THE DLC CRIMINOLOGIST

Volume 3, Issue Number 1 Spring 2015

Welcome from David Farrington

Welcome to the first Newsletter of 2015! We are grateful to Tom Arnold for putting it together, and to Rolf Loeber for organizing a series of articles on longitudinal studies of criminal behavior. The DLC Executive Board hopes that you will find this Newsletter of interest and that you will find the four articles stimulating and useful for your research.

We welcome Beth Huebner as our new ASC Executive Board Liaison Officer, and we are very grateful to Beth's predecessor Lisa Broidy for her very valuable contributions to the DLC.

The big news is that the first issue of our new journal, the Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology, has been published, and the second issue is in production! We are extremely grateful to Tara McGee and Paul Mazerolle for their enormous efforts in getting this journal off the ground. We are also very grateful to Springer and to Katie Chabalko for agreeing to publish our journal and for all their help and support. Please submit your papers! All DLC members will have free access to the electronic version of the journal, so the DLC dues will continue to be very modest, at $10 for full members and $5 for students. DLC members who wish to receive printed copies of the new journal can obtain these for the bargain price of $20 per year.

Our membership is in good shape. We had about 250 members at the end of 2014, and nearly 220 have joined so far in 2015. Please encourage past members to rejoin and new members to join the DLC! Please contact Arjan Blokland with suggestions about how to increase the DLC membership.

We are looking forward to the next ASC meeting in the beautiful city of Washington DC. As usual, we will have an Open Meeting, and we hope that as many DLC members as possible will attend it. At this Meeting, I hope that DLC members will put their names forward to serve on our Committees in 2015-2016. This Meeting is also your opportunity to make suggestions about activities that the DLC should engage in to advance developmental and life-course criminology and criminal career research. We are very grateful to Elaine Doherty, Bianca Bersani, Stacey Bosick, and the DLC program committee for organizing ASC panels. We will list relevant DLC panels in the next Newsletter, which will be sent out before the ASC.

At the next ASC, we will have a Division Table for the first time, and we need volunteers to sit at this table for some time period and give information about the DLC. If you are willing to do this, please email our Secretary/Treasurer Tara McGee.

Our ASC social event at Jillian's last year was very successful, and we are very grateful to Darrick Jolliffe for organizing this. As a reward (?), we have asked Darrick to organize another DLC social event on the Thursday night in Washington DC. Preparations for this, at the Jack Rose Dining Saloon, are underway. All paid-up DLC members are invited and will receive information in due course about how to download their admission ticket. Please put 6.30-8.00 pm on the Thursday night (November 19) in your calendar!

As mentioned in the last Newsletter, the Awards Committee decided to establish a third DLC Award in 2015, for the most outstanding book or article on developmental or life-course criminology in the previous two years. Please note the Call for Nominations for the three DLC Awards; the others are the Life-Time Achievement Award and the Early Career Award. We are very grateful to Jesse Cale for chairing the Awards Committee this year. Please also note the Call for Nominations for the 2015 Election Slate of Officers. We particularly need nominations for a new Graduate Student Representative; we are very grateful to Christoffer Carlsson for his efforts in this post, but he has now graduated and gone on to greater things!

As I mentioned in the last Newsletter, it is apparent that the DLC's original constitution is in need of amendment, and that we need to establish a Constitution Review Committee. Adrian Raine has kindly agreed to chair this committee, which will bring forward proposals for changes in the Constitution before the next ASC meeting. These will be emailed to the membership for voting and the results will be announced at the Open Meeting.

We encourage all DLC members to submit news items to Tom Arnold for publication in the next Newsletter. Please tell us about your recent (2014-15) publications, grants, awards (etc.), and any other information of interest to DLC members (e.g. upcoming conferences).

In conclusion, I would like to thank all Executive Board members for their altruistic support. As always, the Executive Board would very much welcome suggestions from DLC members about what activities the DLC should engage in to advance developmental and life-course criminology and criminal career research. Two suggestions that were made last year were that the DLC should organize a pre-ASC workshop and that the DLC should try to obtain organizational/institutional members who would help to sponsor DLC events such as a breakfast. I would be very happy to receive any further comments or offers of assistance on these topics. We look forward to seeing you in Washington DC if not before!

Inside This Issue

Spread the Word!

Please send this newsletter to any of your colleagues who have an interest in developmental and life-course criminology. We would like to increase our membership so that we can build a larger DLC community of scholars.

Visit our web site at http://www.dlccrim.org

Executive Board Members

Chair:
David Farrington - dpf1@cam.ac.uk
Vice-Chair:
Rolf Loeber - loeberr@upmc.edu
Newsletter and Website Editor
Tom Arnold – arnoldtk@mail.uc.edu
Secretary and Treasurer:
Tara Renae McGee - tr.mcgee@griffith.edu.au
Past Chair:
Adrian Raine - araine@sas.upenn.edu
Executive Counselors:
Arjan Blokland - ablokland@nscr.nl
Elaine Doherty - dohertye@umsl.edu
Jesse Cale - j.cale@unsw.edu.au
ASC Executive Liaison:
Beth Huebner – huebnerb@umsl.edu
Postgraduate Representative: Open

Joining the ASC Division of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology (DLC)

If you would like to join the American Society of Criminology (ASC) Division of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology (DLC), you first need to be a member of the ASC. When you join the ASC, be sure to check the box that says "Division of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology."

To learn more about the ASC, visit http://asc41.com/index.htm

To join the ASC and DLC division visit http://asc41.com/appform1.html

Secretary/ Treasurer's Report

Tara Renae McGee
Secretary / Treasurer
tr.mcgee@griffith.edu.au

All is well with Division membership and finances. You can read about our current membership numbers in Arjan Blokland's report in this newsletter. This has had effects on income for the Division. By the end of April 2015 we had a balance of US$4,000. Some of these funds will be expended on awards, the Division's website ($134.87), and the Division social in Washington DC in November 2015. Further details about this event will be provided closer to the date.

If members have suggestions for how these funds should be used to support the Division, please contact any member of the Executive Board with your ideas.

At last year's annual meeting in San Francisco, the Division met to discuss a number of issues. The full minutes of the meeting are available on the Division website. The executive board of the Division for 2015 was officially announced and the chairperson, David Farrington, encouraged those attending the meeting to volunteer for roles within the Division. A number of new awards were discussed at the meeting and details of these will be provided to members as they are developed.

For the San Francisco conference, Elaine Doherty arranged for a list of papers to be circulated to members to highlight the developmental and life-course panels throughout the conference. If people want to make sure that their paper is included on this list, they should send the details to Elaine: dohertye@umsl.edu

The other big news for the Division is that the official journal, the Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology, has published its first issue. More details on that can be found in another story in this newsletter.

DLC Committees

Awards Committee – Chair: Jesse Cale

Lia Ahonen
Leena Augimeri
Ross Homel
Wesley Jennings
Lila Kazemian
Doris MacKenzie

Membership Committee – Chair: Arjan Blokland

Danielle Boisvert
Shaun Gann
Kelly Knight
Sonja Siennick
Stacy Tzoumakis
Jamie Vaske

Newsletter Committee – Chair: Rolf Loeber

Lia Ahonen
Tom Arnold
Julie Marie Baldwin
Molly Buchanan
Chris Gibson
Marvin Krohn
Jeffrey Mathesius

Nominations Committee – Chair: David Farrington

Anna Baldry
Sarah Bennett
Henriette Bergstrom
Evan McCuish
Jamie Newsome
Helene White

Program Committee – Chair: Elaine Doherty

Bianca Bersani
Leana Allen Bouffard
Constance Hassett-Walker
Darrick Jolliffe
Matthew Larson
Sonja Siennick

Constitution Review Committee:
Chair: Adrian Raine

David Farrington
Beth Huebner
Doris MacKenzie

Nominations Committee Report

David Farrington
dpf1@cam.ac.uk
Chair of the DLC Nominations Committee

The Division of Developmental and Life-course Criminology Call for Nominations for the 2015 Election Slate of Officers

The DLC nominations committee is currently seeking nominations for the positions of Secretary/ Treasurer and two Executive Counselors. All Executive Counselors chair one DLC Committee and the current post holders chair the Membership and Awards Committees in 2015. The appointments will be for two years, from November 2015 to November 2017. The current holders of these posts are eligible for re-election.

Nominations are also sought for the Graduate Student Representative on the DLC Board, which is currently vacant. The holder of this post will serve until they are no longer a graduate student.

Nominees must be current members (including student members) in good standing of the DLC. Self-nominations are accepted. Please send the names of nominees, the position for which they are being nominated, and a brief bio via email before June 30, 2015 to

David Farrington
Chair, Nominations Committee
dpf1@cam.ac.uk

All nominators should include a statement that the nominee is willing to serve if elected.

Awards Committee Report

Jesse Cale
j.cale@unsw.edu.au
Chair of the DLC Awards Committee

The DLC Awards Committee has now established three awards: The Life-Time Achievement Award, the Early Career Award, and the Outstanding Contribution Award. Nominations are now invited for the three 2015 Awards.

The Life-time Achievement Award recognizes an individual who has a record of sustained and outstanding contributions to scholarly acknowledge on developmental and life-course criminology.

The Early Career Award recognizes an individual (within 4 years after receiving the Ph.D. degree or a similar graduate degree) who has made a significant contribution to scholarly knowledge on developmental and life-course criminology in their early career.

The Outstanding Contribution Award recognizes a DLC book, article, or book chapter published in the previous two years (2013-2014). Developmental and life-course criminology includes criminal career research.

Nominees do not need to be DLC members. Nominators should submit an email specifying the contributions of the nominee to developmental and life-course criminology plus a vita of the nominee.

Send materials before June 30, 2015 to

Jesse Cale
Chair of the DLC Awards Committee
j.cale@unsw.edu.au

Recipients will receive their awards at the ASC meeting in November in Washington, DC.

Membership Committee Report

Arjan Blokland
ablokland@nscr.nl

After a steady increase in membership during 2013 and early 2014, membership of the division seems to have reached a (temporary) plateau during the latter half of 2014 and the first months of 2015. It would appear that the problem is that some members have not yet renewed their membership in the division. The DLC membership numbers in April showed 217 registered members, and this number lingers somewhat behind the peak of 247 paying members as of December 2014. This drop is found, even though 115 new members joined the division as of January 2015. If all of the prior members had renewed their membership, the April 2015 membership numbers should have been over 300 members.

This year has seen the launch of the Journal of Developmental and Life-course Criminology which may be responsible for the influx of new members starting January 2015 and we hope this trend will carry on during the coming period.

The coming months, the membership committee will be actively reminding previous members to renew their membership in time, and also be preparing the division's promotional activities during the upcoming ASC meeting in Washington. Our goal remains to promote DLC-research across the globe, and we have set our minds on topping the 2014 membership numbers by the end of the year!

Constitution Review Committee Report

Adrian Raine
araine@sas.upenn.edu

The original constitution of the DLC was drafted by David Farrington and Tara McGee in 2012 and based on the constitution of two other ASC Divisions. However, it needs some minor changes. In particular:

1. The constitution specifies that the Nominations Committee should consist of 3 persons but our policy is that important committees should consist of 7 persons.

2. The constitution does not specify that the Chair can co-opt additional Executive Board members such as the Newsletter Editor, the Graduate Student Representative, and the ASC Executive Board Liaison officer.

3. The constitution specifies that the ASC Executive Office will conduct our elections but they do not want to do this and in practice we have done it ourselves.

Therefore, the DLC Executive Board has created a Constitution Review Committee to propose amendments to the constitution. If any member wishes to suggest an amendment to the DLC constitution (which can be viewed on the DLC website), please send an email before June 30, 2015 to

Adrian Raine
Chair of the Constitution Review Committee
araine@sas.upenn.edu

All proposed amendments need to be approved by a two-thirds vote of DLC members who respond to an email ballot, and then by the ASC Executive Board.

Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology

Tara Renae McGee
Co-editor-in-chief
tr.mcgee@griffith.edu.au

Paul Mazerolle
Co-editor-in-chief
p.mazerolle@griffith.edu.au

The first issue of the Division's Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology was published in March 2105 and the articles from the first issue (listed below) are available online at http://link.springer.com/journal/40865/1/1/page/1

- Sex Differences in the Stability of Self-Regulation Across Childhood Michelle Anne Coyne, Jamie C. Vaske, Danielle L. Boisvert, John Paul Wright
- Understanding Race/Ethnicity Differences in Offending Across the Life Course: Gaps and Opportunities Alex R. Piquero
- When Is a Youth's Debt to Society Paid? Examining the Long-Term Consequences of Juvenile Incarceration for Adult Functioning Amanda B. Gilman, Karl G. Hill, J. David Hawkins
- Intergenerational Similarities in Risk Factors for Offending David P. Farrington, Maria M. Ttofi, Rebecca V. Crago, Jeremy W. Coid
- Elaborating on the Effects of Early Offending: a Study of Factors that Mediate the Impact of Onset Age on Long-Term Trajectories of Criminal Behavior Shaun M. Gann, Christopher J. Sullivan, Omeed S. Ilchi

There are also new articles being added regularly to online first, so be sure to check out the latest papers at http://link.springer.com/journal/40865

The Journal seeks to advance knowledge and understanding of developmental dimensions of offending across the life-course. Research that examines current theories, debates, and knowledge gaps within Developmental and Life-Course Criminology is encouraged. The journal welcomes theoretical papers, empirical papers, and papers that explore the translation of developmental and life-course research into policy and/or practice. Papers that present original research or explore new directions for examination are also encouraged. The journal also welcomes all rigorous methodological approaches and orientations. The Journal of Developmental and Life-course Criminology encourages submissions from a broad array of cognate disciplines including but not limited to psychology, statistics, sociology, psychiatry, neuroscience, geography, political science, history, social work, epidemiology, public health, and economics.

The Journal's co-editors-in-chief are Tara Renae McGee and Paul Mazerolle of Griffith University, Australia. The Associate Editors are Alex Piquero, USA; Ray Corrado, Canada; Georgia Zara, Europe; and Darrick Jolliffe, UK. The Editorial Manager of the Journal is Fiona Saunders and the journal is hosted by Griffith University.

Further information about the journal can be found on the journal's website http://www.springer.com/40865 and any queries can be directed to Tara, Paul, or Fiona at jdlcc@griffith.edu.au.

We welcome your submissions!

Tara Renae McGee and Paul Mazerolle
Co-editors-in-chief

2014 DLC Awards

The DLC Life-time Achievement award was presented to J. David Hawkins of the University of Washington and Marc LeBlanc of the University of Montreal. The Early Career Award was presented to Sytske Besemer of the University of California at Berkeley.

J. David Hawkins received the Lifetime Achievement Award

Mac LeBlanc received the Lifetime Achievement Award

Sytske Besemer received the Early Career Award

Upcoming events and announcements

The newsletter committee encourage members to inform about upcoming meetings, conferences, courses and other interesting events relating to the division.

In September 2015, Örebro University, Sweden launches their new BA-program in Criminology. The program is closely related to the research group CAPS (Center for Criminological and PsychoSocial Research), which has a broad approach to DLC-criminology including (but not exclusively) early psychopathy, institutional care and corrections, the juvenile justice system, policing and public safety.

We welcome researchers and students to come and visit. For more information visit http://www.oru.se/English/Research/Research-Environments/Research-environment/HS/Center-for-Criminological-Research/

or email Lia Ahonen ahonenl@upmc.edu.

DLC Social Event at the ASC in 2015

Continuing on from the success of the DLC social event at the ASC in San Francisco in 2014, we have planned another exciting night out for the DLC in Washington. All paid-up DLC members are invited to attend on

Thursday November 19
6:30pm until 8pm
Balcony Room
Jack Rose Dining Saloon
2007 18th St NW
Washington, DC 20009

The food will be free and drinks can be purchased. The venue is just a short walk from the conference hotel, so do come and enjoy some appetizers and great company. As a final selling point the Jack Rose Saloon features 10 different types of Canadian Whiskey!! More information will be sent to DLC members nearer the time.

A Note from the Editor

Tom Arnold
arnoldtk@mail.uc.edu

I hope that you are finding this newsletter to be of interest. The theme for this edition is retention in longitudinal studies. Some of the top researchers in the world have given us some insights into the steps needed to retain survey participants. The division has taken on several new initiatives and there appears to be progress in several areas. A new division journal is being published, there is a new award, and there may be some changes to the constitution of the division.

Professor Loeber, the DLC Board, and the various committee members, as well as the contributing authors have made my job easy by providing much of the content for this newsletter. If you have any news that could make it into the next newsletter, please forward it to me and I will see if I can get it published for you.

Please remember that the web site is available at http://www.dlccrim.org Ideas for improving the DLC web site are welcome.

I wish you the best.

Tom Arnold

Special Section:
Methods to optimize retention of participants in longitudinal studies

Rolf Loeber
Department of Psychiatry at the University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine
loeberr@upmc.edu

Introduction

It is my pleasure that four longitudinal researchers and their associates were willing to contribute in the series on Methods to optimize retention of participants in longitudinal studies, summarizing their experiences in the course of executing six longitudinal studies. As Chu and Thornberry (see paper below) expressed, the longer the longitudinal study the higher the probability of failure because of loss of participants (also called poor retention), which causes many problems, foremost the inability to generalize findings to the earlier full sample of participants usually because of selective attrition.

This is the main reason why the following papers are important for the field, especially for those of you planning to start longitudinal studies, even short ones, because all of such studies engender the danger of high participant loss. As stated by Stouthamer-Loeber and Loeber in their paper on three longitudinal studies (see below), the planning to counter participant loss and retain participants engaged in repeated assessments needs to take place prior to the first assessment. One of the important points stressed by Hill and co-authors (see below) is that participant retention and the retention of experienced staff in longitudinal studies are equally important.

The complications of follow-ups multiply for intergenerational studies, but these can be managed (Chu and Thornberry, see below). The Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development (see Farrington [[], below), because of its longest follow-up and highest cooperation rate, the 'granddaddy' of all longitudinal crime studies also contains outstanding advice on how to retain participants over more than four decades.

In summary, the knowledge gained by the authors below forms a template for scholars of small and large longitudinal studies in the future. It all depends on what we can learn from the experiences of the older guards.

Participant Retention in the Rochester Youth Development Study

Rebekah Chu

Hindelang Criminal Justice Research Center
University at Albany
rchu@albany.edu

Terence P. Thornberry

Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Maryland
thornbet@umd.edu

By definition, longitudinal studies of crime and delinquency follow individuals over time. For many theoretical and empirical reasons, the longer the follow-up period – especially if it cuts across multiple developmental stages – the better. Yet the longer the follow-up period, the higher attrition is likely to be and the less representative the sample is likely to become. Thus, a fundamental challenge for all longitudinal studies is to maintain high participant retention. We discuss several techniques for doing so in the present article.

Rochester Youth Development Study

In addressing this issue we use our experiences in and lessons learned from the Rochester Youth Development Study (RYDS), a longitudinal study that has followed a panel of participants initially selected when they were adolescents. The initial sample consisted of 1,000 adolescents (average age 14) selected to over-represent high-risk youth. Subjects were interviewed 14 times from 1988 through 2006. At the end of this 18 year period, 80% (n=803) of the original 1,000 were re-interviewed at the age 29 and/or age 31 interviews. In 1999 we began the Rochester Intergenerational Study (RIGS) which focuses on the oldest biological children of the original RYDS subjects. We are currently in the 17th year of data collection. Of those who enrolled in the RIGS about 87% are still enrolled today. The RYDS employs a combination of strategies to attain high retention rates.

Locating Procedures

The first step in maintaining high retention is the ability to locate the participants. Fortunately, given the longevity of the study and the rapport we have built up with our respondents, the majority of the current RIGS participants are easily located. Either their contact information remains the same each year or they contact our office with their new information. At the other extreme, some participants move quite frequently during the course of a year and many use disposable cell phones thereby constantly acquiring a new number. These participants require considerably more effort to locate.

To aid in this effort we maintain extensive paper files as well as an electronic database containing both current and historical information on all RYDS participants. The files contain phone and address histories for the participants as well as for designated secondary sources spanning back to the first year of the study. Secondary sources are relatives or friends nominated at the end of each interview by the participants who would know their whereabouts if they were to move from their current location. We also record the dates and times of locating attempts and keep detailed case notes that aid in contact strategies (e.g., "works night shift, call early morning") so that interviewers can vary future efforts and increase the chances of a successful contact. The basic rule in this area is to maintain detailed records and never to throw any of it away. It is surprising how often old records turn out to be useful.

Two basic locating strategies have been particularly effective over the years. First, by this point we have accumulated literally dozens of secondary source forms for some participants. By contacting these individuals in reverse

chronological order we have been able to find many participants who had "gone missing". Also, at the bottom of each secondary source page the RYDS subject signs a statement indicating that he or she approves of the secondary source providing current contact information to the project. That signature provides assurance to secondary sources who are sometimes reluctant to provide the information.

Second, the most effective locating strategy has always been plain old detective work – in-field searches for our participants. Interviewers visit last known addresses for our participants and their secondary sources. Sometimes, neighbors know the general whereabouts of our participants and will offer new leads. Even if the participant is not located, we are at least able to verify whether or not an address is still valid. For participants who provide work numbers as contact information, interviewers have also visited places of employment in attempts to make contact.

Importantly, there is no set limit on the number of attempts made to locate both active and inactive study participants. We continue to search for them until they directly tell us they no longer want to be involved in the study. We also continue to interview participants who have moved out of the Rochester area. Phone interviews are completed for most of these participants, but as funding permits our interviewers travel out of state to conduct the interviews in person. Face-to-face is the preferred method of administering our interviews as they allow for a more personable experience and traveling to our participants conveys the message that their continued involvement in the study is important to us even though they have moved away from Rochester. In an earlier simulation study, Thornberry, Bjerregaard, and Miles (1993) demonstrated the importance of extensive callback procedures and of following long-distance cases; when hard-to-locate or long-distance cases were excluded from the analysis basic results changed and did not represent those observed for the full sample.

We also turn to online database search services that not only search phone and address listings, but also social and employment networking websites. We use multiple search databases because different services return different information. The growing trend towards eliminating home phone lines and relying solely on cell phones has made online phone number searches increasingly difficult, but not impossible. We piece together the varied search results (e.g., date of birth, listed relatives, last recorded address) and compare it to our internal records allowing us to verify that the results are for our participants and not someone with a similar name. We also regularly check inmate rosters for the New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision and the Monroe County jail and prison which are available online and updated frequently.

Even with all of these strategies, there are some instances where we have exhausted all possible leads and are still unable locate a participant. These cases are put aside and after a couple of months we initiate a new search. During this time, a secondary source could have made contact with a participant and now has a new phone number for them. Online search databases are regularly updated and perhaps our participant now has a new address or appears in an inmate roster. Sometimes, the participant will contact our office after receiving a message that we were looking for them.

Communication

We strive to maintain communication with both our active and inactive study participants. A newsletter, the RYDSLetter, is mailed 3 times a year. This keeps participants informed of current research findings and accomplishments of the project. The RYDS is only as successful as the cooperation of the participants and it is important to let them know that they have contributed to significant scientific research.

The RYDS also has a Facebook page to allow participants to get project updates in electronic form. Since many people are regularly connected to Facebook through a mobile application we also hope to reach participants for whom we do not have valid physical addresses and therefore will not receive our mailings.

Advance letters are mailed to RIGS participants before we start contacting them for appointments. Reminders are also sent just before a scheduled appointment using various means of contact depending upon the participant's preference – letter, phone call, email, or text message.

Those who are not currently being interviewed (e.g., original subjects who are not enrolled in RIGS) are still located on an annual basis. We strive to maintain updated contact information for all subjects, active or inactive. We also mail the RYDSLetter to any subjects for whom we have valid addresses. This continued communication lets them know that the project is operational and that we are still interested in keeping in touch with them after all these years.

Resources and Staff

Essential ingredients for a successful study of this nature are adequate resources and a competent staff. Adequate funding is essential not only for the normal, operational costs of running a research project, but for the additional expenses associated with maintaining participant cooperation. Incentive payments at the end of each interview are central to continued participation especially in high risk, low income samples. Recently, we implemented a bonus incentive drawing at the end of the data collection year; participants who complete an interview are eligible to win a relatively large sum of money in addition to their regular incentive payment. As noted earlier, we also continue to interview participants who have moved out of the Rochester area, preferably with face-to-face interviews. Our interviewers travel out of state to conduct these interviews and the travel budget is not inconsequential.

Those participants who are difficult to locate require considerable effort to track down. Without adequate resources, we would not be able to dedicate the time and effort necessary to locate them. It is important that the locating effort be ongoing throughout the data collection year. If too much time passes between locating attempts we risk missing out on potential leads towards finding them.

A dedicated and well-trained staff is also a major contributing factor to the success of any research project. The high retention rate of the RYDS is largely due to the retention of our staff. The office staff and field interviewers have been with the project for 13 years on average, and during this time they have established excellent rapport with our participants. Longevity is particularly crucial for the appointment coordinator who does most of the scheduling. Her rapport and informal knowledge of the participants and their families is vital for maintaining cooperation. The interviewers are also long-time residents of Rochester who are familiar with the area and are comfortable traveling around the city and surrounding suburbs. Familiarity with the area also allows our appointment coordinator to cluster appointments and locating efforts by location, minimizing interviewer travel times. Interviewing is hard work and interviewers need to be persistent and not afraid to knock on doors, visit places of employment, and make cold calls in attempts to locate participants. They also have to have flexible work hours to accommodate participants' schedules, schedules that are likely to differ day-to-day and week-to-week. Appointments are booked at a time and place that is most convenient for the participant, and we strive to make sure every day of the week is covered.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly our interviewers are trained to always be respectful and courteous to the participants. After all, we are intruding in their daily lives year after year and asking them sensitive and difficult questions. We owe them a great debt of gratitude. The success of any longitudinal study is entirely dependent upon their willingness to help the scientific enterprise and they deserve no less than to be treated with the respect that is due to full and equal members of the research effort.

References

Thornberry, T. P., Bjerregaard, B., & Miles, W. (1993). The Consequences of Respondent Attrition in Panel Studies: A Simulation Based on the Rochester Youth Development Study. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 9(2), 127-158.

Tracing Men in the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development (CSDD)

David P. Farrington

The CSDD is a prospective longitudinal survey of 411 London males. It began in 1961 when the males were age 8. We have been very successful in tracing and securing cooperation from the males; 378 out of 403 still alive were interviewed at age 32 (94%), and 365 out of 394 still alive were interviewed at age 48 (93%), 40 years after the beginning of the project. More recently, we have interviewed 551 out of 653 children of the males at the average age of 25 (84%), in order to compare results in the two generations (Farrington et al., 2015).

It is important to maximize response rates in criminological surveys, because those who are not interviewed tend to be "worse" in many respects, and especially in offending and antisocial behavior, than those who are interviewed. In the CSDD, 389 out of 410 males still alive were interviewed at age 18 (95%). Once personal contact had been established, only a minority of the males (64) were not immediately cooperative. However, 36% of these uncooperative males had been convicted, compared with 22% of the remainder, a significant difference (West & Farrington, 1977, p. 165). Ten years previously, parental uncooperativeness had significantly predicted later convictions of the males (West & Farrington, 1973, p. 77). And the males who were the most uncooperative at age 32 were significantly more likely than the remainder to have been convicted after age 21 (Farrington et al., 1990, p. 143). Therefore, attrition can lead to invalid conclusions about offending (and related types of antisocial behavior).

Attrition is especially a problem in longitudinal surveys, because of the need to contact people repeatedly. If a person is missing in one wave, he/she may continue to be missing in later waves. Missing persons cannot be replaced. Various imputation methods have been proposed to deal with the problem of missing data (see e.g. Goldstein, 2009), but they usually impose regularity on the data by assuming that missing cases are similar to known cases. One advantage of a longitudinal survey is that prior information is usually known about missing cases, but it is surely preferable to have high response rates. It is important that every report of a survey should specify the target sample, the number of persons interviewed, and the reasons for missing cases, and should attempt to estimate the effects of attrition.

How did we trace the males in the CSDD? For every person, a detailed pre-interview sheet was completed that recorded all attempts to locate and interview him. These sheets were subsequently coded and computerized, and Farrington et al. (1990) reported the results of analyzing the age 32 pre-interview sheets, completed in 1984-86. Every man was traced. The tracing methods (25 types) were classified into the categories of telephone calls, letters, visits, and other (e.g. searches of electoral registers, telephone directories, etc.). Only one attempt of a given type was counted on any given day; for example, several visits to a man's house on one day were counted as only one attempt of this type on this day.

The 403 males required a total of 2,915 attempts to trace them (an average of 7.2 attempts each), of which the most common types were searches of the local electoral register (356), visits to the man's presumed address (352), searches for the man in telephone directories (323), searches of other electoral registers (289), searches for family members in telephone directories (179), telephoning the man's presumed address (164), and visits to the family's presumed address (163).

In general, the quicker methods, such as searches of electoral registers and telephone directories, tended to be used first, while the more time-consuming methods, such as personal visits, were used later. Letters were rarely written to the men or their families, because they rarely elicited replies. Generally, the man or his family were only telephoned when it was expected (from past experience) that they would be cooperative. Neighbors and current occupants of past addresses often provided useful information.

Each tracing attempt was classified as a success attempt if, in retrospect, it had contributed to tracing the man (e.g. if it had yielded accurate and useful information or if it had helped to narrow down the possibilities for the man's address). Other attempts were counted as failure attempts. Typically, a man's pre-interview sheet would begin with a chain of failure attempts and end with a chain of success attempts. The most successful methods were telephoning the man's address (78% successful), letters to the family's address (77%), visits to the man's workplace (69%), searches of the National Health Service register to obtain the name of the family doctor who was then contacted (65%), telephoning the family's address (63%), and criminal record searches (59%). There were

obvious selection effects, as telephone calls and letters tended to be used only when it was anticipated that they might be successful.

Seven men were found in the first tracing attempt, 107 by the third attempt, 204 by the fifth attempt, 312 by the ninth attempt, and 387 by the twentieth attempt. The median time taken to trace a man was 8 days, and the interquartile range was from 2 to 32 days; 50 men took longer than 80 days to trace.

The 101 most elusive men were defined as those who had five or more failure attempts before their first success attempt. The methods that proved to be the most successful with these men were remarkably diverse. The most common were leads from other men (12), visits to the man's address (11), National Health Service records (10), visits to the family's address (9), searches of the local electoral register (9), criminal record searches (9), telephoning the man's workplace (8), searching other electoral registers (8), and searches for the family in the telephone directory (7). Methods that were numerically unimportant overall – such as National Health Service records, criminal records, telephoning the man's workplace, and leads from other men – were relatively important for these elusive men in breaking the chain of failure attempts at age 32.

The age 48 pre-interview sheets (completed in 2000-04) have been fully coded and computerized but not yet fully analyzed. In total, more tracing attempts were needed (3,563, or an average of 8.8 per man). By this time period, computerized searching methods were more available, and telephone ownership was much greater. The most common methods were searches for the man on the computerized electoral register (605), telephoning the man (466), visiting the man (409), and searching for the man in telephone directories (282). In general, the computerized electoral register was searched first for the man and his family members, but this became less useful over time as it was made easier for citizens to opt out of having their electoral details available in a computerized register. Then, computerized telephone directories were searched, but again these became less useful over time as more people used mobile phones. Next, the man or his family members were telephoned if it was anticipated that they would be cooperative.

At age 48, five men could not be traced (see Farrington et al., 2006). Of the remainder, 11% were still living in the original small Study area in South London, 24% were living in other London postal districts, 35% were living in the Home Counties south of London (Surrey, Sussex, or Kent), 25% were living in the rest of the UK, and 5% were living abroad. Two men were traced on the first attempt, 143 by the third attempt, 221 by the fifth attempt, 303 by the tenth attempt, 363 by the twentieth attempt, and 381 by the thirtieth attempt. Future analyses are planned to investigate what tracing methods were successful with the most elusive men at age 48. We also plan to code, computerize, and analyze the pre-interview sheets of their children.

How to trace and secure interviews with target persons is a vitally important topic for all criminological researchers who are carrying out surveys, especially longitudinal surveys. However, in general, major criminological journals are not interested in publishing articles on this topic, which is a pity in my view. Of course, tracing methods change over time, and the most useful methods in one time period will not necessarily be the most useful in a later time period. For example, we used Friends Reunited, Facebook, and other internet sources in trying to trace the children, but we did not find that these methods were very useful. I would encourage all longitudinal researchers in criminology to try to analyze and write up their methods of tracing and securing cooperation, in the interests of maximizing the validity of conclusions about offending.

References

Farrington, D. P., Coid, J. W., Harnett, L., Jolliffe, D., Soteriou, N., Turner, R., and West, D. J. (2006). Criminal Careers up to age 50 and Life Success up to age 48: New Findings from the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development. London: Home Office (Research Study No. 299).

Farrington, D. P., Gallagher, B., Morley, L., St Ledger, R., and West, D.J. (1990). Minimizing attrition in longitudinal research: Methods of tracing and securing cooperation in a 24 year follow up study. In Magnusson, D. and Bergman, L. (Eds.) Data Quality in Longitudinal Research. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (pp. 122 147).

Farrington, D. P., Ttofi, M. M., Crago, R. V., and Coid, J. W. (2015). Intergenerational similarities in risk factors for offending. Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology, 1, 48-62.

Goldstein, H. (2009). Handling attrition and non-response in longitudinal data. Longitudinal and Life Course Studies, 1, 63-72.

West, D. J. and Farrington, D. P. (1973). Who Becomes Delinquent? London: Heinemann.

West, D. J. and Farrington, D. P. (1977) The Delinquent Way of Life. London: Heinemann.

How to get a high response rate in longitudinal studies

Rolf Loeber

Department of Psychiatry at the University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine
loeberr@upmc.edu

Magda Stouthamer-Loeber
stoumx@upmc.edu

Three longitudinal studies have occupied much of our academic lives. Together with David Farrington, we started the first assessment of the Pittsburgh Youth Study (PYS; N= 1,517; mostly yearly assessments, still ongoing) in 1987. In that same year, we started with Benjamin B. Lahey the Developmental Trends Study (N=177; yearly assessment, last assessment 2005-6). Thirteen years later we started the Pittsburgh Girls Study (PGS; N=2,451; yearly assessments, still ongoing) with Kate Keenan. An account of the early history of the three studies can be found in Loeber et al. (2002). In our eyes, these studies are exceptional because of the high cooperation rate obtained over long periods of time. In the PYS, 82.8% of the Youngest cohort participated after 20 assessments and 85% after 17 assessments of the Oldest cohort (Stouthamer-Loeber & Loeber, 2014). The average participation rate in the DTS was 91.7% (Loeber et al., 2002), while the PGS has continued to maintain a high average retention rate of over 90%, and it has never fallen below 88% (Ahonen, Loeber, Hipwell & Stepp, 2015). The question is: how were we able to accomplish such a high cooperation rate over long periods of time? To address this, we will focus on the methods used in the PYS, and also the methods applied to the two other studies. We have learned a great deal about participant retention from all three of our studies. An earlier review of data collecting and management can be found in Stouthamer-Loeber and Van Kammen (1995). In the spirit of sharing our experiences with the readers of this newsletter, we will address these three questions below:

1. What are the best techniques for continued success in locating participants in the future and securing their cooperation?

The foundation for participant retention and cooperation should be laid at the beginning of the study, even prior to the first contact with the participants. After that, each contact can lead to improved data collection to enable future contacts, and consolidating and improving the quality of contacts with the participants.

The key first step is the training of the interviewers to make the participants' interview experience as pleasant as possible so that participants are not turned off and refuse future interviews. To counter this, we taught our interviewers that they were "our ambassadors" for the study. It is very important to have interviewers completely trained and tested before they are allowed to do actual interviews in the field. Next, we arranged an essential and routine component of the assessment process which was to conduct post-interview check-ups. Thus, after participants had been interviewed, we checked back with the participants for accuracy of the collected data and to ensure that the interviewers behaved professionally. Interviewers were aware of this check-up process, making it a preventive measure to ensure that there were no shortcuts or cheating. It also gave the supervisor of the interviewers a chance to praise and/or correct interviewer behavior. Another component of the follow-through procedures consisted of training interviewers to report questions or concerns participants expressed, and not to ad-lib these questions, but discuss them with the supervisors first. Supervisors were then instructed to contact

participants soon afterwards to discuss their concerns. The whole idea behind this was to create a relationship with the participants, and to let them know that we took them seriously. We did not use students as interviewers because they generally could not commit themselves to the amount of time that we needed because of their studies and their breaks. We also wanted to build up a stable group of interviewers who would be invested in the project and would be able to contribute their field experience and solutions to problems to their fellow colleagues.

Another complementary strategy concentrated on preventing loss of contact with the participants. Some families often moved residence and, this usually required a lot of searching by our research staff to re-establish contact. The more information about the families that was available to the team, the more likely it was that the participant could be found back. To economize searches, we received permission, as part of the consent forms, from the participants for us to contact others familiar with the family's new location. Typically, those informants were not living in the same household, and included other family members, friends, schools, work places, or other institutions.

A third strategy was to collect other contact information, such as phone numbers, and more recently, e-mail addresses and social media information. This information would be updated every time a participant was interviewed or contacted. We also asked the participants if they had plans to move and to let the project know when they have moved. Fourthly, we promoted participant retention by having a payment schedule that increased the amount of payment over time, so that the next interview would look attractive to the participants from a monetary point of view.

Lastly, one of the advantages of the electronic age that we live in is the availability of many types of electronic websites that are in the public domain. Some of the strategies that are used currently are West Law which a subscription based service where you can get updated information on participants like address, phone number using their subject numbers. We also used www.whitepages.com, where a report can be generated which contains personal, property, criminal history, family members and other information for a small fee. Many States and counties have websites that contain data about their prison population and criminal records. Other public records that may be available are death records, archived newspaper reports on accidents, and sources about criminal activities. It has proved a good strategy to search the web every now and then for new sources. Currently, we have many participants that use Facebook or similar social media such as Twitter, or Instagram. Even though some of their pages may be private, and not display a city or telephone number, in our experience, participants, when contacted this way, very often reply to our inquiries. Even though the electronic information is public information it is wise to let participants know as part of the consent form and in your Institutional Review Board (IRB) protocol that the project may resort to web searches and social media searches in order to locate them if all other contact is lost.

It is also important to realize that a participant who cannot be found in one phase is not irretrievably lost. Continued searching may yield results for the next interview phase. In addition, participants who refuse in one phase may be willing to do the interview in the next phase. It is important, however, to ask permission to contact the participant at a later date, if they have refused to participate in the current year interview. Information about people to contact as well as information about the contacting process (number of phone calls, reasons for reluctance, no-shows) can be stored in a database which makes planning and searching in the next phase easier.

2) How did we optimize securing cooperation from the participants?

Again, the groundwork was laid at the beginning of the study by training the interviewers thoroughly and making sure that the interviewers were as pleasant and non-confrontational as possible. Also participants need to know beforehand what to expect in terms of the

scheduled time of an interview, and how long it will take. In between interviews, we sent the participants birthday cards and holiday cards. This was also a good way to find out which addresses were no longer valid, and to get updated address information from the returned mail. In addition, we provided unexpected gifts for the participants. We found that sometimes local stores or sports teams were willing to donate gifts or tickets for sporting events that we then added to the remuneration. These extra, non-expected gifts were very much appreciated by the participants.

A crucial element in obtaining high cooperation rates in the studies was to not restrict the number of attempts to contact participants, or the time it took to extend searches for them (Cotter, Burke, Stouthamer-Loeber, & Loeber, 2005).

3) What were your best techniques in terms of keeping the participants interested in the study?

Aside from making the interview a pleasant experience, it was essential not to make the interview too long and tiring for the participants. Second, it proved important for the interviewers to be flexible as to what time during the day and what day in the week the interview could be scheduled, even offering several sessions. If necessary, the interview could be done by telephone. Further, we sent participants newsletters about activities of interest, such as city summer programs, also including upcoming concerts and events. After the interview, we gave each participant a resource list about local help sources that are available... Moreover, we sent out newsletters to the participants, but it proved difficult for us to come up with content about the study that did not potentially influence participants' response to the next interview.

It is hard for us now to mention which of the above procedures was more important than others. It is safest to say that different approaches optimized participant retention in our three longitudinal studies.

Acknowledgments

We are indebted to Jennifer Wilson for her comments on an earlier draft of this paper. In executing the three studies we owe a large amount of gratitude to our co-investigators including (in alphabetical order): Jeffrey Burke, David Farrington, Alison E. Hipwell, Benjamin B. Lahey, Dustin Pardini, Stephanie Stepp, and Helene R. White, of which Jeffrey, Alison, Dustin and Stephanie were hands on involved in supervising data collection. Most importantly, we are greatly indebted to the many supervisors and interviewers who were engaged in the search for participants and conducted regular interviews.

References

Ahonen, L., Loeber, R., Hipwell, A., & Stepp, A. (2015). What is the dark figure of girls' delinquency by age and race? Discrepancies between police charges and girls' self-reported delinquency. Manuscript in preparation.

Cotter, R.B., Burke, J.D., Stouthamer-Loeber, M, & Loeber, R. Contacting participants for follow-up: How much effort is required to retain participants in longitudinal studies? Evaluation and Program Planning, 28: 15-21, 2005.

Loeber, R., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., Farrington, D. P., Lahey, B. B., Keenan, K., & White, H. R. Editorial introduction: Three longitudinal studies of children's development in Pittsburgh: the Developmental Trends Study, the Pittsburgh Youth Study, and the Pittsburgh Girls study. Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health, 12: 1-23, 2002.

Stouthamer-Loeber, M., & Loeber, R. What we have learned from collecting data for the Pittsburgh Youth Study. Newsletter of the Division of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology (Fall, 2014).

Stouthamer-Loeber, M., & van Kammen W.B. Data collection and management. A practical guide. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1995.

Planning for Long-Term Follow-up: Strategies Learned from the Seattle Social Development Project

Karl G. Hill

School of Social Work
University of Washington
khill@uw.edu

Danielle Woodward

Social Development Research Group
University of Washington
dgangnes@uw.edu

Tiffany Woelfel

Department of Health Services
University of Washington
tpw@uw.edu

David Hawkins

Social Work Endowed Professor of Prevention
University of Washington
jdh@uw.edu

Sara Green

School of Social Work
University of Washington
srgreen@uw.edu

The Seattle Social Development Project (SSDP) is a longitudinal panel study that began with a drug and delinquency focused preventive intervention in grades 1-6, and was followed-up fifteen times through age 39 (Hawkins et al., 1992; Hawkins et al., 2007; Hill et al., 2014). In the elementary grades, SSDP participants were involved in a nonrandomized test of the social developmental preventive intervention that included the Teacher Training in Classroom Instruction and Management; Child Social, Emotional, and Academic Skill Development, and Parent Training (Hawkins et al., 2008). In 1985, 808 students (from 18 Seattle elementary schools that predominantly served high-crime neighborhoods) and their parents consented to participate in the longitudinal study. The panel is ethnically diverse, and oversampled low-income families. Data collection is currently ongoing at age 39 (wave 15). Retention was 92% at age 33. Attrition at each wave was not related to gender, ethnicity or socioeconomic status.

How to get a high response rate in longitudinal studies?

(1) Maintain a consistent field management staff over multiple waves of data collection. The retention of project historical knowledge is hard to accomplish if your design has intermittent assessments staffed by graduate and undergraduate students of the moment. It is typically between field periods, during the downtime, that valuable staff and project knowledge and skills are lost. Identify within (e.g., locating, see below) and across project activities for field management, thus preventing staff attrition between major field periods. (2) Plan for and invest in locating (see below). (3) Follow your participants beyond their initial catchment area, even if they move abroad or become incarcerated. (4) Don't stop the field period early. Understand that as the field period progresses, cases per week completed will decline and the costs per case will increase. Budget accordingly. Stopping the field period early (e.g., after 70-80% complete) often misses many of the most interesting participants who are in that last 20-30%. (5) Be persistent but not harassing with resistant participants.

How did you optimize finding where the participants were living?

Locating is critical to high follow-up. (1) Collect information on 3 stable locators at each assessment (full name with middle name or middle initial, and contact information). Locators are people "who will always know where you are". (2) Enable locators to provide information.

Obtain explicit, written consent from the respondent to contact others for updated contact information (schools, other locators). By providing my signature below I agree to allow study staff to contact my child's school and other contact persons regarding our whereabouts, to obtain updated address or telephone numbers. (3) Develop a database to track sample members over time. From the outset, it will be essential to have a database (e.g., Microsoft Access) capable of tracking address histories (with associated start and stop dates), contact histories, locator information, details about respondents and interview experiences, survey statuses and details for each wave, problem codes, and other anecdotal information. (4) Use project communications to help update addresses and other information in-between field periods (address correction requests on newsletters, birthday cards, etc.).

How did you optimize securing cooperation from the participants to do the interview?

(1) An important key to successful longitudinal follow-up is in maintaining a positive relationship with your sample participants, and key to this is to really treat them like relationships. Participants do not want to feel like "research subjects." They typically want to be treated as collaborating, thinking, consenting people. One way to do this is to provide them with systematic updates of the study findings through newsletters, a study website, a study Facebook page or Twitter account. Build an understanding that they are taking part of something relatively rare and valuable. (2) Don't make the assessment experience itself unpleasant. Use the mode (web, laptop, face-to-face, telephone) most comfortable with the respondent.

What were your best techniques in terms of keeping the participants interested in the study?

This varies by respondent. Some like the scientific contribution. Others are proud of being in this for a long time. Others just want the stipend. Respondents often hate being asked the same questions every time. Adding new foci with each cycle helps keep it interesting and fresh.

What are the best techniques to use at the beginning to plan for continued success in locating participants in future and securing their cooperation?

We discuss this question (and the previous ones) at length in the forthcoming article by Hill, et al. (in press). Most studies that have been followed up over the long-term did not imagine at the outset that they would still be in the field 30 years later. Keeping a database of locating information, forming a solid relationship of trust with your respondents, sharing with them over the years findings that show that their collaboration has produced valuable knowledge are all important techniques to have in place from the outset.

References

Hawkins, J. D., Catalano, R. F., Morrison, D. M., O'Donnell, J., Abbott, R. D., & Day, L. E. (1992). The Seattle Social Development Project: Effects of the first four years on protective factors and problem behaviors. In J. McCord & R. E. Tremblay (Eds.), Preventing antisocial behavior: Interventions from birth through adolescence (pp. 139-161). New York: Guilford Press.

Hawkins, J. D., Kosterman, R., Catalano, R. F., Hill, K. G., & Abbott, R. D. (2008). Effects of social development intervention in childhood 15 years later. Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine, 162, 1133-1141.

Hawkins, J. D., Smith, B. H., Hill, K. G., Kosterman, R., Catalano, R. F., & Abbott, R. D. (2007). Promoting social development and preventing health and behavior problems during the elementary grades: Results from the Seattle Social Development Project. Victims & Offenders, 2, 161-181.

Hill, K. G., Bailey, J. A., Hawkins, J. D., Catalano, R. F., Kosterman, R., Oesterle, S., & Abbott, R. D. (2014). The onset of STI diagnosis through Age 30: Results from the Seattle Social Development Project intervention. Prevention Science, 15 (Suppl 1), S19-S32. doi: doi 10.1007/s11121-013-0382-x

Hill, K. G., Woodward, D., Woelfel, T., Hawkins, J. D., & Green, S. (in press). Planning for Long-Term Follow-up: Strategies Learned from Longitudinal Studies. Prevention Science.