponding cases at the start of Phase 3, a $\$ 5$ pre-paid incentive was mailed to the sample member with the promise of an additional $\$ 10$ incentive for completing the questionnaire. The remaining cases received no incentive.

Response rates and mode of response for the 2012 Update are provided in Table 5.1. Overall, 68 percent of sample members responded to the 2012 Update. The students provided 57 percent of the responses compared to 43 percent parent responses. Both students and parents were more likely to participate via Web than telephone. Table 5.2 shows response by enrollment status as of the first follow-up. Of the students still enrolled at the base-year school as of the first follow-up, 74 percent participated. Students or parents of transfer students had a response rate of 49 percent. Due to small sample sizes, students who had dropped out of school, graduated early, were home-schooled, or had an unknown status were grouped together and 65 percent participated.

Table 5.1. 2012 Update response rates by sample member, first follow-up enrollment status, and mode of completion

|  | Number of sample <br> members | Percentage of sample <br> members |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total Sample | 754 | 100 |
| Overall response | 514 | 68.2 |
| Student | 292 | 56.8 |
| Web | 159 | 54.5 |
| CATI | 133 | 45.5 |
| Parent | 222 | 43.2 |
| Web | 141 | 63.5 |
| CATI | 81 | 36.5 |
| Mode |  |  |
| Web | 300 | 58.4 |
| CATI | 214 | 41.6 |

Table 5.2. 2012 Update response rates by first follow-up enrollment status

|  | Total sample <br> members | Number <br> responding | Percent <br> responding |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total | 754 | 514 | 68.2 |
| $\quad$ Enrolled at base-year school | 537 | 398 | 74.1 |
| Transferred | 157 | 77 | 49.0 |
| Other/Unknown | 60 | 39 | 65.0 |

## Mahalanobis Distance Function

The 2012 Update field test utilized a responsive design methodology to strategically target nonresponse cases that could potentially contribute to bias if they remained nonrespondents. The methodology centered on identifying nonrespondent cases most unlike respondent cases, and targeting these nonresponding cases in a manner that was intended to increase the likelihood that they would become respondents. A Mahalanobis distance function score was used to rank nonresponding cases in terms of their overall difference from existing respondents.

A combination of survey variables, sample frame variables, and paradata were used in building the model to select target cases. Both student- and parent-level variables were considered for use in the Mahalanobis distance calculations. The variables used to calculate Mahalanobis distance are shown in Table 5.3.

Additional survey variables were considered (performance on the assessment, educational expectations, etc...) for the models, but many of the candidate variables had a large number of unknown values for cases in the field test sample. Imputing missing values for survey variables was ruled out due to the high level of missing values. At the time of calculating the Mahalanobis distance, 210 parent cases had responded, leaving 544 pending cases that were available for consideration for nonresponse follow up period. The 375 highest-distance nonrespondents were selected as the target cases for Phase 3. These 375 targeted cases had a mean Mahalanobis value of 8.33. Non-targeted non responding cases had a mean Mahalanobis value of 5.75. Phase 3 targeted cases and non-targeted cases had response rates ( 54 percent and 59 percent, respectively) that were not statistically different ( $\mathrm{x}^{2}=1.08, \mathrm{p}=.2996$ ). This may suggest that the phase 3 pre-paid $\$ 5$ incentive with the offer of $\$ 10$ more upon completion may have had some effect in encouraging participation from the targeted group of cases, given that they were likely more challenging. Table 5.4 shows the response by phase of data collection.

Table 5.3. Variables used for calculation of Mahalanobis Distance

| Source | Variables |
| :--- | :--- |
| Survey variables | Enrollment status <br> Gender |
| Sample frame variables | School type <br> Metro area <br> Race |
| Paradata | Whether sample member contacted the help desk <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> Whether sample member logged in but did not complete <br> the College Update questionnaire <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> Number of contact attempts in the early data collection <br> period <br> Whether sample member made an appointment to <br> complete the interview <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> Whether sample member told interviewer they would do <br> the web interview <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> Student base year and first follow-up response outcomes <br> Parent base year and first follow-up response outcomes <br> Parent response in the panel maintenance update <br> Student enrollment status at first follow-up <br>  <br>  <br> Reason for prior student nonresponse (refusal, absent) if <br> applicable <br> Call counts in base year and first follow-up |

Table 5.4. 2012 Update field test response by data collection phase

|  | Total | Participated | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 754 | 514 | 68.2 |
| Phase 1 | 754 | 81 | 10.7 |
| Phase 2 | 673 | 129 | 17.1 |
| Phase 3 | 544 | 304 | 55.9 |
| High Distance | 375 | 204 | 54.4 |
| Low distance | 169 | 100 | 59.2 |

The primary goal of offering an incentive to cases with high Mahalanobis distance scores is to reduce the potential for nonresponse bias in key survey estimates. Key survey estimates were examined for indications of reduced nonresponse bias resulting from the third phase of data collection. To do this, estimates produced from the combined set of respondents including phase 1 , phase 2 and the non-targeted phase 3 respondents were compared against the full respondent set that also includes the phase 3 respondents. Non-targeted and targeted cases were also compared to determine if differences existed between these sets of cases. Five key variables were analyzed: 1) earned a high school diploma, 2) taking classes at a college or university, 3) applied to college, 4) completed a FAFSA, and 5) currently working. Differences in estimates would suggest that the incentives offered in Phase 3 were effective in lowering the potential for bias by capturing responses from sample members who would otherwise have not participated. The estimates are shown in Table 5.4.

An examination of the estimates shows that the targeted cases who responded were less likely than the non-targeted cases to have earned a high school diploma, less likely to be taking college or university classes, less likely to have applied to a postsecondary institution, less likely to have completed a FAFSA, and more likely to be working. All these differences in point estimates were significant at the .05 level. The Mahalanobis distance function identified cases that were different, but importantly, these identified and targeted cases appear different in their survey responses. Examining these estimates suggests that the high-distance cases were a good choice of nonresponding cases to target. While the estimates of the targeted cases that participated look different from the overall set of respondent estimates, the non-targeted phase-3 cases that participated look more similar to the overall respondent set. Targeting the nonresponding non-targeted set of cases would likely have brought into the respondent pool cases that look similar to those who had already been interviewed, a nonresponse follow-up scenario that is not advisable (Schouten, Cobben, and Bethlehem, 2009).

Table 5.5. Survey estimates with and without phase 3 respondents

| Variable | Phase 3 <br> targeted <br> cases (n = <br> 201) | Phase 3 <br> non <br> targeted <br> cases <br> $(n=84)$ | Phase 1, phase 2 <br> and phase 3 non <br> targeted cases <br> (without phase 3 <br> targeted cases, $n$ <br> $=313)$ | Overall <br> estimate <br> $(n=514)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Earned a high school <br> diploma | 84.6 | 94.0 | 96.5 | 91.8 |
| Did not earn a high school <br> diploma | 15.4 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 8.2 |
| Taking classes at a <br> postsecondary institution | 68.7 | 85.7 | 87.5 | 80.2 |
| Applied to postsecondary <br> institution(s) | 36.3 | 54.8 | 61.7 | 51.8 |
| Completed a FAFSA | 62.7 | 81.0 | 77.3 | 71.6 |
| Currently working | 56.2 | 42.7 | 47.6 | 50.1 |

## Validation Study

In addition to the primary data collection, a validation study was conducted to determine the reliability between student and parent responses on the same items. The 2012 Update interview was designed to be administered to either the teenage sample member or one of his/her parents. When selecting items for the instrument, preference was given to factual questions that could be answered by either the teenager or the parent and had the highest likelihood of consistent teenager-parent responses. However, some important questions that were subjective in nature were included as well.

To evaluate consistency of responses, the complete interview was conducted with both the student and one of his/her parents for 112 pairs. At the beginning of the data collection cycle, student and parent respondents who reached the end of the interview were asked to provide contact information for the other (i.e., students were asked to provide parent contact information and parents were asked to provide student contact information) so that RTI could follow up for the validation study. Student-parent pairs were recruited regardless of the mode of the first interview, self-administered web interview or CATI. RTI then attempted to contact and
interview the other or encourage completion by web. When at least 100 pairs of completed interviews had been achieved, participants were no longer recruited.

For analysis of the results, before the percentage agreement was calculated for a variable, cases with a "don't know" response or a nonresponse to the question were eliminated from the analysis. In other words, both the student and the parent had to have a response other than "don't know" to be considered a valid pair for comparison. Additionally, continuous variables were categorized and job earnings were placed on the same scale (annual earnings). When questions pertained to a particular institution named by the respondent, care was taken to only compare responses when the institutions named by the student and the parent were the same. When the two respondents listed the same schools but in a different order, the responses were matched up by institution before comparison.

Many of the items in the 2012 Update provided an explicit "don’t know" option for students and parents. However, students and parents who did not know may have also left the question unanswered. Therefore, for the comparison of the percentage of "don't know" responses, both explicit and implicit forms of "don't know" were counted. Cases where an item was legitimately skipped based on instrument routing were excluded from the analysis.

Results from the validation study analysis are presented in table 5.6. The table presents the number of valid student-parent pairs, the percent agreement within valid pairs, and the percent of students and parents who either answered with a "don't know" category, or left the item missing. In summary, 108 items had sufficient and appropriate data to conduct an analysis. Among the 108 items, 45 items ( 41.7 percent) had at least 85 percent of valid pairs giving the same answer, 36 items ( 33.3 percent) had 70 to 84.9 percent of valid pairs in agreement, and 27 items ( 25 percent) had less than 70 percent of pairs in agreement. Furthermore, 78 items ( 72.2 percent) had less than 10 percent of students answering "don't know" or skipping the item, while 30 items ( 27.8 percent) had 10 percent or more of respondents answering "don't know" or skipping the item. Among parents, 66 items ( 61.1 percent) had less than 10 percent of respondents who answered "don't know" or skipped the item, and 42 items ( 38.9 percent) that had 10 percent or more "don't know" or nonresponse.

Results from the analysis were presented to the Technical Review Panel. Along with the results from the analysis, additional measures of distribution, and expert knowledge of the content, the Technical Review Panel reviewed the instrument and made recommendations for the 2013 Update instrument, which have been incorporated into the main study design.

Table 5.6. Percent agreement of valid pairs and percent of students and parents who did not answer item

| Variable name | Variable label | Number of valid pairs | Percent agreement of valid pairs | Percent of respondent who answered don't know or did not answer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Student | Parent |
| CUHSCRED | Earned high school credential and credential type | 112 | 97.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| HSCREDDATE | Combined month and year high school credential awarded (recode) | 108 | 88.9 | 2.7 | 0.9 |
| CUENROLLHS12 | High school enrollment status | \# | \# | \# | \# |
| CULASTHSMO | Month last attended high school | \# | \# | \# | \# |
| CULASTHSYR | Year last attended high school | \# | \# | \# | \# |
| CULASTHS | Last attended BY school, F1 school or another school | 111 | 100.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 |
| CULASTHSNAME | Name of high school last attended | \# | \# | \# | \# |
| CUOTHHS | Has attended any other high school besides BY school \& most recent | 110 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 |
| CUOTHHSNAME | Name of other high school attended | \# | \# | \# | \# |
| CUOTHERHS | Attended any other high schools | \# | \# | \# | \# |
| CUDUALMATH | Has taken a math course for college credit | 91 | 81.3 | 8.9 | 13.4 |
| CUDUALSCIENCE | Has taken a science course for college credit | 90 | 83.3 | 9.8 | 13.4 |
| CUDUALOTHER | Has taken a course in another subject for college credit | 105 | 84.8 | 1.8 | 4.5 |
| CUCLGUNIV | Taking classes at a college or university in fall 2012 | 107 | 97.2 | 4.5 | 0.0 |
| CUOCCSCHOOL | Taking classes at a school for occupational training in fall 2012 | 91 | 84.6 | 10.7 | 9.8 |
| CUCERTLIC | Studying for an industry certification or license in fall 2012 | 91 | 92.3 | 12.5 | 6.3 |
| CUAPPRENTICE | Participating in an apprenticeship program in fall 2012 | 91 | 98.9 | 11.6 | 9.8 |
| CUOTHTRAIN | Receiving another form of training in fall 2012 | 93 | 93.6 | 8.0 | 8.9 |
| CUWORK | Working in fall 2012 | 83 | 69.9 | 16.1 | 10.7 |
| CUMILITARY | Serving in the military fall 2012 | 100 | 99.0 | 1.8 | 8.9 |
| CUFAMILY | Starting a family or taking care of children in fall 2012 | 103 | 99.0 | 0.9 | 7.1 |
| CUHS | Attending high school in fall 2012 | \# | \# | \# | \# |
| CUGEDCOURSE | Attending a GED completion course in fall 2012 | \# | \# | \# | \# |
| CUFOCUS | Teenager's main focus in fall 2012 | 27 | 92.6 | 0.0 | 4.5 |


| Variable name | Variable label | Number of valid pairs | Percent agreement of valid pairs | Percent of respondent who answered don't know or did not answer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Student | Parent |
| CUBACHELOR | Enrolling in Bachelor's degree program | 100 | 92.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| CUAABA | Enrolling in Associate's degree program-plans to transfer to BA/BS | 100 | 91.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| CUAANOBA | Enrolling in Associate's degree program-no plans to transfer to BA/BS | 100 | 99.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| CUCERTPROG | Enrolling in certificate/diploma program at school providing occupational training | 100 | 99.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| CUNOPROG | Not enrolling in program, just taking classes | 100 | 96.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| CUOTHPROG | Enrolling in another type of program | 100 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| CUDK | Don't know what type of program will enroll in | 100 | 97.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| CUCLGFT | Enrolling full-time or part-time | 95 | 96.8 | 6.7 | 1.0 |
| CUCLGIPEDS | Fall 2012 postsecondary institution | 91 | 98.9 | 1.0 | 2.9 |
| CUMAJORGENO1 | Major in Fall 2012 postsecondary institution | 82 | 73.2 | 12.6 | 9.6 |
| CUWORKFT | Working full-time | 24 | 83.3 | 19.2 | 2.3 |
| CUACTDUTY | On active duty | \# | \# | \# | \# |
| CUAPPCLG | Applied to any (other) colleges | 112 | 76.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| CUCLGAPPNUM | Number of colleges applied to | 58 | 70.7 | 0.0 | 1.4 |
| CUAPP1IPEDS | (Other) college applied to-1 | 57 | 80.7 | 1.4 | 0.0 |
| CUAPP2IPEDS | (Other) college applied to - 2 | 45 | 57.8 | 8.1 | 5.4 |
| CUCHOICEAPP | First choice of schools applied to, not considering cost | 50 | 72.0 | 0.9 | 1.8 |
| CUAPP1STATUS | Status of application at (other) college applied to - 1 | 46 | 97.8 | 1.4 | 2.9 |
| CUAPP2STATUS | Status of application at (other) college applied to - 2 | 26 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| CUCHOICEACC | First choice of schools accepted to, not considering cost | 46 | 91.3 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| CUAPPFAFSA | Completed a FAFSA | 96 | 96.9 | 10.7 | 4.5 |
| CUNODEBT | Did not complete FAFSA because didn't want debt | 9 | 55.6 | 6.7 | 13.6 |
| CUCANAFFORD | Did not complete FAFSA because can afford college/school without it | 11 | 81.8 | 0.0 | 4.5 |
| CUINELIGIBLE | Did not complete FAFSA because thought ineligible/unqualified | 11 | 63.6 | 0.0 | 9.1 |
| CUDKHOW | Did not complete FAFSA because didn't have information on how to | 10 | 70.0 | 0.0 | 13.6 |
| CUFORMWORK | Did not complete FAFSA because too much work or time | 11 | 81.8 | 0.0 | 9.1 |


| Variable name | Variable label | Number <br> of valid <br> pairs | Percent agreement of valid pairs | Percent of respondent who answered don't know or did not answer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Student | Parent |
| CUDKCOULD | Did not complete FAFSA because didn't know could | 10 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 13.6 |
| CUNOPOSTSEC | Did not complete FAFSA because don't plan to continue education | 9 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 18.2 |
| CUNOQUALFAM | Thought would not qualify because another family member didn't qualify | 5 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 7.1 |
| CUNOQUALCRED | Thought would not qualify because of credit score | 5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
| CUNOQUALINC | Thought would not qualify because income is too high | 5 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 7.1 |
| CUNOQUALTEST | Thought would not qualify because grades or test scores too low | 5 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
| CUNOQUALPT | Thought would not qualify because will attend part-time | 5 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
| CUNOQUALOTH | Thought would not qualify for another reason | 4 | 75.0 | 16.7 | 21.4 |
| CUAPPOTHAID | Completed financial aid applications besides FAFSA | 75 | 86.7 | 21.4 | 13.4 |
| CUFLSTAFFORD | Fall 2012 college offered Stafford loan for first academic year | 41 | 80.5 | 36.6 | 22.1 |
| CUFLOTHLOAN | Fall 2012 college offered other loan for first academic year | 46 | 63.0 | 23.2 | 22.1 |
| CUFLWKSTD | Fall 2012 college offered work-study for first academic year | 46 | 84.8 | 17.1 | 22.1 |
| CUFLPELL | Fall 2012 college offered Pell grant for first academic year | 37 | 86.5 | 30.5 | 25.6 |
| CUFLOTHGRNT | Fall 2012 college offered other grant for first academic year | 59 | 79.7 | 11.0 | 12.8 |
| CUFLOTHAID | Fall 2012 college offered other financial aid for first academic year | 38 | 73.7 | 25.6 | 32.6 |
| CUFLNOAID | Fall 2012 college offered no financial aid for first academic year | 33 | 69.7 | 30.5 | 36.0 |
| CUCHSTAFFORD | First choice accepted college offered Stafford loan for 1st academic yr | 2 | 100.0 | 63.6 | 36.4 |
| CUCHOTHLOAN | First choice accepted college offered other loan for 1st academic yr | 3 | 100.0 | 18.2 | 36.4 |
| CUCHWKSTD | First choice accepted college offered work-study for 1st academic yr | 3 | 100.0 | 18.2 | 36.4 |
| CUCHPELL | First choice accepted college offered Pell grant for 1st academic yr | 1 | 100.0 | 45.5 | 45.5 |
| CUCHOTHGRNT | First choice accepted college offered other grant for 1st academic yr | 3 | 33.3 | 0.0 | 45.5 |
| CUCHOTHAID | First choice accepted college offered other financial aid for 1st academic yr | 1 | 100.0 | 27.3 | 45.5 |
| CUCHNOAID | First choice accepted college offered no financial aid for 1st academic yr | 3 | 33.3 | 18.2 | 36.4 |
| CUAIDANYCLG | Offered financial aid apart from offers from these schools | 103 | 72.8 | 5.4 | 2.7 |
| CUCOSTFALLCLG ${ }^{1}$ | Total cost of fall 2012 college for 2012-2013 school year | 86 | 76.7 | 12.6 | 6.7 |
| CUFALLBORROW ${ }^{1}$ | Amount will borrow to pay for fall 2012 college | 70 | 90.0 | 21.4 | 13.5 |


| Variable name | Variable label | Number of valid pairs | Percent agreement of valid pairs | Percent of respondent who answered don't know or did not answer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Student | Parent |
| CUFALLSCHOLAR ${ }^{1}$ | Amount will receive in scholarships and grants for fall 2012 college | 81 | 72.8 | 13.6 | 9.6 |
| CUCOSTCHOICE ${ }^{1}$ | Total cost of 1st choice accepted college for 2012-2013 school year | 7 | 42.9 | 18.8 | 16.7 |
| CUCHCBORROW ${ }^{1}$ | Amount would have borrowed to pay for 1st choice accepted college | 7 | 71.4 | 18.8 | 16.7 |
| CUCHCSCHOLAR ${ }^{1}$ | Amount would have received in scholarships and grants for 1st choice accepted | 7 | 57.1 | 12.5 | 16.7 |
| CUREPUTATION | Importance of academic quality/reputation when choosing fall 2012 college/school | 91 | 75.8 | 1.0 | 4.8 |
| CUCOSTATTEND | Importance of cost of attendance when choosing fall 2012 college/school | 72 | 75.0 | 1.9 | 1.9 |
| CUCLOSEHOME | Importance of being close to home when choosing fall 2012 college/school | 42 | 73.8 | 1.0 | 1.9 |
| CUFARHOME | Importance of being far from home when choosing fall 2012 college/school | 15 | 73.3 | 6.8 | 11.5 |
| CUJOBPLC | Importance of job placement when choosing fall 2012 college/school | 69 | 60.9 | 4.9 | 12.5 |
| CUGRADSCHPLC | Importance of graduate school placement when choosing fall 2012 college/school | 59 | 67.8 | 6.8 | 12.5 |
| CU4YRBAPLC | Importance of placement in 4-yr Bachelor's program when choosing fall 2012 | 61 | 57.4 | 8.7 | 19.2 |
| CUSPORTS | Importance of opportunity to play sports when choosing fall 2012 college/school | 14 | 71.4 | 4.9 | 4.8 |
| CURECOMMEND | Importance of family/friend recommendations when choosing fall 2012 college/school | 45 | 64.4 | 5.8 | 6.7 |
| CUOFFERSPGRM | Importance of program of study when choosing fall 2012 college/school | 80 | 76.3 | 2.9 | 4.8 |
| CUSOCIALLIFE | Importance of good social life when choosing fall 2012 college/school | 59 | 64.4 | 4.9 | 6.7 |
| CUWHERELIVE | Where student will live in fall 2012 | 101 | 95.1 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| CUDISLIKESCH | Not attending school in fall 2012 because does not like school | 6 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| CUDIDPOORLY | Not attending school in fall 2012 because did not do well in school | 6 | 83.3 | 0.0 | 12.5 |
| CUCANTAFFORD | Not attending school in fall 2012 because can't afford it | 6 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 12.5 |
| CURATHERWORK | Not attending school in fall 2012 because needs to/would rather work | 5 | 40.0 | 22.2 | 0.0 |
| CUNOTACCEPTED | Not attending school in fall 2012 because not accepted where wanted | 2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| CUBADOPTIONS | Not attending school in fall 2012 because did not want to go where accepted | 2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| CUDEFER | Not attending school in fall 2012 because deferred enrollment | 2 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| CUNOTENOUGH | Not attending school in fall 2012 because didn't receive enough financial aid | 6 | 66.7 | 0.0 | 12.5 |
| CUOTHRSN | Not attending school in fall 2012 for another reason | 6 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 12.5 |
| CUJOBNOW | Currently working for pay | 30 | 73.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |


| Variable name | Variable label | Number of valid pairs | Percent agreement of valid pairs | Percent of respondent who answered don't know or did not answer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Student | Parent |
| CUJ1OCC2 | Current job | 18 | 72.2 | 3.0 | 5.7 |
| CUJOBRELATE | Current job's relationship to job wants to have when education completed | 19 | 79.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 |
| CUAPPRENTSHP | Current job is a formal apprenticeship | 20 | 65.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 |
| CULICENSEHRS | Earning hours for license for occupational field on current job | 15 | 100.0 | 9.1 | 11.4 |
| CUHSJOB | Started current job while in high school | 20 | 90.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| CUHSPRG | Got current job through high school-arranged program | 20 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| CUHSASSIST | Got current job with other assistance from high school | 20 | 95.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| CUJOBEARN | Job earnings (Recoded) | 15 | 66.7 | 6.1 | 17.1 |
| CUJOBPLAN | Plans to have current job on November 1, 2012 | 19 | 89.5 | 0.0 | 2.9 |
| CUJ2OCC2 | Job plans to have on November 1, 2012 | 2 | 0.0 | 29.6 | 41.2 |
| CUCNSLCLG | How well counselor prepared teenager to gain admission to college | 102 | 49.0 | 2.7 | 6.3 |
| CUCNSLAID | How well counselor prepared teenager to apply for financial aid | 98 | 38.8 | 5.4 | 7.1 |
| CUCNSLJOB | How well counselor prepared teenager to find a job | 88 | 40.9 | 4.5 | 17.9 |

[^0]
[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Continuous variable categorized for analysis.
    \# No data available

