Caring for kids

A critical study of urban school leavers

Richard J. Altenbaugh

David E. Engel

Don T. Martin

Caring for Kids

DEDICATION

To Louis A. Petrone (1927–1991) we dedicate this book. Friend, colleague and mentor, Lou helped us formulate this research and gave us good humored encouragement long before any of us could adequately convey our appreciation of him or fully understand what he meant to us. We hope some of his warmth, insight, and sensitivity shows through our words.

Caring For Kids:
A Critical Study of Urban School Leavers

Richard J. Altenbaugh, David E. Engel
and Don T. Martin

Contents

Acknowledgments

Preface

We began this research because we were impressed, like so many pro-
fessionals in the 1980s, that school leavers represented a major social
and educational problem. The high school completion rate had not
substantially increased since the mid-1960s. In some areas, mostly ur-
ban centers, the school leaver rate was growing worse. Students had
seemingly not improved in national reports of Scholastic Aptitude Test
(SAT) performance. Business leaders in the United States bemoaned
the linguistic and computational skills of the typical public high school
graduate entering the workforce. It all seemed to be pretty grim. How
was the nation going to compete internationally if our high school
graduates could not perform up to standard with their Japanese and
European counterparts? If 25 to 30 per cent of high school students
were early school leavers, did this not create a growing number of
unemployable youth?

I was especially concerned because, in the early eighties, I was a
member, and for two years President, of the Board of Education of the
Pittsburgh public schools. During those years the dropout rate fell
from the low 30s to the mid 20th percentile. I consulted the Superin-
tendent and the Director of Research and Evaluation seeking an expla-
nation. To what could this apparent improvement be attributed? The
Director of Research could cite statistics, but comparisons to other
similar school districts were difficult to make because different states
computed dropout rates in different ways. The Superintendent could
offer some intuitive hunches, but neither had data from the students'
experiences. Both agreed that documentation of students' reasons for
leaving school before completion would be useful. So the concept
driving this research was born.

It was obvious from the outset that actual dropouts would need to
be interviewed. An interview protocol was developed in consultation
with the district's Director of Research and Evaluation and related
literature was reviewed. Several diversions got in the way, not the least
of which was contacting subjects for interview.

Initially we obtained a list of forty-eight students who had dropped

out of Pittsburgh high schools. In all but one case, we found that the dropouts were no longer at the address on the list. Where had they gone? No one could tell us: it was if they had fallen off the face of the earth. Still, it was necessary to test the interview protocol before proceeding to a larger sample. The one student who seemed to be at the last known address on the list was called. He agreed to an interview. On the appointed day and hour, that student failed to appear; with a follow-up telephone call, I was told by that motherly electronic voice that the number had been disconnected. We seemed to have reached a dead end.

Then Don Martin came up with a fruitful suggestion. He had prior experience with the Pittsburgh Job Corps program and knew that it served school dropouts who wanted to obtain a Graduate Equivalency Diploma (GED). Here was an accessible group to interview. After making arrangements and gaining clearance from the Job Corps and the US Department of Labor, which oversees the program, we began interviews.

The students we interviewed were at variance from those we initially had anticipated. Because they had taken the initiative to obtain a GED, they could not be viewed as leaving school in any absolute sense. They were motivated to return to an alternative educational program. In most cases, they went to the Job Corps to learn a vocational skill as well as earn the GED. They have been able to tell us why they left school as well as why they dropped back, thus enriching our data; we refer to them as *dropbacks*. They stopped their schooling and then restarted, showing us that there can be life after leaving school.

This experience has renewed our faith in American education. Instead of believing that the rate of school leavers catalogues failures, we now feel that there is potential for students who leave school early. If those who leave school before completion can find alternatives to ordinary programs, they can rejoin their peers with a high school diploma.

David E. Engel
Pittsburgh, PA, 1994

This page intentionally left blank

Part I

Introduction

This page intentionally left blank

The Social Terrain

No one really knows what causes students to drop out of high
school. (Rumberger, 1986)

Studies of school leavers, relying mainly on statistical approaches and
descriptive narrative, too often produce ill-informed policies. This liter-
ature generally remains ahistorical, viewing school leaving as a wholly
contemporary issue. It also lacks a social framework, avoiding critical
analyses. In contrast, this study attempts to place our student narratives
within broader historical, philosophical and social contexts. Our purpose
is only partly utilitarian. It is committed to understanding the experience
of school leaving: we reconstruct schooling through students' percep-
tions in order to gain some insight into the school leaving process.

From a traditional perspective, the United States appears to face a
deep and nagging dilemma, which seems even more problematic given
current trends. 'While national estimates of rates of leaving school before
a diploma range from 18 to 25 per cent of 18-year-olds, estimates from
large cities are often double these rates, and, for some subgroups of
urban students, rates have been reported at 60 per cent or higher'
(Hammack, 1986, p. 326; see also Mann, 1986, p. 311). In certain
localities, Hispanics claim a 78 per cent rate, with Native Americans as
high as 90 per cent (Kunisawa, 1988, p. 62). Rumberger (1983), pointed
to yet another disturbing pattern: the school leaver rate appeared to be
escalating among white middle-class youth (p. 200). Asian-American
students, with a 9.6 per cent school leaver mark, represent the only
exceptions (Kunisawa, 1988, p. 62). Finally, slightly more males than
females leave school, at 53 and 47 per cent, respectively (Beck and
Muia, 1980, p. 66; Markey, 1988, p. 37). It appears from all accounts,
therefore, that the population at-risk transcends race, ethnicity, social
class, as well as gender (Natriello, Pallas, and McDill, 1986; Stoughton
and Grody, 1978). Moreover, although this country has experienced a
long-term decline in the incidence of school leaving, 'the short-term
has remained steady and even increased' (Rumberger, 1986, p. 101;
General Accounting Office, 1987, p. 10).

Full attendance has never been achieved, and ironically recent school reform policies may exacerbate, rather than ameliorate, this problem. An avalanche of reports, issued amid heavy media blitzes since 1983, condemned the general 'crisis' in American public education and have, with almost total unanimity, called for a more academically oriented curriculum and tougher graduation standards. High schools have received special attention in this regard (Boyer, 1983; Goodlad, 1984; National Commission of Excellence in Education, 1983; Sizer, 1984). With much fanfare and for obvious political purposes, George Bush in 1988 declared himself the 'education president'. He anointed, as well as reinvigorated, this movement when he proclaimed in his 1990 State of the Union message: 'The nation will not accept anything less than excellence in education' (quoted in Spring, 1991, p. 23). Bush and the National Governor's Association established six basic goals to be attained by the year 2000, calling for 'competency in challenging subject matter' and striving for 'first in the world in mathematics and science achievement' while at the same time prescribing a 90 per cent high school graduation rate. Showing little imagination, the Clinton administration, with its 'Goals 2000: Educate America', has chosen to maintain the same basic objectives. National assessment, based on standardized test scores given in the fourth, eighth and twelfth grades, represents the means to measure and report progress ('Text of Statement', 1990, p. 16; 'Tracking Progress', 1991, p. 6; Spring, 1991, p. 23; 'Riley Announces "Goals"', 1993, p. 1).

However, simply raising academic codes and instituting more tests could leave more students 'behind in the pursuit of excellence' (Natriello, 1986, p. 306; Alexander *et al*, 1985; Foley, 1985; Natriello, Pallas and McDill, 1986). Assessment, which often becomes 'the primary form of education reform', masks this deep-seated problem: 'Testing . . . can only measure progress . . . not engender it . . . Assessment would not address the issue of rigid and bureaucratic school governance and structure, high school dropout rates, teacher quality, or a whole host of other issues critical to school reform' ('National Testing Debate', 1991, p. 2). This school reform movement appears to have some degree of failure, rather than success, built into it by further aggravating the 'fragility of school completion' (Mann, 1986, p. 310), because increased standards through measurement alone could result in frequent grade repetition, which would further undermine attendance. 'Being retained one grade increases the risk of dropping out by 40–50 per cent, two grades by 90 per cent' (Natriello, 1986, p. 308; Voss, Mendling and Elliot, 1966, p. 365).

Research on school leavers unfortunately has not provided policy

makers with adequate answers to this problem, and has at best pro-
duced ambiguities. In spite of a large number of studies, they appear
to be plagued by three widely varying but significant obstacles: defi-
nitions, causes, and solutions.[1]

Definitions

Until recently, definitions differed, and at times confused the issue
(Hammack, 1986, p. 328; Morrow, 1986, p. 343; Rumberger, 1986,
p. 103; General Accounting Office, 1987, p. 38; Stoughton and Grady,
1978, p. 312). In 1987, a frustrated Government Accounting Office
(GAO) report observed that only forty-one states even bothered to
'count students who drop out of school and that states vary in their
definitions of a dropout. One state includes a transfer to a non-public
school, thirty-four states include military enlistees, twenty-one states
include persons completing a GED, eight include education-at-home
students, and thirty-two include expelled students' (General Account-
ing Office, p. 40). Consequently, *pushouts*, or expelled students, received
inconsistent reporting (Mann, 1986, p. 309). School leaving criteria
fluctuate as well: 'Eleven states use the lack of a school transcript as
a factor that classifies a student as a dropout' (Hammack, 1986, pp.
327–8).
    Structural questions have also clouded this issue. Special schools
and alternative programs as well as different grade sequences have
perplexed researchers and federal agencies alike. An exasperated
Hammack (pp. 327–8), in a 1986 survey of urban school leavers, that
focused on Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, Miami, New York and San
Diego, noted that 'some districts include special education students in
their reports, while others do not; some include all students enrolled in
any type of program offered by the district, while others include only
those enrolled in regular day high schools'. Grade levels also lacked
uniformity, according to the 1987 GAO study (General Accounting
Office, pp. 40–1): 'Among forty-one states, twelve states report drop-
outs for grades 9–12 and fifteen states count grades 7–12, with most of
the others (twelve) reporting dropouts for kindergarten through grade
12'. Of course, the accuracy of these statistics depended on the thor-
oughness of 'centralized record keeping' (Hammack, 1986, p. 327).
This included, as the GAO (1987), lamented, 'time periods during the
school year that dropout data are collected' and 'tracking or follow-up
of youth no longer in school to determine if they continue or complete
secondary education elsewhere' (p. 40). Because of these unreliable

reporting procedures, students simply disappeared in this Kafkaesque, bureaucratic maze.

Recent attempts by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), with support from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), to introduce uniformity in the definition of school leavers and in reporting practices, so as to gather 'accurate statistics', have also proven to be frustrating (Clements, 1990, p. 18). Selected school districts in thirty-one states have been piloting a reporting system developed by the CCSSO and NCES. The base population now includes special students, or those in alternative public-school programs, and compulsory school-age youths who have not graduated. This definition excludes school-age children in 'prisons, mental institutions, juvenile institutions, and adult training centers' from the base population (*ibid*, p. 21). Reporting procedures involve annual school leaver reports and cover grades 7 through 12. Early returns from this pilot project appear mixed, however. States still vary regarding expulsions and home-based instruction, and transfers remain difficult to track, particularly those to non-public schools. Some school administrators have also complained about the 'time and expense involved in revising current collection and reporting practices to meet the proposed national standards' (Goldman, 1990, p. 20). A few Wisconsin districts have likewise complained about their participation because no uniform transcripts or student identifications exist below tenth grade. On the other hand, Florida and Mississippi districts have found the new definition and reporting procedures usable and enlightening. In the end, no consensus exists even among the pilot programs, which further confuses the issue of defining school leavers.

Worse yet, and as alluded to above, most districts do not report, and too many researchers fail to study, students who return to school, otherwise known as 'dropbacks'. Approximately 10 to 33 per cent of all school leavers return, and 90 per cent of these continue their education onto post-secondary levels. 'Some do not rejoin high school but try another sort of post-secondary institution' (Borus and Carpenter, 1983, p. 501; Mann, 1986, p. 315; Weis, Farrar and Petrie, 1989, p. x). These returnees tend to be young and single, who long maintained post-secondary aspirations. As Borus and Carpenter (1983) conclude, one set of variables shaped their decisions to terminate schooling while another set effected their resumption: 'For the most part, return to school seemed to be based on the individual's characteristics rather than on school-related factors' (pp. 502–3). We believe that their perspectives of why they left school and then returned would prove invaluable to educators and policy makers.

Causes

Investigating the reasons for school leaving poses an equally perplexing problem. Many excellent school leaver studies, especially Project TALENT (see Bachman, O'Malley and Johnston, 1979), Youth in Transition, the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth Labor Market Experience (see Borus and Carpenter, 1983; Rumberger, 1983), and High School and Beyond (Kolstad and Owings, 1986, p. 7), have produced extensive data that review the reasons for school leaving, and made 'several generalizations' about them (Wehlage and Rutter, 1986, p. 375). School leavers, according to these reports, come from impoverished families, accrued feeble academic records, maintained high failure rates, and reflected poor outlooks, such as 'negative school attitudes, low self-esteem, and external locus of control' (*ibid*; Beck and Muia, 1980, p. 66; Boyer, 1983, pp. 244–5; Kowalski and Cangemi, 1974, p. 41; Rumberger, 1986, p. 109; Stoughton and Grady, 1978, p. 314; Wagner, 1984; Weidman and Friedmann, 1984, p. 27).

   More important, these explanations have remained somewhat static for decades (Rumberger, 1983, p. 201). Sherman Dorn (1993, pp. 356 and 363) argues that the modern school leaver dilemma assumed legitimacy and gained wide public attention beginning in the 1960s, with the publication of several hundred articles in education journals. The manpower concerns of the 1950s, and demographic changes, i.e., 'more teenagers graduated from high school', set the stage for the sixties' explosion in research into the school leaver phenomenon. School leaving emerged as a deviant activity, as Dorn (1993) explains:

> Much space within the dropout literature was devoted to five motifs, all of which were to some extent explicit: equating the dropout problem with unemployment, linking it with urban poverty, using the language of juvenile delinquency, assuming that dropouts were male, and asserting that psychological defects were a primary distinction between dropouts and graduates. (p. 363)

These themes persisted, evident in contemporary 'public debate'.

   Such categories, of limited help, tend to oversimplify matters and, obfuscate intricate patterns. Melissa Roderick (1993, pp. 43 and 82) attempts to unravel the process by concisely analyzing the school leaver literature and placing it into three groups. First, at one end of the spectrum, many studies point to student background as primarily responsible for leaving school, diminishing the impact of schooling.

Second, at the other end of the spectrum, some literature focuses solely on school 'structure, organization, and policies'. Third, more complex research stresses a combination of factors, i.e., family background as well as insensitive and inadequate school policies and staff. 'The singular outcome — not finishing high school — is in fact a nest of problems' (Mann, 1986, p. 311; Wehlage *et al*, 1989, pp. 25–6). We fall into this latter category, yet place more emphasis on the school's role in the leaving process; we cannot — nor do we presume to — change family conditions, but we can recommend alterations in school culture and structure to mitigate school leaving.

The methodology used to conduct school leaver research often contributes to its shortcomings. Descriptive statistical studies provide valuable information, to be sure, but generally lack in-depth analysis of this social and educational problem. While Rumberger (1983, pp. 210–11), for example, sees family background as strongly influencing 'the probability of dropping out for members of all race and sex groups', he cautions that 'as with all previous studies of dropout behavior, the results obtained from these models have certain limitations'. These research efforts, he continues, present 'associations between independent variables and the probability of dropping out', yet they do not 'infer causality from various factors'. These 'factors' might really be 'symptoms' rather than causes of dropout behavior (see also Bachman, O'Malley and Johnston, 1979, p. 482). Hence, these studies fail largely to reveal the mechanisms that actually caused students to abandon schooling. As Rumberger (1986, p. 109) concludes in another study: 'No one really knows what causes students to drop out of high school'. Even worse, we know little, virtually nothing, about the *process* of student disengagement.

Most studies also fail to account for the causes of why school leavers resume their schooling. This represents a serious oversight, because, as Borus and Carpenter (1983) ironically contend, returning to school defies most traditional reasons for leaving it:

> Family background variables, including father's education, poverty status, and absence of mother and/or father in the home at age 14, all which increased the probability of dropping out of school, seemed not to alter the rate for returning. Likewise, the proxy for ability, knowledge of the world of work score, was not significant. . . . Having had or parenting a child . . . was not a significant factor after marital status was accounted for. This implied that it is marriage rather than a presence of a child that hinders returning to school. Finally, the local unemployment

rate, personal unemployment status, and being from a poverty
household were also not statistically significant, which would
appear to indicate that economic conditions do not induce drop-
outs to either remain in the labor market or return to school
when the other factors are controlled. (p. 505)

Their statistical analysis of this phenomenon is helpful but limited,
because, like most investigations, these researchers examine the results
of school leavers' decisions, not the decision-making process. And this
leads us to our central point.

School leaver research typically dismisses the students' perspec-
tive. Of course, the ambitious National Longitudinal Survey of Youth
Labor Market Experiences relied, in part, on data obtained through 'a
series of annual interviews for a national sample of approximately 12,700
young men and women', while the large-scale High School and Be-
yond study utilized questionnaires (Rumberger, 1983; see also Borus
and Carpenter, 1983). Yet, as Wehlage and Rutter (1986), point out in
their valuable analysis, 'although the major studies sought student views,
there is a tendency by researchers to see such information as less im-
portant, or at least to treat it as "surface" data as opposed to "under-
lying" data, which are assumed to be more "powerful"' (p. 376). Except
for surveys and questionnaires, students, who are the principal actors
in the school leaving process, have been treated, at best, marginally
and, at worst, overlooked.

Some recent studies depend on interviews with school leavers.
Such an approach defies seemingly neat patterns, shedding light on the
process as well as the causes of leaving school. As Farrell (1990) convinc-
ingly argues: 'There is a myriad of statistical information available on
the dropout phenomenon with which educators have attempted to go
from the general to the particular. To get the at-risk students' view,
however, we have to do the opposite — go from the particular to the
general' (p. 6). His examination, which grew out of the New York
City's Stay-in-School Partnership program, relies on ninety-one stu-
dent interviews. Its analysis, while insightful, seems limited because it
concentrates on a psychological perspective to explain dropout behavior,
tapping Erik Erickson's concept of adolescent 'self' with its 'conflict-
ing selves' (p. 3). A broader context is needed to better understand the
social forces and educational conditions shaping dropout behavior.

Fine's (1985, 1986 and 1991) ethnographic research focusing on a
New York City public high school, uses interviews of administrators,
teachers, and students, the latter supplemented by surveys, to demon-
strate social 'reproduction': 'The analysis relies upon life in this school

as a way of examining how the act of dropping out, even if intended as an act of social resistance, ultimately reproduces and exacerbates social inequities' (Fine, 1985, p. 44). However, she only focuses on one high school, limiting generalizations.

Overlooking students' perspectives can also diminish the importance of schooling itself as a cause of leaving. According to Wehlage and Rutter (1986, p. 376), 'there is a clear trend in what students say. They leave because they do not have much success in school and they do not like it. Many of them chose to accept entry-level work to care for their children, choices that apparently are seen as more attractive than staying in school' (p. 376).[2] This is what Ken Reid (1983) found in his study of school absenteeism in South Wales. He interviewed 128 persistent school absentees, selected from two inner-city comprehensive schools in an industrially depressed area, in order to gain insights into their initial and continued reasons for missing school. His findings suggest that despite the absentees' generally unfavorable social and educational backgrounds, a greater proportion of these students seemed inclined to blame their institutions rather than psychological or social factors for their behavior.

Solutions

This kind of information is critical because research approaches and findings shape the solution. 'The focus on social, family, and personal characteristics does not carry any obvious implications for shaping school policy and practice. Moreover, if the research on school leaving continues to focus on the relatively fixed attributes of students, the effect of such research may well be to give schools an excuse for their lack of success with the dropout' (Wehlage and Rutter, 1986, p. 376). Such cynicism fuels the 'blame-the-victim' perspective (Mann, 1986, pp. 310–11). Wehlage and Rutter (1986) warn against such shortsighted, traditional lines of research, arguing for new approaches: 'Researchers need now to ask why these youth are educationally at risk and, further, what policies and practices of public schools can be constructive in reducing the chances that these students will drop out' (p. 377).

Countless commissions have been convened 'to address the problems of at-risk students' (Rumberger, 1986, p. 116). Past as well as present policy recommendations have usually followed standard causal research data. Current efforts 'that seem to work' include 'work-experience programs', small-scale settings that emphasize caring, computer-assisted instructional techniques, computerized monitoring of students at risk,

and 'business-school partnerships' guaranteeing employment for high school graduates (Mann, 1986, pp. 318–20; Bachman, O'Malley and Johnston, 1979, p. 482; Balfour and Harris, 1979; Wagner, 1984; Weidman and Friedmann, 1984, p. 37). Other policy makers and researchers have pointed to a variety of alternative schools or programs (Boyer, 1983, pp. 245–6; Farrell, 1990; Foley, 1985; Kunisawa, 1988). Finally, the characteristics of 'reentry' programs have differed markedly from prevention efforts (School Dropouts, 1987, pp. 22–5).

Nevertheless, without the students' perspectives, we simply do not know what will work (*ibid*, p. 20). As Wehlage and Rutter (1986) maintain: 'From the standpoint of school policy and practice, it is essential for educators to become knowledgeable about the way school can be perceived differently and can affect different groups of adolescents in different ways' (p. 380).

A New Direction

Other studies and findings directly confront the flurry of publicity over the 'educational crisis' in general and the school leaver dilemma in particular. Bracey's findings are provocative, since he sees no decline in American schools; rather, just the opposite: The 'education system — as a system — continues to perform better than ever' (Bracey, 1992, p. 107). Concerning the specific school leaver problem, Bracey (1991) states that 'high school graduation rates are at an all-time high' (p. 106). Not only did the United States experience an 83 per cent graduation rate in 1989, but this represented a 'misleadingly low' figure because it only accounted for those students who graduated within the traditional twelve-to-fourteen-year period (*ibid*). Unlike the situation in many other countries, growing numbers of young Americans resume their schooling, often completing it. 'In 1989, 87 per cent of Americans between the ages of 25 and 29 held high school diplomas or GED (general equivalency diploma) certificates, up from 73 per cent only twenty years earlier' (*ibid*, p. 107). Even more startling, and undermining the credibility of the 'Goals 2000: Educate America' graduation projection, '91 per cent of the class of 1980 had completed high school or its equivalent by 1986' (*ibid*; NCES, 1994). The typical twelve-year template does not apply to all students, due to a number of variables including development, maturity, and life experiences. The standard expectation is understandable, yet it masks the fact that some do complete school over a longer period of time and often in unconventional

ways. Thus, when young people take fourteen to sixteen years to finish school, the leaver situation appears to be significantly different.

Return rates therefore prove encouraging. However, dropbacks — those dropouts who resume their schooling — receive little or no attention from researchers. According to Kolstad and Owings (1986) who tapped the High School and Beyond data, 38 per cent of school leavers nationwide 'returned and completed high school or obtained a GED' (p. 14). This resumption rate varies depending on when students first abandoned schooling, as well as their gender, race, ethnicity, social class, test scores, location, post-secondary expectations, and employment opportunities. Twenty-seven per cent of sophomore school leavers returned to complete their graduation requirements, with 37 and 41 per cent for juniors and seniors, respectively (*ibid*, p. 15). Although slightly more males than females leave school before graduation, female school leavers returned at the same general rate as males. However, when Kolstad and Owings combined gender with ethnicity and race, different patterns emerged: 'Among majority whites, young male and female dropouts were about equally likely to return and complete high school, but among Hispanics and Blacks, young male dropouts were about 10 percentage points more likely to return and complete high school than young female dropouts' (*ibid*, p. 16).

These researchers also isolated ethnic and racial differences: 30 per cent of Latino, 33 per cent of African-American and 41 per cent of White school leavers returned. Yet socioeconomic status significantly affected these figures. Affluent students, regardless of their ethnic and racial backgrounds, returned at a higher rate, with 42 per cent for Latinos, 44 per cent for African Americans and 56 per cent for Whites. These rates dropped dramatically for low-status students, with 32, 25 and 32 per cent respectively (*ibid*, p. 27; Weidman and Friedmann, 1984, p. 26). When Kolstad and Owings (pp. 17 and 28) introduced academic achievement, as measured by standardized test scores, they found yet another pattern. In the upper three test score quartiles, 69 per cent of Latino and 58 per cent of African-American school leavers returned, with 55 per cent for Whites. These percentages plummeted to 18, 25 and 22 per cent, respectively, for low-achieving students.

Location too affected the dropping back process. 'The South and Northeast had return/completion rates around 40 per cent, compared to a 35 per cent rate in the West and North Central regions'. Dropback rates too varied according to the community: 'High school dropouts in urban areas had dropout/return rates around 35 per cent, compared to 37 per cent in rural areas and to 42 per cent in suburban areas' (*ibid*, p. 18).