

ICPSR 29961

**Research on Pathways to
Desistance [Maricopa County, AZ
and Philadelphia County, PA]:
Subject Measures, 2000-2010**

Edward P. Mulvey
University of Pittsburgh

Frequencies for 60 Month Follow-up Data

Inter-university Consortium for
Political and Social Research
P.O. Box 1248
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106
www.icpsr.umich.edu

Terms of Use

The terms of use for this study can be found at:
<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/studies/29961/terms>

Information about Copyrighted Content

Some instruments administered as part of this study may contain in whole or substantially in part contents from copyrighted instruments. Reproductions of the instruments are provided as documentation for the analysis of the data associated with this collection. Restrictions on "fair use" apply to all copyrighted content. More information about the reproduction of copyrighted works by educators and librarians is available from the United States Copyright Office.

**NOTICE
WARNING CONCERNING COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS**

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTES

The following measures were implemented to protect the confidentiality of the study's respondents. ICPSR made these decisions in conjunction with the Principal Investigator and his staff.

1. Several questions asked for the specific relationship of family members and friends in multiple sections. These were recoded into broader categories; i.e., "Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)", "Female relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, girl cousin)".
2. Due to small frequency counts ethnicity groups other than White, African American, and Hispanic were combined together and merged with the group "Other".
3. In the original files, dummy identification codes were present on variables grouping respondents that attended the same school or detention facility, or belonged to the same gang. Although the codes were already de-identified a decision was made to mask the valid data.
4. The specifics concerning household size and composition were recoded. The total number of persons living in the same household was top-coded at nine. With the exception of biological parents, siblings, and grandparents other household members specific relationships were grouped together to form broader categories.
5. The specific ages of a respondent's children (if any) were masked.
6. The section on "Self-Reported Offending" asked a series of six questions about multiple specific crimes and delinquent acts. The series of questions were masked for all respondents for the crimes of forcible sex on another person and for killing another person.

VARIABLE GROUP CROSSWALK ACROSS WAVES

Note: Like variables across waves share the same variable name with the exception of the first two characters which designate what wave the variable is from (i.e., S0 for the baseline; S1 for the 6 Month follow-up; S2 for the 12 Month follow-up; continuing on upto S9 for the 72 month follow-up and SA for variables part of the 84 Month follow-up data.

ICPSR 29961

Research on Pathways to Desistance [Maricopa County, AZ and Philadelphia County, PA]: Subject Measures, 2000-2010

Variable Description and Frequencies

Note: Frequencies displayed for the variables are not weighted. They are purely descriptive and may not be representative of the study population. Please review any sampling or weighting information available with the study.

Summary statistics (minimum, maximum, mean, median, and standard deviation) may not be available for every variable in the codebook. Conversely, a listing of frequencies in table format may not be present for every variable in the codebook either. However, all variables in the dataset are present and display sufficient information about each variable. These decisions are made intentionally and are at the discretion of the archive producing this codebook.

60 Month Follow-Up

LINEID: Line Identification Number

This variable was created by ICPSR to provide an exact line number to each case so that the file may be returned, if needed, to its original order as it was received from ICPSR.

Based upon 1,354 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1-4 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

CASEID: S8 IntInfo: Subject ID

The variable CASEID was assigned a unique, random identification number by the Principal Investigator. This ID number is the same number for the respondent in each of the 11 waves of this study. Please use this variable when attempting to merge multiple data- files to one another. This number will also be the same to identify respondents across the Pathways data series.

Based upon 1,354 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 5-9 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

S8INTCOMPSTAT: S8 IntInfo: Interview completion status

Completion status of the interview.

MEASURE: Interview Information

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Complete	1203	88.8 %
2	Partial	4	0.3 %
4	Incomplete	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,354 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 10-10 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

S8QVERSION: S8 IntInfo: Version number associated with programming changes to the interview

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
01.19	-	415	30.6 %
01.20	-	187	13.8 %
01.21	-	532	39.3 %
01.22	-	73	5.4 %
INC	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	0	0.0 %
Inc	-	147	10.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,354 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 11-15 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: character

S8INTYR: S8 IntInfo: Year of Interview

What year did the interview take place in?

MEASURE: Interview Information

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2005	-	53	3.9 %
2006	-	593	43.8 %
2007	-	557	41.1 %
2008	-	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,207 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 16-19 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -201

S8INTLOC: S8 IntInfo: Interview location

Where did this interview take place?

MEASURE: Interview Information

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Subject's home	516	38.1 %
2	At the placement	341	25.2 %
3	Somewhere else	350	25.8 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,207 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 20-23 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: -201

S8PLCCOD: S8 IntInfo: Interview location - facility code

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	341	25.2 %
	Missing Data		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	NA: Interview not conducted at the placement	866	64.0 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 341 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 24-28 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -201 , -101

S8PLCTYPE: S8 IntInfo: Interview location - facility type

What type of facility did the interview take place in?

MEASURE: Interview Information

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
8	Residential treatment center (centralized staff, institutional setting)	3	0.2 %
14	Secure	2	0.1 %
15	Jail / Prison	310	22.9 %
16	Detention	20	1.5 %
20	Other	6	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	NA: Interview conducted not at placement	866	64.0 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 341 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 29-32 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -201 , -101

S8NMONTHS: S8 IntInfo: Number of months covered in the recall period

Number of months in the recall period.

MEASURE: Interview Information

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
8	-	2	0.1 %
9	-	8	0.6 %
10	-	69	5.1 %
11	-	249	18.4 %
12	-	544	40.2 %
13	-	258	19.1 %
14	-	77	5.7 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,207 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 33-36 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -201

S8DAY SINRP: S8 IntInfo: Number of days covered in the recall period

Number of days in the recall period.

MEASURE: Interview Information

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
230	-	1	0.1 %
243	-	1	0.1 %
262	-	1	0.1 %
271	-	1	0.1 %
273	-	2	0.1 %
274	-	1	0.1 %
275	-	3	0.2 %
276	-	1	0.1 %
281	-	1	0.1 %
290	-	1	0.1 %
291	-	2	0.1 %
293	-	2	0.1 %
294	-	1	0.1 %
295	-	2	0.1 %
297	-	1	0.1 %
299	-	2	0.1 %
300	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
301	-	2	0.1 %
302	-	5	0.4 %
303	-	11	0.8 %
304	-	29	2.1 %
306	-	8	0.6 %
311	-	1	0.1 %
316	-	1	0.1 %
318	-	2	0.1 %
319	-	5	0.4 %
320	-	4	0.3 %
321	-	4	0.3 %
322	-	5	0.4 %
323	-	7	0.5 %
324	-	6	0.4 %
325	-	5	0.4 %
326	-	4	0.3 %
327	-	4	0.3 %
328	-	2	0.1 %
329	-	9	0.7 %
330	-	8	0.6 %
331	-	8	0.6 %
332	-	5	0.4 %
333	-	9	0.7 %
334	-	97	7.2 %
335	-	45	3.3 %
336	-	1	0.1 %
337	-	18	1.3 %
338	-	1	0.1 %
339	-	1	0.1 %
340	-	1	0.1 %
344	-	3	0.2 %
345	-	2	0.1 %
349	-	7	0.5 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,207 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 37-40 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -201

S8SITE: S8 DEM: Study Site Location

The geographic site where the subject is located.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Philadelphia	700	51.7 %
2	Phoenix	654	48.3 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,354 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 41-41 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

S8SGEND: S8 DEM: Subject gender

Subject's gender.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Male	1031	76.1 %
2	Female	176	13.0 %
	Missing Data		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,207 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 42-45 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8AGE: S8 DEM: Subject Age as of the interview date - Truncated

Subject's age at the time of the interview (Truncated); interview date minus the subject's DOB truncated to a whole number.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
18	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
19	-	144	10.6 %
20	-	241	17.8 %
21	-	367	27.1 %
22	-	356	26.3 %
23	-	96	7.1 %
24	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,207 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 46-49 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -201

S8CTAGE: S8 DEM: Subject Age as of the interview date - Continuous

Subject's age at the time of the interview (Continuous); interview date minus the subject's DOB as a continuous variable.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1207	89.1 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,207 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 50-54 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -201

S8BL_ETH: S8 DEM: Ethnicity stated at Baseline

Ethnicity (from baseline).

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1354	100.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,354 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 55-59 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

S8ETHN_R: S8 DEM: Subjects Ethnicity - Recoded

Recoded ethnicity; self-reported ethnicity collapsed into 4 groups.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	White	274	20.2 %
2	Black	561	41.4 %
3	Hispanic	454	33.5 %
4	Other	65	4.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,354 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 60-63 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

S8JOBQ_MIL01: S8 Military: Been on active duty for military training/service during recall period

Have you been on active duty for military training/service during the recall period?

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1199	88.6 %
1	Yes	7	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,206 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 64-67 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -147 , -9 , -8

S8JOBQ_MIL02: S8 Military: Attempted to enlist in the military during recall period but unable

Did you attempt to enlist in the military but were unable to during the recall period

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1152	85.1 %
1	Yes	54	4.0 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,206 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 68-71 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -147 , -9 , -8

S8JOBQ_VOT01: S8 Voting: Is registered to vote

Are you registered to vote?

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	658	48.6 %
1	Yes	544	40.2 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-9	Dont Know	4	0.3 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,202 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 72-75 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -147 , -9 , -8

S8JOBQ_VOT02: S8 Voting: Voted in any election during recall period

Did you vote in any election during the recall period?

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	414	30.6 %
1	Yes	130	9.6 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-148	Skipped: Not registered to vote	663	49.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 544 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 76-79 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -148 , -147 , -9 , -8

S8DEMO_PARDTH: S8 FamStr: Biological parents passed away during recall period

Whether either biological parent passed away in the recall period.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1187	87.7 %
1	Yes - Mom	7	0.5 %
2	Yes - Dad	11	0.8 %
3	Yes - Both	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,206 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 80-83 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8DEMO_PMONDTN: S8 FamStr: Primary caregiver pass away during recall period

Whether a primary caregiver passed away in the recall period.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	26	1.9 %
1	Yes	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Skipped: Subject didnt have a primary caregiver	1180	87.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 27 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 84-87 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8ARMSA_MEXAM: S8 ARSMA: Consider yourself to be Mexican American

Background Mexican American.

MEASURE: Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARSMA-II)

The Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARSMA-II; Cuellar, Arnold, and Maldonado, 1995) was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's cultural orientation toward Mexican and Anglo cultures. This instrument was only administered to adolescents who identified themselves as Mexican-American. The scale contains 48 items to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all" to "Extremely often or almost always," with higher scores indicating greater cultural orientation.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	896	66.2 %
1	Yes	311	23.0 %
	Missing Data		
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,207 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 88-91 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8AOS: S8 ARSMA: Anglo Orientation Subscale

Anglo Orientation - General; Mean of 11 items.

MEASURE: Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARSMA-II)

The Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARSMA-II; Cuellar, Arnold, and Maldonado, 1995) was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's cultural orientation toward Mexican and Anglo cultures. This instrument was only administered

to adolescents who identified themselves as Mexican-American. The scale contains 48 items to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all" to "Extremely often or almost always," with higher scores indicating greater cultural orientation.

- (1) Not at all
- (2) Very little or not very often
- (3) Moderately
- (4) More or very often
- (5) Extremely often or almost always

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all	0	0.0 %
2.00	Very little or not very often	0	0.0 %
2.36	-	1	0.1 %
2.55	-	1	0.1 %
2.64	-	1	0.1 %
2.82	-	2	0.1 %
2.91	-	2	0.1 %
3.00	Moderately	0	0.0 %
3.09	-	2	0.1 %
3.18	-	5	0.4 %
3.27	-	4	0.3 %
3.36	-	9	0.7 %
3.45	-	8	0.6 %
3.55	-	9	0.7 %
3.64	-	16	1.2 %
3.73	-	18	1.3 %
3.82	-	17	1.3 %
3.91	-	35	2.6 %
4.00	More or very often	20	1.5 %
4.09	-	26	1.9 %
4.18	-	13	1.0 %
4.27	-	17	1.3 %
4.36	-	25	1.8 %
4.45	-	18	1.3 %
4.55	-	15	1.1 %
4.64	-	11	0.8 %
4.73	-	5	0.4 %
4.82	-	9	0.7 %
4.91	-	6	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	15	1.1 %
	Missing Data		
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into ARSMA	896	66.2 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 310 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 92-98 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8ANGAFF: S8 ARSMA: Anglo Affiliation Subscale

Anglo Orientation - Affiliation; Mean of 3 items.

MEASURE: Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARSMA-II)

The Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARSMA-II; Cuellar, Arnold, and Maldonado, 1995) was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's cultural orientation toward Mexican and Anglo cultures. This instrument was only administered to adolescents who identified themselves as Mexican-American. The scale contains 48 items to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all" to "Extremely often or almost always," with higher scores indicating greater cultural orientation.

- (1) Not at all
- (2) Very little or not very often
- (3) Moderately
- (4) More or very often
- (5) Extremely often or almost always

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all	26	1.9 %
1.33	-	8	0.6 %
1.67	-	14	1.0 %
2.00	Very little or not very often	22	1.6 %
2.33	-	30	2.2 %
2.67	-	42	3.1 %
3.00	Moderately	42	3.1 %
3.33	-	48	3.5 %
3.67	-	22	1.6 %
4.00	More or very often	19	1.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4.33	-	12	0.9 %
4.67	-	9	0.7 %
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	16	1.2 %
	Missing Data		
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into ARSMA	896	66.2 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 310 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 99-105 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8ENGLNG: S8 ARSMA: English Language Subscale

Anglo Orientation - Language; Mean of 8 items.

MEASURE: Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARSMA-II)

The Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARSMA-II; Cuellar, Arnold, and Maldonado, 1995) was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's cultural orientation toward Mexican and Anglo cultures. This instrument was only administered to adolescents who identified themselves as Mexican-American. The scale contains 48 items to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all" to "Extremely often or almost always," with higher scores indicating greater cultural orientation.

- (1) Not at all
- (2) Very little or not very often
- (3) Moderately
- (4) More or very often
- (5) Extremely often or almost always

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all	0	0.0 %
2.00	Very little or not very often	0	0.0 %
2.63	-	1	0.1 %
2.75	-	1	0.1 %
2.88	-	1	0.1 %
3.00	Moderately	4	0.3 %
3.25	-	4	0.3 %
3.38	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.50	-	4	0.3 %
3.63	-	9	0.7 %
3.75	-	13	1.0 %
3.88	-	8	0.6 %
4.00	More or very often	22	1.6 %
4.13	-	20	1.5 %
4.25	-	18	1.3 %
4.38	-	8	0.6 %
4.50	-	23	1.7 %
4.63	-	14	1.0 %
4.75	-	18	1.3 %
4.88	-	18	1.3 %
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	122	9.0 %
Missing Data			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into ARSMA	896	66.2 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 310 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 106-112 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8MOS: S8 ARSMA: Mexican Orientation Subscale

Mexican Orientation - General; Mean of 12 items.

MEASURE: Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARSMA-II)

The Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARSMA-II; Cuellar, Arnold, and Maldonado, 1995) was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's cultural orientation toward Mexican and Anglo cultures. This instrument was only administered to adolescents who identified themselves as Mexican-American. The scale contains 48 items to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all" to "Extremely often or almost always," with higher scores indicating greater cultural orientation.

- (1) Not at all
- (2) Very little or not very often
- (3) Moderately
- (4) More or very often
- (5) Extremely often or almost always

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all	0	0.0 %
1.25	-	1	0.1 %
1.42	-	2	0.1 %
1.50	-	1	0.1 %
1.58	-	10	0.7 %
1.67	-	8	0.6 %
1.73	-	1	0.1 %
1.75	-	9	0.7 %
1.82	-	1	0.1 %
1.83	-	9	0.7 %
1.91	-	1	0.1 %
1.92	-	10	0.7 %
2.00	Very little or not very often	16	1.2 %
2.08	-	14	1.0 %
2.17	-	9	0.7 %
2.25	-	8	0.6 %
2.33	-	12	0.9 %
2.42	-	12	0.9 %
2.50	-	6	0.4 %
2.58	-	6	0.4 %
2.67	-	8	0.6 %
2.75	-	12	0.9 %
2.83	-	7	0.5 %
2.92	-	6	0.4 %
3.00	Moderately	2	0.1 %
3.08	-	7	0.5 %
3.17	-	11	0.8 %
3.25	-	6	0.4 %
3.33	-	8	0.6 %
3.42	-	5	0.4 %
3.50	-	4	0.3 %
3.58	-	6	0.4 %
3.67	-	2	0.1 %
3.75	-	9	0.7 %
3.83	-	7	0.5 %
3.92	-	2	0.1 %
4.00	More or very often	3	0.2 %
4.08	-	5	0.4 %
4.17	-	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4.25	-	2	0.1 %
4.33	-	3	0.2 %
4.42	-	3	0.2 %
4.50	-	4	0.3 %
4.58	-	1	0.1 %
4.67	-	1	0.1 %
4.75	-	1	0.1 %
4.83	-	1	0.1 %
4.92	-	5	0.4 %
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	40	3.0 %
Missing Data			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into ARSMA	896	66.2 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 310 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 113-119 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8MEXAFF: S8 ARSMA: Mexican Affiliation Subscale

Mexican Orientation - Affiliation; Mean of 3 items.

MEASURE: Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARSMA-II)

The Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARSMA-II; Cuellar, Arnold, and Maldonado, 1995) was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's cultural orientation toward Mexican and Anglo cultures. This instrument was only administered to adolescents who identified themselves as Mexican-American. The scale contains 48 items to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all" to "Extremely often or almost always," with higher scores indicating greater cultural orientation.

- (1) Not at all
- (2) Very little or not very often
- (3) Moderately
- (4) More or very often
- (5) Extremely often or almost always

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all	0	0.0 %
2.00	Very little or not very often	2	0.1 %
2.33	-	3	0.2 %
2.67	-	8	0.6 %
3.00	Moderately	22	1.6 %
3.33	-	29	2.1 %
3.67	-	35	2.6 %
4.00	More or very often	34	2.5 %
4.33	-	37	2.7 %
4.67	-	33	2.4 %
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	107	7.9 %
Missing Data			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into ARSMA	896	66.2 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 310 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 120-126 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8SPALNG: S8 ARSMA: Spanish Language Subscale

Mexican Orientation - Language; Mean of 9 items.

MEASURE: Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARSMA-II)

The Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans-II (ARSMA-II; Cuellar, Arnold, and Maldonado, 1995) was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's cultural orientation toward Mexican and Anglo cultures. This instrument was only administered to adolescents who identified themselves as Mexican-American. The scale contains 48 items to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all" to "Extremely often or almost always," with higher scores indicating greater cultural orientation.

- (1) Not at all
- (2) Very little or not very often
- (3) Moderately
- (4) More or very often
- (5) Extremely often or almost always

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all	25	1.8 %
1.11	-	14	1.0 %
1.13	-	3	0.2 %
1.22	-	11	0.8 %
1.33	-	16	1.2 %
1.44	-	13	1.0 %
1.56	-	9	0.7 %
1.67	-	16	1.2 %
1.78	-	7	0.5 %
1.89	-	8	0.6 %
2.00	Very little or not very often	12	0.9 %
2.11	-	10	0.7 %
2.22	-	6	0.4 %
2.33	-	8	0.6 %
2.44	-	5	0.4 %
2.56	-	8	0.6 %
2.67	-	5	0.4 %
2.78	-	10	0.7 %
2.89	-	8	0.6 %
3.00	Moderately	5	0.4 %
3.11	-	5	0.4 %
3.22	-	7	0.5 %
3.33	-	8	0.6 %
3.44	-	5	0.4 %
3.56	-	6	0.4 %
3.67	-	6	0.4 %
3.78	-	5	0.4 %
3.89	-	3	0.2 %
4.00	More or very often	1	0.1 %
4.11	-	7	0.5 %
4.22	-	1	0.1 %
4.33	-	4	0.3 %
4.44	-	3	0.2 %
4.56	-	1	0.1 %
4.67	-	1	0.1 %
4.78	-	1	0.1 %
4.89	-	4	0.3 %
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	43	3.2 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into ARSMA	896	66.2 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 310 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 127-133 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8BSISOM: S8 BSI: Somatization

The mean of the individual items which comprise the somatization subscale.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety (ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements"), and psychoticism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

- (0) Not at all
- (1) A little bit
- (2) Moderately
- (3) Quite a bit
- (4) Extremely

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	Not at all	497	36.7 %
0.14	-	130	9.6 %
0.29	-	68	5.0 %
0.43	-	47	3.5 %
0.57	-	38	2.8 %
0.71	-	20	1.5 %
0.86	-	14	1.0 %
1.00	A little bit	13	1.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.14	-	7	0.5 %
1.29	-	7	0.5 %
1.43	-	3	0.2 %
1.57	-	7	0.5 %
1.71	-	3	0.2 %
1.86	-	7	0.5 %
2.00	Moderately	1	0.1 %
2.14	-	4	0.3 %
2.29	-	2	0.1 %
2.43	-	3	0.2 %
2.57	-	1	0.1 %
2.86	-	3	0.2 %
3.00	Quite a bit	0	0.0 %
3.14	-	1	0.1 %
3.29	-	1	0.1 %
3.71	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Extremely	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97.00	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 134-140 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -98.00 , -97.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8SOM_T: S8 BSI: Somatization Clinically Significant

The mean of the clinically significant individual items which comprise the somatization subscale.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety (ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper

credit for your achievements"), and psychoticism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	Not clinically significant	848	62.6 %
1	Clinical range	30	2.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 141-144 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -98 , -97 , -9 , -8

S8BSIOC: S8 BSI: Obsessive-Compulsive

The mean of the individual items which comprise the obsessive-compulsive subscale.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety (ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements"), and psychoticism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

- (0) Not at all
- (1) A little bit
- (2) Moderately
- (3) Quite a bit
- (4) Extremely

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	Not at all	270	19.9 %
0.17	-	127	9.4 %
0.33	-	100	7.4 %
0.50	-	76	5.6 %
0.67	-	72	5.3 %
0.83	-	41	3.0 %
1.00	A little bit	38	2.8 %
1.17	-	26	1.9 %
1.33	-	26	1.9 %
1.50	-	16	1.2 %
1.67	-	14	1.0 %
1.83	-	12	0.9 %
2.00	Moderately	15	1.1 %
2.17	-	8	0.6 %
2.33	-	9	0.7 %
2.50	-	5	0.4 %
2.67	-	5	0.4 %
2.83	-	2	0.1 %
3.00	Quite a bit	3	0.2 %
3.17	-	5	0.4 %
3.33	-	6	0.4 %
3.67	-	2	0.1 %
4.00	Extremely	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97.00	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 145-151 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -98.00 , -97.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8OC_T: S8 BSI: Obsessive-Compulsive Clinically Significant

The mean of the clinically significant individual items which comprise the obsessive-compulsive subscale.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-

report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety (ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements"), and psychoticism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	Not clinically significant	818	60.4 %
1	Clinical range	60	4.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 152-155 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -98 , -97 , -9 , -8

S8BSIIS: S8 BSI: Interpersonal Sensitivity

The mean of the individual items which comprise the interpersonal sensitivity subscale.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety (ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements"), and psychoticism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

- (0) Not at all
- (1) A little bit
- (2) Moderately

- (3) Quite a bit
 (4) Extremely

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	Not at all	532	39.3 %
0.25	-	123	9.1 %
0.50	-	75	5.5 %
0.75	-	59	4.4 %
1.00	A little bit	34	2.5 %
1.25	-	10	0.7 %
1.50	-	11	0.8 %
1.75	-	8	0.6 %
2.00	Moderately	9	0.7 %
2.25	-	4	0.3 %
2.50	-	3	0.2 %
2.75	-	4	0.3 %
3.00	Quite a bit	3	0.2 %
3.50	-	2	0.1 %
4.00	Extremely	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97.00	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 156-162 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -98.00 , -97.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8IS_T: S8 BSI: Interpersonal Sensitivity Clinically Significant

The mean of the clinically significant individual items which comprise the interpersonal sensitivity subscale.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety

(ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements"), and psychoticism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	Not clinically significant	861	63.6 %
1	Clinical range	17	1.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 163-166 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -98 , -97 , -9 , -8

S8BSIDEP: S8 BSI: Depression

The mean of the individual items which comprise the depression subscale.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety (ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements"), and psychoticism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

- (0) Not at all
- (1) A little bit
- (2) Moderately
- (3) Quite a bit
- (4) Extremely

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	Not at all	438	32.3 %
0.17	-	112	8.3 %
0.33	-	75	5.5 %
0.50	-	67	4.9 %
0.67	-	44	3.2 %
0.83	-	22	1.6 %
1.00	A little bit	25	1.8 %
1.17	-	14	1.0 %
1.33	-	11	0.8 %
1.50	-	16	1.2 %
1.67	-	7	0.5 %
1.83	-	9	0.7 %
2.00	Moderately	10	0.7 %
2.17	-	9	0.7 %
2.33	-	3	0.2 %
2.50	-	5	0.4 %
2.67	-	2	0.1 %
2.83	-	1	0.1 %
3.00	Quite a bit	3	0.2 %
3.17	-	1	0.1 %
3.33	-	3	0.2 %
3.67	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Extremely	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97.00	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 167-173 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -98.00 , -97.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8DEP_T: S8 BSI: Depression Clinically Significant

The mean of the clinically significant individual items which comprise the depression subscale.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-

report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety (ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements"), and psychoticism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	Not clinically significant	840	62.0 %
1	Clinical range	38	2.8 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 174-177 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -98 , -97 , -9 , -8

S8BSIANX: S8 BSI: Anxiety

The mean of the individual items which comprise the anxiety subscale.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety (ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements"), and psychoticism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

- (0) Not at all
- (1) A little bit
- (2) Moderately

- (3) Quite a bit
 (4) Extremely

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	Not at all	411	30.4 %
0.17	-	161	11.9 %
0.33	-	75	5.5 %
0.50	-	71	5.2 %
0.67	-	47	3.5 %
0.83	-	27	2.0 %
1.00	A little bit	15	1.1 %
1.17	-	22	1.6 %
1.33	-	7	0.5 %
1.50	-	8	0.6 %
1.67	-	7	0.5 %
1.83	-	5	0.4 %
2.00	Moderately	5	0.4 %
2.17	-	3	0.2 %
2.33	-	4	0.3 %
2.50	-	3	0.2 %
2.67	-	3	0.2 %
3.00	Quite a bit	1	0.1 %
3.17	-	1	0.1 %
3.33	-	1	0.1 %
3.50	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Extremely	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97.00	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 178-184 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -98.00 , -97.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8ANX_T: S8 BSI: Anxiety Clinically Significant

The mean of the clinically significant individual items which comprise the anxiety subscale.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety (ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements"), and psychoticism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	Not clinically significant	851	62.9 %
1	Clinical range	27	2.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 185-188 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -98 , -97 , -9 , -8

S8BSIHOS: S8 BSI: Hostility

The mean of the individual items which comprise the hostility subscale.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety (ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements"), and psychoticism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

- (0) Not at all
- (1) A little bit
- (2) Moderately
- (3) Quite a bit
- (4) Extremely

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.0	Not at all	296	21.9 %
0.2	-	188	13.9 %
0.4	-	105	7.8 %
0.6	-	74	5.5 %
0.8	-	71	5.2 %
1.0	A little bit	41	3.0 %
1.2	-	21	1.6 %
1.4	-	17	1.3 %
1.6	-	17	1.3 %
1.8	-	11	0.8 %
2.0	Moderately	5	0.4 %
2.2	-	5	0.4 %
2.4	-	6	0.4 %
2.6	-	7	0.5 %
2.8	-	5	0.4 %
3.0	Quite a bit	1	0.1 %
3.2	-	3	0.2 %
3.4	-	1	0.1 %
3.6	-	2	0.1 %
3.8	-	1	0.1 %
4.0	Extremely	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.0	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97.0	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 189-195 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.0 , -202.0 , -201.0 , -98.0 , -97.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

S8HOS_T: S8 BSI: Hostility Clinically Significant

The mean of the clinically significant individual items which comprise the hostility subscale.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety (ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements"), and psychoticism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	Not clinically significant	847	62.6 %
1	Clinical range	31	2.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 196-199 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -98 , -97 , -9 , -8

S8BSIPHB: S8 BSI: Phobic Anxiety

The mean of the individual items which comprise the phobic anxiety subscale.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety (ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements"), and psychoticism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

credit for your achievements"), and psychotism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

- (0) Not at all
- (1) A little bit
- (2) Moderately
- (3) Quite a bit
- (4) Extremely

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.0	Not at all	630	46.5 %
0.2	-	100	7.4 %
0.4	-	49	3.6 %
0.6	-	30	2.2 %
0.8	-	23	1.7 %
1.0	A little bit	14	1.0 %
1.2	-	7	0.5 %
1.4	-	3	0.2 %
1.6	-	1	0.1 %
1.8	-	3	0.2 %
2.0	Moderately	5	0.4 %
2.2	-	3	0.2 %
2.4	-	2	0.1 %
2.6	-	2	0.1 %
2.8	-	2	0.1 %
3.0	Quite a bit	1	0.1 %
3.4	-	1	0.1 %
3.6	-	1	0.1 %
3.8	-	1	0.1 %
4.0	Extremely	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202.0	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97.0	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 200-206 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.0 , -202.0 , -201.0 , -98.0 , -97.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

S8PHB_T: S8 BSI: Phobic Anxiety Clinically Significant

The mean of the clinically significant individual items which comprise the phobic anxiety subscale.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety (ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements"), and psychotism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	Not clinically significant	855	63.1 %
1	Clinical range	23	1.7 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 207-210 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700, -202, -201, -98, -97, -9, -8

S8BSIPAR: S8 BSI: Paranoid Ideation

The mean of the individual items which comprise the paranoid ideation subscale.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety (ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break

or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements"), and psychoticism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

- (0) Not at all
- (1) A little bit
- (2) Moderately
- (3) Quite a bit
- (4) Extremely

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.0	Not at all	266	19.6 %
0.2	-	128	9.5 %
0.4	-	103	7.6 %
0.6	-	102	7.5 %
0.8	-	71	5.2 %
1.0	A little bit	35	2.6 %
1.2	-	31	2.3 %
1.4	-	31	2.3 %
1.6	-	26	1.9 %
1.8	-	20	1.5 %
2.0	Moderately	15	1.1 %
2.2	-	8	0.6 %
2.4	-	17	1.3 %
2.6	-	8	0.6 %
2.8	-	6	0.4 %
3.0	Quite a bit	2	0.1 %
3.2	-	5	0.4 %
3.4	-	1	0.1 %
3.6	-	1	0.1 %
3.8	-	2	0.1 %
4.0	Extremely	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202.0	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97.0	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
Total			1,354 100%

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 211-217 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.0 , -202.0 , -201.0 , -98.0 , -97.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

S8PAR_T: S8 BSI: Paranoid Ideation Clinically Significant

The mean of the clinically significant individual items which comprise the paranoid ideation subscale.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety (ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements"), and psychoticism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	Not clinically significant	835	61.7 %
1	Clinical range	43	3.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 218-221 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -98 , -97 , -9 , -8

S8BSIPSY: S8 BSI: Psychoticism

The mean of the individual items which comprise the psychoticism subscale.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling

inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety (ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements"), and psychoticism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

- (0) Not at all
- (1) A little bit
- (2) Moderately
- (3) Quite a bit
- (4) Extremely

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.0	Not at all	480	35.5 %
0.2	-	121	8.9 %
0.4	-	69	5.1 %
0.6	-	56	4.1 %
0.8	-	42	3.1 %
1.0	A little bit	28	2.1 %
1.2	-	25	1.8 %
1.4	-	15	1.1 %
1.6	-	10	0.7 %
1.8	-	5	0.4 %
2.0	Moderately	5	0.4 %
2.2	-	8	0.6 %
2.4	-	5	0.4 %
2.6	-	2	0.1 %
2.8	-	4	0.3 %
3.0	Quite a bit	2	0.1 %
3.2	-	1	0.1 %
4.0	Extremely	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202.0	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97.0	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 222-228 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.0 , -202.0 , -201.0 , -98.0 , -97.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

S8PSY_T: S8 BSI: Psychoticism Clinically Significant

The mean of the clinically significant individual items which comprise the psychoticism subscale.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety (ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements"), and psychoticism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	Not clinically significant	846	62.5 %
1	Clinical range	32	2.4 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 229-232 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -98 , -97 , -9 , -8

S8BSIGSI: S8 BSI: Global Severity Index

Global Severity Index - GSI; this score is the mean of all of the subscale scores.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety (ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break

or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements"), and psychoticism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

- (0) Not at all
- (1) A little bit
- (2) Moderately
- (3) Quite a bit
- (4) Extremely

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	Not at all	0	0.0 %
0.02	-	76	5.6 %
0.04	-	52	3.8 %
0.06	-	43	3.2 %
0.08	-	41	3.0 %
0.09	-	41	3.0 %
0.11	-	37	2.7 %
0.13	-	38	2.8 %
0.15	-	28	2.1 %
0.17	-	31	2.3 %
0.19	-	23	1.7 %
0.21	-	29	2.1 %
0.23	-	32	2.4 %
0.25	-	22	1.6 %
0.26	-	20	1.5 %
0.28	-	13	1.0 %
0.30	-	14	1.0 %
0.32	-	20	1.5 %
0.34	-	14	1.0 %
0.36	-	11	0.8 %
0.38	-	11	0.8 %
0.40	-	14	1.0 %
0.42	-	10	0.7 %
0.43	-	16	1.2 %
0.45	-	6	0.4 %
0.47	-	11	0.8 %
0.49	-	13	1.0 %
0.51	-	9	0.7 %
0.53	-	9	0.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.55	-	6	0.4 %
0.57	-	7	0.5 %
0.58	-	9	0.7 %
0.60	-	8	0.6 %
0.62	-	6	0.4 %
0.64	-	4	0.3 %
0.66	-	6	0.4 %
0.68	-	6	0.4 %
0.70	-	2	0.1 %
0.72	-	7	0.5 %
0.74	-	8	0.6 %
0.75	-	7	0.5 %
0.77	-	3	0.2 %
0.79	-	1	0.1 %
0.81	-	8	0.6 %
0.83	-	4	0.3 %
0.85	-	4	0.3 %
0.87	-	6	0.4 %
0.89	-	5	0.4 %
0.91	-	1	0.1 %
0.92	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97.00	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 233-239 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -98.00 , -97.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8GSI_T: S8 BSI: GSI Clinically Significant

Global Severity Index - GSI; this score is the mean of all of the clinically significant subscale scores.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-

report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety (ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements"), and psychoticism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	Not clinically significant	849	62.7 %
1	Clinical range	29	2.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 240-243 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -98 , -97 , -9 , -8

S8BSIPST: S8 BSI: Positive Symptom Total

Positive Symptoms Total - PST; a count of the number of items endorsed at a level higher than 0.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety (ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements"), and psychoticism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	107	7.9 %
2	-	88	6.5 %
3	-	60	4.4 %
4	-	49	3.6 %
5	-	42	3.1 %
6	-	39	2.9 %
7	-	51	3.8 %
8	-	28	2.1 %
9	-	38	2.8 %
10	-	29	2.1 %
11	-	30	2.2 %
12	-	23	1.7 %
13	-	22	1.6 %
14	-	27	2.0 %
15	-	27	2.0 %
16	-	14	1.0 %
17	-	25	1.8 %
18	-	15	1.1 %
19	-	5	0.4 %
20	-	7	0.5 %
21	-	15	1.1 %
22	-	10	0.7 %
23	-	15	1.1 %
24	-	11	0.8 %
25	-	9	0.7 %
26	-	8	0.6 %
27	-	7	0.5 %
28	-	10	0.7 %
29	-	4	0.3 %
30	-	10	0.7 %
31	-	3	0.2 %
32	-	7	0.5 %
33	-	5	0.4 %
35	-	3	0.2 %
36	-	3	0.2 %
37	-	3	0.2 %
38	-	4	0.3 %
39	-	2	0.1 %
40	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
41	-	1	0.1 %
42	-	4	0.3 %
43	-	3	0.2 %
45	-	2	0.1 %
46	-	1	0.1 %
47	-	1	0.1 %
48	-	2	0.1 %
49	-	2	0.1 %
50	-	2	0.1 %
51	-	2	0.1 %
53	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 244-247 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -98 , -97 , -9 , -8

S8BSIPSD: S8 BSI: Positive Symptom Distress Index

Positive Symptoms Distress Index; the sum of all item values divided by the PST.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety (ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements"), and psychoticism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

- (0) Not at all
- (1) A little bit
- (2) Moderately

- (3) Quite a bit
 (4) Extremely

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	Not at all	0	0.0 %
1.00	A little bit	240	17.7 %
1.03	-	1	0.1 %
1.04	-	2	0.1 %
1.06	-	2	0.1 %
1.07	-	1	0.1 %
1.08	-	8	0.6 %
1.09	-	5	0.4 %
1.10	-	4	0.3 %
1.11	-	6	0.4 %
1.12	-	1	0.1 %
1.13	-	6	0.4 %
1.14	-	8	0.6 %
1.15	-	2	0.1 %
1.17	-	8	0.6 %
1.18	-	7	0.5 %
1.19	-	2	0.1 %
1.20	-	10	0.7 %
1.21	-	1	0.1 %
1.22	-	9	0.7 %
1.24	-	3	0.2 %
1.25	-	19	1.4 %
1.27	-	2	0.1 %
1.29	-	8	0.6 %
1.30	-	3	0.2 %
1.31	-	4	0.3 %
1.32	-	1	0.1 %
1.33	-	14	1.0 %
1.34	-	2	0.1 %
1.35	-	4	0.3 %
1.36	-	1	0.1 %
1.37	-	2	0.1 %
1.38	-	5	0.4 %
1.39	-	2	0.1 %
1.40	-	10	0.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.41	-	3	0.2 %
1.42	-	3	0.2 %
1.43	-	6	0.4 %
1.44	-	6	0.4 %
1.45	-	2	0.1 %
1.46	-	1	0.1 %
1.47	-	4	0.3 %
1.48	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	22	1.6 %
1.51	-	1	0.1 %
1.53	-	3	0.2 %
1.55	-	3	0.2 %
1.56	-	3	0.2 %
1.57	-	6	0.4 %
1.58	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97.00	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 248-254 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -98.00 , -97.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8BSIDX1: S8 BSI: Subscale Diagnosis Significant

Number of subscales which reach clinical significance.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety (ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements"), and psychoticism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something

is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	759	56.1 %
1	-	56	4.1 %
2	-	21	1.6 %
3	-	14	1.0 %
4	-	10	0.7 %
5	-	6	0.4 %
6	-	3	0.2 %
7	-	1	0.1 %
8	-	6	0.4 %
9	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 255-258 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -98 , -97 , -9 , -8

S8BSIDX: S8 BSI: Clinically Significant

Marker for cases which reach clinical significance on 2 or more subscale.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms. The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling inferior to others"), depression (DEP, e.g., "Feeling no interest in things"), anxiety (ANX, e.g., "Feeling tense or keyed up"), hostility (HOS, e.g., "Having urges to break or smash things"), phobic anxiety (PHOB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie"), paranoid ideation (PAR, e.g., "Others not giving you proper credit for your achievements"), and psychoticism (PSY, e.g., "The idea that something is wrong with your mind"). The BSI also includes three scales that capture global psychological distress.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	Not clinically significant	815	60.2 %
1	Clinical range	63	4.7 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97	Invalid Test	325	24.0 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 878 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 259-262 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -98 , -97 , -9 , -8

S8CADPRE: S8 CarAdlt: Domains of Social Support

Domains of social support; Count of number of domains with at least 1 person mentioned.

MEASURE: Caring Adult

The Contact with Caring Adults inventory was derived from several sources for this study (Nakkula, et al., 1990; Phillips and Springer, 1992; Institute of Behavioral Science, 1990). It assesses the type and range of supportive adults in the adolescent's life. This support is assessed across eight domains: adults you admire and want to be like, adults you could talk to if you needed information or advice about something, adults you could talk to about trouble at home, adults you would tell about an award or if you did something well, adults with whom you can talk about important decisions, adults you can depend on for help, adults you feel comfortable talking about problems with, special adults who care about your feelings. This measure asks youth to identify the total number of adults who are supportive in each domain as well as to nominate the person that they are most likely to turn to within each domain. These endorsements are summarized across the eight different domains in three ways - the total domains with a person named, the diversity of the individuals named across the domains, and the depth of the pool of individuals named across the domains. The first of the dimensions calculated, Domains of Social Support, provides the number of different domains for which at least one caring adult is present. Diversity of Caring Adults, the second dimension of social support, identifies the unique individuals mentioned across all eight domains. Diversity of Caring Adults is further refined by also calculating the number of caring adults mentioned in the particular domain in which the youth identifies the highest number of caring adults (Maximum Diversity Within Domains). Finally, the Depth of Social Support assesses the number of caring adults who are mentioned in more than two domains, and further distinguishes between sources of support that are familial versus non-familial.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	186	13.7 %
1	-	46	3.4 %
2	-	42	3.1 %
3	-	46	3.4 %
4	-	39	2.9 %
5	-	49	3.6 %
6	-	133	9.8 %
7	-	409	30.2 %
8	-	255	18.8 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing due to data cleaning	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,205 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 263-266 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8CADFM: S8 CarAdlt: Domains of Social Support - Family

Domains of social support - family; Count of number of domains with at least 1 family member mentioned.

MEASURE: Caring Adult

The Contact with Caring Adults inventory was derived from several sources for this study (Nakkula, et al., 1990; Phillips and Springer, 1992; Institute of Behavioral Science, 1990). It assesses the type and range of supportive adults in the adolescent's life. This support is assessed across eight domains: adults you admire and want to be like, adults you could talk to if you needed information or advice about something, adults you could talk to about trouble at home, adults you would tell about an award or if you did something well, adults with whom you can talk about important decisions, adults you can depend on for help, adults you feel comfortable talking about problems with, special adults who care about your feelings. This measure asks youth to identify the total number of adults who are supportive in each domain as well as to nominate the person that they are most likely to turn to within each domain. These endorsements are summarized across the eight different domains in three ways - the total domains with a person named, the diversity of the individuals named across the domains, and the depth of the pool of individuals named across the domains. The first of the dimensions calculated, Domains of Social Support, provides the number of different domains for which at least one caring adult is present. Diversity of Caring Adults, the second dimension of social support, identifies the unique individuals mentioned across all eight domains. Diversity of Caring Adults is further refined by also calculating the number of caring adults mentioned in the particular domain in which the youth identifies the highest number of caring adults (Maximum Diversity Within Domains). Finally, the Depth of Social Support assesses the number of caring

adults who are mentioned in more than two domains, and further distinguishes between sources of support that are familial versus non-familial.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	87	6.4 %
1	-	71	5.2 %
2	-	45	3.3 %
3	-	53	3.9 %
4	-	59	4.4 %
5	-	76	5.6 %
6	-	127	9.4 %
7	-	322	23.8 %
8	-	179	13.2 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing due to data cleaning	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Did not skip into CaringAdlt measure	186	13.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,019 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 267-270 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -99 , -98

S8CADNFM: S8 CarAdlt: Domains of Social Support - Non-Family

Domains of social support - non family; Count of number of domains with at least 1 non-family member mentioned.

MEASURE: Caring Adult

The Contact with Caring Adults inventory was derived from several sources for this study (Nakkula, et al., 1990; Phillips and Springer, 1992; Institute of Behavioral Science, 1990). It assesses the type and range of supportive adults in the adolescent's life. This support is assessed across eight domains: adults you admire and want to be like, adults you could talk to if you needed information or advice about something, adults you could talk to about trouble at home, adults you would tell about an award or if you did something well, adults with whom you can talk about important decisions, adults you can depend on for help, adults you feel comfortable talking about problems with, special adults who care about your feelings. This measure asks youth to identify the total number of adults who are supportive in each domain as well as to nominate the person that they are most likely to turn to within each domain. These endorsements are summarized across the eight different domains in three ways - the total domains with a person named, the diversity of the individuals named across the domains, and the depth of the pool of individuals named across the domains. The

first of the dimensions calculated, Domains of Social Support, provides the number of different domains for which at least one caring adult is present. Diversity of Caring Adults, the second dimension of social support, identifies the unique individuals mentioned across all eight domains. Diversity of Caring Adults is further refined by also calculating the number of caring adults mentioned in the particular domain in which the youth identifies the highest number of caring adults (Maximum Diversity Within Domains). Finally, the Depth of Social Support assesses the number of caring adults who are mentioned in more than two domains, and further distinguishes between sources of support that are familial versus non-familial.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	721	53.2 %
1	-	90	6.6 %
2	-	60	4.4 %
3	-	34	2.5 %
4	-	25	1.8 %
5	-	22	1.6 %
6	-	22	1.6 %
7	-	35	2.6 %
8	-	10	0.7 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing due to data cleaning	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Did not skip into CaringAdlt measure	186	13.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,019 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 271-274 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -99 , -98

S8CADETH: S8 CarAdlt: Domains with either Family or Non-Family support

Domains of social support; Count of domains that have either a family member or a nonfamily member based on the relationship code supplied.

MEASURE: Caring Adult

The Contact with Caring Adults inventory was derived from several sources for this study (Nakkula, et al., 1990; Phillips and Springer, 1992; Institute of Behavioral Science, 1990). It assesses the type and range of supportive adults in the adolescent's life. This support is assessed across eight domains: adults you admire and want to be like, adults you could talk to if you needed information or advice about something, adults you could talk to about trouble at home, adults you would tell about an award or if you did something well, adults with whom you can talk about

important decisions, adults you can depend on for help, adults you feel comfortable talking about problems with, special adults who care about your feelings. This measure asks youth to identify the total number of adults who are supportive in each domain as well as to nominate the person that they are most likely to turn to within each domain. These endorsements are summarized across the eight different domains in three ways - the total domains with a person named, the diversity of the individuals named across the domains, and the depth of the pool of individuals named across the domains. The first of the dimensions calculated, Domains of Social Support, provides the number of different domains for which at least one caring adult is present. Diversity of Caring Adults, the second dimension of social support, identifies the unique individuals mentioned across all eight domains. Diversity of Caring Adults is further refined by also calculating the number of caring adults mentioned in the particular domain in which the youth identifies the highest number of caring adults (Maximum Diversity Within Domains). Finally, the Depth of Social Support assesses the number of caring adults who are mentioned in more than two domains, and further distinguishes between sources of support that are familial versus non-familial.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1	0.1 %
1	-	46	3.4 %
2	-	41	3.0 %
3	-	46	3.4 %
4	-	40	3.0 %
5	-	50	3.7 %
6	-	132	9.7 %
7	-	409	30.2 %
8	-	254	18.8 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing due to data cleaning	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Did not skip into CaringAdlt measure	186	13.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,019 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 275-278 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -99 , -98

S8CADRNG: S8 CarAdlt: Total Number of Adults Mentioned

Total Number of Adults Mentioned.

MEASURE:Caring Adult

The Contact with Caring Adults inventory was derived from several sources for this

study (Nakkula, et al., 1990; Phillips and Springer, 1992; Institute of Behavioral Science, 1990). It assesses the type and range of supportive adults in the adolescent's life. This support is assessed across eight domains: adults you admire and want to be like, adults you could talk to if you needed information or advice about something, adults you could talk to about trouble at home, adults you would tell about an award or if you did something well, adults with whom you can talk about important decisions, adults you can depend on for help, adults you feel comfortable talking about problems with, special adults who care about your feelings. This measure asks youth to identify the total number of adults who are supportive in each domain as well as to nominate the person that they are most likely to turn to within each domain. These endorsements are summarized across the eight different domains in three ways - the total domains with a person named, the diversity of the individuals named across the domains, and the depth of the pool of individuals named across the domains. The first of the dimensions calculated, Domains of Social Support, provides the number of different domains for which at least one caring adult is present. Diversity of Caring Adults, the second dimension of social support, identifies the unique individuals mentioned across all eight domains. Diversity of Caring Adults is further refined by also calculating the number of caring adults mentioned in the particular domain in which the youth identifies the highest number of caring adults (Maximum Diversity Within Domains). Finally, the Depth of Social Support assesses the number of caring adults who are mentioned in more than two domains, and further distinguishes between sources of support that are familial versus non-familial.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	33	2.4 %
2	-	29	2.1 %
3	-	33	2.4 %
4	-	27	2.0 %
5	-	31	2.3 %
6	-	45	3.3 %
7	-	107	7.9 %
8	-	106	7.8 %
9	-	52	3.8 %
10	-	33	2.4 %
11	-	42	3.1 %
12	-	28	2.1 %
13	-	39	2.9 %
14	-	60	4.4 %
15	-	43	3.2 %
16	-	34	2.5 %
17	-	28	2.1 %
18	-	25	1.8 %
19	-	14	1.0 %
20	-	18	1.3 %
21	-	35	2.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
22	-	17	1.3 %
23	-	10	0.7 %
24	-	18	1.3 %
25	-	13	1.0 %
26	-	8	0.6 %
27	-	5	0.4 %
28	-	13	1.0 %
29	-	6	0.4 %
30	-	4	0.3 %
31	-	7	0.5 %
32	-	3	0.2 %
33	-	2	0.1 %
34	-	4	0.3 %
35	-	10	0.7 %
36	-	1	0.1 %
37	-	1	0.1 %
38	-	4	0.3 %
40	-	4	0.3 %
41	-	3	0.2 %
42	-	2	0.1 %
43	-	2	0.1 %
44	-	1	0.1 %
49	-	2	0.1 %
51	-	1	0.1 %
57	-	1	0.1 %
58	-	1	0.1 %
66	-	1	0.1 %
69	-	1	0.1 %
70	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing due to data cleaning	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Did not skip into CaringAdlt measure	186	13.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,019 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 279-282 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -99 , -98

S8CADMDV: S8 CarAdlt: Maximum Diversity within Domains

Maximum diversity within domain; Count of adults mentioned in the domain with the highest number of adults mentioned.

MEASURE: Caring Adult

The Contact with Caring Adults inventory was derived from several sources for this study (Nakkula, et al., 1990; Phillips and Springer, 1992; Institute of Behavioral Science, 1990). It assesses the type and range of supportive adults in the adolescent's life. This support is assessed across eight domains: adults you admire and want to be like, adults you could talk to if you needed information or advice about something, adults you could talk to about trouble at home, adults you would tell about an award or if you did something well, adults with whom you can talk about important decisions, adults you can depend on for help, adults you feel comfortable talking about problems with, special adults who care about your feelings. This measure asks youth to identify the total number of adults who are supportive in each domain as well as to nominate the person that they are most likely to turn to within each domain. These endorsements are summarized across the eight different domains in three ways - the total domains with a person named, the diversity of the individuals named across the domains, and the depth of the pool of individuals named across the domains. The first of the dimensions calculated, Domains of Social Support, provides the number of different domains for which at least one caring adult is present. Diversity of Caring Adults, the second dimension of social support, identifies the unique individuals mentioned across all eight domains. Diversity of Caring Adults is further refined by also calculating the number of caring adults mentioned in the particular domain in which the youth identifies the highest number of caring adults (Maximum Diversity Within Domains). Finally, the Depth of Social Support assesses the number of caring adults who are mentioned in more than two domains, and further distinguishes between sources of support that are familial versus non-familial.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	288	21.3 %
2	-	269	19.9 %
3	-	159	11.7 %
4	-	85	6.3 %
5	-	98	7.2 %
6	-	9	0.7 %
7	-	7	0.5 %
8	-	7	0.5 %
10	-	70	5.2 %
12	-	4	0.3 %
15	-	8	0.6 %
20	-	9	0.7 %
30	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
42	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	2	0.1 %
55	-	1	0.1 %
90	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing due to data cleaning	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Did not skip into CaringAdlt measure	186	13.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,019 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 283-286 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -99 , -98

S8CADDIV: S8 CarAdlt: Diversity of Social Support

Diversity of social support; Count of unique adults mentioned based on the name of the adult.

MEASURE: Caring Adult

The Contact with Caring Adults inventory was derived from several sources for this study (Nakkula, et al., 1990; Phillips and Springer, 1992; Institute of Behavioral Science, 1990). It assesses the type and range of supportive adults in the adolescent's life. This support is assessed across eight domains: adults you admire and want to be like, adults you could talk to if you needed information or advice about something, adults you could talk to about trouble at home, adults you would tell about an award or if you did something well, adults with whom you can talk about important decisions, adults you can depend on for help, adults you feel comfortable talking about problems with, special adults who care about your feelings. This measure asks youth to identify the total number of adults who are supportive in each domain as well as to nominate the person that they are most likely to turn to within each domain. These endorsements are summarized across the eight different domains in three ways - the total domains with a person named, the diversity of the individuals named across the domains, and the depth of the pool of individuals named across the domains. The first of the dimensions calculated, Domains of Social Support, provides the number of different domains for which at least one caring adult is present. Diversity of Caring Adults, the second dimension of social support, identifies the unique individuals mentioned across all eight domains. Diversity of Caring Adults is further refined by also calculating the number of caring adults mentioned in the particular domain in which the youth identifies the highest number of caring adults (Maximum Diversity Within Domains). Finally, the Depth of Social Support assesses the number of caring adults who are mentioned in more than two domains, and further distinguishes between sources of support that are familial versus non-familial.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	187	13.8 %
1	-	458	33.8 %
2	-	335	24.7 %
3	-	155	11.4 %
4	-	57	4.2 %
5	-	12	0.9 %
6	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,206 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 287-290 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201

S8DEPSUP: S8 CarAdlt: Depth of Social Support - Number of unique adults mentioned 3 or more times

Depth of social support; Count of adults mentioned more than 2 times.

MEASURE: Caring Adult

The Contact with Caring Adults inventory was derived from several sources for this study (Nakkula, et al., 1990; Phillips and Springer, 1992; Institute of Behavioral Science, 1990). It assesses the type and range of supportive adults in the adolescent's life. This support is assessed across eight domains: adults you admire and want to be like, adults you could talk to if you needed information or advice about something, adults you could talk to about trouble at home, adults you would tell about an award or if you did something well, adults with whom you can talk about important decisions, adults you can depend on for help, adults you feel comfortable talking about problems with, special adults who care about your feelings. This measure asks youth to identify the total number of adults who are supportive in each domain as well as to nominate the person that they are most likely to turn to within each domain. These endorsements are summarized across the eight different domains in three ways - the total domains with a person named, the diversity of the individuals named across the domains, and the depth of the pool of individuals named across the domains. The first of the dimensions calculated, Domains of Social Support, provides the number of different domains for which at least one caring adult is present. Diversity of Caring Adults, the second dimension of social support, identifies the unique individuals mentioned across all eight domains. Diversity of Caring Adults is further refined by also calculating the number of caring adults mentioned in the particular domain in which the youth identifies the highest number of caring adults (Maximum Diversity Within Domains). Finally, the Depth of Social Support assesses the number of caring adults who are mentioned in more than two domains, and further distinguishes between sources of support that are familial versus non-familial.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	326	24.1 %
1	-	804	59.4 %
2	-	76	5.6 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,206 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 291-294 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201

S8CADNFD: S8 CarAdlt: Diversity of Non-Family Social Support

Diversity of non-family support; Count of unique non-family members mentioned across all 8 domains.

MEASURE: Caring Adult

The Contact with Caring Adults inventory was derived from several sources for this study (Nakkula, et al., 1990; Phillips and Springer, 1992; Institute of Behavioral Science, 1990). It assesses the type and range of supportive adults in the adolescent's life. This support is assessed across eight domains: adults you admire and want to be like, adults you could talk to if you needed information or advice about something, adults you could talk to about trouble at home, adults you would tell about an award or if you did something well, adults with whom you can talk about important decisions, adults you can depend on for help, adults you feel comfortable talking about problems with, special adults who care about your feelings. This measure asks youth to identify the total number of adults who are supportive in each domain as well as to nominate the person that they are most likely to turn to within each domain. These endorsements are summarized across the eight different domains in three ways - the total domains with a person named, the diversity of the individuals named across the domains, and the depth of the pool of individuals named across the domains. The first of the dimensions calculated, Domains of Social Support, provides the number of different domains for which at least one caring adult is present. Diversity of Caring Adults, the second dimension of social support, identifies the unique individuals mentioned across all eight domains. Diversity of Caring Adults is further refined by also calculating the number of caring adults mentioned in the particular domain in which the youth identifies the highest number of caring adults (Maximum Diversity Within Domains). Finally, the Depth of Social Support assesses the number of caring adults who are mentioned in more than two domains, and further distinguishes between sources of support that are familial versus non-familial.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	910	67.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	225	16.6 %
2	-	58	4.3 %
3	-	12	0.9 %
4	-	1	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,206 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 295-298 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201

S8DEPNFS: S8 CarAdlt: Depth of Non-Family Social Support - Number of Adults mentioned more than 2 times

Depth of non-family support; Count of non-family adults mentioned more than 2 times.

MEASURE: Caring Adult

The Contact with Caring Adults inventory was derived from several sources for this study (Nakkula, et al., 1990; Phillips and Springer, 1992; Institute of Behavioral Science, 1990). It assesses the type and range of supportive adults in the adolescent's life. This support is assessed across eight domains: adults you admire and want to be like, adults you could talk to if you needed information or advice about something, adults you could talk to about trouble at home, adults you would tell about an award or if you did something well, adults with whom you can talk about important decisions, adults you can depend on for help, adults you feel comfortable talking about problems with, special adults who care about your feelings. This measure asks youth to identify the total number of adults who are supportive in each domain as well as to nominate the person that they are most likely to turn to within each domain. These endorsements are summarized across the eight different domains in three ways - the total domains with a person named, the diversity of the individuals named across the domains, and the depth of the pool of individuals named across the domains. The first of the dimensions calculated, Domains of Social Support, provides the number of different domains for which at least one caring adult is present. Diversity of Caring Adults, the second dimension of social support, identifies the unique individuals mentioned across all eight domains. Diversity of Caring Adults is further refined by also calculating the number of caring adults mentioned in the particular domain in which the youth identifies the highest number of caring adults (Maximum Diversity Within Domains). Finally, the Depth of Social Support assesses the number of caring adults who are mentioned in more than two domains, and further distinguishes between sources of support that are familial versus non-familial.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1074	79.3 %
1	-	126	9.3 %
2	-	6	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,206 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 299-302 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201

S8DEMO_FMCRIM: S8 FamCrim: Anyone in family involved in criminal activity during recall period

Marker for whether any family members were involved in criminal activity in the recall period.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1003	74.1 %
1	Yes	191	14.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-9	Dont Know	12	0.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,194 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 303-306 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8DEMO_FAMCRIM1_FCREL: S8 FamCrim: Rel01 - Relationship of relative involved in crime - recall period

Relationship of family member 1 involved in crime to the subject.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	24	1.8 %
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	101	7.5 %
3	Significant Other (spouse, fiance, boyfriend/girlfriend)	1	0.1 %
4	Child (biological, step)	0	0.0 %
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	55	4.1 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	7	0.5 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1015	75.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 191 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 307-310 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98 , -97

S8DEMO_FAMCRIM1_FCARR: S8 FamCrim: Rel01 - Was relative involved in crime arrested

Whether relative 1 involved in criminal activity was arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	41	3.0 %
1	Yes	147	10.9 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1015	75.0 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 188 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 311-314 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8DEMO_FAMCRIM1_FCJAI: S8 FamCrim: Rel01 - Was relative involved in crime jailed

Whether relative 1 involved in criminal activity was jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	17	1.3 %
1	Yes	130	9.6 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-103	Skipped: Subject doesnt know if this family member was arrested	44	3.2 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1015	75.0 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 147 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 315-318 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600 , -202 , -201 , -103 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8DEMO_FAMCRIM1_FCATH: S8 FamCrim: Rel01 - Does relative involved in crime live at home address

Whether relative 1 involved in criminal activity lives at home of subject.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	145	10.7 %
1	Yes	44	3.2 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1015	75.0 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 189 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 319-322 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8DEMO_FAMCRIM2_FCREL: S8 FamCrim: Rel02 - Relationship of relative involved in crime - recall period

Relationship of family member 2 involved in crime to the subject.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	4	0.3 %
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	23	1.7 %
3	Significant Other (spouse, fiance, boyfriend/girlfriend)	1	0.1 %
4	Child (biological, step)	0	0.0 %
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	30	2.2 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	4	0.3 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1015	75.0 %
-97	Not Applicable	127	9.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 64 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 323-326 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600, -202, -201, -102, -101, -99, -98, -97

S8DEMO_FAMCRIM2_FCARR: S8 FamCrim: Rel02 - Was relative involved in crime arrested

Whether relative 2 involved in criminal activity was arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	23	1.7 %
1	Yes	41	3.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	127	9.4 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1015	75.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 64 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 327-330 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600, -202, -201, -102, -101, -9, -8

S8DEMO_FAMCRIM2_FCJAI: S8 FamCrim: Rel02 - Was relative involved in crime jailed

Whether relative 2 involved in criminal activity was jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	3	0.2 %
1	Yes	38	2.8 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-103	Skipped: Subject doesnt know if this family member was arrested	23	1.7 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	127	9.4 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1015	75.0 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 41 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 331-334 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600 , -202 , -201 , -103 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8DEMO_FAMCRIM2_FCATH: S8 FamCrim: Rel02 - Does relative involved in crime live at home address

Whether relative 2 involved in criminal activity lives at home of subject.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	53	3.9 %
1	Yes	11	0.8 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	127	9.4 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1015	75.0 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 64 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 335-338 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8DEMO_FAMCRIM3_FCREL: S8 FamCrim: Rel03 - Relationship of relative involved in crime - recall period

Relationship of family member 3 involved in crime to the subject.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	2	0.1 %
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	7	0.5 %
3	Significant Other (spouse, fiance, boyfriend/girlfriend)	0	0.0 %
4	Child (biological, step)	0	0.0 %
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	11	0.8 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	1	0.1 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	127	9.4 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1015	75.0 %
-97	Not Applicable	43	3.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 21 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 339-342 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98 , -97

S8DEMO_FAMCRIM3_FCARR: S8 FamCrim: Rel03 - Was relative involved in crime arrested

Whether relative 3 involved in criminal activity was arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	11	0.8 %
1	Yes	10	0.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	170	12.6 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1015	75.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 21 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 343-346 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8DEMO_FAMCRIM3_FCJAI: S8 FamCrim: Rel03 - Was relative involved in crime jailed

Whether relative 3 involved in criminal activity was jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	0	0.0 %
1	Yes	10	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-103	Skipped: Subject doesn't know if this family member was arrested	11	0.8 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	170	12.6 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1015	75.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 10 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 347-350 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600 , -202 , -201 , -103 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8DEMO_FAMCRIM3_FCATH: S8 FamCrim: Rel03 - Does relative involved in crime live at home address

Whether relative 3 involved in criminal activity lives at home of subject.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	18	1.3 %
1	Yes	3	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	170	12.6 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1015	75.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 21 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 351-354 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8DEMO_FAMCRIM4_FCREL: S8 FamCrim: Rel04 - Relationship of relative involved in crime - recall period

Relationship of family member 4 involved in crime to the subject.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	1	0.1 %
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	1	0.1 %
3	Significant Other (spouse, fiance, boyfriend/girlfriend)	0	0.0 %
4	Child (biological, step)	0	0.0 %
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	4	0.3 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	4	0.3 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	170	12.6 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1015	75.0 %
-97	Not Applicable	11	0.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 10 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 355-358 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98 , -97

S8DEMO_FAMCRIM4_FCARR: S8 FamCrim: Rel04 - Was relative involved in crime arrested

Whether relative 4 involved in criminal activity was arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	6	0.4 %
1	Yes	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	181	13.4 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1015	75.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 10 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 359-362 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8DEMO_FAMCRIM4_FCJAI: S8 FamCrim: Rel04 - Was relative involved in crime jailed

Whether relative 4 involved in criminal activity was jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1	0.1 %
1	Yes	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-103	Skipped: Subject doesn't know if this family member was arrested	6	0.4 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	181	13.4 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1015	75.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 4 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 363-366 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600 , -202 , -201 , -103 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8DEMO_FAMCRIM4_FCATH: S8 FamCrim: Rel04 - Does relative involved in crime live at home address

Whether relative 4 involved in criminal activity lives at home of subject.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	9	0.7 %
1	Yes	1	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	181	13.4 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1015	75.0 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 10 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 367-370 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8DEMO_FAMCRIM5_FCREL: S8 FamCrim: Rel05 - Relationship of relative involved in crime - recall period

Relationship of family member 5 involved in crime to the subject.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	0	0.0 %
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	0	0.0 %
3	Significant Other (spouse, fiance, boyfriend/girlfriend)	0	0.0 %
4	Child (biological, step)	0	0.0 %
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	4	0.3 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	1	0.1 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	181	13.4 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1015	75.0 %
-97	Not Applicable	5	0.4 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 5 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 371-374 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98 , -97

S8DEMO_FAMCRIM5_FCARR: S8 FamCrim: Rel05 - Was relative involved in crime arrested

Whether relative 5 involved in criminal activity was arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	2	0.1 %
1	Yes	3	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	186	13.7 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1015	75.0 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 5 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 375-378 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8DEMO_FAMCRIM5_FCJAI: S8 FamCrim: Rel05 - Was relative involved in crime jailed

Whether relative 5 involved in criminal activity was jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	0	0.0 %
1	Yes	3	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-103	Skipped: Subject doesnt know if this family member was arrested	2	0.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	186	13.7 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1015	75.0 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 3 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 379-382 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600 , -202 , -201 , -103 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8DEMO_FAMCRIM5_FCATH: S8 FamCrim: Rel05 - Does relative involved in crime live at home address

Whether relative 5 involved in criminal activity lives at home of subject.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	5	0.4 %
1	Yes	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	186	13.7 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1015	75.0 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 5 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 383-386 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600, -202, -201, -102, -101, -9, -8

S8CRIMEATH: S8 FamCrim: A recall period marker for any family members involved in crime and living at subj home address

Marker for any family member involved in crime that lives at the subject's home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - family member(s) involved in crime but none live at subj home address	92	6.8 %
1	Yes - at least one family member involved in crime also lives at subj home address	31	2.3 %
	Missing Data		
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	327	24.2 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100	No family members involved in crime	754	55.7 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 123 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 387-390 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -202 , -201 , -104 , -103 , -102 , -101 , -100

S8FCATH: S8 FamCrim: A recall period count of the number of family members involved in crime and living at subj home address

Count of family members living at the subject's home address involved in crime.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	92	6.8 %
1	-	26	1.9 %
2	-	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	327	24.2 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100	No family members involved in crime	754	55.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 123 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 391-394 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -202 , -201 , -104 , -103 , -102 , -101 , -100

S8CRIMEATH_REL1: S8 FamCrim: Relationship of fam member 1 if living at subj home address

Relationship of person 1 involved in crime that lives at the subject's home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	6	0.4 %
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	16	1.2 %
3	Significant Other (spouse, fiance, boyfriend/girlfriend)	1	0.1 %
4	Child (biological, step)	0	0.0 %
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	5	0.4 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	0	0.0 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	327	24.2 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-105	Family involved in crime, but this relative doesn't live at subject's home address	95	7.0 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100	Skipped: No family members involved in crime	754	55.7 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 28 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 395-398 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -600 , -500 , -202 , -201 , -105 , -101 , -100 , -97 , -9 , -8

S8CRIMEATH_REL2: S8 FamCrim: Relationship of fam member 2 if living at subj home address

Relationship of person 2 involved in crime that lives at the subject's home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	0	0.0 %
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	2	0.1 %
3	Significant Other (spouse, fiance, boyfriend/girlfriend)	0	0.0 %
4	Child (biological, step)	0	0.0 %
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	3	0.2 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	1	0.1 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	327	24.2 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-105	Family involved in crime, but this relative doesn't live at subject's home address	34	2.5 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100	Skipped: No family members involved in crime	754	55.7 %
-97	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	83	6.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 6 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 399-402 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600, -500, -202, -201, -105, -101, -100, -97, -9, -8

S8CRIMEATH_REL3: S8 FamCrim: Relationship of fam member 3 if living at subj home address

Relationship of person 3 involved in crime that lives at the subject's home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	0	0.0 %
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	1	0.1 %
3	Significant Other (spouse, fiance, boyfriend/girlfriend)	0	0.0 %
4	Child (biological, step)	0	0.0 %
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	0	0.0 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	0	0.0 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	327	24.2 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-105	Family involved in crime, but this relative doesn't live at subject's home address	13	1.0 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100	Skipped: No family members involved in crime	754	55.7 %
-97	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	109	8.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 403-406 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600, -500, -202, -201, -105, -101, -100, -97, -9, -8

S8CRIMEATH_REL4: S8 FamCrim: Relationship of fam member 4 if living at subj home address

Relationship of person 4 involved in crime that lives at the subject's home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	0	0.0 %
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	0	0.0 %
3	Significant Other (spouse, fiance, boyfriend/girlfriend)	0	0.0 %
4	Child (biological, step)	0	0.0 %
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	1	0.1 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	0	0.0 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	327	24.2 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-105	Family involved in crime, but this relative doesn't live at subject's home address	6	0.4 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100	Skipped: No family members involved in crime	754	55.7 %
-97	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	116	8.6 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 407-410 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -600 , -500 , -202 , -201 , -105 , -101 , -100 , -97 , -9 , -8

S8CRIMEATH_REL5: S8 FamCrim: Relationship of fam member 5 if living at subj home address

Relationship of person 5 involved in crime that lives at the subject's home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	0	0.0 %
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	0	0.0 %
3	Significant Other (spouse, fiance, boyfriend/girlfriend)	0	0.0 %
4	Child (biological, step)	0	0.0 %
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	0	0.0 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	0	0.0 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	327	24.2 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-105	Family involved in crime, but this relative doesn't live at subject's home address	3	0.2 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100	Skipped: No family members involved in crime	754	55.7 %
-97	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	120	8.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 0 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 411-414 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600 , -500 , -202 , -201 , -105 , -101 , -100 , -97 , -9 , -8

S8PCRIMEATH: S8 FamCrim: Proportion family members involved in crime that live at subj home address

Proportion of family members living at the subject's home address involved in crime.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	92	6.8 %
0.20	-	1	0.1 %
0.50	-	6	0.4 %
0.67	-	1	0.1 %
1.00	-	23	1.7 %
Missing Data			
-500.00	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	327	24.2 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101.00	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100.00	No family members involved in crime	754	55.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 123 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 415-421 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -101.00 , -100.00

S8FAMJAILATH_COUNT: S8 FamCrim: Count of family members that were jailed and living at subj home address

Count of family members living at the subject's home address who were

jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	35	2.6 %
1	-	71	5.2 %
2	-	10	0.7 %
3	-	5	0.4 %
4	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	327	24.2 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100	No family members involved in crime	754	55.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 123 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 422-425 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -202 , -201 , -101 , -100

S8PJAILEDATH: S8 FamCrim: Proportion family members involved in crime, live at subj home address and were jailed

Proportion of family members living at the subject's home address who have been jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	35	2.6 %
0.33	-	2	0.1 %
0.50	-	8	0.6 %
0.60	-	1	0.1 %
0.67	-	1	0.1 %
0.75	-	1	0.1 %
0.80	-	1	0.1 %
1.00	-	74	5.5 %
Missing Data			
-500.00	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	327	24.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101.00	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100.00	No family members involved in crime	754	55.7 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 123 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 426-432 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -500.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -101.00 , -100.00

S8ARRDAD: S8 FamCrim: Biological father arrested or jailed in recall period

Biological father arrested or jailed in recall period.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	Biological father was not arrested or jailed	113	8.3 %
1	Biological father was arrested or jailed	10	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	327	24.2 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100	No family members involved in crime	754	55.7 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 123 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 433-436 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -500 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -100

S8ARRMOM: S8 FamCrim: Biological mother arrested or jailed in recall period

Biological mother arrested or jailed in recall period.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	Biological mother was not arrested or jailed	123	9.1 %
1	Biological mother was arrested or jailed	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	327	24.2 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100	No family members involved in crime	754	55.7 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 123 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 437-440 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -100

S8ARRBTH: S8 FamCrim: Both biological parents arrested or jailed in recall period

Both biological parents arrested or jailed in recall period.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	Neither biological parent arrested or jailed	113	8.3 %
1	Both biological parents were arrested or jailed	0	0.0 %
2	Biological mother or biological father arrested or jailed, but not both	10	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	327	24.2 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100	No family members involved in crime	754	55.7 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 123 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 441-444 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -100

S8LVCAL_MAINFREEID: S8 LivCal: Recall Period - Unique ID associated with main community location

Recall Period - Unique ID associated with main community location.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1016	75.0 %
	Missing Data		
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-112	Unknown: Main community location mistakenly set to an institution	1	0.1 %
-102	Skipped: No community locations mentioned on the calendar	190	14.0 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,016 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 445-449 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -112 , -102

S8LIVCAL_MAINFREETYPE: S8 LivCal: Recall Period - Main community location type

Recall Period - Main community location type.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Own place	293	21.6 %
2	Private home: birth/adoptive family/partners home	505	37.3 %
3	Private home: foster family	2	0.1 %
4	Private home: friends/partners family	78	5.8 %
5	Private home: other relatives	105	7.8 %
7	Group home, supervised living in community	4	0.3 %
11	Shelter/emergency shelter	6	0.4 %
12	Place to place, different people	1	0.1 %
13	Streets/homeless	2	0.1 %
17	College Dorm	3	0.2 %
18	Community Location NOS	1	0.1 %
96	Other (specify)	16	1.2 %
	Missing Data		
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-112	Unknown: Main community location mistakenly set to an institution	1	0.1 %
-102	Skipped: No community locations mentioned on the calendar	190	14.0 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,016 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 450-453 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -202 , -201 , -112 , -102 , -99 , -98

S8HOMEQ_HHNUM: S8 HHComp: Recall Period - Number of people (other than subj) living in the household (associated w/location stored in S8LivCal_MainLocID)

Recall Period - Number of people (other than subj) living in the household (associated w/location stored in S1LivCal_MainLocID).

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	47	3.5 %
1	-	144	10.6 %
2	-	196	14.5 %
3	-	191	14.1 %
4	-	117	8.6 %
5	-	82	6.1 %
6	-	38	2.8 %
7	-	24	1.8 %
8	-	17	1.3 %
9	9 or More	12	0.9 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	332	24.5 %
-99	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 868 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 454-457 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -600 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S8HOMEQ_BIOFATHER: S8 HHComp: Recall Period - Biological father living in the household

Recall Period - Biological father living in the household.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	759	56.1 %
1	Yes	109	8.1 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	332	24.5 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 868 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 458-461 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101

S8HOMEQ_BIOMOTHER: S8 HHComp: Recall Period - Biological mother living in the household

Recall Period - Biological mother living in the household.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	524	38.7 %
1	Yes	344	25.4 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	332	24.5 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 868 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 462-465 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101

S8HOMEQ BIOSISTER: S8 HHComp: Recall Period - Biological sister living in the household

Recall Period - Biological sister living in the household.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	676	49.9 %
1	Yes	192	14.2 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	332	24.5 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 868 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 466-469 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101

S8HOMEQ_BIOBROTHER: S8 HHComp: Recall Period - Biological brother living in the household

Recall Period - Biological brother living in the household.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	651	48.1 %
1	Yes	217	16.0 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	332	24.5 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 868 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 470-473 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101

S8HOMEQ_BIOPRANTMOTHER: S8 HHComp: Recall Period - Biological grandmother living in the household

Recall Period - Biological grandmother living in the household.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	795	58.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Yes	73	5.4 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	332	24.5 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 868 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 474-477 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700, -202, -201, -102, -101

S8HOMEQ_BIOGRANDFATHER: S8 HHComp: Recall Period - Biological grandfather living in the household

Recall Period - Biological grandfather living in the household.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	840	62.0 %
1	Yes	28	2.1 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	332	24.5 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 868 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 478-481 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700, -202, -201, -102, -101

S8HOMEQ_OTHDAD: S8 HHComp: Recall Period - Other fathers (step, adopted, foster) living in the household

Recall Period - Other fathers (step, adopted, foster) living in the household.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	799	59.0 %
1	Yes	69	5.1 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	332	24.5 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 868 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 482-485 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101

S8HOMEQ_OTHMOM: S8 HHComp: Recall Period - Other mothers (step, adopted, foster) living in the household

Recall Period - Other mothers (step, adopted, foster) living in the household.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	858	63.4 %
1	Yes	10	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	332	24.5 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 868 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 486-489 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101

S8HOMEQ_OTHSIB: S8 HHComp: Recall Period - Other siblings (step, adopted, foster) living in the household

Recall Period - Other siblings (step, adopted, foster) living in the household.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	856	63.2 %
1	Yes	12	0.9 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	332	24.5 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 868 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 490-493 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101

S8HOMEQ_SIGOTH: S8 HHComp: Recall Period - Significant others (gf, bf, fiance, parent of child) living in the household

Recall Period - A significant other (spouse, fiance, boyfriend/girlfriend, parent of child) living in the household.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	595	43.9 %
1	Yes	273	20.2 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	332	24.5 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 868 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 494-497 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101

S8HOMEQ_CHILD: S8 HHComp: Recall Period - Your child / step-child living in the household

Recall Period - Your own child / step-child living in the household.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	663	49.0 %
1	Yes	205	15.1 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	332	24.5 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 868 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 498-501 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101

S8HOMEQ_RELATIVE: S8 HHComp: Recall Period - Other relatives living in the household

Recall Period - Other relatives (aunt, uncle, nephew, niece, male cousin, female cousin, some other relative) living in the household.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	673	49.7 %
1	Yes	195	14.4 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	332	24.5 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 868 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 502-505 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101

S8HOMEQ_FRIEND: S8 HHComp: Recall Period - Friends living in the household

Recall Period - Friends / roommates living in the household.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	812	60.0 %
1	Yes	56	4.1 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	332	24.5 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 868 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 506-509 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101

S8HOMEQ_OTHERS: S8 HHComp: Recall Period - Others living in the household

Recall Period - Any other person living in the household.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	715	52.8 %
1	Yes	153	11.3 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	332	24.5 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 868 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 510-513 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101

S8PEERCHAR_NFRND: S8 CharFriends: Number of close friends

How many close friends subject has.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	297	21.9 %
1	-	267	19.7 %
2	-	242	17.9 %
3	-	183	13.5 %
4	-	93	6.9 %
5	-	66	4.9 %
6	-	22	1.6 %
7	-	7	0.5 %
8	-	6	0.4 %
9	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	8	0.6 %
11	-	1	0.1 %
12	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	5	0.4 %
20	-	4	0.3 %
23	-	2	0.1 %
30	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,206 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 514-517 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -99 , -98

S8FRIENDS1_SAMEAS: S8 CharFriends: Friend1 - Was this friend mentioned in last interview

Friend1 - Was this friend mentioned in last interview.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Same friend as friend 1 from previous interview	256	18.9 %
2	Same friend as friend 2 from previous interview	97	7.2 %
3	Same friend as friend 3 from previous interview	32	2.4 %
4	Same friend as friend 4 from previous interview	18	1.3 %
5	No, this is not one of those people (this is a new friend)	506	37.4 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 909 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 518-521 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8FRIENDS1_GENFR: S8 CharFriends: Friend1 - Gender (male/female)

Gender of friend 1 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Male	637	47.0 %
2	Female	272	20.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 909 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 522-525 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8FRIENDS1_AGEFR: S8 CharFriends: Friend1 - Age

Age of friend 1 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	1	0.1 %
12	-	1	0.1 %
13	-	1	0.1 %
14	-	2	0.1 %
15	-	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
16	-	6	0.4 %
17	-	16	1.2 %
18	-	48	3.5 %
19	-	93	6.9 %
20	-	107	7.9 %
21	-	138	10.2 %
22	-	115	8.5 %
23	-	81	6.0 %
24	-	54	4.0 %
25	-	33	2.4 %
26	-	32	2.4 %
27	-	28	2.1 %
28	-	24	1.8 %
29	-	14	1.0 %
30	-	6	0.4 %
31	-	6	0.4 %
32	-	4	0.3 %
33	-	7	0.5 %
34	-	5	0.4 %
35	-	9	0.7 %
36	-	10	0.7 %
37	-	3	0.2 %
38	-	5	0.4 %
39	-	5	0.4 %
40	-	10	0.7 %
41	-	4	0.3 %
42	-	7	0.5 %
43	-	5	0.4 %
44	-	2	0.1 %
45	-	1	0.1 %
46	-	1	0.1 %
47	-	3	0.2 %
50	-	4	0.3 %
52	-	2	0.1 %
53	-	1	0.1 %
54	-	1	0.1 %
55	-	3	0.2 %
59	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
71	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 907 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 526-529 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101

S8FR1_ARRESTREC: S8 CharFriends: Friend1 - Has this friend EVER been arrested

Marker for friend 1 ever being arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never been arrested	465	34.3 %
1	Yes - friend has been arrested	441	32.6 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	297	21.9 %
-9	Subject DK if friend was ever arrested	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 906 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 530-533 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8FR1_JAILEDREC: S8 CharFriends: Friend1 - Has this friend EVER been in jail

Marker for friend 1 ever in jail.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never been in jail	541	40.0 %
1	Yes - friend has been in jail	365	27.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	297	21.9 %
-9	Subject DK if friend was ever in jail	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 906 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 534-537 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8FR1_MHRECORD: S8 CharFriends: Friend1 - Has this friend EVER been in a mental health facility

Marker for friend 1 ever being in a mental health facility.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never been in a mental health facility	887	65.5 %
1	Yes - friend has been in a mental hospital	21	1.6 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	297	21.9 %
-9	Subject DK if friend has been in MH	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 908 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 538-541 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8FRIENDS1_CONT: S8 CharFriends: Friend1 - Frequency of contact

Contact frequency with friend 1.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	478	35.3 %
2	3-6 times per week	165	12.2 %
3	2 times per week	59	4.4 %
4	1 time per week	78	5.8 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	45	3.3 %
6	1 time per month	29	2.1 %
7	Less than monthly	55	4.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 909 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 542-545 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202, -201, -102, -101, -9, -8

S8FR1_DRUGUSEREC: S8 CharFriends: Friend1 - Has this friend EVER used drugs

Marker for friend 1 ever using drugs.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never used drugs	477	35.2 %
1	Yes - friend has used drugs	429	31.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	297	21.9 %
-9	Subject DK if friend has used drugs	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 906 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 546-549 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400, -300, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8FRIENDS2_SAMEAS: S8 CharFriends: Friend2 - Was this friend mentioned in last interview

Friend2 - Was this friend mentioned in last interview.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Same friend as friend 1 from previous interview	86	6.4 %
2	Same friend as friend 2 from previous interview	92	6.8 %
3	Same friend as friend 3 from previous interview	26	1.9 %
4	Same friend as friend 4 from previous interview	15	1.1 %
5	No, this is not one of those people (this is a new friend)	423	31.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	267	19.7 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 642 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 550-553 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202, -201, -102, -101, -9, -8

S8FRIENDS2_GENFR: S8 CharFriends: Friend2 - Gender (male/female)

Gender of friend 2 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Male	497	36.7 %
2	Female	145	10.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	267	19.7 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 642 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 554-557 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202, -201, -102, -101, -9, -8

S8FRIENDS2_AGEFR: S8 CharFriends: Friend2 - Age

Age of friend 2 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	1	0.1 %
2	-	1	0.1 %
9	-	1	0.1 %
14	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	1	0.1 %
16	-	5	0.4 %
17	-	14	1.0 %
18	-	40	3.0 %
19	-	39	2.9 %
20	-	87	6.4 %
21	-	94	6.9 %
22	-	75	5.5 %
23	-	61	4.5 %
24	-	52	3.8 %
25	-	30	2.2 %
26	-	24	1.8 %
27	-	11	0.8 %
28	-	18	1.3 %
29	-	11	0.8 %
30	-	10	0.7 %
31	-	5	0.4 %
32	-	5	0.4 %
33	-	1	0.1 %
34	-	4	0.3 %
35	-	3	0.2 %
36	-	6	0.4 %
37	-	3	0.2 %
38	-	1	0.1 %
39	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	3	0.2 %
41	-	1	0.1 %
42	-	2	0.1 %
43	-	4	0.3 %
44	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
46	-	1	0.1 %
47	-	1	0.1 %
48	-	1	0.1 %
49	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	5	0.4 %
51	-	1	0.1 %
52	-	1	0.1 %
54	-	2	0.1 %
55	-	1	0.1 %
57	-	1	0.1 %
62	-	1	0.1 %
64	-	1	0.1 %
65	-	1	0.1 %
67	-	1	0.1 %
69	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	267	19.7 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 641 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 558-561 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101

S8FR2_ARRESTREC: S8 CharFriends: Friend2 - Has this friend EVER been arrested

Marker for friend 2 ever being arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never been arrested	325	24.0 %
1	Yes - friend has been arrested	316	23.3 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	564	41.7 %
-9	Subject DK if friend was ever arrested	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 641 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 562-565 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8FR2_JAILEDREC: S8 CharFriends: Friend2 - Has this friend EVER been in jail

Marker for friend 2 ever in jail.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never been in jail	370	27.3 %
1	Yes - friend has been in jail	271	20.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	564	41.7 %
-9	Subject DK if friend was ever in jail	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 641 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 566-569 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8FR2_MHRECORD: S8 CharFriends: Friend2 - Has this friend EVER been in a mental health facility

Marker for friend 2 ever being in a mental health facility.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never been in a mental health facility	626	46.2 %
1	Yes - friend has been in a mental hospital	15	1.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	564	41.7 %
-9	Subject DK if friend has been in MH	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 641 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 570-573 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8FRIENDS2_CONT: S8 CharFriends: Friend2 - Frequency of contact

Contact frequency with friend 2.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	262	19.4 %
2	3-6 times per week	131	9.7 %
3	2 times per week	61	4.5 %
4	1 time per week	75	5.5 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	39	2.9 %
6	1 time per month	27	2.0 %
7	Less than monthly	47	3.5 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	267	19.7 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 642 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 574-577 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8FR2_DRUGUSEREC: S8 CharFriends: Friend2 - Has this friend EVER used drugs

Marker for friend 2 ever using drugs.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never used drugs	341	25.2 %
1	Yes - friend has used drugs	301	22.2 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	564	41.7 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 642 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 578-581 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8FRIENDS3_SAMEAS: S8 CharFriends: Friend3 - Was this friend mentioned in last interview

Friend3 - Was this friend mentioned in last interview.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Same friend as friend 1 from previous interview	32	2.4 %
2	Same friend as friend 2 from previous interview	33	2.4 %
3	Same friend as friend 3 from previous interview	35	2.6 %
4	Same friend as friend 4 from previous interview	15	1.1 %
5	No, this is not one of those people (this is a new friend)	285	21.0 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	509	37.6 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 400 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 582-585 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8FRIENDS3_GENFR: S8 CharFriends: Friend3 - Gender (male/female)

Gender of friend 3 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Male	292	21.6 %
2	Female	108	8.0 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	509	37.6 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 400 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 586-589 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202, -201, -102, -101, -9, -8

S8FRIENDS3_AGEFR: S8 CharFriends: Friend3 - Age

Age of friend 3 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
12	-	1	0.1 %
13	-	2	0.1 %
15	-	1	0.1 %
16	-	4	0.3 %
17	-	7	0.5 %
18	-	28	2.1 %
19	-	44	3.2 %
20	-	59	4.4 %
21	-	57	4.2 %
22	-	39	2.9 %
23	-	33	2.4 %
24	-	19	1.4 %
25	-	14	1.0 %
26	-	18	1.3 %
27	-	10	0.7 %
28	-	12	0.9 %
29	-	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
30	-	9	0.7 %
31	-	5	0.4 %
32	-	4	0.3 %
35	-	3	0.2 %
36	-	2	0.1 %
37	-	3	0.2 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
41	-	1	0.1 %
43	-	3	0.2 %
44	-	3	0.2 %
45	-	1	0.1 %
47	-	1	0.1 %
48	-	1	0.1 %
49	-	2	0.1 %
52	-	1	0.1 %
54	-	1	0.1 %
57	-	1	0.1 %
58	-	1	0.1 %
59	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	1	0.1 %
65	-	1	0.1 %
67	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	509	37.6 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 399 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 590-593 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999, -998, -202, -201, -102, -101

S8FR3_ARRESTREC: S8 CharFriends: Friend3 - Has this friend EVER been arrested

Marker for friend 3 ever being arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never been arrested	211	15.6 %
1	Yes - friend has been arrested	189	14.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	806	59.5 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 400 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 594-597 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8FR3_JAILEDREC: S8 CharFriends: Friend3 - Has this friend EVER been in jail

Marker for friend 3 ever in jail.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never been in jail	249	18.4 %
1	Yes - friend has been in jail	150	11.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	806	59.5 %
-9	Subject DK if friend was ever in jail	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 399 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 598-601 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8FR3_MHRECORD: S8 CharFriends: Friend3 - Has this friend EVER been in a mental health facility

Marker for friend 3 ever being in a mental health facility.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never been in a mental health facility	395	29.2 %
1	Yes - friend has been in a mental hospital	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	806	59.5 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 400 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 602-605 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8FRIENDS3_CONT: S8 CharFriends: Friend3 - Frequency of contact

Contact frequency with friend 3.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	164	12.1 %
2	3-6 times per week	67	4.9 %
3	2 times per week	36	2.7 %
4	1 time per week	47	3.5 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	29	2.1 %
6	1 time per month	26	1.9 %
7	Less than monthly	31	2.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	509	37.6 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 400 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 606-609 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8FR3_DRUGUSEREC: S8 CharFriends: Friend3 - Has this friend EVER used drugs

Marker for friend 3 ever using drugs.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never used drugs	205	15.1 %
1	Yes - friend has used drugs	194	14.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	806	59.5 %
-9	Subject DK if friend has used drugs	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 399 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 610-613 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8FRIENDS4_SAMEAS: S8 CharFriends: Friend4 - Was this friend mentioned in last interview

Friend4 - Was this friend mentioned in last interview.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Same friend as friend 1 from previous interview	14	1.0 %
2	Same friend as friend 2 from previous interview	14	1.0 %
3	Same friend as friend 3 from previous interview	13	1.0 %
4	Same friend as friend 4 from previous interview	11	0.8 %
5	No, this is not one of those people (this is a new friend)	165	12.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	692	51.1 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 217 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 614-617 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8FRIENDS4_GENFR: S8 CharFriends: Friend4 - Gender (male/female)

Gender of friend 4 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Male	152	11.2 %
2	Female	65	4.8 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	692	51.1 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 217 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 618-621 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202, -201, -102, -101, -9, -8

S8FRIENDS4_AGEFR: S8 CharFriends: Friend4 - Age

Age of friend 4 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	1	0.1 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	2	0.1 %
16	-	3	0.2 %
17	-	6	0.4 %
18	-	14	1.0 %
19	-	20	1.5 %
20	-	30	2.2 %
21	-	25	1.8 %
22	-	26	1.9 %
23	-	20	1.5 %
24	-	13	1.0 %
25	-	7	0.5 %
26	-	4	0.3 %
27	-	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
28	-	12	0.9 %
29	-	5	0.4 %
30	-	2	0.1 %
31	-	2	0.1 %
32	-	3	0.2 %
33	-	2	0.1 %
34	-	2	0.1 %
35	-	2	0.1 %
36	-	2	0.1 %
39	-	3	0.2 %
40	-	2	0.1 %
45	-	1	0.1 %
46	-	1	0.1 %
51	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	692	51.1 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 216 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 622-625 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101

S8FR4_ARRESTREC: S8 CharFriends: Friend4 - Has this friend EVER been arrested

Marker for friend 4 ever being arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never been arrested	127	9.4 %
1	Yes - friend has been arrested	90	6.6 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	989	73.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 217 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 626-629 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8FR4_JAILEDREC: S8 CharFriends: Friend4 - Has this friend EVER been in jail

Marker for friend 4 ever in jail.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never been in jail	136	10.0 %
1	Yes - friend has been in jail	81	6.0 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	989	73.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 217 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 630-633 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8FR4_MHRECORD: S8 CharFriends: Friend4 - Has this friend EVER been in a mental health facility

Marker for friend 4 ever being in a mental health facility.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never been in a mental health facility	212	15.7 %
1	Yes - friend has been in a mental hospital	5	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	989	73.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 217 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 634-637 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8FRIENDS4_CONT: S8 CharFriends: Friend4 - Frequency of contact

Contact frequency with friend 4.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	79	5.8 %
2	3-6 times per week	40	3.0 %
3	2 times per week	34	2.5 %
4	1 time per week	26	1.9 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	10	0.7 %
6	1 time per month	9	0.7 %
7	Less than monthly	19	1.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	692	51.1 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 217 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 638-641 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8FR4_DRUGUSEREC: S8 CharFriends: Friend4 - Has this friend EVER used drugs

Marker for friend 4 ever using drugs.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never used drugs	120	8.9 %
1	Yes - friend has used drugs	97	7.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	989	73.0 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 217 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 642-645 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8FRARR: S8 CharFriends: Count of 4 closest friends ever arrested

Count of 4 closest friends ever arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	309	22.8 %
1	-	312	23.0 %
2	-	172	12.7 %
3	-	84	6.2 %
4	-	32	2.4 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 909 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 646-649 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8ARRDEN: S8 CharFriends: Denominator for number of friends mentioned-arrest

Denominator for number of friends mentioned-arrest.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	267	19.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	-	242	17.9 %
3	-	183	13.5 %
4	-	217	16.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 909 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 650-653 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8PFRARR: S8 CharFriends: Proportion of 4 closest friends ever arrested

The proportion of the 4 closest friends who have been arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	309	22.8 %
0.25	-	52	3.8 %
0.33	-	55	4.1 %
0.50	-	136	10.0 %
0.67	-	50	3.7 %
0.75	-	46	3.4 %
1.00	-	261	19.3 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 909 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 654-660 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8FRJAIL: S8 CharFriends: Count of 4 closest friends ever in jail

Count of 4 closest friends ever in jail.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	378	27.9 %
1	-	306	22.6 %
2	-	135	10.0 %
3	-	69	5.1 %
4	-	21	1.6 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 909 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 661-664 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8JAIDEN: S8 CharFriends: Denominator for number of friends mentioned-jailed

Denominator for number of friends mentioned-jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	267	19.7 %
2	-	242	17.9 %
3	-	183	13.5 %
4	-	217	16.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 909 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 665-668 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8PFRJAI: S8 CharFriends: Proportion of 4 closest friends ever in jail

The proportion of the 4 closest friends who have been in jail.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	378	27.9 %
0.25	-	56	4.1 %
0.33	-	59	4.4 %
0.50	-	123	9.1 %
0.67	-	39	2.9 %
0.75	-	43	3.2 %
1.00	-	211	15.6 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 909 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 669-675 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8FRDRUG: S8 CharFriends: Count of 4 closest friends ever used drugs

Count of 4 closest friends ever used drugs.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	369	27.3 %
1	-	241	17.8 %
2	-	164	12.1 %
3	-	88	6.5 %
4	-	47	3.5 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 909 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 676-679 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800, -400, -300, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8DRUDEN: S8 CharFriends: Denominator for number of friends mentioned-drugs

Denominator for number of friends who had ever used drugs.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	267	19.7 %
2	-	242	17.9 %
3	-	183	13.5 %
4	-	217	16.0 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 909 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 680-683 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800, -400, -300, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8PFRDRU: S8 CharFriends: Proportion of 4 closest friends ever used drugs

The proportion of the 4 closest friends who have ever used drugs.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	369	27.3 %
0.25	-	26	1.9 %
0.33	-	39	2.9 %
0.50	-	103	7.6 %
0.67	-	39	2.9 %
0.75	-	42	3.1 %
1.00	-	291	21.5 %
	Missing Data		
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-100.00	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 909 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 684-691 (width: 8; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800.00 , -400.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8FRMHOS: S8 CharFriends: Count of 4 closest friends ever in a mental health facility

Count of 4 closest friends ever in a mental health facility.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	866	64.0 %
1	-	40	3.0 %
2	-	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 909 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 692-695 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8MHODEN: S8 CharFriends: Denominator for number of friends mentioned-mental health facility

Denominator for number of friends who had ever in a mental health facility.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	267	19.7 %
2	-	242	17.9 %
3	-	183	13.5 %
4	-	217	16.0 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 909 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 696-699 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8PFRMHO: S8 CharFriends: Proportion of 4 closest friends ever in mental health facility

The proportion of the 4 closest friends who have ever in a mental health facility.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	866	64.0 %
0.25	-	15	1.1 %
0.33	-	10	0.7 %
0.50	-	8	0.6 %
0.67	-	1	0.1 %
1.00	-	9	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	297	21.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 909 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 700-707 (width: 8; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8WALDEN: S8 Walden: Self-Regulation Scale

Walden self-regulation scale; Mean of the 9 items included.

MEASURE: Children's Emotional Intensity Child Report (Walden)

The Children's Emotion Regulation scale was adapted for this study to serve as a self-report measure of the adolescent's ability to regulate emotions (Walden, Harris, Weiss, and Catron, 1995). Only a subset (n=12) of the 33 original items contained in this scale are included in the Pathway's version. Examples of items

are "I know things to do to make myself more happy," and "I can change my feelings by thinking of something else". Participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all like me" to "Really like me". Higher scores indicate a better ability to regulate emotion.

- (1) Not at all like me
- (2) A little like me
- (3) Kind of like me
- (4) Really like me

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all like me	6	0.4 %
1.11	-	7	0.5 %
1.22	-	6	0.4 %
1.25	-	1	0.1 %
1.33	-	7	0.5 %
1.44	-	7	0.5 %
1.56	-	11	0.8 %
1.67	-	24	1.8 %
1.78	-	17	1.3 %
1.89	-	30	2.2 %
2.00	A little bit like me	83	6.1 %
2.11	-	40	3.0 %
2.13	-	1	0.1 %
2.22	-	52	3.8 %
2.33	-	69	5.1 %
2.44	-	67	4.9 %
2.50	-	1	0.1 %
2.56	-	69	5.1 %
2.67	-	52	3.8 %
2.78	-	69	5.1 %
2.89	-	83	6.1 %
3.00	Kind of like me	128	9.5 %
3.11	-	54	4.0 %
3.13	-	1	0.1 %
3.22	-	47	3.5 %
3.33	-	44	3.2 %
3.44	-	30	2.2 %
3.56	-	26	1.9 %
3.63	-	1	0.1 %
3.67	-	40	3.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.78	-	30	2.2 %
3.89	-	26	1.9 %
4.00	Really like me	77	5.7 %
	Missing Data		
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,206 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 708-714 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8COM6MO: S8 ComIn: Involvement in Community Activities - Recall period

Involvement in community activities; count of endorsed activities, independent of the recency of involvement.

MEASURE: Community Involvement

The Community Involvement scale (Elliot, 1990) was modified for this study to assess the adolescent's involvement in structured community activities. Scores indicate the extent of an adolescent's involvement in four different community organizations (e.g., sports teams, scouts, church related groups, and volunteer work).

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	851	62.9 %
1	-	137	10.1 %
2	-	21	1.6 %
3	-	3	0.2 %
4	-	2	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Did not skip into ComInv measure	191	14.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,014 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 715-718 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -666 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8DV_VICTIM: S8 DV: Marker for victim of domestic violence

Victim of domestic violence; marker for at least one victim item endorsed

MEASURE: Domestic Violence

The Domestic Violence Inventory, adapted for this study, is designed to measure four dimensions of victimization and offending for events that occur within the past year between the subject and any of his/her intimate partners (boyfriend or girlfriend), spouse, ex-spouse, or ex-partner (ex-boyfriend or girlfriend). Previous research has shown that both physical and psychological aggression within intimate relationships is associated with alcohol and other substance abuse (Leonard, 1993), violence toward strangers (Fagan and Browne, 1990), and a variety of mental health diagnostic categories (Holzworth-Munroe et al., 2000). Accordingly, we include four domains of intimate partner violence and victimization: physical violence (e.g., "Has your partner grabbed, pushed, or shoved you?"), psychological aggression (e.g., "Have you called your partner stupid, fat or ugly?"), controlling behavior (e.g., "Has your partner restricted your use of the car or telephone?"), and injury (e.g., "Have you ever passed out from being hit by your partner?"). We also include items on sexual coercion (e.g., "Have you used physical force your partner to have sex with you?"), but distinguish it from physical violence. The items included here were adapted from prior studies that measure intimate partner violence in a variety of samples and contexts (Moffitt et al., 1997, 2000; Straus et al., 1996). The items can be scaled in several ways, including (a) variety, prevalence and frequency, (b) seriousness, and (c) reciprocity within relationships.

We also use this section to determine whether the romantic relationship asked about earlier in the interview had violence. We ask whether any of a) the reported physical violence, b) the psychological or aggression or controlling behavior or c) sexual coercion involved the partner named earlier as the most significant romantic relationship during the follow-up period. The name of this individual is pulled forward from earlier responses to make sure that the subject is referring to the person named earlier. We also differentiate whether the research participant was the victim, perpetrator, or both regarding each of these types of aggression in the identified relationship. These questions allow for a characterization of the earlier named relationship as involving physical violence (Y/N) or nonphysical aggression (Y/N) and/or sexual coercion (Y/N). It also allows for each of these characterizations to be crossed by whether the research participant was the perpetrator or victim.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	433	32.0 %
1	Yes	413	30.5 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-900	Skipped by mistake - sub not in federal facility	3	0.2 %
-300	Cannot determine - some questions not answered	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Measure skipped - DoDV<>yes or FedPrs=1	356	26.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 846 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 719-722 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -900 , -800 , -500 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

S8DV_PERPETRATOR: S8 DV: Marker for perpetrator of domestic violence

Perpetrator of domestic violence; marker for at least one perpetrator item endorse

MEASURE: Domestic Violence

The Domestic Violence Inventory, adapted for this study, is designed to measure four dimensions of victimization and offending for events that occur within the past year between the subject and any of his/her intimate partners (boyfriend or girlfriend), spouse, ex-spouse, or ex-partner (ex-boyfriend or girlfriend). Previous research has shown that both physical and psychological aggression within intimate relationships is associated with alcohol and other substance abuse (Leonard, 1993), violence toward strangers (Fagan and Browne, 1990), and a variety of mental health diagnostic categories (Holzworth-Munroe et al., 2000). Accordingly, we include four domains of intimate partner violence and victimization: physical violence (e.g., "Has your partner grabbed, pushed, or shoved you?"), psychological aggression (e.g., "Have you called your partner stupid, fat or ugly?"), controlling behavior (e.g., "Has your partner restricted your use of the car or telephone?"), and injury (e.g., "Have you ever passed out from being hit by your partner?"). We also include items on sexual coercion (e.g., "Have you used physical force your partner to have sex with you?"), but distinguish it from physical violence. The items included here were adapted from prior studies that measure intimate partner violence in a variety of samples and contexts (Moffitt et al., 1997, 2000; Straus et al., 1996). The items can be scaled in several ways, including (a) variety, prevalence and frequency, (b) seriousness, and (c) reciprocity within relationships.

We also use this section to determine whether the romantic relationship asked about earlier in the interview had violence. We ask whether any of a) the reported physical violence, b) the psychological or aggression or controlling behavior or c) sexual coercion involved the partner named earlier as the most significant romantic relationship during the follow-up period. The name of this individual is pulled forward from earlier responses to make sure that the subject is referring to the person named earlier. We also differentiate whether the research participant was the victim, perpetrator, or both regarding each of these types of aggression in the identified relationship. These questions allow for a characterization of the earlier named relationship as involving physical violence (Y/N) or nonphysical aggression (Y/N) and/or sexual coercion (Y/N). It also allows for each of these characterizations to be crossed by whether the research participant was the perpetrator or victim.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	445	32.9 %
1	Yes	401	29.6 %
	Missing Data		
-999	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-900	Skipped by mistake - sub not in federal facility	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-300	Cannot determine - some questions not answered	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Measure skipped - DoDV<>yes or FedPrs=1	356	26.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 846 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 723-726 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -900 , -800 , -500 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

S8DV_VIC_PHYS: S8 DV: Count of victim - physical items endorsed

Victim of domestic violence - physical; count of physical domestic violence items endorsed where subject is the victim

MEASURE: Domestic Violence

The Domestic Violence Inventory, adapted for this study, is designed to measure four dimensions of victimization and offending for events that occur within the past year between the subject and any of his/her intimate partners (boyfriend or girlfriend), spouse, ex-spouse, or ex-partner (ex-boyfriend or girlfriend). Previous research has shown that both physical and psychological aggression within intimate relationships is associated with alcohol and other substance abuse (Leonard, 1993), violence toward strangers (Fagan and Browne, 1990), and a variety of mental health diagnostic categories (Holzworth-Munroe et al., 2000). Accordingly, we include four domains of intimate partner violence and victimization: physical violence (e.g., "Has your partner grabbed, pushed, or shoved you?"), psychological aggression (e.g., "Have you called your partner stupid, fat or ugly?"), controlling behavior (e.g., "Has your partner restricted your use of the car or telephone?"), and injury (e.g., "Have you ever passed out from being hit by your partner?"). We also include items on sexual coercion (e.g., "Have you used physical force your partner to have sex with you?"), but distinguish it from physical violence. The items included here were adapted from prior studies that measure intimate partner violence in a variety of samples and contexts (Moffitt et al., 1997, 2000; Straus et al., 1996). The items can be scaled in several ways, including (a) variety, prevalence and frequency, (b) seriousness, and (c) reciprocity within relationships.

We also use this section to determine whether the romantic relationship asked about earlier in the interview had violence. We ask whether any of a) the reported physical violence, b) the psychological or aggression or controlling behavior or c) sexual coercion involved the partner named earlier as the most significant romantic relationship during the follow-up period. The name of this individual is pulled forward from earlier responses to make sure that the subject is referring to the person named earlier. We also differentiate whether the research participant was the victim, perpetrator, or both regarding each of these types of aggression in the identified relationship. These questions allow for a characterization of the earlier named relationship as involving physical violence (Y/N) or nonphysical aggression (Y/N) and/or sexual coercion (Y/N). It also allows for each of these characterizations to be crossed by whether the research participant was the perpetrator or victim.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	652	48.2 %
1	-	71	5.2 %
2	-	54	4.0 %
3	-	32	2.4 %
4	-	17	1.3 %
5	-	15	1.1 %
6	-	3	0.2 %
7	-	1	0.1 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-900	Skipped by mistake - sub not in federal facility	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Measure skipped - DoDV<>yes or FedPrs=1	356	26.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 846 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 727-730 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -900 , -800 , -500 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

S8DV_VIC_EMOT: S8 DV: Count of victim - emotional items endorsed

Victim of domestic violence - emotional; count of emotional domestic violence items endorsed where subject is the victim

MEASURE: Domestic Violence

The Domestic Violence Inventory, adapted for this study, is designed to measure four dimensions of victimization and offending for events that occur within the past year between the subject and any of his/her intimate partners (boyfriend or girlfriend), spouse, ex-spouse, or ex-partner (ex-boyfriend or girlfriend). Previous research has shown that both physical and psychological aggression within intimate relationships is associated with alcohol and other substance abuse (Leonard, 1993), violence toward strangers (Fagan and Browne, 1990), and a variety of mental health diagnostic categories (Holzworth-Munroe et al., 2000). Accordingly, we include four domains of intimate partner violence and victimization: physical violence (e.g., "Has your partner grabbed, pushed, or shoved you?"), psychological aggression (e.g., "Have you called your partner stupid, fat or ugly?"), controlling behavior (e.g., "Has your partner restricted your use of the car or telephone?"), and injury (e.g., "Have you ever passed out from being hit by your partner?"). We also include items on sexual coercion (e.g., "Have you used physical force your partner to have sex with you?"), but distinguish it from physical violence. The items included here were adapted from prior studies that measure intimate partner violence in a variety of samples and contexts (Moffitt et al., 1997, 2000; Straus et al., 1996). The items can be scaled in several ways, including (a) variety, prevalence and frequency, (b) seriousness, and (c) reciprocity within relationships.

We also use this section to determine whether the romantic relationship asked about earlier in the interview had violence. We ask whether any of a) the reported physical violence, b) the psychological or aggression or controlling behavior or c) sexual coercion involved the partner named earlier as the most significant romantic relationship during the follow-up period. The name of this individual is pulled forward from earlier responses to make sure that the subject is referring to the person named earlier. We also differentiate whether the research participant was the victim, perpetrator, or both regarding each of these types of aggression in the identified relationship. These questions allow for a characterization of the earlier named relationship as involving physical violence (Y/N) or nonphysical aggression (Y/N) and/or sexual coercion (Y/N). It also allows for each of these characterizations to be crossed by whether the research participant was the perpetrator or victim.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	463	34.2 %
1	-	164	12.1 %
2	-	88	6.5 %
3	-	43	3.2 %
4	-	33	2.4 %
5	-	27	2.0 %
6	-	17	1.3 %
7	-	7	0.5 %
8	-	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-900	Skipped by mistake - sub not in federal facility	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Measure skipped - DoDV<>yes or FedPrs=1	356	26.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 846 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 731-734 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -900 , -800 , -500 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

S8DV_VIC_SEXUAL: S8 DV: Count of victim - sexual items endorsed

Victim of domestic violence - sexual; count of sexual domestic violence items endorsed where subject is the victim

MEASURE: Domestic Violence

The Domestic Violence Inventory, adapted for this study, is designed to measure four dimensions of victimization and offending for events that occur within the past year between the subject and any of his/her intimate partners (boyfriend or girlfriend), spouse, ex-spouse, or ex-partner (ex-boyfriend or girlfriend). Previous research has

shown that both physical and psychological aggression within intimate relationships is associated with alcohol and other substance abuse (Leonard, 1993), violence toward strangers (Fagan and Browne, 1990), and a variety of mental health diagnostic categories (Holzworth-Munroe et al., 2000). Accordingly, we include four domains of intimate partner violence and victimization: physical violence (e.g., "Has your partner grabbed, pushed, or shoved you?"), psychological aggression (e.g., "Have you called your partner stupid, fat or ugly?"), controlling behavior (e.g., "Has your partner restricted your use of the car or telephone?"), and injury (e.g., "Have you ever passed out from being hit by your partner?"). We also include items on sexual coercion (e.g., "Have you used physical force your partner to have sex with you?"), but distinguish it from physical violence. The items included here were adapted from prior studies that measure intimate partner violence in a variety of samples and contexts (Moffitt et al., 1997, 2000; Straus et al., 1996). The items can be scaled in several ways, including (a) variety, prevalence and frequency, (b) seriousness, and (c) reciprocity within relationships.

We also use this section to determine whether the romantic relationship asked about earlier in the interview had violence. We ask whether any of a) the reported physical violence, b) the psychological or aggression or controlling behavior or c) sexual coercion involved the partner named earlier as the most significant romantic relationship during the follow-up period. The name of this individual is pulled forward from earlier responses to make sure that the subject is referring to the person named earlier. We also differentiate whether the research participant was the victim, perpetrator, or both regarding each of these types of aggression in the identified relationship. These questions allow for a characterization of the earlier named relationship as involving physical violence (Y/N) or nonphysical aggression (Y/N) and/or sexual coercion (Y/N). It also allows for each of these characterizations to be crossed by whether the research participant was the perpetrator or victim.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	834	61.6 %
1	-	11	0.8 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
-900	Skipped by mistake - sub not in federal facility	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Measure skipped - DoDV<>yes or FedPrs=1	356	26.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 845 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 735-738 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -999, -998, -900, -800, -500, -400, -300, -202, -201, -100)

S8DV_PERP_PHYS: S8 DV: Count of perpetrator - physical items endorsed

Perpetrator of domestic violence - physical; count of physical domestic violence items endorsed where subject is the perpetrator

MEASURE: Domestic Violence

The Domestic Violence Inventory, adapted for this study, is designed to measure four dimensions of victimization and offending for events that occur within the past year between the subject and any of his/her intimate partners (boyfriend or girlfriend), spouse, ex-spouse, or ex-partner (ex-boyfriend or girlfriend). Previous research has shown that both physical and psychological aggression within intimate relationships is associated with alcohol and other substance abuse (Leonard, 1993), violence toward strangers (Fagan and Browne, 1990), and a variety of mental health diagnostic categories (Holzworth-Munroe et al., 2000). Accordingly, we include four domains of intimate partner violence and victimization: physical violence (e.g., "Has your partner grabbed, pushed, or shoved you?"), psychological aggression (e.g., "Have you called your partner stupid, fat or ugly?"), controlling behavior (e.g., "Has your partner restricted your use of the car or telephone?"), and injury (e.g., "Have you ever passed out from being hit by your partner?"). We also include items on sexual coercion (e.g., "Have you used physical force your partner to have sex with you?"), but distinguish it from physical violence. The items included here were adapted from prior studies that measure intimate partner violence in a variety of samples and contexts (Moffitt et al., 1997, 2000; Straus et al., 1996). The items can be scaled in several ways, including (a) variety, prevalence and frequency, (b) seriousness, and (c) reciprocity within relationships.

We also use this section to determine whether the romantic relationship asked about earlier in the interview had violence. We ask whether any of a) the reported physical violence, b) the psychological or aggression or controlling behavior or c) sexual coercion involved the partner named earlier as the most significant romantic relationship during the follow-up period. The name of this individual is pulled forward from earlier responses to make sure that the subject is referring to the person named earlier. We also differentiate whether the research participant was the victim, perpetrator, or both regarding each of these types of aggression in the identified relationship. These questions allow for a characterization of the earlier named relationship as involving physical violence (Y/N) or nonphysical aggression (Y/N) and/or sexual coercion (Y/N). It also allows for each of these characterizations to be crossed by whether the research participant was the perpetrator or victim.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	696	51.4 %
1	-	49	3.6 %
2	-	42	3.1 %
3	-	22	1.6 %
4	-	15	1.1 %
5	-	11	0.8 %
6	-	5	0.4 %
7	-	3	0.2 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
9	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-900	Skipped by mistake - sub not in federal facility	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Measure skipped - DoDV<>yes or FedPrs=1	356	26.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 846 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 739-742 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -900 , -800 , -500 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

S8DV_PERP_EMOT: S8 DV: Count of perpetrator - emotional items endorsed

Perpetrator of domestic violence - emotional; count of emotional domestic violence items endorsed where subject is the perpetrator

MEASURE: Domestic Violence

The Domestic Violence Inventory, adapted for this study, is designed to measure four dimensions of victimization and offending for events that occur within the past year between the subject and any of his/her intimate partners (boyfriend or girlfriend), spouse, ex-spouse, or ex-partner (ex-boyfriend or girlfriend). Previous research has shown that both physical and psychological aggression within intimate relationships is associated with alcohol and other substance abuse (Leonard, 1993), violence toward strangers (Fagan and Browne, 1990), and a variety of mental health diagnostic categories (Holzworth-Munroe et al., 2000). Accordingly, we include four domains of intimate partner violence and victimization: physical violence (e.g., "Has your partner grabbed, pushed, or shoved you?"), psychological aggression (e.g., "Have you called your partner stupid, fat or ugly?"), controlling behavior (e.g., "Has your partner restricted your use of the car or telephone?"), and injury (e.g., "Have you ever passed out from being hit by your partner?"). We also include items on sexual coercion (e.g., "Have you used physical force your partner to have sex with you?"), but distinguish it from physical violence. The items included here were adapted from prior studies that measure intimate partner violence in a variety of samples and contexts (Moffitt et al., 1997, 2000; Straus et al., 1996). The items can be scaled in several ways, including (a) variety, prevalence and frequency, (b) seriousness, and (c) reciprocity within relationships.

We also use this section to determine whether the romantic relationship asked about earlier in the interview had violence. We ask whether any of a) the reported physical violence, b) the psychological or aggression or controlling behavior or c) sexual coercion involved the partner named earlier as the most significant romantic relationship during the follow-up period. The name of this individual is pulled forward from earlier responses to make sure that the subject is referring to the person named earlier. We also differentiate whether the research participant was the victim, perpetrator, or both regarding each of these types of aggression in the identified relationship. These questions allow for a characterization of the earlier named relationship as involving physical violence (Y/N) or nonphysical aggression (Y/N) and/or sexual coercion (Y/N). It also allows for each of these characterizations to be crossed by whether the research participant was the perpetrator or victim.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	465	34.3 %
1	-	152	11.2 %
2	-	96	7.1 %
3	-	72	5.3 %
4	-	29	2.1 %
5	-	22	1.6 %
6	-	6	0.4 %
7	-	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-900	Skipped by mistake - sub not in federal facility	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Measure skipped - DoDV<>yes or FedPrs=1	356	26.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 846 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 743-746 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -900 , -800 , -500 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

S8DV_PERP_SEXUAL: S8 DV: Count of perpetrator - sexual items endorsed

Perpetrator of domestic violence - sexual; count of sexual domestic violence items endorsed where subject is the perpetrator

MEASURE: Domestic Violence

The Domestic Violence Inventory, adapted for this study, is designed to measure four dimensions of victimization and offending for events that occur within the past year between the subject and any of his/her intimate partners (boyfriend or girlfriend), spouse, ex-spouse, or ex-partner (ex-boyfriend or girlfriend). Previous research has shown that both physical and psychological aggression within intimate relationships is associated with alcohol and other substance abuse (Leonard, 1993), violence toward strangers (Fagan and Browne, 1990), and a variety of mental health diagnostic categories (Holzworth-Munroe et al., 2000). Accordingly, we include four domains of intimate partner violence and victimization: physical violence (e.g., "Has your partner grabbed, pushed, or shoved you?"), psychological aggression (e.g., "Have you called your partner stupid, fat or ugly?"), controlling behavior (e.g., "Has your partner restricted your use of the car or telephone?"), and injury (e.g., "Have you ever passed out from being hit by your partner?"). We also include items on sexual coercion (e.g., "Have you used physical force your partner to have sex with you?"), but distinguish it from physical violence. The items included here were adapted from prior studies that measure intimate partner violence in a variety of samples and contexts (Moffitt et al., 1997, 2000; Straus et al., 1996). The items can be scaled in several ways, including (a) variety, prevalence and frequency, (b) seriousness, and (c) reciprocity within relationships.

We also use this section to determine whether the romantic relationship asked about

earlier in the interview had violence. We ask whether any of a) the reported physical violence, b) the psychological or aggression or controlling behavior or c) sexual coercion involved the partner named earlier as the most significant romantic relationship during the follow-up period. The name of this individual is pulled forward from earlier responses to make sure that the subject is referring to the person named earlier. We also differentiate whether the research participant was the victim, perpetrator, or both regarding each of these types of aggression in the identified relationship. These questions allow for a characterization of the earlier named relationship as involving physical violence (Y/N) or nonphysical aggression (Y/N) and/or sexual coercion (Y/N). It also allows for each of these characterizations to be crossed by whether the research participant was the perpetrator or victim.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	844	62.3 %
2	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
-900	Skipped by mistake - sub not in federal facility	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Measure skipped - DoDV<>yes or FedPrs=1	356	26.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 845 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 747-750 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999, -998, -900, -800, -500, -400, -300, -202, -201, -100

S8PERP_PHYS_MRP: S8 DV: Whether subject was perpetrator of physical abuse towards main partner

Perpetrator - physical abuse with main romantic partner

MEASURE: Domestic Violence

The Domestic Violence Inventory, adapted for this study, is designed to measure four dimensions of victimization and offending for events that occur within the past year between the subject and any of his/her intimate partners (boyfriend or girlfriend), spouse, ex-spouse, or ex-partner (ex-boyfriend or girlfriend). Previous research has shown that both physical and psychological aggression within intimate relationships is associated with alcohol and other substance abuse (Leonard, 1993), violence toward strangers (Fagan and Browne, 1990), and a variety of mental health diagnostic categories (Holzworth-Munroe et al., 2000). Accordingly, we include four domains of intimate partner violence and victimization: physical violence (e.g., "Has your partner grabbed, pushed, or shoved you?"), psychological aggression (e.g., "Have you called your partner stupid, fat or ugly?"), controlling behavior (e.g., "Has your partner restricted your use of the car or telephone?"), and injury (e.g., "Have you ever passed out from being hit by your partner?"). We also include items on sexual coercion (e.g., "Have you used physical force your partner to have sex with you?"), but distinguish it from physical violence. The items included here were adapted from

prior studies that measure intimate partner violence in a variety of samples and contexts (Moffitt et al., 1997, 2000; Straus et al., 1996). The items can be scaled in several ways, including (a) variety, prevalence and frequency, (b) seriousness, and (c) reciprocity within relationships.

We also use this section to determine whether the romantic relationship asked about earlier in the interview had violence. We ask whether any of a) the reported physical violence, b) the psychological or aggression or controlling behavior or c) sexual coercion involved the partner named earlier as the most significant romantic relationship during the follow-up period. The name of this individual is pulled forward from earlier responses to make sure that the subject is referring to the person named earlier. We also differentiate whether the research participant was the victim, perpetrator, or both regarding each of these types of aggression in the identified relationship. These questions allow for a characterization of the earlier named relationship as involving physical violence (Y/N) or nonphysical aggression (Y/N) and/or sexual coercion (Y/N). It also allows for each of these characterizations to be crossed by whether the research participant was the perpetrator or victim.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	12	0.9 %
1	Yes	128	9.5 %
Missing Data			
-900	Skipped by mistake - sub not in federal facility	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-103	DVSum1 skipped: sub didnt physically abuse partner	594	43.9 %
-102	Did not have romantic partner - question skipped	114	8.4 %
-101	01.17+: DV skipped if DoDv<>yes	356	26.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 140 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 751-754 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -900 , -800 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -120 , -103 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8VIC_PHYS_MRP: S8 DV: Whether subject was victim of physical abuse from the main partner

Victim - physical abuse with main romantic partner

MEASURE: Domestic Violence

The Domestic Violence Inventory, adapted for this study, is designed to measure four dimensions of victimization and offending for events that occur within the past year between the subject and any of his/her intimate partners (boyfriend or girlfriend), spouse, ex-spouse, or ex-partner (ex-boyfriend or girlfriend). Previous research has shown that both physical and psychological aggression within intimate relationships is associated with alcohol and other substance abuse (Leonard, 1993), violence toward strangers (Fagan and Browne, 1990), and a variety of mental health diagnostic categories (Holzworth-Munroe et al., 2000). Accordingly, we include four domains of

intimate partner violence and victimization: physical violence (e.g., "Has your partner grabbed, pushed, or shoved you?"), psychological aggression (e.g., "Have you called your partner stupid, fat or ugly?"), controlling behavior (e.g., "Has your partner restricted your use of the car or telephone?"), and injury (e.g., "Have you ever passed out from being hit by your partner?"). We also include items on sexual coercion (e.g., "Have you used physical force your partner to have sex with you?"), but distinguish it from physical violence. The items included here were adapted from prior studies that measure intimate partner violence in a variety of samples and contexts (Moffitt et al., 1997, 2000; Straus et al., 1996). The items can be scaled in several ways, including (a) variety, prevalence and frequency, (b) seriousness, and (c) reciprocity within relationships.

We also use this section to determine whether the romantic relationship asked about earlier in the interview had violence. We ask whether any of a) the reported physical violence, b) the psychological or aggression or controlling behavior or c) sexual coercion involved the partner named earlier as the most significant romantic relationship during the follow-up period. The name of this individual is pulled forward from earlier responses to make sure that the subject is referring to the person named earlier. We also differentiate whether the research participant was the victim, perpetrator, or both regarding each of these types of aggression in the identified relationship. These questions allow for a characterization of the earlier named relationship as involving physical violence (Y/N) or nonphysical aggression (Y/N) and/or sexual coercion (Y/N). It also allows for each of these characterizations to be crossed by whether the research participant was the perpetrator or victim.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	10	0.7 %
1	Yes	163	12.0 %
Missing Data			
-900	Skipped by mistake - sub not in federal facility	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-104	DVSum2 skipped: partner didnt physically abuse subject	561	41.4 %
-102	Did not have romantic partner - question skipped	114	8.4 %
-101	01.17+: DV skipped if DoDv<>yes	356	26.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 173 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 755-758 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -900 , -800 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -120 , -104 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8PERP_EMO_MRP: S8 DV: Whether subject was perpetrator of emotional abuse towards main partner

Perpetrator - emotional abuse with main romantic partner

MEASURE: Domestic Violence

The Domestic Violence Inventory, adapted for this study, is designed to measure four

dimensions of victimization and offending for events that occur within the past year between the subject and any of his/her intimate partners (boyfriend or girlfriend), spouse, ex-spouse, or ex-partner (ex-boyfriend or girlfriend). Previous research has shown that both physical and psychological aggression within intimate relationships is associated with alcohol and other substance abuse (Leonard, 1993), violence toward strangers (Fagan and Browne, 1990), and a variety of mental health diagnostic categories (Holzworth-Munroe et al., 2000). Accordingly, we include four domains of intimate partner violence and victimization: physical violence (e.g., "Has your partner grabbed, pushed, or shoved you?"), psychological aggression (e.g., "Have you called your partner stupid, fat or ugly?"), controlling behavior (e.g., "Has your partner restricted your use of the car or telephone?"), and injury (e.g., "Have you ever passed out from being hit by your partner?"). We also include items on sexual coercion (e.g., "Have you used physical force your partner to have sex with you?"), but distinguish it from physical violence. The items included here were adapted from prior studies that measure intimate partner violence in a variety of samples and contexts (Moffitt et al., 1997, 2000; Straus et al., 1996). The items can be scaled in several ways, including (a) variety, prevalence and frequency, (b) seriousness, and (c) reciprocity within relationships.

We also use this section to determine whether the romantic relationship asked about earlier in the interview had violence. We ask whether any of a) the reported physical violence, b) the psychological or aggression or controlling behavior or c) sexual coercion involved the partner named earlier as the most significant romantic relationship during the follow-up period. The name of this individual is pulled forward from earlier responses to make sure that the subject is referring to the person named earlier. We also differentiate whether the research participant was the victim, perpetrator, or both regarding each of these types of aggression in the identified relationship. These questions allow for a characterization of the earlier named relationship as involving physical violence (Y/N) or nonphysical aggression (Y/N) and/or sexual coercion (Y/N). It also allows for each of these characterizations to be crossed by whether the research participant was the perpetrator or victim.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	11	0.8 %
1	Yes	328	24.2 %
Missing Data			
-900	Skipped by mistake - sub not in federal facility	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-105	DVSum3 skipped: sub didnt emotionally abuse partner	395	29.2 %
-102	Did not have romantic partner - question skipped	114	8.4 %
-101	01.17+: DV skipped if DoDv<>yes	356	26.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 339 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 759-762 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -900 , -800 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -120 , -105 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8VIC_EMO_MRP: S8 DV: Whether subject was victim of emotional abuse from the main partner

Victim - emotional abuse with main romantic partner

MEASURE: Domestic Violence

The Domestic Violence Inventory, adapted for this study, is designed to measure four dimensions of victimization and offending for events that occur within the past year between the subject and any of his/her intimate partners (boyfriend or girlfriend), spouse, ex-spouse, or ex-partner (ex-boyfriend or girlfriend). Previous research has shown that both physical and psychological aggression within intimate relationships is associated with alcohol and other substance abuse (Leonard, 1993), violence toward strangers (Fagan and Browne, 1990), and a variety of mental health diagnostic categories (Holzworth-Munroe et al., 2000). Accordingly, we include four domains of intimate partner violence and victimization: physical violence (e.g., "Has your partner grabbed, pushed, or shoved you?"), psychological aggression (e.g., "Have you called your partner stupid, fat or ugly?"), controlling behavior (e.g., "Has your partner restricted your use of the car or telephone?"), and injury (e.g., "Have you ever passed out from being hit by your partner?"). We also include items on sexual coercion (e.g., "Have you used physical force your partner to have sex with you?"), but distinguish it from physical violence. The items included here were adapted from prior studies that measure intimate partner violence in a variety of samples and contexts (Moffitt et al., 1997, 2000; Straus et al., 1996). The items can be scaled in several ways, including (a) variety, prevalence and frequency, (b) seriousness, and (c) reciprocity within relationships.

We also use this section to determine whether the romantic relationship asked about earlier in the interview had violence. We ask whether any of a) the reported physical violence, b) the psychological or aggression or controlling behavior or c) sexual coercion involved the partner named earlier as the most significant romantic relationship during the follow-up period. The name of this individual is pulled forward from earlier responses to make sure that the subject is referring to the person named earlier. We also differentiate whether the research participant was the victim, perpetrator, or both regarding each of these types of aggression in the identified relationship. These questions allow for a characterization of the earlier named relationship as involving physical violence (Y/N) or nonphysical aggression (Y/N) and/or sexual coercion (Y/N). It also allows for each of these characterizations to be crossed by whether the research participant was the perpetrator or victim.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	11	0.8 %
1	Yes	331	24.4 %
	Missing Data		
-900	Skipped by mistake - sub not in federal facility	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	DVSum4 skipped: Partner did not emotionally abuse subject	392	29.0 %
-102	Did not have romantic partner - question skipped	114	8.4 %
-101	01.17+: DV skipped if DoDv<>yes	356	26.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 342 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 763-766 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -900 , -800 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -120 , -106 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8PERP_SEX_MRP: S8 DV: Whether subject was perpetrator of sexual abuse towards main partner

Perpetrator - sexual abuse with main romantic partner

MEASURE: Domestic Violence

The Domestic Violence Inventory, adapted for this study, is designed to measure four dimensions of victimization and offending for events that occur within the past year between the subject and any of his/her intimate partners (boyfriend or girlfriend), spouse, ex-spouse, or ex-partner (ex-boyfriend or girlfriend). Previous research has shown that both physical and psychological aggression within intimate relationships is associated with alcohol and other substance abuse (Leonard, 1993), violence toward strangers (Fagan and Browne, 1990), and a variety of mental health diagnostic categories (Holzworth-Munroe et al., 2000). Accordingly, we include four domains of intimate partner violence and victimization: physical violence (e.g., "Has your partner grabbed, pushed, or shoved you?"), psychological aggression (e.g., "Have you called your partner stupid, fat or ugly?"), controlling behavior (e.g., "Has your partner restricted your use of the car or telephone?"), and injury (e.g., "Have you ever passed out from being hit by your partner?"). We also include items on sexual coercion (e.g., "Have you used physical force your partner to have sex with you?"), but distinguish it from physical violence. The items included here were adapted from prior studies that measure intimate partner violence in a variety of samples and contexts (Moffitt et al., 1997, 2000; Straus et al., 1996). The items can be scaled in several ways, including (a) variety, prevalence and frequency, (b) seriousness, and (c) reciprocity within relationships.

We also use this section to determine whether the romantic relationship asked about earlier in the interview had violence. We ask whether any of a) the reported physical violence, b) the psychological or aggression or controlling behavior or c) sexual coercion involved the partner named earlier as the most significant romantic relationship during the follow-up period. The name of this individual is pulled forward from earlier responses to make sure that the subject is referring to the person named earlier. We also differentiate whether the research participant was the victim, perpetrator, or both regarding each of these types of aggression in the identified relationship. These questions allow for a characterization of the earlier named relationship as involving physical violence (Y/N) or nonphysical aggression (Y/N) and/or sexual coercion (Y/N). It also allows for each of these characterizations to be crossed by whether the research participant was the perpetrator or victim.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Yes	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
-900	Skipped by mistake - sub not in federal facility	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-107	DVSum5 skipped: Subject did not sexually abuse partner	733	54.1 %
-102	Did not have romantic partner - question skipped	114	8.4 %
-101	01.17+: DV skipped if DoDv<>yes	356	26.3 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 767-770 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -900 , -800 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -120 , -107 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8VIC_SEX_MRP: S8 DV: Whether subject was victim of sexual abuse from the main partner

Victim - sexual abuse with main romantic partner

MEASURE: Domestic Violence

The Domestic Violence Inventory, adapted for this study, is designed to measure four dimensions of victimization and offending for events that occur within the past year between the subject and any of his/her intimate partners (boyfriend or girlfriend), spouse, ex-spouse, or ex-partner (ex-boyfriend or girlfriend). Previous research has shown that both physical and psychological aggression within intimate relationships is associated with alcohol and other substance abuse (Leonard, 1993), violence toward strangers (Fagan and Browne, 1990), and a variety of mental health diagnostic categories (Holzworth-Munroe et al., 2000). Accordingly, we include four domains of intimate partner violence and victimization: physical violence (e.g., "Has your partner grabbed, pushed, or shoved you?"), psychological aggression (e.g., "Have you called your partner stupid, fat or ugly?"), controlling behavior (e.g., "Has your partner restricted your use of the car or telephone?"), and injury (e.g., "Have you ever passed out from being hit by your partner?"). We also include items on sexual coercion (e.g., "Have you used physical force your partner to have sex with you?"), but distinguish it from physical violence. The items included here were adapted from prior studies that measure intimate partner violence in a variety of samples and contexts (Moffitt et al., 1997, 2000; Straus et al., 1996). The items can be scaled in several ways, including (a) variety, prevalence and frequency, (b) seriousness, and (c) reciprocity within relationships.

We also use this section to determine whether the romantic relationship asked about earlier in the interview had violence. We ask whether any of a) the reported physical violence, b) the psychological or aggression or controlling behavior or c) sexual coercion involved the partner named earlier as the most significant romantic relationship during the follow-up period. The name of this individual is pulled forward from earlier responses to make sure that the subject is referring to the person named earlier. We also differentiate whether the research participant was the victim, perpetrator, or both regarding each of these types of aggression in the identified relationship. These questions allow for a characterization of the earlier named relationship as involving physical violence (Y/N) or nonphysical aggression (Y/N) and/or sexual coercion (Y/N). It also allows for each of these characterizations

to be crossed by whether the research participant was the perpetrator or victim.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	2	0.1 %
1	Yes	8	0.6 %
Missing Data			
-900	Skipped by mistake - sub not in federal facility	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-108	DVSum6 skipped: Partner has not sexually abused subject	724	53.5 %
-102	Did not have romantic partner - question skipped	114	8.4 %
-101	01.17+: DV skipped if DoDv<>yes	356	26.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 10 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 771-774 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -900 , -800 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -120 , -108 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8SCHCAL_MAINSCHOOLID: S8 Education: Unique ID associated with the primary school (independent of type)

The unique ID marker associated with the primary school. It can be used to link the primary school with the follow-up data from the school calendar for that school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	304	22.5 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	4	0.3 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	899	66.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 304 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 775-779 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -114 , -109 , -107 , -102

S8SCHCAL_MAINSCHOOLTYPE: S8 Education: Primary school - type

The school type associated with the primary school (e.g., regular public, charter, institution, etc.).

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Regular/public	15	1.1 %
2	Parochial/private	0	0.0 %
3	Private approved	0	0.0 %
4	Institution school	115	8.5 %
5	Alternative public	8	0.6 %
6	Trade/vocation	58	4.3 %
7	College/junior college	67	4.9 %
8	Charter school	16	1.2 %
9	Home-schooling	2	0.1 %
10	GED program	22	1.6 %
96	Other (specify)	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	4	0.3 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	898	66.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 305 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 780-783 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -114 , -107 , -102 , -99 , -98

S8SCHCAL_MAINSCHOOLTYPE_SPEC: S8 Education: Primary school - institution type specified

This variable will only have a value if the school type is 4 (institution), and provides the specific type of schooling the subject received in the institution (e.g., GED classes, online courses, etc.).

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Institution: Online or Correspondence	4	0.3 %
2	Institution: College	9	0.7 %
3	Institution: GED/ HSD/ High School Continuation	59	4.4 %
4	Institution: Unspecified	43	3.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	4	0.3 %
-108	NA: This is a community based school	189	14.0 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	899	66.4 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 115 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 784-787 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -114 , -108 , -107 , -102 , -99 , -98

S8SCHCAL_MAINSCHOOLCOUNT: S8 Education: Number of months subject attended the primary school

A count of the number of months the subject attended the primary school, based on the school calendar data.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	35	2.6 %
2	-	50	3.7 %
3	-	33	2.4 %
4	-	23	1.7 %
5	-	27	2.0 %
6	-	22	1.6 %
7	-	22	1.6 %
8	-	21	1.6 %
9	-	26	1.9 %
10	-	15	1.1 %
11	-	13	1.0 %
12	-	11	0.8 %
13	-	3	0.2 %
14	-	2	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	4	0.3 %
-107	Data missing: Subject was enrolled in a GED program but months unknown	1	0.1 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	899	66.4 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 303 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 788-791 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -114 , -109 , -107 , -102

S8SCHCAL_MAINFREEID: S8 Education: Community school - Unique ID associated with community school attended the most

The unique ID associated with the primary community school. It can be used to link the primary community school with the school calendar monthly data (where the school ID is plotted by month).

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	194	14.3 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-117	Skipped: Not enrolled in any community based schools	110	8.1 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	4	0.3 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	899	66.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 194 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 792-796 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -117 , -114 , -107 , -102

S8SCHCAL_MAINFREETYPE: S8 Education: Community school - Primary community school - type

The school type associated with the primary school (e.g., regular public, charter school, GED classes, etc.).

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Regular/public	15	1.1 %
2	Parochial/private	0	0.0 %
3	Private approved	0	0.0 %
4	Institution school	0	0.0 %
5	Alternative public	9	0.7 %
6	Trade/vocation	59	4.4 %
7	College/junior college	67	4.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
8	Charter school	16	1.2 %
9	Home-schooling	2	0.1 %
10	GED program	25	1.8 %
96	Other (specify)	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-117	Skipped: Not enrolled in any community based schools	110	8.1 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	4	0.3 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	898	66.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 195 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 797-800 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800, -400, -202, -201, -117, -114, -107, -102, -99, -98

S8SCHCAL_MAINFREECOUNT: S8 Education: Community school - Number of months subject attended the primary community school

A count of the number of months the subject attended the primary school, based on the school calendar data.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	24	1.8 %
2	-	34	2.5 %
3	-	21	1.6 %
4	-	17	1.3 %
5	-	19	1.4 %
6	-	11	0.8 %
7	-	13	1.0 %
8	-	11	0.8 %
9	-	16	1.2 %
10	-	10	0.7 %
11	-	8	0.6 %
12	-	7	0.5 %
13	-	1	0.1 %
14	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-117	Skipped: Not enrolled in any community based schools	110	8.1 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	4	0.3 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	899	66.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 194 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 801-804 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -117 , -114 , -107 , -102

S8SCH_REGQHOMWORK: S8 Education: Community school - Hours per week spent on homework

Hours per week spent on homework - community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	None, or Homework given but none done	13	1.0 %
1	Less than one hour	16	1.2 %
2	One to five hours	67	4.9 %
3	Six to ten hours	33	2.4 %
4	More than ten hours	19	1.4 %
7	NA (No homework assigned)	40	3.0 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	1017	75.1 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 188 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 805-808 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -112 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_REGQ_SCHQ18: S8 Education: Community school - Days per week on Student govt

Student Government activities participated in - community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	181	13.4 %
1	-	3	0.2 %
3	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	1019	75.3 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 185 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 809-812 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -112 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_REGQ_SCHQ19: S8 Education: Community school - Days per week athletic teams

Athletic Teams activities participated in - community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	172	12.7 %
1	-	2	0.1 %
2	-	1	0.1 %
3	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	5	0.4 %
6	-	2	0.1 %
7	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	1019	75.3 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 185 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 813-816 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -112 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_REGQ_SCHQ20: S8 Education: Community school - Days per week sport team

Cheerleading or other sport-related team activities participated in - community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	184	13.6 %
2	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	1019	75.3 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
Total			1,354 100%

Based upon 185 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 817-820 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -112 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_REGQ_SCHQ21: S8 Education: Community school - Days per week music/band

Music/Band activities participated in - community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	184	13.6 %
1	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	1019	75.3 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
Total			1,354 100%

Based upon 185 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 821-824 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -112 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_REGQ_SCHQ22: S8 Education: Community school - Days per week school clubs

School Clubs activities participated in - community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	178	13.1 %
1	-	1	0.1 %
2	-	2	0.1 %
3	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	2	0.1 %
7	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	1019	75.3 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 185 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 825-828 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -112 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_REGQ_SCHQ23: S8 Education: Community school - Days per week National Honors Soc

National Honor Society activities participated in - community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	184	13.6 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	1019	75.3 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 185 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 829-832 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -112 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_REGQ_SCHQ24: S8 Education: Community school - Days per week newspaper/yearbook

Newspaper/Yearbook activities in - community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	183	13.5 %
1	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	1019	75.3 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 185 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 833-836 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -112 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_REGQ_SCHQ25: S8 Education: Community school - Days per week attend events

Attending athletic events, plays or school dances in - community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	174	12.9 %
1	-	7	0.5 %
2	-	2	0.1 %
3	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	1019	75.3 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 185 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 837-840 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -112 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_REGQ_SCHQ26: S8 Education: Community school - How important participate in these activities

[If any time is more than 0] How important was it for you to participate in these activities in - community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	0	0.0 %
2	Not too important	2	0.1 %
3	Somewhat important	9	0.7 %
4	Pretty important	4	0.3 %
5	Very important	11	0.8 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-113	Skipped: Not involved in any school activities	161	11.9 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	1019	75.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 26 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 841-844 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -113 , -112 , -9 , -8

S8TTOTEXA: S8 Education: Community school - Total Number Extracurricular School Activities

Total number extracurricular community school activities.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	159	11.7 %
1	-	17	1.3 %
2	-	4	0.3 %
3	-	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	1019	75.3 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 185 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 845-848 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8SCHTCH: S8 Education: Community school - Bonding to Teachers

Bonding to teachers; mean of 3 items in the scale for community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

The school attachment items included are taken from the work of Cernkovich and Giordano (1992). The items are used to evaluate the adolescent's educational experience along two dimensions: Bonding to Teachers (e.g., "Most of my teachers treat me fairly.") and School Orientation (e.g., "Schoolwork is very important to me."). Respondents rate 13 statements, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of academic commitment. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in an institution for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the institutional school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree or Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0 %
1.67	-	2	0.1 %
2.00	Disagree	3	0.2 %
2.33	-	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.67	-	5	0.4 %
3.00	Neither Agree or Disagree	16	1.2 %
3.33	-	29	2.1 %
3.67	-	16	1.2 %
4.00	Agree	78	5.8 %
4.33	-	9	0.7 %
4.67	-	9	0.7 %
5.00	Strongly Agree	13	1.0 %
Missing Data			
-800.00	Data missing: Data cleaning	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	1019	75.3 %
-9.00	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 184 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 849-855 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8SCHATC: S8 Education: Community school - School Orientation

School orientation; mean of 7 items in the scale for community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

The school attachment items included are taken from the work of Cernkovich and Giordano (1992). The items are used to evaluate the adolescent's educational experience along two dimensions: Bonding to Teachers (e.g., "Most of my teachers treat me fairly.") and School Orientation (e.g., "Schoolwork is very important to me."). Respondents rate 13 statements, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of academic commitment. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in an institution for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the institutional school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree or Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0 %
2.00	Disagree	0	0.0 %
2.29	-	1	0.1 %
2.43	-	1	0.1 %
2.57	-	1	0.1 %
2.86	-	4	0.3 %
3.00	Neither Agree or Disagree	1	0.1 %
3.14	-	4	0.3 %
3.29	-	5	0.4 %
3.43	-	4	0.3 %
3.57	-	4	0.3 %
3.71	-	15	1.1 %
3.86	-	19	1.4 %
4.00	Agree	54	4.0 %
4.14	-	10	0.7 %
4.29	-	13	1.0 %
4.43	-	10	0.7 %
4.57	-	10	0.7 %
4.71	-	8	0.6 %
4.86	-	7	0.5 %
5.00	Strongly Agree	14	1.0 %
Missing Data			
-800.00	Data missing: Data cleaning	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	1019	75.3 %
-9.00	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 185 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 856-862 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8SCH_HSSATISFACTION: S8 Education: Community school - Satisfaction with School - Community School

Satisfaction - Community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

The school attachment items included are taken from the work of Cernkovich and Giordano (1992). The items are used to evaluate the adolescent's educational experience along two dimensions: Bonding to Teachers (e.g., "Most of my teachers

treat me fairly.") and School Orientation (e.g., "Schoolwork is very important to me."). Respondents rate 13 statements, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of academic commitment. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in an institution for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the institutional school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree or Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.0	Strongly disagree	1	0.1 %
2.0	Disagree	4	0.3 %
2.5	-	6	0.4 %
3.0	Neither agree nor disagree	17	1.3 %
3.5	-	20	1.5 %
4.0	Agree	100	7.4 %
4.5	-	15	1.1 %
5.0	Strongly agree	22	1.6 %
Missing Data			
-800.0	Data missing: Data cleaning	1	0.1 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.0	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	1019	75.3 %
-9.0	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 185 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 863-869 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800.0 , -202.0 , -201.0 , -100.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

S8SCH_HSENGAGEMENT: S8 Education: Community school - High School Engagement - Community School

Engagement - Community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

The school attachment items included are taken from the work of Cernkovich and Giordano (1992). The items are used to evaluate the adolescent's educational experience along two dimensions: Bonding to Teachers (e.g., "Most of my teachers treat me fairly.") and School Orientation (e.g., "Schoolwork is very important to me."). Respondents rate 13 statements, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging

from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of academic commitment. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in an institution for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the institutional school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree or Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly disagree	0	0.0 %
2.00	Disagree	1	0.1 %
2.25	-	1	0.1 %
2.50	-	1	0.1 %
2.75	-	2	0.1 %
3.00	Neither agree nor disagree	3	0.2 %
3.25	-	7	0.5 %
3.50	-	13	1.0 %
3.75	-	23	1.7 %
4.00	Agree	68	5.0 %
4.25	-	16	1.2 %
4.50	-	19	1.4 %
4.75	-	10	0.7 %
5.00	Strongly agree	21	1.6 %
Missing Data			
-800.00	Data missing: Data cleaning	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	1019	75.3 %
-9.00	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 185 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 870-876 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8SCHCAL_MAINDETID: S8 Education: Institutional school - Unique ID associated with the primary institution school

The unique ID marker associated with the primary institutional school.

It can be used to link the primary institutional school with the school

calendar monthly data (where the school ID is plotted by month).

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	117	8.6 %
	Missing Data		
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-116	Skipped: Not enrolled in any institution schools	187	13.8 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	4	0.3 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	899	66.4 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 117 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 877-881 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -116 , -114 , -108 , -107 , -102

S8SCHCAL_MAINDETTYPE: S8 Education: Institutional school - Primary institution school - type

The school type associated with the primary institution school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	Institution school	117	8.6 %
	Missing Data		
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-116	Skipped: Not enrolled in any institution schools	187	13.8 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	4	0.3 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	899	66.4 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 117 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 882-885 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -116 , -114 , -108 , -107 , -102

S8SCHCAL_MAINDETTYPE_SPEC: S8 Education: Institutional school - Primary institution school - institution type specified

The specific type of schooling the subject received in the institution
(e.g., GED classes, online courses, etc.).

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Institution: Online or Correspondence	4	0.3 %
2	Institution: College	9	0.7 %
3	Institution: GED/ HSD/ High School Continuation	61	4.5 %
4	Institution: Unspecified	43	3.2 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-116	Skipped: Not enrolled in any institution schools	187	13.8 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	4	0.3 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	899	66.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 117 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 886-889 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -116 , -114 , -108 , -107 , -102 , -99 , -98

S8SCHCAL_MAINDETCOUNT: S8 Education: Institutional school - Number of months subject attended the primary institution school

A count of the number of months the subject attended the primary institutional school based on the school calendar data.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	13	1.0 %
2	-	19	1.4 %
3	-	13	1.0 %
4	-	7	0.5 %
5	-	8	0.6 %
6	-	11	0.8 %
7	-	9	0.7 %
8	-	10	0.7 %
9	-	10	0.7 %
10	-	5	0.4 %
11	-	5	0.4 %
12	-	4	0.3 %
13	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-116	Skipped: Not enrolled in any institution schools	187	13.8 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	4	0.3 %
-107	Data missing: Subject was enrolled in a GED program but months unknown	1	0.1 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	899	66.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 116 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 890-893 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -116 , -114 , -108 , -107 , -102

S8SCH_DETQ_DETHWRK: S8 Education: Institutional school - Hours per week spent on homework

Hours per week spent on homework - institutional school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	None	29	2.1 %
1	Less than one hour	11	0.8 %
2	One to Five hours	19	1.4 %
3	One to ten hours	3	0.2 %
4	More than 10 hours	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	20	1.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-110	Skipped: Enrolled in institutional school but for less than three months	32	2.4 %
-109	Skipped: Not enrolled in institutional school	1090	80.5 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 64 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 894-897 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_DETQ_DETACT0: S8 Education: Institutional school - Involved in any activities

Involved activities in - institutional school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	51	3.8 %
1	Yes	7	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	27	2.0 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-110	Skipped: Enrolled in institutional school but for less than three months	31	2.3 %
-109	Skipped: Not enrolled in institutional school	1090	80.5 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 58 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 898-901 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_DETQ_DETDYS1: S8 Education: Institutional school - Days per week on activity 1

Number of days participated in activities - institutional school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	1	0.1 %
2	-	2	0.1 %
3	-	1	0.1 %
7	-	3	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	26	1.9 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-111	Skipped: Not involved in any school activities	52	3.8 %
-110	Skipped: Enrolled in institutional school but for less than three months	32	2.4 %
-109	Skipped: Not enrolled in institutional school	1090	80.5 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 7 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 902-905 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -111 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_DETQ_DETDYS2: S8 Education: Institutional school - Days per week on activity 2

Number of days participated in activities - institutional school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	26	1.9 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-114	Skipped: Only involved in one school activity	7	0.5 %
-111	Skipped: Not involved in any school activities	52	3.8 %
-110	Skipped: Enrolled in institutional school but for less than three months	32	2.4 %
-109	Skipped: Not enrolled in institutional school	1090	80.5 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 0 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 906-909 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -114 , -111 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_DETQ_DETDYS3: S8 Education: Institutional school - Days per week on activity 3

Number of days participated in activities - institutional school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	26	1.9 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-114	Skipped: Only involved in one school activity	7	0.5 %
-111	Skipped: Not involved in any school activities	52	3.8 %
-110	Skipped: Enrolled in institutional school but for less than three months	32	2.4 %
-109	Skipped: Not enrolled in institutional school	1090	80.5 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 0 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 910-913 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -115 , -114 , -111 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_DETQ_DETQ26: S8 Education: Institutional school - How important participate in these activities

Importance to subject to participate in these school activities in - institutional school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	2	0.1 %
2	Not too important	0	0.0 %
3	Somewhat important	2	0.1 %
4	Pretty important	1	0.1 %
5	Very important	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	26	1.9 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-111	Skipped: Not involved in any school activities	52	3.8 %
-110	Skipped: Enrolled in institutional school but for less than three months	32	2.4 %
-109	Skipped: Not enrolled in institutional school	1090	80.5 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 7 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 914-917 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -111 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

S8DETTCH: S8 Education: Institutional school - Bonding to Teachers

Bonding to teachers - institutional school; mean of 3 items in the scale for institutional school

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

The school attachment items included are taken from the work of Cernkovich and Giordano (1992). The items are used to evaluate the adolescent's educational experience along two dimensions: Bonding to Teachers (e.g., "Most of my teachers treat me fairly.") and School Orientation (e.g., "Schoolwork is very important to me."). Respondents rate 13 statements, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of academic commitment. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in an institution for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the institutional school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree or Disagree

- (4) Agree
 (5) Strongly Agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Disagree	1	0.1 %
1.33	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	Disagree	2	0.1 %
2.33	-	1	0.1 %
2.67	-	6	0.4 %
3.00	Neither Agree or Disagree	10	0.7 %
3.33	-	20	1.5 %
3.67	-	6	0.4 %
4.00	Agree	14	1.0 %
4.33	-	1	0.1 %
4.67	-	2	0.1 %
5.00	Strongly Agree	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-800.00	Data missing: Data cleaning	19	1.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Skipped: Did not skip into institutional school section	1122	82.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 66 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 918-924 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -800.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8DETATC: S8 Education: Institutional school - School Orientation

School orientation - institutional school; mean of 7 items in the scale for institutional school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

The school attachment items included are taken from the work of Cernkovich and Giordano (1992). The items are used to evaluate the adolescent's educational experience along two dimensions: Bonding to Teachers (e.g., "Most of my teachers treat me fairly.") and School Orientation (e.g., "Schoolwork is very important to me."). Respondents rate 13 statements, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of academic commitment. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in an institution for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the institutional school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree or Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0 %
2.00	Disagree	0	0.0 %
2.14	-	1	0.1 %
2.29	-	1	0.1 %
2.43	-	1	0.1 %
2.86	-	1	0.1 %
3.00	Neither Agree or Disagree	1	0.1 %
3.14	-	4	0.3 %
3.29	-	2	0.1 %
3.43	-	3	0.2 %
3.57	-	3	0.2 %
3.71	-	7	0.5 %
3.86	-	8	0.6 %
4.00	Agree	18	1.3 %
4.14	-	3	0.2 %
4.17	-	1	0.1 %
4.43	-	3	0.2 %
4.57	-	5	0.4 %
4.86	-	2	0.1 %
5.00	Strongly Agree	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-800.00	Data missing: Data cleaning	19	1.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Skipped: Did not skip into institutional school section	1122	82.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 66 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 925-931 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8SCH_DETSATISFACTION: S8 Education: Institutional school - Satisfaction with School

Satisfaction - Institutional school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

The school attachment items included are taken from the work of Cernkovich and Giordano (1992). The items are used to evaluate the adolescent's educational experience along two dimensions: Bonding to Teachers (e.g., "Most of my teachers treat me fairly.") and School Orientation (e.g., "Schoolwork is very important to me."). Respondents rate 13 statements, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of academic commitment. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in an institution for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the institutional school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree or Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.0	Strongly disagree	1	0.1 %
1.5	-	1	0.1 %
2.0	Disagree	4	0.3 %
2.5	-	2	0.1 %
3.0	Neither agree nor disagree	13	1.0 %
3.5	-	9	0.7 %
4.0	Agree	30	2.2 %
4.5	-	3	0.2 %
5.0	Strongly agree	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-800.0	Data missing: Data cleaning	19	1.4 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.0	Skipped: Did not skip into institutional school section	1122	82.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 66 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 932-938 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800.0, -202.0, -201.0, -100.0, -9.0, -8.0

S8SCH_DETENGAGEMENT: S8 Education: Institutional school - High School Engagement

Engagement - Institutional school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

The school attachment items included are taken from the work of Cernkovich and

Giordano (1992). The items are used to evaluate the adolescent's educational experience along two dimensions: Bonding to Teachers (e.g., "Most of my teachers treat me fairly.") and School Orientation (e.g., "Schoolwork is very important to me."). Respondents rate 13 statements, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of academic commitment. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in an institution for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the institutional school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree or Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly disagree	0	0.0 %
2.00	Disagree	1	0.1 %
2.50	-	1	0.1 %
2.75	-	1	0.1 %
3.00	Neither agree nor disagree	7	0.5 %
3.25	-	4	0.3 %
3.50	-	6	0.4 %
3.75	-	5	0.4 %
4.00	Agree	28	2.1 %
4.25	-	2	0.1 %
4.50	-	7	0.5 %
5.00	Strongly agree	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-800.00	Data missing: Data cleaning	19	1.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Skipped: Did not skip into institutional school section	1122	82.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 66 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 939-945 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ01: S8 Education: College - Since graduating/GED have you applied to college/university

Since you graduated from high school or obtained your GED have you applied to a college or university?

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	482	35.6 %
1	Yes	168	12.4 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	556	41.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 650 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 946-949 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800, -700, -400, -202, -201, -118, -9, -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ35: S8 Education: College - Have you applied to college/university during recall period

Have you applied to a college / university during the recall period?

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	293	21.6 %
1	Yes	33	2.4 %
	Missing Data		
-400	Not available in this version	602	44.5 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	278	20.5 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 326 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 950-953 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800, -700, -400, -202, -201, -118, -9, -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ02: S8 Education: College - Type of college applied to (4yr or 2yr)

What type of college did you apply to?

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Four year college or university	41	3.0 %
2	Two year, technical, or vocational college	126	9.3 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-119	Skipped: Has never applied to college	479	35.4 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	559	41.3 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 167 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 954-957 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -119 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ03: S8 Education: College - Status of college application

What is the status of your application?

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Accepted	146	10.8 %
2	Rejected	3	0.2 %
3	Waiting list	6	0.4 %
4	Havent heard	8	0.6 %
96	Other	4	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-119	Skipped: Has never applied to college	479	35.4 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	559	41.3 %
-99	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 167 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 958-961 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -119 , -118 , -99 , -98

S8SCH_COLQ_FINPARENTS: S8 Education: College - Source of financing for college: Parents

Where sources of income did you receive to attend college?

Parents

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	130	9.6 %
1	Yes	28	2.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-119	Skipped: Has never applied to college	479	35.4 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	567	41.9 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 158 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 962-965 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -119 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_FINRELATIVE: S8 Education: College - Source of financing for college: Relatives

Where sources of income did you receive to attend college?

Relatives

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	151	11.2 %
1	Yes	4	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-119	Skipped: Has never applied to college	479	35.4 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	570	42.1 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 155 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 966-969 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -119 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_FINGRANTS: S8 Education: College - Source of financing for college: Grants

Where sources of income did you receive to attend college?

Grants

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	88	6.5 %
1	Yes	72	5.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-119	Skipped: Has never applied to college	479	35.4 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	565	41.7 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 160 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 970-973 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -119 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_FINSCHOLARSHIPS: S8 Education: College - Source of financing for college: Scholarships

Where sources of income did you receive to attend college?

Scholarship

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	124	9.2 %
1	Yes	34	2.5 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-119	Skipped: Has never applied to college	479	35.4 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	567	41.9 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 158 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 974-977 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -119 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_FINLOANS: S8 Education: College - Source of financing for college: Loans

Where sources of income did you receive to attend college?

Financial loans

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	94	6.9 %
1	Yes	69	5.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-119	Skipped: Has never applied to college	479	35.4 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	562	41.5 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 163 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 978-981 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -119 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_FINSAVINGS: S8 Education: College - Source of financing for college: Personal savings

Where sources of income did you receive to attend college?

Personal savings

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	111	8.2 %
1	Yes	48	3.5 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-119	Skipped: Has never applied to college	479	35.4 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	566	41.8 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 159 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 982-985 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -119 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_FINOTHER: S8 Education: College - Source of financing for college: Other

Where sources of income did you receive to attend college?

Other sources

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	136	10.0 %
1	Yes	19	1.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-119	Skipped: Has never applied to college	479	35.4 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	570	42.1 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 155 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 986-989 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -119 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ07: S8 Education: College - Last semester, frequency of attending/participate in extracurricular activities

During your last semester at college, about how frequently did you attend and/or

participate in school-sponsored functions or extracurricular activities where you interacted with students from the college?

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	26	1.9 %
2	Once or twice a month	9	0.7 %
3	Once or twice a week	2	0.1 %
4	More than twice a week	8	0.6 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Result of a change made to correct an interviewer error	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-120	Skipped: Has not attended college in the recall period	598	44.2 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	560	41.4 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 45 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 990-993 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -120 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ08: S8 Education: College - Last semester, frequency of attending parties/social gatherings

During your last semester at college, about how frequently did you attend parties or social gatherings where you interacted with students from the college?

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	29	2.1 %
2	Once or twice a month	4	0.3 %
3	Once or twice a week	9	0.7 %
4	More than twice a week	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Result of a change made to correct an interviewer error	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-120	Skipped: Has not attended college in the recall period	598	44.2 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	560	41.4 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 45 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 994-997 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -120 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ09: S8 Education: College - How often raise hand during lecture when dont understand something

How frequently you do or did the following things while enrolled in college?

Raised your hand during lecture when youd on't understand something.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	3	0.2 %
2	Once or twice a month	7	0.5 %
3	Once or twice a week	17	1.3 %
4	More than twice a week	18	1.3 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Result of a change made to correct an interviewer error	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-120	Skipped: Has not attended college in the recall period	598	44.2 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	560	41.4 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 45 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 998-1001 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -120 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ10: S8 Education: College - How often contact professor outside of class for course-related issues

How frequently you do or did the following things while enrolled in college?

Contacted a professor outside of class to discuss course-related issues.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	8	0.6 %
2	Once or twice a month	13	1.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	Once or twice a week	18	1.3 %
4	More than twice a week	6	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Result of a change made to correct an interviewer error	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-120	Skipped: Has not attended college in the recall period	598	44.2 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	560	41.4 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 45 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1002-1005 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -120 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ11: S8 Education: College - How often contact professor outside of class to socialize/discuss personal problem

How frequently you do or did the following things while enrolled in college?

Contacted professors outside of class to socialize informally or discuss a personal problem.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	31	2.3 %
2	Once or twice a month	9	0.7 %
3	Once or twice a week	4	0.3 %
4	More than twice a week	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Result of a change made to correct an interviewer error	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-120	Skipped: Has not attended college in the recall period	598	44.2 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	560	41.4 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 45 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1006-1009 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -120 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ12: S8 Education: College - How often use campus library

How frequently you do or did the following things while enrolled in college?

Use the campus library.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	7	0.5 %
2	Once or twice a month	5	0.4 %
3	Once or twice a week	18	1.3 %
4	More than twice a week	15	1.1 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Result of a change made to correct an interviewer error	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-120	Skipped: Has not attended college in the recall period	598	44.2 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	560	41.4 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 45 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1010-1013 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -120 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ13: S8 Education: College - How often study with friends/classmates

How frequently you do or did the following things while enrolled in college?

Study with friends / classmates.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	9	0.7 %
2	Once or twice a month	14	1.0 %
3	Once or twice a week	16	1.2 %
4	More than twice a week	6	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Result of a change made to correct an interviewer error	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-120	Skipped: Has not attended college in the recall period	598	44.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	560	41.4 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 45 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1014-1017 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -120 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ14: S8 Education: College - How often seek help from formal tutor

How frequently you do or did the following things while enrolled in college?

Seek help from a formal tutor (faculty or student).

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	19	1.4 %
2	Once or twice a month	12	0.9 %
3	Once or twice a week	11	0.8 %
4	More than twice a week	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Result of a change made to correct an interviewer error	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-120	Skipped: Has not attended college in the recall period	598	44.2 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	560	41.4 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 45 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1018-1021 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -120 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ15: S8 Education: College - How often use college career placement services

How frequently you do or did the following things while enrolled in college?

Use college career placement services.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	37	2.7 %
2	Once or twice a month	6	0.4 %
3	Once or twice a week	2	0.1 %
4	More than twice a week	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Result of a change made to correct an interviewer error	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-120	Skipped: Has not attended college in the recall period	598	44.2 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	560	41.4 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 45 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1022-1025 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -120 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ16: S8 Education: College - How often visit academic advisor to discuss your progress

How frequently you do or did the following things while enrolled in college?

Visit an academic advisor to discuss your progress.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	22	1.6 %
2	Once or twice a month	7	0.5 %
3	Once or twice a week	13	1.0 %
4	More than twice a week	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Result of a change made to correct an interviewer error	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-120	Skipped: Has not attended college in the recall period	598	44.2 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	560	41.4 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 45 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1026-1029 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -120 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ17: S8 Education: College - How often speak to financial aid counselor about money matters

How frequently you do or did the following things while enrolled in college?

Speak to a financial aid counselor about money matters.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	21	1.6 %
2	Once or twice a month	10	0.7 %
3	Once or twice a week	10	0.7 %
4	More than twice a week	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Result of a change made to correct an interviewer error	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-120	Skipped: Has not attended college in the recall period	598	44.2 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	560	41.4 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 45 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1030-1033 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -120 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ18: S8 Education: College - Ever been placed on academic probation because you were struggling with class

Ever been placed on academic probation because you were struggling with class

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	41	3.0 %
1	Yes	6	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Result of a change made to correct an interviewer error	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-120	Skipped: Has not attended college in the recall period	598	44.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	560	41.4 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 47 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1034-1037 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -120 , -119 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ22: S8 Education: College - Currently enrolled in college

Currently enrolled in college

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	18	1.3 %
1	Yes	30	2.2 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Result of a change made to correct an interviewer error	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-120	Skipped: Has not attended college in the recall period	598	44.2 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	560	41.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 48 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1038-1041 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -120 , -119 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ24: S8 Education: College - I dont have much in common with other students

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

I dont have much in common with other students

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	12	0.9 %
2	Disagree	14	1.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	Neither Agree nor Disagree	2	0.1 %
4	Agree	1	0.1 %
5	Strongly Agree	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Result of a change made to correct an interviewer error	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-122	Skipped: Not currently enrolled in college	13	1.0 %
-120	Skipped: Has not attended college in the recall period	598	44.2 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	565	41.7 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 29 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1042-1045 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -122 , -120 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ25: S8 Education: College - I dont think I can really be myself here

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

I don't think I can really be myself here

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	19	1.4 %
2	Disagree	7	0.5 %
3	Neither Agree nor Disagree	2	0.1 %
4	Agree	1	0.1 %
5	Strongly Agree	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Result of a change made to correct an interviewer error	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-122	Skipped: Not currently enrolled in college	13	1.0 %
-120	Skipped: Has not attended college in the recall period	598	44.2 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	565	41.7 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 29 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1046-1049 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800, -700, -400, -202, -201, -122, -120, -118, -9, -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ26: S8 Education: College - Overall my experiences here are very different from what I expected before coming

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Overall my experiences here are very different from what I expected before coming

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	11	0.8 %
2	Disagree	8	0.6 %
3	Neither Agree nor Disagree	10	0.7 %
4	Agree	0	0.0 %
5	Strongly Agree	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Result of a change made to correct an interviewer error	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-122	Skipped: Not currently enrolled in college	13	1.0 %
-120	Skipped: Has not attended college in the recall period	598	44.2 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	565	41.7 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 29 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1050-1053 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800, -700, -400, -202, -201, -122, -120, -118, -9, -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ27: S8 Education: College - I am doing less well in college than I would like

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

I am doing less well in college than I would like

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	13	1.0 %
2	Disagree	8	0.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	Neither Agree nor Disagree	6	0.4 %
4	Agree	2	0.1 %
5	Strongly Agree	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Result of a change made to correct an interviewer error	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-122	Skipped: Not currently enrolled in college	13	1.0 %
-120	Skipped: Has not attended college in the recall period	598	44.2 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	565	41.7 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 29 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1054-1057 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -122 , -120 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ28: S8 Education: College - I am having problems paying for my college education

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

I am having problems paying for my college education

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	14	1.0 %
2	Disagree	10	0.7 %
3	Neither Agree nor Disagree	5	0.4 %
4	Agree	0	0.0 %
5	Strongly Agree	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Result of a change made to correct an interviewer error	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-122	Skipped: Not currently enrolled in college	13	1.0 %
-120	Skipped: Has not attended college in the recall period	598	44.2 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	565	41.7 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 29 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1058-1061 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -122 , -120 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ29: S8 Education: College - I have too little time to do schoolwork

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

I have too little time to do my schoolwork

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	10	0.7 %
2	Disagree	11	0.8 %
3	Neither Agree nor Disagree	6	0.4 %
4	Agree	2	0.1 %
5	Strongly Agree	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Result of a change made to correct an interviewer error	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-122	Skipped: Not currently enrolled in college	13	1.0 %
-120	Skipped: Has not attended college in the recall period	598	44.2 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	565	41.7 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 29 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1062-1065 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -122 , -120 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ30: S8 Education: College - Compared with my college peers, I feel less prepared for college

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Compared with my college peers, I feel less prepared for college

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	13	1.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	Disagree	9	0.7 %
3	Neither Agree nor Disagree	4	0.3 %
4	Agree	3	0.2 %
5	Strongly Agree	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Result of a change made to correct an interviewer error	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-122	Skipped: Not currently enrolled in college	13	1.0 %
-120	Skipped: Has not attended college in the recall period	598	44.2 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	565	41.7 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 29 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1066-1069 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -122 , -120 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLQ_CQ31: S8 Education: College - My high school prepared me well for college work

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

My high school prepared me well for college and work

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	8	0.6 %
2	Disagree	11	0.8 %
3	Neither Agree nor Disagree	9	0.7 %
4	Agree	1	0.1 %
5	Strongly Agree	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Result of a change made to correct an interviewer error	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-122	Skipped: Not currently enrolled in college	13	1.0 %
-120	Skipped: Has not attended college in the recall period	598	44.2 %
-118	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	565	41.7 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 29 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1070-1073 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -122 , -120 , -118 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_COLSATISFACTION: S8 Education: College - Satisfaction with School

Satisfaction with college

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

- (1) Very Satisfied
- (2) Somewhat Satisfied
- (3) Somewhat Dissatisfied
- (4) Very Dissatisfied

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Very satisfied	14	1.0 %
2.00	Somewhat satisfied	10	0.7 %
3.00	Somewhat dissatisfied	3	0.2 %
4.00	Very dissatisfied	2	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-800.00	Data missing: Result of a change made to correct an interviewer error	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-122.00	Skipped: Not currently enrolled in college	13	1.0 %
-120.00	Skipped: Has not attended college in the recall period	598	44.2 %
-118.00	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	565	41.7 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 29 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1074-1080 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800.00 , -700.00 , -400.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -122.00 , -120.00 , -118.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8SCH_COLENGAGEMENT: S8 Education: College - College Engagement

College engagement - Mean of 9 items

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

- (1) Never
- (2) Once or twice a month
- (3) Once or twice a week
- (4) More than twice a week

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	1	0.1 %
1.11	-	1	0.1 %
1.33	-	1	0.1 %
1.56	-	5	0.4 %
1.67	-	4	0.3 %
1.78	-	1	0.1 %
1.89	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	Once or twice a month	4	0.3 %
2.11	-	7	0.5 %
2.22	-	4	0.3 %
2.33	-	2	0.1 %
2.44	-	2	0.1 %
2.56	-	5	0.4 %
2.67	-	1	0.1 %
2.78	-	1	0.1 %
2.89	-	1	0.1 %
3.00	Once or twice a week	1	0.1 %
3.11	-	1	0.1 %
3.44	-	1	0.1 %
3.67	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	More than twice a week	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-800.00	Data missing: Result of a change made to correct an interviewer error	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-120.00	Skipped: Has not attended college in the recall period	601	44.4 %
-100.00	Skipped: No indication of receiving a HSD or GED	560	41.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 45 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1081-1087 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800.00 , -700.00 , -400.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -120.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8SCHOOL_PERFORMANCE: S8 Education: School Performance/Grades

School performance (based on average grades) during the recall period.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Mostly A's	32	2.4 %
2	About half As and half Bs	51	3.8 %
3	Mostly Bs	35	2.6 %
4	About half Bs and half Cs	40	3.0 %
5	Mostly Cs	16	1.2 %
6	About half Cs and half Ds	9	0.7 %
7	Mostly Ds	3	0.2 %
8	Mostly below Ds	1	0.1 %
9	No grades given	121	8.9 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-104	01.14+: Skipped if not enrolled in school in recall period	898	66.3 %
-99	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 308 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1088-1091 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -700 , -500 , -202 , -201 , -104 , -99 , -98

S8SCH_BEHAVIOR: S8 Education: Count of academic or Behavioral Problems in School (suspension/expulsion, truancy, academic problems limiting college enrollment)

Academic or Behavioral problems during the recall period.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	275	20.3 %
1	-	33	2.4 %
2	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-108	Skipped: Not enrolled in school in recall period	897	66.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 310 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1092-1095 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -108

S8JOBCAL_NWEEKSF: S8 JobCal: FACILITY : Total weeks worked in recall period across all facility jobs

FACILITY : Total weeks worked in recall period across all facility jobs.

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	1059	78.2 %
2.17	-	14	1.0 %
4.33	-	12	0.9 %
6.50	-	5	0.4 %
8.67	-	8	0.6 %
10.83	-	4	0.3 %
13.00	-	11	0.8 %
15.17	-	5	0.4 %
17.33	-	13	1.0 %
19.50	-	1	0.1 %
21.67	-	8	0.6 %
23.83	-	4	0.3 %
26.00	-	3	0.2 %
28.17	-	2	0.1 %
30.33	-	9	0.7 %
32.50	-	4	0.3 %
34.67	-	2	0.1 %
36.83	-	1	0.1 %
39.00	-	3	0.2 %
41.17	-	8	0.6 %
43.33	-	5	0.4 %
45.50	-	5	0.4 %
47.67	-	9	0.7 %
49.83	-	4	0.3 %
52.00	-	4	0.3 %
54.17	-	1	0.1 %
56.33	-	2	0.1 %
58.50	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,207 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1096-1102 (width: 7; decimal: 2)
 Variable Type: numeric
 (Range of) Missing Values: -888.00 , -201.00

S8JOBCAL_NWEEKSC: S8 JobCal: COMMUNITY: Total weeks worked in recall period across all community only jobs

COMMUNITY: Total weeks worked in recall period across all community jobs.

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	295	21.8 %
2.17	-	14	1.0 %
4.33	-	26	1.9 %
5.42	-	1	0.1 %
6.50	-	6	0.4 %
8.67	-	13	1.0 %
9.75	-	1	0.1 %
10.83	-	7	0.5 %
13.00	-	20	1.5 %
15.17	-	6	0.4 %
17.33	-	14	1.0 %
18.42	-	1	0.1 %
19.50	-	4	0.3 %
21.67	-	11	0.8 %
23.83	-	12	0.9 %
26.00	-	9	0.7 %
28.17	-	8	0.6 %
30.33	-	6	0.4 %
32.50	-	5	0.4 %
34.67	-	7	0.5 %
36.83	-	9	0.7 %
39.00	-	4	0.3 %
41.17	-	11	0.8 %
43.33	-	10	0.7 %
45.50	-	12	0.9 %
47.67	-	20	1.5 %
49.83	-	21	1.6 %
52.00	-	23	1.7 %
54.17	-	7	0.5 %
56.33	-	16	1.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
58.50	-	3	0.2 %
60.67	-	3	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
-400.00	Not available in this version	602	44.5 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 605 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1103-1109 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -888.00 , -400.00 , -201.00

S8JOBCAL_NWEEKSU: S8 JobCal: UNDER-THE-TABLE: Total weeks worked in recall period across all under-the-table only jobs

UNDER-THE-TABLE: Totals weeks worked in recall period across all under-the-table only jobs.

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	477	35.2 %
2.17	-	13	1.0 %
4.33	-	10	0.7 %
6.50	-	5	0.4 %
8.67	-	20	1.5 %
10.83	-	4	0.3 %
13.00	-	6	0.4 %
15.17	-	3	0.2 %
17.33	-	8	0.6 %
19.50	-	2	0.1 %
21.67	-	6	0.4 %
23.83	-	5	0.4 %
26.00	-	1	0.1 %
28.17	-	2	0.1 %
30.33	-	2	0.1 %
32.50	-	2	0.1 %
34.67	-	2	0.1 %
39.00	-	1	0.1 %
41.17	-	1	0.1 %
43.33	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
47.67	-	10	0.7 %
49.83	-	4	0.3 %
52.00	-	6	0.4 %
54.17	-	8	0.6 %
56.33	-	2	0.1 %
58.50	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-400.00	Not available in this version	602	44.5 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-167.00	Under-the-table calendar not completed	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 602 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1110-1116 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -888.00 , -400.00 , -201.00 , -167.00 , -166.00

S8JOBCAL_NWEEKSCU: S8 JobCal: COMMUNITY & UNDER-THE-TABLE: Total weeks worked in recall period across all community and under-the-table jobs

COMMUNITY & UNDER-THE-TABLE: Total weeks worked in recall period across all community and under-the-table jobs.

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	494	36.5 %
2.17	-	35	2.6 %
4.33	-	48	3.5 %
5.42	-	2	0.1 %
6.50	-	15	1.1 %
8.67	-	38	2.8 %
9.75	-	1	0.1 %
10.83	-	16	1.2 %
13.00	-	28	2.1 %
14.08	-	1	0.1 %
15.17	-	17	1.3 %
17.33	-	25	1.8 %
18.42	-	1	0.1 %
19.50	-	6	0.4 %
20.58	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21.67	-	32	2.4 %
22.75	-	1	0.1 %
23.83	-	28	2.1 %
24.92	-	1	0.1 %
26.00	-	19	1.4 %
28.17	-	20	1.5 %
30.33	-	18	1.3 %
31.42	-	2	0.1 %
32.50	-	15	1.1 %
34.67	-	25	1.8 %
35.75	-	1	0.1 %
36.83	-	22	1.6 %
39.00	-	21	1.6 %
41.17	-	21	1.6 %
43.33	-	33	2.4 %
45.50	-	23	1.7 %
46.58	-	1	0.1 %
47.67	-	47	3.5 %
49.83	-	36	2.7 %
52.00	-	55	4.1 %
54.17	-	20	1.5 %
56.33	-	29	2.1 %
58.50	-	3	0.2 %
60.67	-	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-167.00	Under-the-table calendar not completed	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1117-1123 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -888.00 , -201.00 , -167.00 , -166.00

S8EXPWIT: S8 ExpV: Witnessed score

Exposure to Violence - Witnessed; count of items subject witnessed.

MEASURE: Exposure to Violence (ETV)

The Exposure to Violence Inventory (ETV; Selner-O'Hagan, Kindlon, Buka, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1998) was modified for this study to assess the

frequency of exposure to violent events. Items from the ETV document the types of violence the adolescent has both experienced (i.e., Victim - 6 items, e.g., "Have you been chased where you thought you might be seriously hurt in the past N months?") and observed (i.e., Witnessed - 7 items, e.g., "Have you seen someone else being raped, an attempt made to rape someone or any other type of sexual attack in the past N months?"). Higher scores indicate a greater exposure to violence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	728	53.8 %
1	-	158	11.7 %
2	-	122	9.0 %
3	-	91	6.7 %
4	-	49	3.6 %
5	-	35	2.6 %
6	-	21	1.6 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1124-1127 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -100

S8EXPVIC: S8 ExpV: Victim score

Exposure to Violence - Victim; count of items where subject was victim.

MEASURE: Exposure to Violence (ETV)

The Exposure to Violence Inventory (ETV; Selner-O'Hagan, Kindlon, Buka, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1998) was modified for this study to assess the frequency of exposure to violent events. Items from the ETV document the types of violence the adolescent has both experienced (i.e., Victim - 6 items, e.g., "Have you been chased where you thought you might be seriously hurt in the past N months?") and observed (i.e., Witnessed - 7 items, e.g., "Have you seen someone else being raped, an attempt made to rape someone or any other type of sexual attack in the past N months?"). Higher scores indicate a greater exposure to violence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1037	76.6 %
1	-	102	7.5 %
2	-	40	3.0 %
3	-	15	1.1 %
4	-	10	0.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1128-1131 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -100

S8EXPTOT: S8 ExpV: Total score - witnessed plus victim

Exposure to Violence - Total; sum of the victim and witness scales endorsed.

MEASURE: Exposure to Violence (ETV)

The Exposure to Violence Inventory (ETV; Selner-O'Hagan, Kindlon, Buka, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1998) was modified for this study to assess the frequency of exposure to violent events. Items from the ETV document the types of violence the adolescent has both experienced (i.e., Victim - 6 items, e.g., "Have you been chased where you thought you might be seriously hurt in the past N months?") and observed (i.e., Witnessed - 7 items, e.g., "Have you seen someone else being raped, an attempt made to rape someone or any other type of sexual attack in the past N months?"). Higher scores indicate a greater exposure to violence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	686	50.7 %
1	-	164	12.1 %
2	-	124	9.2 %
3	-	92	6.8 %
4	-	48	3.5 %
5	-	30	2.2 %
6	-	32	2.4 %
7	-	15	1.1 %
8	-	6	0.4 %
9	-	6	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
10	-	1	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1132-1135 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -100

S8FRDQLT: S8 FQual: Friendship - Quality of Relationship

Friendship Quality of Relationship; mean of 10 items in the scale, at least 7 must contain valid data.

MEASURE: Friendship Quality

The items in the Friendship Quality scale are an adaptation of those included in the Quality of Relationships Inventory (Pierce, et al. 1994). The original scale was designed to measure interpersonal support from a single romantic partner but our adaptation changed the focus to a global rating regarding the youth's five closest friends (participant's are asked to average the rating across these closest friends). The scale contains 10 items which vary the context of support offered (e.g. "How much can you count on the people for help with a problem", "How close do you think you will be to these people in ten years" and "How much do you depend on these friends"). The youth responds on a 4-point likert scale ranging from "not at all" to "very much".

- (1) Not at all
- (2) A little
- (3) Quite a bit
- (4) Very much

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all	0	0.0 %
1.70	-	1	0.1 %
1.80	-	1	0.1 %
1.90	-	3	0.2 %
2.00	A little	7	0.5 %
2.10	-	3	0.2 %
2.20	-	12	0.9 %
2.22	-	1	0.1 %
2.30	-	7	0.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.40	-	20	1.5 %
2.50	-	28	2.1 %
2.60	-	23	1.7 %
2.70	-	29	2.1 %
2.78	-	1	0.1 %
2.80	-	48	3.5 %
2.90	-	46	3.4 %
3.00	Quite a bit	52	3.8 %
3.10	-	54	4.0 %
3.20	-	50	3.7 %
3.30	-	51	3.8 %
3.40	-	54	4.0 %
3.50	-	73	5.4 %
3.56	-	1	0.1 %
3.60	-	68	5.0 %
3.70	-	70	5.2 %
3.78	-	1	0.1 %
3.80	-	63	4.7 %
3.89	-	1	0.1 %
3.90	-	52	3.8 %
4.00	Very much	89	6.6 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into FriendQuality section	297	21.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 909 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1136-1142 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8FUTURE: S8 FOI: Future Orientation Inventory Scale

Future Outlook Inventory; mean of the eight items included in the computation; 7 items in the scale are not considered in the total score.

MEASURE: Future Outlook Inventory (FOI)

The Future Outlook Inventory is a 15-item scale used in this study to assess the degree each participant gives consideration to future planning. The scale was developed by Cauffman and Woolard (1999; unpublished), using items from the Life

Orientation Task (Scheier and Carver, 1985), the Zimbardo Time Perspective Scale (Zimbardo, 1980), and the Consideration of Future Consequences Scale (Strathman, Gleicher, Boninger, and Edwards, 1994). The Future Outlook Inventory asks participants to rank from 1 to 4 (1=Never True to 4=Always True) the degree to which each statement reflects how they usually are (e.g., I will keep working at difficult, boring tasks if I know they will help me get ahead later). Higher scores indicate a greater degree of future consideration and planning.

- (1) Never true
- (2) Rarely true
- (3) Often true
- (4) Always true

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never True	1	0.1 %
1.25	-	2	0.1 %
1.38	-	8	0.6 %
1.50	-	9	0.7 %
1.63	-	18	1.3 %
1.75	-	29	2.1 %
1.88	-	33	2.4 %
2.00	Rarely True	55	4.1 %
2.13	-	58	4.3 %
2.25	-	71	5.2 %
2.38	-	101	7.5 %
2.50	-	109	8.1 %
2.63	-	106	7.8 %
2.75	-	116	8.6 %
2.88	-	113	8.3 %
3.00	Often True	94	6.9 %
3.13	-	75	5.5 %
3.25	-	50	3.7 %
3.38	-	36	2.7 %
3.50	-	34	2.5 %
3.63	-	33	2.4 %
3.75	-	21	1.6 %
3.88	-	10	0.7 %
4.00	Always True	19	1.4 %
Missing Data			
-700.00	Data missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1143-1149 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8GANG_OGNG1: S8 Gang: Still a member of gang from the last interview

Still a member of gang from the last interview.

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	22	1.6 %
1	Yes	67	4.9 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Skipped: Not in a gang during last interview	1114	82.3 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 89 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1150-1153 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8GANG_LASTGANG_CODE: S8 Gang: Unique ID associated with the gang from the last interview

Unique ID associated with the gang from the last interview.

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	22	1.6 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Subject responded DK to still in gang item	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 22 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1154-1158 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -9992 , -9991 , -9982 , -9981 , -9972 , -9971 , -202 , -201 , -107 , -106 , -102 , -101

S8GANG_LASTGANG_WHENLEFT: S8 Gang: Recall period month (s8m#) subject left the gang from the last interview

Recall period month (s#m#) subject left the gang from the last interview.

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
DATE UNKNOWN	-	8	0.6 %
IntCompStat = 2	-	3	0.2 %
IntCompStat = 4	-	147	10.9 %
NA: DK if still member	-	1	0.1 %
NA: Has not left gang	-	67	4.9 %
NA: Not in gang last RP	-	1114	82.3 %
S8M01	-	3	0.2 %
S8M02	-	2	0.1 %
S8M03	-	1	0.1 %
S8M04	-	1	0.1 %
S8M05	-	1	0.1 %
S8M06	-	1	0.1 %
S8M07	-	1	0.1 %
S8M08	-	1	0.1 %
S8M10	-	2	0.1 %
SUBJ DOES NOT KNOW DATE	-	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,354 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1159-1183 (width: 25; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: character

S8GANG_NGNG1: S8 Gang: Join a gang during this recall period

Join a gang during this recall period.

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1124	83.0 %
1	Yes	13	1.0 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	67	4.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,137 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1184-1187 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -102 , -9 , -8

S8GANG_CURRENT_CODE: S8 Gang: Unique ID associated with the gang that is the focus of all followup items

Unique ID associated with the gang that is the focus of all followup items.

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	75	5.5 %
	Missing Data		
-9991	PA: Subj doesnt know name of the gang	1	0.1 %
-9982	AZ: Subj refused to provide name of gang	3	0.2 %
-9981	PA: Subj refused to provide name of gang	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 75 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1188-1192 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -9992 , -9991 , -9982 , -9981 , -9972 , -9971 , -202 , -201 , -109 , -108 , -103

S8GANG_GANG5: S8 Gang: How many members in gang (associated with gang from current_code)

How many members in gang (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
7	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	3	0.2 %
500	-	2	0.1 %
1000	-	1	0.1 %
1488	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-9999	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1124	83.0 %
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	67	4.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 10 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1193-1197 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -9999 , -9998 , -202 , -201 , -109 , -108 , -103 , -102

S8GANG_GANG6: S8 Gang: Age oldest member of gang (associated with gang from current_code)

Age oldest member of gang (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
21	-	1	0.1 %
27	-	1	0.1 %
28	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	2	0.1 %
38	-	1	0.1 %
55	-	1	0.1 %
88	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1124	83.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	67	4.9 %
-99	Dont Know	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 8 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1198-1201 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -109 , -108 , -103 , -102 , -99 , -98

S8GANG_GANG7: S8 Gang: Have any colors (associated with gang from current_code)

Have any colors (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	3	0.2 %
1	Yes	10	0.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1124	83.0 %
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	67	4.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 13 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1202-1205 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -109 , -108 , -103 , -102 , -9 , -8

S8GANG_GANG8: S8 Gang: Have any rules (associated with gang from current_code)

Have any rules (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	4	0.3 %
1	Yes	9	0.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1124	83.0 %
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	67	4.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 13 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1206-1209 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -109 , -108 , -103 , -102 , -9 , -8

S8GANG_GANG9: S8 Gang: Share money (associated with gang from current_code)

Share money (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	6	0.4 %
1	Yes	7	0.5 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1124	83.0 %
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	67	4.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 13 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1210-1213 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -109 , -108 , -103 , -102 , -9 , -8

S8GANG_GANG10: S8 Gang: Share drugs (associated with gang from current_code)

Share drugs (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	2	0.1 %
1	Yes	11	0.8 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1124	83.0 %
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	67	4.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 13 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1214-1217 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -109 , -108 , -103 , -102 , -9 , -8

S8GANG_GANG11: S8 Gang: Have punishments breaking rules (associated with gang from current_code)

Have punishments breaking rules (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	3	0.2 %
1	Yes	10	0.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1124	83.0 %
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	67	4.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 13 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1218-1221 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -109 , -108 , -103 , -102 , -9 , -8

S8GANG_GANG12: S8 Gang: How often contact (associated with gang from current_code)

How often contact (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	25	1.8 %
2	3-6 times per week	5	0.4 %
3	twice per week	6	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	Once per week	4	0.3 %
5	Less weekly, ore than monthly	3	0.2 %
6	Once per month	11	0.8 %
7	Less than monthly	26	1.9 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1124	83.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 80 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1222-1225 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -109 , -108 , -103 , -9 , -8

S8GANG_GNGNOW: S8 Gang: Still member new gang (associated with gang from current_code)

Still member new gang (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	4	0.3 %
1	Yes	76	5.6 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1124	83.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 80 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1226-1229 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -109 , -108 , -103 , -9 , -8

S8GANG_CURRENT_WHENLEFT: S8 Gang: Recall period month (s8m#) subject left the current gang (associated with gang from current_code)

Recall period month (s#m#) subject left the current gang (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
IntCompStat = 2	-	3	0.2 %
IntCompStat = 4	-	147	10.9 %
NA: Has not left new gang	-	76	5.6 %
NA: Not in any gang in RP	-	1124	83.0 %
S8M05	-	1	0.1 %
S8M06	-	1	0.1 %
S8M09	-	2	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,354 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1230-1254 (width: 25; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: character

S8GANG_GANG13: S8 Gang: Position in the gang (associated with gang from current_code)

Position in the gang (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Leader	3	0.2 %
2	Not leader, but one of the top people	15	1.1 %
3	Member	58	4.3 %
4	Something else (other)	4	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1124	83.0 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 80 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1255-1258 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -109 , -108 , -103 , -9 , -8

S8GANG_GANG16: S8 Gang: How important to you (associated with gang from current_code)

How important to you (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	Not at all	29	2.1 %
1	A little bit	15	1.1 %
2	Moderately	10	0.7 %
3	Quite a bit	19	1.4 %
4	Extremely	7	0.5 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1124	83.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 80 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1259-1262 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202, -201, -109, -108, -103, -9, -8

S8GANG_GANG17: S8 Gang: How many friend not members (associated with gang from current_code)

How many friends not members (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	None (all are members)	9	0.7 %
2	A few are not	34	2.5 %
3	Half are not	14	1.0 %
4	Most are not	12	0.9 %
5	All (none are members)	10	0.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1124	83.0 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 79 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1263-1266 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202, -201, -109, -108, -103, -9, -8

S8GNGINV: S8 GANG: Involved in a gang during the recall period

Involved in a gang during the recall period.

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1124	83.0 %
1	Yes	80	5.9 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1267-1270 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8SOCCAP17: S8 GunAccess: Person wants to buy a gun he/she can

If a young person in this neighborhood wants to buy a gun, he/she can.

MEASURE: Gun Accessibility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Agree	81	6.0 %
2	Agree	516	38.1 %
3	Neither Agree nor Disagree	223	16.5 %
4	Disagree	130	9.6 %
5	Strongly Disagree	55	4.1 %
	Missing Data		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Skipped: Subject locked up for entire recall period	191	14.1 %
-9	Dont Know	11	0.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,005 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1271-1274 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -666 , -202 , -201 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8SOCCAP18: S8 GunAccess: How much to buy a 9mm gun

How much would it cost to buy a 9mm gun?

MEASURE: Gun Accessibility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	-	1	0.1 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	4	0.3 %
50	-	14	1.0 %
60	-	3	0.2 %
70	-	1	0.1 %
75	-	5	0.4 %
80	-	13	1.0 %
85	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	56	4.1 %
110	-	3	0.2 %
120	-	3	0.2 %
125	-	3	0.2 %
130	-	1	0.1 %
138	-	1	0.1 %
145	-	1	0.1 %
150	-	61	4.5 %
170	-	1	0.1 %
175	-	5	0.4 %
180	-	1	0.1 %
200	-	70	5.2 %
225	-	1	0.1 %
250	-	66	4.9 %
255	-	1	0.1 %
270	-	2	0.1 %
275	-	2	0.1 %
280	-	1	0.1 %
300	-	100	7.4 %
350	-	53	3.9 %
375	-	2	0.1 %
400	-	48	3.5 %
450	-	19	1.4 %
500	-	22	1.6 %
550	-	2	0.1 %
600	-	6	0.4 %
700	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
750	-	1	0.1 %
800	-	3	0.2 %
900	-	2	0.1 %
995	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	433	32.0 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Skipped: Subject locked up for entire recall period	191	14.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 583 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1275-1278 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999, -998, -800, -666, -202, -201, -101

S8SOCCAP19: S8 GunAccess: How much to buy a .38

How much would it cost to buy a .38?

MEASURE: Gun Accessibility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
30	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	19	1.4 %
60	-	8	0.6 %
70	-	1	0.1 %
75	-	5	0.4 %
80	-	10	0.7 %
90	-	2	0.1 %
100	-	60	4.4 %
110	-	1	0.1 %
120	-	3	0.2 %
125	-	4	0.3 %
130	-	3	0.2 %
135	-	1	0.1 %
140	-	3	0.2 %
150	-	87	6.4 %
160	-	2	0.1 %
170	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
175	-	6	0.4 %
180	-	5	0.4 %
200	-	108	8.0 %
215	-	1	0.1 %
220	-	1	0.1 %
225	-	3	0.2 %
240	-	1	0.1 %
245	-	1	0.1 %
250	-	82	6.1 %
275	-	1	0.1 %
300	-	59	4.4 %
350	-	29	2.1 %
380	-	1	0.1 %
400	-	18	1.3 %
450	-	5	0.4 %
500	-	11	0.8 %
600	-	4	0.3 %
800	-	2	0.1 %
995	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	464	34.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Skipped: Subject locked up for entire recall period	191	14.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 552 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1279-1282 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -800 , -666 , -202 , -201 , -101

S8HEADIN: S8 HeadInj: Head Injury in the recall period where lost consciousness or needed medical treatment

A marker for the presence of a head injury which caused unconsciousness or needed medical attention.

MEASURE: Head Injury

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1163	85.9 %
1	Yes	41	3.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1283-1286 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201

S8HEADINJ_HEADN: S8 HeadInj: Number of head injuries in recall period where lost consciousness or needed medical treatment

Number of head injuries in recall period where lost consciousness or needed medical treatment.

MEASURE: Head Injury

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1163	85.9 %
1	-	39	2.9 %
2	-	1	0.1 %
3	-	1	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1287-1290 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8HC1: S8 HC: Have health insurance

Do you have health insurance?

MEASURE: Health Care

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Yes, on my own	41	3.0 %
2	Yes, through college	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	Yes, through my job	133	9.8 %
4	Yes, through my parents plan	81	6.0 %
5	Yes, through my spouses plan	9	0.7 %
6	Yes, qualified for medical assistance	325	24.0 %
7	No	605	44.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-9	Dont Know	10	0.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,196 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1291-1294 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8HC2: S8 HC: When need to see doctor for checkup/sick, where do you go

When you need to see a doctor for a check-up or when you are sick, where do you usually go?

MEASURE: Health Care

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Hospital Emergency Room	281	20.8 %
2	Private Doctors office	323	23.9 %
3	Student Health Center (if youth is in school)	3	0.2 %
4	Hospital Clinic	122	9.0 %
5	Another clinic (not a hospital)	140	10.3 %
6	I dont have any place to go	129	9.5 %
97	NA - in secure setting entire recall period	205	15.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-99	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1295-1298 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98

S8HC3: S8 HC: Rate overall health

Generally speaking, how would you rate your overall health?

MEASURE: Health Care

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Excellent	415	30.6 %
2	Good	619	45.7 %
3	Fair	160	11.8 %
4	Poor	12	0.9 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,206 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1299-1302 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8HIV1: S8 HIV: Number times had unprotected sex in recall period

How many times in the recall period have you had unprotected sex
(by that we mean, sex without a condom)?

MEASURE: HIV Risk Behaviors

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	489	36.1 %
1	-	51	3.8 %
2	-	63	4.7 %
3	-	39	2.9 %
4	-	28	2.1 %
5	-	41	3.0 %
6	-	13	1.0 %
7	-	8	0.6 %
8	-	4	0.3 %
9	-	5	0.4 %
10	-	42	3.1 %
12	-	5	0.4 %
13	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
15	-	12	0.9 %
17	-	1	0.1 %
18	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	32	2.4 %
21	-	1	0.1 %
23	-	1	0.1 %
24	-	1	0.1 %
25	-	7	0.5 %
30	-	18	1.3 %
31	-	1	0.1 %
34	-	1	0.1 %
35	-	3	0.2 %
36	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	6	0.4 %
44	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	48	3.5 %
52	-	7	0.5 %
54	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	12	0.9 %
61	-	1	0.1 %
68	-	1	0.1 %
70	-	5	0.4 %
72	-	1	0.1 %
75	-	2	0.1 %
80	-	4	0.3 %
84	-	1	0.1 %
88	-	1	0.1 %
90	-	6	0.4 %
96	-	1	0.1 %
98	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	47	3.5 %
101	-	1	0.1 %
104	-	1	0.1 %
108	-	1	0.1 %
110	-	1	0.1 %
115	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	10	0.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,194 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1303-1306 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -107

S8HIV2: S8 HIV: Number different partners had unprotected sex with in recall period

[If more than once] About how many different partners did you do this with?

MEASURE: HIV Risk Behaviors

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	497	36.7 %
2	-	84	6.2 %
3	-	30	2.2 %
4	-	11	0.8 %
5	-	6	0.4 %
6	-	8	0.6 %
7	-	4	0.3 %
8	-	2	0.1 %
10	-	7	0.5 %
12	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	1	0.1 %
80	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Skipped: Had unprotected sex one or fewer times	553	40.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 654 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1307-1310 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -107 , -101

S8HIV3: S8 HIV: Number times injected drugs in recall period

How many times in the recall period have you injected drugs?

MEASURE: HIV Risk Behaviors

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1175	86.8 %
1	-	13	1.0 %
2	-	2	0.1 %
3	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	2	0.1 %
10	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	1	0.1 %
16	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	1	0.1 %
80	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	1	0.1 %
150	-	1	0.1 %
180	-	2	0.1 %
200	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1311-1314 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -107

S8HIV4: S8 HIV: Number times shared a needle in recall period

[If more than once] About how many times in the recall period have you shared a needle to inject drugs?

MEASURE: HIV Risk Behaviors

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	25	1.8 %
2	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	2	0.1 %
20	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: Injected drugs 0 times	1178	87.0 %
Total			1,354
			100%

Based upon 29 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1315-1318 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -107 , -103 , -102

S8HIV5: S8 HIV: Number people shared needle with in recall period

About how many people did you share the needle with?

MEASURE: HIV Risk Behaviors

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	2	0.1 %
5	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-103	Skipped: Injected drugs but did not share needles	25	1.8 %
-102	Skipped: Injected drugs 0 times	1178	87.0 %
Total			1,354
			100%

Based upon 4 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1319-1322 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -107 , -103 , -102

S8HIV6: S8 HIV: Any sex partners inject drugs in recall period

To the best of your knowledge, do/did any of your sex partners in the recall period inject drugs?

MEASURE: HIV Risk Behaviors

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1197	88.4 %
1	Yes	6	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1323-1326 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -107 , -9 , -8

S8HIV7: S8 HIV: Traded sex for drugs/money/other in recall period

Have you traded sex for drugs, money, or other things in the recall period?

MEASURE: HIV Risk Behaviors

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1196	88.3 %
1	Yes	8	0.6 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1327-1330 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -107 , -9 , -8

S8HIV8: S8 HIV: Number times traded sex for drugs/money/other in recall period

[If yes] How many times did you trade sex for drugs, money, or other things in the recall period?

MEASURE: HIV Risk Behaviors

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	4	0.3 %
2	-	2	0.1 %
5	-	2	0.1 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-104	Skipped: Did not trade sex for drugs/other	1196	88.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 8 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1331-1334 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -107 , -104

S8HIV9: S8 HIV: Number different people traded sex with in recall period

With how many different people did you trade sex for drugs, money, or other things in the recall period?

MEASURE: HIV Risk Behaviors

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	5	0.4 %
2	-	1	0.1 %
3	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-104	Skipped: Did not trade sex for drugs/other	1196	88.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 8 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1335-1338 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -107 , -104

S8HIV10: S8 HIV: Ever been told that sex partner was HIV positive

Have you ever been told by anyone that one of your sex partners was HIV positive?

MEASURE: HIV Risk Behaviors

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1202	88.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Yes	2	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1339-1342 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8HIV11: S8 HIV: Number different partners that were HIV positive

[If yes] How many different partners were HIV positive?

MEASURE: HIV Risk Behaviors

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	2	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-105	Skipped: Sex partner did not say they had HIV	1202	88.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 2 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1343-1346 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -105

S8HIV12: S8 HIV: Ever been tested for HIV

Have you ever been tested for HIV?

MEASURE: HIV Risk Behaviors

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	273	20.2 %
1	Yes	928	68.5 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1347-1350 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8HIV13: S8 HIV: Ever been tested for STDs

Have you ever been tested for Sexually Transmitted Diseases (like syphilis, gonorrhea, or herpes)?

MEASURE: HIV Risk Behaviors

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	295	21.8 %
1	Yes	906	66.9 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1351-1354 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8RLG1: S8 Religion: During recall period how often attend religious service

During recall period how often did you attend church, synagogue, or other religious activities?

MEASURE: Importance of Spirituality

The Importance of Spirituality measure, developed by Maton (1989), is a highly reliable assessment of spirituality (Maton, Teti, Corns, Vieira-Baker, Lavine, Gouze, and Keating, 1996). The scale contains three items that ask participants to indicate how much their actions are influenced by belief in a god. Participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all true" to "Completely true," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of spirituality. These three items are summed into a single scale score. Two additional items are included to evaluate the importance of one's religion (e.g., "How important has religion been in your life?"), as well as the participant's average yearly service attendance (e.g., "During the past year, how often did you attend church, synagogue, or other religious service?"). These are left as individual items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	708	52.3 %
2	Several times a year	196	14.5 %
3	Once or twice per month	116	8.6 %
4	Once a week	145	10.7 %
5	Several times per week	38	2.8 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1355-1358 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8RLG2: S8 Religion: How important has religion been in your life

How important has religion been in your life?

MEASURE: Importance of Spirituality

The Importance of Spirituality measure, developed by Maton (1989), is a highly reliable assessment of spirituality (Maton, Teti, Corns, Vieira-Baker, Lavine, Gouze, and Keating, 1996). The scale contains three items that ask participants to indicate how much their actions are influenced by belief in a god. Participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all true" to "Completely true," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of spirituality. These three items are summed into a single scale score. Two additional items are included to evaluate the importance of one's religion (e.g., "How important has religion been in your life?"), as well as the participant's average yearly service attendance (e.g., "During the past year, how often did you attend church, synagogue, or other religious service?"). These are left as individual items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	214	15.8 %
2	Not too important	191	14.1 %
3	Somewhat important	338	25.0 %
4	Pretty important	189	14.0 %
5	Very important	271	20.0 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1359-1362 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8RLG3: S8 Religion: I experience Gods love and caring on a regular basis

I experience God's love and caring on a regular basis.

MEASURE: Importance of Spirituality

The Importance of Spirituality measure, developed by Maton (1989), is a highly reliable assessment of spirituality (Maton, Teti, Corns, Vieira-Baker, Lavine, Gouze, and Keating, 1996). The scale contains three items that ask participants to indicate how much their actions are influenced by belief in a god. Participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all true" to "Completely true," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of spirituality. These three items are summed into a single scale score. Two additional items are included to evaluate the importance of one's religion (e.g., "How important has religion been in your life?"), as well as the participant's average yearly service attendance (e.g., "During the past year, how often did you attend church, synagogue, or other religious service?"). These are left as individual items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all true	186	13.7 %
2	Not very true	140	10.3 %
3	Somewhat true	356	26.3 %
4	Pretty true	223	16.5 %
5	Completely true	294	21.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-9	Dont Know	4	0.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,199 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1363-1366 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8RLG4: S8 Religion: I experience a close personal relationship to God

I experience a close personal relationship to God.

MEASURE: Importance of Spirituality

The Importance of Spirituality measure, developed by Maton (1989), is a highly reliable assessment of spirituality (Maton, Teti, Corns, Vieira-Baker, Lavine, Gouze, and Keating, 1996). The scale contains three items that ask participants to indicate how much their actions are influenced by belief in a god. Participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all true" to "Completely true," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of spirituality. These three items are summed into a single scale score. Two additional items are included to evaluate the importance of one's religion (e.g., "How important has religion been in your life?"), as well as the participant's average yearly service attendance (e.g., "During the past year, how often did you attend church, synagogue, or other religious service?"). These are left as individual items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all true	206	15.2 %
2	Not very true	154	11.4 %
3	Somewhat true	375	27.7 %
4	Pretty true	208	15.4 %
5	Completely true	256	18.9 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-9	Dont Know	4	0.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,199 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1367-1370 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8RLG5: S8 Religion: Religion helps me to deal with my problems

Religion helps me to deal with my problems.

MEASURE: Importance of Spirituality

The Importance of Spirituality measure, developed by Maton (1989), is a highly reliable assessment of spirituality (Maton, Teti, Corns, Vieira-Baker, Lavine, Gouze, and Keating, 1996). The scale contains three items that ask participants to indicate how much their actions are influenced by belief in a god. Participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all true" to "Completely true," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of spirituality. These three

items are summed into a single scale score. Two additional items are included to evaluate the importance of one's religion (e.g., "How important has religion been in your life?"), as well as the participant's average yearly service attendance (e.g., "During the past year, how often did you attend church, synagogue, or other religious service?"). These are left as individual items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all true	312	23.0 %
2	Not very true	179	13.2 %
3	Somewhat true	327	24.2 %
4	Pretty true	166	12.3 %
5	Completely true	216	16.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1371-1374 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8RELIGN: S8 Religion: Importance of Spirituality

Importance of spirituality; Mean of three items.

MEASURE: Importance of Spirituality

The Importance of Spirituality measure, developed by Maton (1989), is a highly reliable assessment of spirituality (Maton, Teti, Corns, Vieira-Baker, Lavine, Gouze, and Keating, 1996). The scale contains three items that ask participants to indicate how much their actions are influenced by belief in a god. Participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all true" to "Completely true," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of spirituality. These three items are summed into a single scale score. Two additional items are included to evaluate the importance of one's religion (e.g., "How important has religion been in your life?"), as well as the participant's average yearly service attendance (e.g., "During the past year, how often did you attend church, synagogue, or other religious service?"). These are left as individual items.

- (1) Not at all true
- (2) Not very true
- (3) Somewhat true
- (4) Pretty true
- (5) Completely true

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all true	162	12.0 %
1.33	-	20	1.5 %
1.67	-	40	3.0 %
2.00	Not very true	88	6.5 %
2.33	-	91	6.7 %
2.67	-	78	5.8 %
3.00	Somewhat true	199	14.7 %
3.33	-	66	4.9 %
3.67	-	77	5.7 %
4.00	Pretty true	111	8.2 %
4.33	-	53	3.9 %
4.67	-	43	3.2 %
5.00	Completely true	171	12.6 %
Missing Data			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-9.00	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,199 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1375-1381 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8PUNOTH: S8 PainCost: Certainty of Punishment - Other

Certainty of punishment - others; Mean of 7 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is comprised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {Others and You (e.g., "How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?")}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., "If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?"), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., "Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?")}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., "If I take things, other people my age will respect me more.")}, and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g., "How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?"). \

(0) No chance

(10) Absolutely certain to be caught

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	No chance	12	0.9 %
0.14	-	1	0.1 %
0.43	-	3	0.2 %
0.57	-	2	0.1 %
0.71	-	5	0.4 %
0.83	-	1	0.1 %
0.86	-	3	0.2 %
1.00	-	3	0.2 %
1.14	-	5	0.4 %
1.29	-	4	0.3 %
1.43	-	9	0.7 %
1.57	-	3	0.2 %
1.71	-	12	0.9 %
1.86	-	11	0.8 %
2.00	-	9	0.7 %
2.14	-	8	0.6 %
2.29	-	6	0.4 %
2.43	-	12	0.9 %
2.57	-	11	0.8 %
2.71	-	10	0.7 %
2.86	-	13	1.0 %
3.00	-	12	0.9 %
3.14	-	12	0.9 %
3.29	-	22	1.6 %
3.43	-	20	1.5 %
3.57	-	30	2.2 %
3.71	-	19	1.4 %
3.86	-	31	2.3 %
4.00	-	21	1.6 %
4.14	-	22	1.6 %
4.29	-	34	2.5 %
4.43	-	23	1.7 %
4.57	-	27	2.0 %
4.71	-	20	1.5 %
4.86	-	26	1.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5.00	-	108	8.0 %
5.14	-	17	1.3 %
5.29	-	34	2.5 %
5.43	-	20	1.5 %
5.57	-	34	2.5 %
5.71	-	28	2.1 %
5.86	-	23	1.7 %
6.00	-	20	1.5 %
6.14	-	20	1.5 %
6.29	-	19	1.4 %
6.43	-	27	2.0 %
6.57	-	15	1.1 %
6.71	-	24	1.8 %
6.86	-	20	1.5 %
7.00	-	13	1.0 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-99.00	Dont Know	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1382-1388 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -99.00 , -98.00

S8PUNYOU: S8 PainCost: Certainty of Punishment - You

Certainty of punishment - you; Mean of 7 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is compromised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {Others and You (e.g., "How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?")}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., "If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?"), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., "Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?")}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., "If I take things, other people my age will respect me more.")}, and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g.,

"How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?").

(0) No chance

(10) Absolutely certain to be caught

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	No chance	69	5.1 %
0.14	-	2	0.1 %
0.29	-	3	0.2 %
0.43	-	3	0.2 %
0.57	-	1	0.1 %
0.71	-	6	0.4 %
1.00	-	9	0.7 %
1.14	-	7	0.5 %
1.29	-	6	0.4 %
1.43	-	15	1.1 %
1.57	-	6	0.4 %
1.71	-	6	0.4 %
1.86	-	13	1.0 %
2.00	-	9	0.7 %
2.14	-	13	1.0 %
2.29	-	6	0.4 %
2.43	-	10	0.7 %
2.57	-	10	0.7 %
2.67	-	2	0.1 %
2.71	-	10	0.7 %
2.86	-	31	2.3 %
3.00	-	14	1.0 %
3.14	-	12	0.9 %
3.29	-	9	0.7 %
3.43	-	16	1.2 %
3.57	-	26	1.9 %
3.71	-	14	1.0 %
3.86	-	9	0.7 %
4.00	-	11	0.8 %
4.14	-	12	0.9 %
4.29	-	38	2.8 %
4.43	-	14	1.0 %
4.57	-	16	1.2 %
4.71	-	14	1.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4.86	-	11	0.8 %
5.00	-	106	7.8 %
5.14	-	10	0.7 %
5.29	-	9	0.7 %
5.43	-	16	1.2 %
5.57	-	17	1.3 %
5.71	-	29	2.1 %
5.86	-	10	0.7 %
6.00	-	19	1.4 %
6.14	-	17	1.3 %
6.29	-	14	1.0 %
6.43	-	14	1.0 %
6.57	-	14	1.0 %
6.71	-	18	1.3 %
6.86	-	11	0.8 %
7.00	-	14	1.0 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-99.00	Dont Know	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1389-1395 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -99.00 , -98.00

S8SOCCST: S8 PainCost: Social Costs of Punishment

Social costs of punishment; Mean of 6 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is compromised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {Others and You (e.g., "How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?")}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., "If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?"), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., "Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?")}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., "If I take things,

other people my age will respect me more."}), and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g., "How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?").

- (1) Very unlikely
- (2) Somewhat unlikely
- (3) Neither likely nor unlikely
- (4) Somewhat likely
- (5) Very likely

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Very unlikely	27	2.0 %
1.20	-	6	0.4 %
1.33	-	3	0.2 %
1.40	-	6	0.4 %
1.50	-	1	0.1 %
1.60	-	34	2.5 %
1.67	-	7	0.5 %
1.80	-	41	3.0 %
1.83	-	3	0.2 %
2.00	Somewhat unlikely	26	1.9 %
2.17	-	4	0.3 %
2.20	-	24	1.8 %
2.33	-	5	0.4 %
2.40	-	47	3.5 %
2.50	-	4	0.3 %
2.60	-	32	2.4 %
2.67	-	10	0.7 %
2.80	-	42	3.1 %
2.83	-	8	0.6 %
3.00	Neither likely or unlikely	97	7.2 %
3.17	-	18	1.3 %
3.20	-	89	6.6 %
3.33	-	19	1.4 %
3.40	-	105	7.8 %
3.50	-	10	0.7 %
3.60	-	90	6.6 %
3.67	-	20	1.5 %
3.80	-	80	5.9 %
3.83	-	22	1.6 %
4.00	Somewhat likely	88	6.5 %
4.17	-	8	0.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4.20	-	67	4.9 %
4.33	-	14	1.0 %
4.40	-	37	2.7 %
4.50	-	6	0.4 %
4.60	-	26	1.9 %
4.67	-	7	0.5 %
4.80	-	23	1.7 %
5.00	Very likely	49	3.6 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,205 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1396-1402 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8WGTCST: S8 PainCost: Punishment Costs - Weight

Punishment costs - weight; Mean of 18 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is comprised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {Others and You (e.g., "How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?")}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., "If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?"), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., "Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?")}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., "If I take things, other people my age will respect me more.")}, and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g., "How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?").

- (1) Not at all
- (2) A little
- (3) Quite a bit
- (4) Very much

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all	34	2.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.06	-	1	0.1 %
1.27	-	1	0.1 %
1.33	-	1	0.1 %
1.43	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	4	0.3 %
1.67	-	1	0.1 %
1.71	-	1	0.1 %
1.75	-	1	0.1 %
1.80	-	1	0.1 %
1.83	-	1	0.1 %
1.88	-	1	0.1 %
1.93	-	2	0.1 %
1.94	-	2	0.1 %
2.00	A little	32	2.4 %
2.06	-	1	0.1 %
2.07	-	1	0.1 %
2.09	-	1	0.1 %
2.13	-	1	0.1 %
2.14	-	1	0.1 %
2.17	-	1	0.1 %
2.18	-	2	0.1 %
2.20	-	2	0.1 %
2.25	-	1	0.1 %
2.29	-	2	0.1 %
2.31	-	4	0.3 %
2.33	-	1	0.1 %
2.36	-	1	0.1 %
2.40	-	1	0.1 %
2.41	-	1	0.1 %
2.47	-	1	0.1 %
2.50	-	10	0.7 %
2.56	-	3	0.2 %
2.57	-	1	0.1 %
2.59	-	2	0.1 %
2.60	-	1	0.1 %
2.67	-	4	0.3 %
2.69	-	1	0.1 %
2.71	-	1	0.1 %
2.73	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.75	-	1	0.1 %
2.78	-	2	0.1 %
2.80	-	2	0.1 %
2.81	-	2	0.1 %
2.82	-	2	0.1 %
2.83	-	2	0.1 %
2.88	-	1	0.1 %
2.89	-	6	0.4 %
2.90	-	1	0.1 %
2.92	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into section	683	50.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 522 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1403-1409 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8VARCST: S8 PainCost: Punishment Costs - Variety

Punishment costs - variety; Count of 18 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is comprised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {Others and You (e.g., "How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?")}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., "If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?"), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., "Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?")}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., "If I take things, other people my age will respect me more.")}, and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g., "How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	67	4.9 %
1	-	50	3.7 %
2	-	19	1.4 %
3	-	7	0.5 %
4	-	6	0.4 %
5	-	7	0.5 %
6	-	2	0.1 %
7	-	4	0.3 %
8	-	4	0.3 %
9	-	3	0.2 %
10	-	5	0.4 %
11	-	13	1.0 %
12	-	21	1.6 %
13	-	30	2.2 %
14	-	48	3.5 %
15	-	46	3.4 %
16	-	43	3.2 %
17	-	71	5.2 %
18	-	143	10.6 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Did not skip into section	616	45.5 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 589 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1410-1413 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8MATCST: S8 PainCost: Punishment Costs (13) - Material Issues

Punishment costs (13) - material issues; Sum of 13 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is comprised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {Others and You (e.g., "How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?")}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., "If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?"), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., "Has your court

sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?"}}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., "If I take things, other people my age will respect me more."}), and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g., "How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	137	10.1 %
1	-	20	1.5 %
2	-	3	0.2 %
3	-	4	0.3 %
4	-	3	0.2 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
6	-	10	0.7 %
7	-	12	0.9 %
8	-	34	2.5 %
9	-	41	3.0 %
10	-	53	3.9 %
11	-	41	3.0 %
12	-	66	4.9 %
13	-	164	12.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Did not skip into section	616	45.5 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 589 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1414-1417 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8FRECST: S8 PainCost: Punishment Costs (5) - Freedom Issues

Punishment costs (5) - freedom issues; Sum of 5 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is compromised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {Others and You (e.g., "How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?")}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., "If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?"), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., "Has your court

sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?"}}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., "If I take things, other people my age will respect me more."}), and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g., "How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	69	5.1 %
1	-	53	3.9 %
2	-	24	1.8 %
3	-	20	1.5 %
4	-	88	6.5 %
5	-	335	24.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Did not skip into section	616	45.5 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 589 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1418-1421 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8STLRWD: S8 PainCost: Social Rewards of Crime - Stealing

Social rewards of crime - stealing; Mean of 5 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is comprised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {Others and You (e.g., "How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?")}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., "If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?"), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., "Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?")}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., "If I take things, other people my age will respect me more.")}, and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g., "How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?").

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Somewhat disagree
- (3) Somewhat agree
- (4) Strongly agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.0	Strongly disagree	261	19.3 %
1.2	-	36	2.7 %
1.4	-	31	2.3 %
1.6	-	34	2.5 %
1.8	-	48	3.5 %
2.0	Somewhat disagree	490	36.2 %
2.2	-	159	11.7 %
2.4	-	66	4.9 %
2.6	-	35	2.6 %
2.8	-	22	1.6 %
3.0	Somewhat agree	14	1.0 %
3.2	-	3	0.2 %
3.4	-	1	0.1 %
3.6	-	1	0.1 %
3.8	-	1	0.1 %
4.0	Strongly agree	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-202.0	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,205 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1422-1428 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600.0 , -300.0 , -202.0 , -201.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

S8FGTRWD: S8 PainCost: Social Rewards of Crime - Fighting

Social rewards of crime - fighting; Mean of 5 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is compromised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {Others and You (e.g., "How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?")}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., "If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?"), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., "Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?")}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., "If I take things, other people my age will respect me more.")}, and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g.,

"How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?").

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Somewhat disagree
- (3) Somewhat agree
- (4) Strongly agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly disagree	231	17.1 %
1.20	-	8	0.6 %
1.40	-	26	1.9 %
1.60	-	18	1.3 %
1.80	-	24	1.8 %
2.00	Somewhat disagree	456	33.7 %
2.20	-	131	9.7 %
2.40	-	100	7.4 %
2.60	-	87	6.4 %
2.75	-	1	0.1 %
2.80	-	61	4.5 %
3.00	Somewhat agree	38	2.8 %
3.20	-	5	0.4 %
3.40	-	8	0.6 %
3.60	-	4	0.3 %
3.80	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Strongly agree	6	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,205 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1429-1435 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8ROBRWD: S8 PainCost: Social Rewards of Crime - Robbery

Social rewards of crime - robbery; Mean of 5 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure

is compromised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {Others and You (e.g., "How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?")}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., "If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?"), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., "Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?")}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., "If I take things, other people my age will respect me more.")}, and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g., "How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?").

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Somewhat disagree
- (3) Somewhat agree
- (4) Strongly agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.0	Strongly disagree	286	21.1 %
1.2	-	8	0.6 %
1.4	-	29	2.1 %
1.6	-	22	1.6 %
1.8	-	24	1.8 %
2.0	Somewhat disagree	607	44.8 %
2.2	-	94	6.9 %
2.4	-	42	3.1 %
2.6	-	40	3.0 %
2.8	-	26	1.9 %
3.0	Somewhat agree	14	1.0 %
3.2	-	4	0.3 %
3.4	-	5	0.4 %
3.6	-	1	0.1 %
4.0	Strongly agree	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-202.0	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,205 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1436-1442 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600.0 , -300.0 , -202.0 , -201.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

S8PERRWD: S8 PainCost: Personal Rewards of Crime

Personal Rewards of crime; Mean of 7 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is comprised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {Others and You (e.g., "How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?")}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., "If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?"), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., "Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?")}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., "If I take things, other people my age will respect me more.")}, and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g., "How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?").

- (0) No fun or kick at all
- (10) A great deal of fun or kick

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	No fun or kick at all	562	41.5 %
0.14	-	12	0.9 %
0.29	-	39	2.9 %
0.43	-	24	1.8 %
0.57	-	14	1.0 %
0.71	-	74	5.5 %
0.86	-	20	1.5 %
1.00	-	18	1.3 %
1.14	-	20	1.5 %
1.29	-	13	1.0 %
1.43	-	45	3.3 %
1.57	-	17	1.3 %
1.71	-	11	0.8 %
1.86	-	11	0.8 %
2.00	-	15	1.1 %
2.14	-	12	0.9 %
2.29	-	6	0.4 %
2.43	-	10	0.7 %
2.57	-	11	0.8 %
2.71	-	6	0.4 %
2.86	-	10	0.7 %
3.00	-	13	1.0 %
3.14	-	9	0.7 %
3.29	-	9	0.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.43	-	5	0.4 %
3.57	-	8	0.6 %
3.71	-	6	0.4 %
3.86	-	4	0.3 %
4.00	-	12	0.9 %
4.14	-	6	0.4 %
4.29	-	12	0.9 %
4.43	-	8	0.6 %
4.57	-	11	0.8 %
4.71	-	7	0.5 %
4.86	-	8	0.6 %
5.00	-	25	1.8 %
5.14	-	3	0.2 %
5.29	-	6	0.4 %
5.43	-	4	0.3 %
5.57	-	7	0.5 %
5.71	-	10	0.7 %
5.86	-	8	0.6 %
6.00	-	5	0.4 %
6.14	-	7	0.5 %
6.29	-	5	0.4 %
6.43	-	3	0.2 %
6.57	-	6	0.4 %
6.71	-	2	0.1 %
6.86	-	1	0.1 %
7.00	-	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,205 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1443-1449 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -99.00 , -98.00

S8DEMO_PRGNOW: S8 Pregnancy: Currently pregnant

Are you currently pregnant? (females only)

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	146	10.8 %
1	Yes	26	1.9 %
7	Suspected but not confirmed	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Skipped: Subject is male	1031	76.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 176 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1450-1453 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8DEMO_HOWPRG: S8 Pregnancy: Number of months along in current pregnancy

How many months pregnant are you? (females only)

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1-3 months	10	0.7 %
2	4-6 months	12	0.9 %
3	7-9 months	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: Not currently pregnant	150	11.1 %
-101	Skipped: Subject is male	1031	76.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 26 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1454-1457 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8DEMO_PREGRP: S8 Pregnancy: Been pregnant during recall period (other than current pregnancy if currently pregnant)

Have you been pregnant during the recall period (other than current pregnancy if you are currently pregnant)? (females only)

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	127	9.4 %
1	Yes	49	3.6 %
	Missing Data		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Skipped: Subject is male	1031	76.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 176 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1458-1461 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8DEMO_PRGENDRP: S8 Pregnancy: How did pregnancy end (refers to pregnancy from SS8Demo_PregRP)

How did this pregnancy end? (females only)

(refers to pregnancy from SS#Demo_PregRP)

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Live birth	32	2.4 %
2	Still birth, miscarriage or abortion	17	1.3 %
	Missing Data		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-103	Skipped: Was not pregnant any other time during recall period	127	9.4 %
-101	Skipped: Subject is male	1031	76.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 49 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1462-1465 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -103 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8DEMO_ABORTION: S8 Pregnancy: Did you have an abortion in the recall period

Did you have an abortion in the recall period? (females only)

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	49	3.6 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-103	Skipped: Was not pregnant any other time during recall period	127	9.4 %
-101	Skipped: Subject is male	1031	76.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 49 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1466-1470 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -103 , -101

S8DEMO_WIFPRG: S8 Pregnancy: Is wife currently pregnant

Is your wife currently pregnant? (males only)

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	34	2.5 %
1	Yes	8	0.6 %
7	NA	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-105	Skipped: Subject is not married, or marital status is unknown	986	72.8 %
-104	Skipped: Subject is female	176	13.0 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 43 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1471-1474 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -105 , -104 , -9 , -8

S8DEMO_GFPRG: S8 Pregnancy: Any girlfriends currently pregnant with your child

Do you have any girlfriends who are currently pregnant with your child? (males only)

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	938	69.3 %
1	Yes	91	6.7 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-104	Skipped: Subject is female	176	13.0 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,029 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1475-1478 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -104 , -9 , -8

S8DEMO_GFPRN: S8 Pregnancy: Number of girlfriends currently pregnant with your child

How many girlfriends are currently pregnant with your child? (males only)

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	88	6.5 %
2	-	3	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-107	Skipped: Subject doesnt know if girlfriend is pregnant	1	0.1 %
-106	Skipped: Girlfriend is not pregnant	938	69.3 %
-104	Skipped: Subject is female	176	13.0 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 91 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1479-1482 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -107 , -106 , -104 , -99 , -98

S8DEMO_GFHWFR: S8 Pregnancy: Number of months along wife/girlfriend is in current pregnancy

How many months pregant is she? (males only)

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1-3 months	24	1.8 %
2	4-6 months	34	2.5 %
3	7-9 months	33	2.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-107	Skipped: Subject doesn't know if girlfriend is pregnant	1	0.1 %
-106	Skipped: Girlfriend is not pregnant	938	69.3 %
-104	Skipped: Subject is female	176	13.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 91 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1483-1486 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202, -201, -107, -106, -104, -9, -8

S8CHLD01 OMIT: S8 Children: Child01 - Do not ask about this child in future interviews

Child01 - Do not ask about this child in future interviews.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	468	34.6 %
1	Yes	54	4.0 %
Missing Data			
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	11	0.8 %
-650	No child reported	636	47.0 %
-400	Not asked in this version	33	2.4 %
-202	IntCompStat 2	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	4	0.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 522 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1487-1490 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD01 OMITWHY: S8 Children: Child01 - Why should this child no longer be asked about

Child01 - Why should this child not be asked about anymore?

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not a biological child or no longer in relationship with child's bio parent	52	3.8 %
2	Parental rights terminated or child given up for adoption	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	11	0.8 %
-650	No child reported	636	47.0 %
-400	Not asked in this version	33	2.4 %
-202	IntCompStat 2	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	470	34.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 56 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1491-1494 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100

S8CHLD01_ALIVE: S8 Children: Child01 - Is this child alive

Child01 - Is this child alive.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	11	0.8 %
1	Yes	496	36.6 %
Missing Data			
-811	Child omitted--questions not asked	49	3.6 %
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	11	0.8 %
-650	No child reported	636	47.0 %
-601	Incorrectly omitted by interviewer	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 507 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1495-1498 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -202, -201, -9, -8

S8CHLD01_AGE: S8 Children: Child01 - Age

Child01 - How old is this child.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	432	31.9 %
	Missing Data		
-811	Child omitted--questions not asked	54	4.0 %
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	11	0.8 %
-650	No child reported	636	47.0 %
-601	Incorrectly omitted by interviewer	4	0.3 %
-526	Age unknown	24	1.8 %
-400	Not asked in this version	33	2.4 %
-202	IntCompStat 2	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	11	0.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 432 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1499-1503 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -526 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -99 , -98

S8CHLD01_BIO: S8 Children: Child01 - Is this your biological child

Child01 - Is this your biological child.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	52	3.8 %
1	Yes	506	37.4 %
	Missing Data		
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	11	0.8 %
-650	No child reported	636	47.0 %
-506	Biological relationship unknown	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat 2	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 558 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1504-1507 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -506, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD01_LIVWNW: S8 Children: Child01 - Does this child live with you

Child01 - Does this child live with you.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	173	12.8 %
1	Yes	159	11.7 %
	Missing Data		
-811	Child omitted--questions not asked	28	2.1 %
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	11	0.8 %
-650	No child reported	636	47.0 %
-601	Incorrectly omitted by interviewer	3	0.2 %
-400	Not asked in this version	190	14.0 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	7	0.5 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 332 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1508-1511 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD01_LIVWRP: S8 Children: Child01 - Has this child lived in the same household as you in the recall period

Child01 - Has this child lived in the same household as you in the recall period.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	217	16.0 %
1	Yes	237	17.5 %
6	Omit	19	1.4 %
7	Deceased	11	0.8 %
	Missing Data		
-811	Child omitted--questions not asked	36	2.7 %
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	11	0.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-650	No child reported	636	47.0 %
-601	Incorrectly omitted by interviewer	3	0.2 %
-400	Not asked in this version	33	2.4 %
-202	IntCompStat 2	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 484 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1512-1515 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD01_CONTNW: S8 Children: Child01 - Frequency of contact with child now

Child01 - Frequency of contact with child now.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	195	14.4 %
2	3-6 times per week	31	2.3 %
3	2 times per week	17	1.3 %
4	1 time per week	21	1.6 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	13	1.0 %
6	1 time per month	5	0.4 %
7	Less than monthly	51	3.8 %
Missing Data			
-811	Child omitted--questions not asked	28	2.1 %
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	11	0.8 %
-650	No child reported	636	47.0 %
-601	Incorrectly omitted by interviewer	2	0.1 %
-400	Not asked in this version	190	14.0 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	7	0.5 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 333 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1516-1519 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD01_CONTRP: S8 Children: Child01 - Frequency of contact with child in the recall periods

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	269	19.9 %
2	3-6 times per week	54	4.0 %
3	2 times per week	16	1.2 %
4	1 time per week	18	1.3 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	28	2.1 %
6	1 time per month	10	0.7 %
7	Less than monthly	63	4.7 %
Missing Data			
-811	Child omitted--questions not asked	49	3.6 %
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	11	0.8 %
-650	No child reported	636	47.0 %
-601	Incorrectly omitted by interviewer	3	0.2 %
-400	Not asked in this version	33	2.4 %
-202	IntCompStat 2	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	14	1.0 %
-9	Don't Know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 458 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1520-1523 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD02 OMIT: S8 Children: Child02 - Do not ask about this child in future interviews

Child02 - Do not ask about this child in future interviews.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	190	14.0 %
1	Yes	14	1.0 %
Missing Data			
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	3	0.2 %
-650	No child reported	972	71.8 %
-400	Not asked in this version	28	2.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1524-1527 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD02 OMITWHY: S8 Children: Child02 - Why should this child no longer be asked about

Child02 - Why should this child not be asked about anymore?

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not a biological child or no longer in relationship with child's bio parent	13	1.0 %
2	Parental rights terminated or child given up for adoption	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	3	0.2 %
-650	No child reported	972	71.8 %
-400	Not asked in this version	28	2.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	190	14.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 14 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1528-1531 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100

S8CHLD02 ALIVE: S8 Children: Child02 - Is this child alive

Child02 - Is this child alive.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	5	0.4 %
1	Yes	215	15.9 %
Missing Data			
-811	Child omitted--questions not asked	10	0.7 %
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	3	0.2 %
-700	Missing due to bug in Interview	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-650	No child reported	972	71.8 %
-601	Incorrectly omitted by interviewer	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 220 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1532-1535 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -202, -201, -9, -8

S8CHLD02_AGE: S8 Children: Child02 - Age

Child02 - How old is this child.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	175	12.9 %
Missing Data			
-811	Child omitted--questions not asked	14	1.0 %
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	3	0.2 %
-700	Missing due to bug in Interview	1	0.1 %
-650	No child reported	972	71.8 %
-601	Incorrectly omitted by interviewer	1	0.1 %
-526	Age unknown	8	0.6 %
-400	Not asked in this version	28	2.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 175 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1536-1540 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -526, -400, -202, -201, -100, -99, -98

S8CHLD02_BIO: S8 Children: Child02 - Is this your biological child

Child02 - Is this your biological child.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	14	1.0 %
1	Yes	217	16.0 %
	Missing Data		
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	3	0.2 %
-650	No child reported	971	71.7 %
-506	Biological relationship unknown	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 231 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1541-1544 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -506, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD02_LIVWNW: S8 Children: Child02 - Does this child live with you

Child02 - Does this child live with you.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	73	5.4 %
1	Yes	87	6.4 %
	Missing Data		
-811	Child omitted--questions not asked	8	0.6 %
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	3	0.2 %
-700	Missing due to bug in Interview	1	0.1 %
-650	No child reported	972	71.8 %
-601	Incorrectly omitted by interviewer	1	0.1 %
-400	Not asked in this version	59	4.4 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	3	0.2 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 160 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1545-1548 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD02_LIVWRP: S8 Children: Child02 - Has this child lived in the same household as you in the recall period

Child02 - Has this child lived in the same household as you in the recall period.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	77	5.7 %
1	Yes	97	7.2 %
6	Omit	4	0.3 %
7	Deceased	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-811	Child omitted--questions not asked	10	0.7 %
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	3	0.2 %
-700	Missing due to bug in Interview	1	0.1 %
-650	No child reported	972	71.8 %
-601	Incorrectly omitted by interviewer	1	0.1 %
-400	Not asked in this version	28	2.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	9	0.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 183 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1549-1552 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD02_CONTNW: S8 Children: Child02 - Frequency of contact with child now

Child02 - Frequency of contact with child now.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	118	8.7 %
2	3-6 times per week	9	0.7 %
3	2 times per week	5	0.4 %
4	1 time per week	11	0.8 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	2	0.1 %
6	1 time per month	2	0.1 %
7	Less than monthly	13	1.0 %
Missing Data			
-811	Child omitted--questions not asked	8	0.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	3	0.2 %
-700	Missing due to bug in Interview	1	0.1 %
-650	No child reported	972	71.8 %
-601	Incorrectly omitted by interviewer	1	0.1 %
-400	Not asked in this version	59	4.4 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 160 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1553-1556 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8CHLD02_CONTRP: S8 Children: Child02 - Frequency of contact with child in the recall periods

Child02 - Frequency of contact with child in the recall periods.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	115	8.5 %
2	3-6 times per week	21	1.6 %
3	2 times per week	5	0.4 %
4	1 time per week	11	0.8 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	5	0.4 %
6	1 time per month	2	0.1 %
7	Less than monthly	17	1.3 %
Missing Data			
-811	Child omitted--questions not asked	10	0.7 %
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	3	0.2 %
-700	Missing due to bug in Interview	1	0.1 %
-650	No child reported	972	71.8 %
-601	Incorrectly omitted by interviewer	1	0.1 %
-400	Not asked in this version	28	2.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	14	1.0 %
-9	Don't Know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 176 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1557-1560 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD03 OMIT: S8 Children: Child03 - Do not ask about this child in future interviews

Child03 - Do not ask about this child in future interviews.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	59	4.4 %
1	Yes	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-650	No child reported	1133	83.7 %
-400	Not asked in this version	13	1.0 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 61 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1561-1564 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD03 OMITWHY: S8 Children: Child03 - Why should this child no longer be asked about

Child03 - Why should this child not be asked about anymore?

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not a biological child or no longer in relationship with child's bio parent	2	0.1 %
2	Parental rights terminated or child given up for adoption	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-650	No child reported	1133	83.7 %
-400	Not asked in this version	13	1.0 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	59	4.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 2 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1565-1568 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100

S8CHLD03_ALIVE: S8 Children: Child03 - Is this child alive

Child03 - Is this child alive.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	0	0.0 %
1	Yes	72	5.3 %
Missing Data			
-811	Child omitted--questions not asked	2	0.1 %
-650	No child reported	1133	83.7 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 72 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1569-1572 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8CHLD03_AGE: S8 Children: Child03 - Age

Child03 - How old is this child.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	57	4.2 %
Missing Data			
-811	Child omitted--questions not asked	2	0.1 %
-650	No child reported	1133	83.7 %
-526	Age unknown	1	0.1 %
-400	Not asked in this version	13	1.0 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 57 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1573-1577 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -526 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -99 , -98

S8CHLD03_BIO: S8 Children: Child03 - Is this your biological child

Child03 - Is this your biological child.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	2	0.1 %
1	Yes	72	5.3 %
	Missing Data		
-650	No child reported	1133	83.7 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 74 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1578-1581 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -506, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD03_LIVWNW: S8 Children: Child03 - Does this child live with you

Child03 - Does this child live with you.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	22	1.6 %
1	Yes	39	2.9 %
	Missing Data		
-811	Child omitted--questions not asked	2	0.1 %
-650	No child reported	1133	83.7 %
-400	Not asked in this version	11	0.8 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 61 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1582-1585 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD03_LIVWRP: S8 Children: Child03 - Has this child lived in the same household as you in the recall period

Child03 - Has this child lived in the same household as you in the recall period.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	23	1.7 %
1	Yes	33	2.4 %
6	Omit	0	0.0 %
7	Deceased	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-811	Child omitted--questions not asked	2	0.1 %
-650	No child reported	1133	83.7 %
-400	Not asked in this version	13	1.0 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	2	0.1 %
-9	Don't Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 56 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1586-1589 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD03_CONTNW: S8 Children: Child03 - Frequency of contact with child now

Child03 - Frequency of contact with child now.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	42	3.1 %
2	3-6 times per week	7	0.5 %
3	2 times per week	2	0.1 %
4	1 time per week	0	0.0 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	1	0.1 %
6	1 time per month	2	0.1 %
7	Less than monthly	7	0.5 %
Missing Data			
-811	Child omitted--questions not asked	2	0.1 %
-650	No child reported	1133	83.7 %
-400	Not asked in this version	11	0.8 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 61 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1590-1593 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD03_CONTRP: S8 Children: Child03 - Frequency of contact with child in the recall periods

Child03 - Frequency of contact with child in the recall periods.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	36	2.7 %
2	3-6 times per week	8	0.6 %
3	2 times per week	2	0.1 %
4	1 time per week	1	0.1 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	2	0.1 %
6	1 time per month	1	0.1 %
7	Less than monthly	6	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-811	Child omitted--questions not asked	2	0.1 %
-650	No child reported	1133	83.7 %
-400	Not asked in this version	13	1.0 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	2	0.1 %
-9	Don't Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 56 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1594-1597 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD04 OMIT: S8 Children: Child04 - Do not ask about this child in future interviews

Child04 - Do not ask about this child in future interviews.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	19	1.4 %
1	Yes	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
-650	No child reported	1186	87.6 %
-400	Not asked in this version	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 19 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1598-1601 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8CHLD04 OMITWHY: S8 Children: Child04 - Why should this child no longer be asked about

Child04 - Why should this child not be asked about anymore?

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not a biological child or no longer in relationship with child's bio parent	0	0.0 %
2	Parental rights terminated or child given up for adoption	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
-650	No child reported	1186	87.6 %
-400	Not asked in this version	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	19	1.4 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 0 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1602-1605 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100

S8CHLD04 ALIVE: S8 Children: Child04 - Is this child alive

Child04 - Is this child alive.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	0	0.0 %
1	Yes	21	1.6 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-650	No child reported	1186	87.6 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 21 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1606-1609 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8CHLD04_AGE: S8 Children: Child04 - Age

Child04 - How old is this child.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	19	1.4 %
Missing Data			
-650	No child reported	1186	87.6 %
-400	Not asked in this version	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 19 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1610-1614 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -526 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -99 , -98

S8CHLD04_BIO: S8 Children: Child04 - Is this your biological child

Child04 - Is this your biological child.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	0	0.0 %
1	Yes	21	1.6 %
Missing Data			
-650	No child reported	1186	87.6 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 21 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1615-1618 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -506, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD04_LIVWNW: S8 Children: Child04 - Does this child live with you

Child04 - Does this child live with you.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	7	0.5 %
1	Yes	12	0.9 %
Missing Data			
-650	No child reported	1186	87.6 %
-400	Not asked in this version	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 19 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1619-1622 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD04_LIVWRP: S8 Children: Child04 - Has this child lived in the same household as you in the recall period

Child04 - Has this child lived in the same household as you in the recall period.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	6	0.4 %
1	Yes	12	0.9 %
6	Omit	0	0.0 %
7	Deceased	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-650	No child reported	1186	87.6 %
-400	Not asked in this version	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 18 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1623-1626 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8CHLD04_CONTNW: S8 Children: Child04 - Frequency of contact with child now

Child04 - Frequency of contact with child now.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	14	1.0 %
2	3-6 times per week	2	0.1 %
3	2 times per week	0	0.0 %
4	1 time per week	2	0.1 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	1	0.1 %
6	1 time per month	0	0.0 %
7	Less than monthly	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-650	No child reported	1186	87.6 %
-400	Not asked in this version	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 19 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1627-1630 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8CHLD04_CONTRP: S8 Children: Child04 - Frequency of contact with child in the recall periods

Child04 - Frequency of contact with child in the recall periods.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	13	1.0 %
2	3-6 times per week	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	2 times per week	0	0.0 %
4	1 time per week	2	0.1 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	0	0.0 %
6	1 time per month	0	0.0 %
7	Less than monthly	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-650	No child reported	1186	87.6 %
-400	Not asked in this version	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 18 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1631-1634 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD05 OMIT: S8 Children: Child05 - Do not ask about this child in future interviews

Child05 - Do not ask about this child in future interviews.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	3	0.2 %
1	Yes	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-650	No child reported	1204	88.9 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 3 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1635-1638 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD05 OMITWHY: S8 Children: Child05 - Why should this child no longer be asked about

Child05 - Why should this child not be asked about anymore?

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not a biological child or no longer in relationship with child's bio parent	0	0.0 %
2	Parental rights terminated or child given up for adoption	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
-650	No child reported	1204	88.9 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	3	0.2 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 0 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1639-1642 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100

S8CHLD05_ALIVE: S8 Children: Child05 - Is this child alive

Child05 - Is this child alive.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	0	0.0 %
1	Yes	3	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
-650	No child reported	1204	88.9 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 3 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1643-1646 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -202, -201, -9, -8

S8CHLD05_AGE: S8 Children: Child05 - Age

Child05 - How old is this child.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	2	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-650	No child reported	1204	88.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-526	Age unknown	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 2 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1647-1651 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -526 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -99 , -98

S8CHLD05_BIO: S8 Children: Child05 - Is this your biological child

Child05 - Is this your biological child.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	0	0.0 %
1	Yes	3	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
-650	No child reported	1204	88.9 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 3 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1652-1655 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -506 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8CHLD05_LIVWNW: S8 Children: Child05 - Does this child live with you

Child05 - Does this child live with you.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1	0.1 %
1	Yes	1	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-650	No child reported	1204	88.9 %
-400	Not asked in this version	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 2 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1656-1659 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD05_LIVWRP: S8 Children: Child05 - Has this child lived in the same household as you in the recall period

Child05 - Has this child lived in the same household as you in the recall period.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1	0.1 %
1	Yes	2	0.1 %
6	Omit	0	0.0 %
7	Deceased	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-650	No child reported	1204	88.9 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 3 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1660-1663 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD05_CONTNW: S8 Children: Child05 - Frequency of contact with child now

Child05 - Frequency of contact with child now.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	1	0.1 %
2	3-6 times per week	0	0.0 %
3	2 times per week	0	0.0 %
4	1 time per week	0	0.0 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	0	0.0 %
6	1 time per month	0	0.0 %
7	Less than monthly	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-650	No child reported	1204	88.9 %
-400	Not asked in this version	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 2 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1664-1667 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD05_CONTRP: S8 Children: Child05 - Frequency of contact with child in the recall periods

Child05 - Frequency of contact with child in the recall periods.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	2	0.1 %
2	3-6 times per week	0	0.0 %
3	2 times per week	0	0.0 %
4	1 time per week	0	0.0 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	0	0.0 %
6	1 time per month	0	0.0 %
7	Less than monthly	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-650	No child reported	1204	88.9 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 3 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1668-1671 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S8CHLD_COUNT: S8 Children: Count - Count of living, not omitted children reported in this recall period

Count - Count of living, not omitted children reported in this recall period.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	683	50.4 %
1	-	328	24.2 %
2	-	138	10.2 %
3	-	40	3.0 %
4	-	16	1.2 %
5	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,207 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1672-1675 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -201

S8MORDIS: S8 MorThk: Moral Disengagement Overall

Moral Disengagement Overall.

MEASURE: Moral Thinking

The Mechanisms of Moral Disengagement (Bandura, Barbarelli, Caprara, & Pastorelli, 1996) was used for this study to measure the adolescent's attitudes concerning the treatment of others. The self-report measure contains 32 items to which participants respond on a 3-point Likert scale ranging from "Disagree" to "Agree," with higher scores indicating a greater moral detachment. Items from the scale tap the following eight dimensions: moral justification (e.g., "It is alright to beat someone who bad mouths your family."), euphemistic language (e.g., "Slapping and shoving someone is just a way of joking."), advantageous comparison (e.g., "It is okay to insult a classmate because beating him/her is worse."), displacement of responsibility (e.g., "Kids cannot be blamed for using bad words when all their friends do it."), diffusion of responsibility (e.g., "A kid in a gang should not be blamed for the trouble the gang causes."), distorting consequences (e.g., "Teasing someone does not really hurt them."), attribution of blame (e.g., "If kids fight and misbehave in school it is their teacher's fault."), and dehumanization (e.g., "Some people deserve to be treated like animals.").

- (1) Disagree
- (2) Neither Agree nor Disagree
- (3) Agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Disagree	27	2.0 %
1.03	-	39	2.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.06	-	110	8.1 %
1.09	-	56	4.1 %
1.13	-	79	5.8 %
1.16	-	50	3.7 %
1.19	-	76	5.6 %
1.22	-	37	2.7 %
1.25	-	63	4.7 %
1.28	-	44	3.2 %
1.31	-	52	3.8 %
1.34	-	33	2.4 %
1.38	-	43	3.2 %
1.41	-	21	1.6 %
1.44	-	41	3.0 %
1.47	-	28	2.1 %
1.50	-	30	2.2 %
1.53	-	27	2.0 %
1.56	-	22	1.6 %
1.59	-	25	1.8 %
1.61	-	1	0.1 %
1.63	-	30	2.2 %
1.66	-	23	1.7 %
1.69	-	14	1.0 %
1.72	-	19	1.4 %
1.75	-	11	0.8 %
1.78	-	11	0.8 %
1.81	-	21	1.6 %
1.84	-	9	0.7 %
1.88	-	13	1.0 %
1.91	-	15	1.1 %
1.94	-	12	0.9 %
1.97	-	8	0.6 %
2.00	Neither Agree nor disagree	26	1.9 %
2.03	-	24	1.8 %
2.06	-	14	1.0 %
2.09	-	4	0.3 %
2.13	-	8	0.6 %
2.16	-	6	0.4 %
2.19	-	6	0.4 %
2.22	-	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.25	-	2	0.1 %
2.28	-	4	0.3 %
2.31	-	4	0.3 %
2.34	-	1	0.1 %
2.38	-	4	0.3 %
2.41	-	2	0.1 %
2.50	-	1	0.1 %
2.56	-	2	0.1 %
2.63	-	1	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1676-1682 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8MORAL: S8 MorThk: Moral Disengagement Count

Moral Disengagement - count (a count of all items for which the subject responded "agree"). This summary score can range from zero to 32.

MEASURE: Moral Thinking

The Mechanisms of Moral Disengagement (Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara, & Pastorelli, 1996) was used for this study to measure the adolescent's attitudes concerning the treatment of others. The self-report measure contains 32 items to which participants respond on a 3-point Likert scale ranging from "Disagree" to "Agree," with higher scores indicating a greater moral detachment. Items from the scale tap the following eight dimensions: moral justification (e.g., "It is alright to beat someone who bad mouths your family."), euphemistic language (e.g., "Slapping and shoving someone is just a way of joking."), advantageous comparison (e.g., "It is okay to insult a classmate because beating him/her is worse."), displacement of responsibility (e.g., "Kids cannot be blamed for using bad words when all their friends do it."), diffusion of responsibility (e.g., "A kid in a gang should not be blamed for the trouble the gang causes."), distorting consequences (e.g., "Teasing someone does not really hurt them."), attribution of blame (e.g., "If kids fight and misbehave in school it is their teacher's fault."), and dehumanization (e.g., "Some people deserve to be treated like animals.").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	147	10.9 %
1	-	298	22.0 %
2	-	191	14.1 %
3	-	128	9.5 %
4	-	90	6.6 %
5	-	72	5.3 %
6	-	60	4.4 %
7	-	33	2.4 %
8	-	39	2.9 %
9	-	36	2.7 %
10	-	26	1.9 %
11	-	15	1.1 %
12	-	10	0.7 %
13	-	12	0.9 %
14	-	12	0.9 %
15	-	9	0.7 %
16	-	4	0.3 %
17	-	4	0.3 %
18	-	4	0.3 %
19	-	6	0.4 %
20	-	1	0.1 %
21	-	1	0.1 %
22	-	1	0.1 %
24	-	1	0.1 %
25	-	2	0.1 %
26	-	1	0.1 %
27	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1683-1686 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_SCH40: S8 Motivate: In my neighborhood easy for young person to get good job

In my neighborhood, it's pretty easy for a young person to get a good-paying, honest job.

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items are taken from Eccles et al. (1998). These six items tap the subject's assessment of the opportunities available in his/her neighborhood regarding schooling and work. At each follow-up interview, this measure reflects the perceived opportunities for the neighborhood where the adolescent lived the longest during the recall period. An additional two items are included regarding the adolescent's perceptions of how far they would like to go in school and how far they think they will go in school. These are treated as individual items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	34	2.5 %
2	Disagree	202	14.9 %
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	307	22.7 %
4	Agree	593	43.8 %
5	Strongly Agree	69	5.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,205 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1687-1690 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_SCH41: S8 Motivate: Most of my friends will graduate from high school

Most of my friends will graduate from high school.

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items are taken from Eccles et al. (1998). These six items tap the subject's assessment of the opportunities available in his/her neighborhood regarding schooling and work. At each follow-up interview, this measure reflects the perceived opportunities for the neighborhood where the adolescent lived the longest during the recall period. An additional two items are included regarding the adolescent's perceptions of how far they would like to go in school and how far they think they will go in school. These are treated as individual items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	35	2.6 %
2	Disagree	261	19.3 %
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	251	18.5 %
4	Agree	557	41.1 %
5	Strongly Agree	101	7.5 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,205 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1691-1694 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_SCH42: S8 Motivate: In my neighborhood hard to make money without doing something illegal

In my neighborhood, it's hard to make much money without doing something illegal.

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items are taken from Eccles et al. (1998). These six items tap the subject's assessment of the opportunities available in his/her neighborhood regarding schooling and work. At each follow-up interview, this measure reflects the perceived opportunities for the neighborhood where the adolescent lived the longest during the recall period. An additional two items are included regarding the adolescent's perceptions of how far they would like to go in school and how far they think they will go in school. These are treated as individual items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	117	8.6 %
2	Disagree	512	37.8 %
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	287	21.2 %
4	Agree	269	19.9 %
5	Strongly Agree	20	1.5 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,205 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1695-1698 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_SCH43: S8 Motivate: College too expensive for most people in my neighborhood

College is too expensive for most of the people in my neighborhood.

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items are taken from Eccles et al. (1998). These six items tap the subject's assessment of the opportunities available in his/her neighborhood regarding schooling and work. At each follow-up interview, this measure reflects the perceived opportunities for the neighborhood where the adolescent lived the longest during the recall period. An additional two items are included regarding the adolescent's perceptions of how far they would like to go in school and how far they think they will go in school. These are treated as individual items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	82	6.1 %
2	Disagree	363	26.8 %
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	331	24.4 %
4	Agree	393	29.0 %
5	Strongly Agree	36	2.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,205 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1699-1702 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_SCH44: S8 Motivate: Not much opportunity to succeed as kids from other neighborhoods

I'll never have as much opportunity to succeed as kids from other neighborhoods.

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items are taken from Eccles et al. (1998). These six items tap the subject's assessment of the opportunities available in his/her neighborhood regarding schooling and work. At each follow-up interview, this measure reflects the perceived opportunities for the neighborhood where the adolescent lived the longest during the recall period. An additional two items are included regarding the adolescent's perceptions of how far they would like to go in school and how far they think they will go in school. These are treated as individual items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	219	16.2 %
2	Disagree	669	49.4 %
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	206	15.2 %
4	Agree	102	7.5 %
5	Strongly Agree	10	0.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,206 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1703-1706 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_SCH45: S8 Motivate: Chances of getting ahead/being successful not very good

My chances of getting ahead and being successful are not very good.

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items are taken from Eccles et al. (1998). These six items tap the subject's assessment of the opportunities available in his/her neighborhood regarding schooling and work. At each follow-up interview, this measure reflects the perceived opportunities for the neighborhood where the adolescent lived the longest during the recall period. An additional two items are included regarding the adolescent's perceptions of how far they would like to go in school and how far they think they will go in school. These are treated as individual items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	267	19.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	Disagree	707	52.2 %
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	155	11.4 %
4	Agree	71	5.2 %
5	Strongly Agree	6	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,206 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1707-1710 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8SCH_SCH46: S8 Motivate: How far would you LIKE to go in school

How far would you like to go in school?

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items are taken from Eccles et al. (1998). These six items tap the subject's assessment of the opportunities available in his/her neighborhood regarding schooling and work. At each follow-up interview, this measure reflects the perceived opportunities for the neighborhood where the adolescent lived the longest during the recall period. An additional two items are included regarding the adolescent's perceptions of how far they would like to go in school and how far they think they will go in school. These are treated as individual items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Drop out before graduation	21	1.6 %
2	Graduate from high school	260	19.2 %
3	Go to a business, technical school or junior college	342	25.3 %
4	Graduate from college	441	32.6 %
5	Go to graduate or professional school	137	10.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-9	Dont Know	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1711-1714 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: -202, -201, -9, -8

S8SCH_SCH47: S8 Motivate: How far do you THINK you will go in school

How far do you think you will go in school?

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items are taken from Eccles et al. (1998). These six items tap the subject's assessment of the opportunities available in his/her neighborhood regarding schooling and work. At each follow-up interview, this measure reflects the perceived opportunities for the neighborhood where the adolescent lived the longest during the recall period. An additional two items are included regarding the adolescent's perceptions of how far they would like to go in school and how far they think they will go in school. These are treated as individual items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Drop out before graduation	64	4.7 %
2	Graduate from high school	304	22.5 %
3	Go to a business, technical school or junior college	374	27.6 %
4	Graduate from college	361	26.7 %
5	Go to graduate or professional school	95	7.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-9	Dont Know	8	0.6 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,198 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1715-1718 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: -202, -201, -9, -8

S8MOTSUC: S8 Motivate: Motivation to Succeed

An overall "motivation to succeed" score is computed from the six items which represents the mean of the items. A higher score indicates more optimism regarding future success.

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items are taken from Eccles et al. (1998). These six items tap the subject's assessment of the opportunities available in his/her neighborhood regarding schooling and work. At each follow-up interview, this

measure reflects the perceived opportunities for the neighborhood where the adolescent lived the longest during the recall period. An additional two items are included regarding the adolescent's perceptions of how far they would like to go in school and how far they think they will go in school. These are treated as individual items.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly disagree	2	0.1 %
1.33	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	2	0.1 %
1.67	-	1	0.1 %
1.83	-	2	0.1 %
2.00	Disagree	8	0.6 %
2.17	-	8	0.6 %
2.33	-	29	2.1 %
2.50	-	24	1.8 %
2.67	-	51	3.8 %
2.83	-	51	3.8 %
3.00	Neither agree nor disagree	124	9.2 %
3.17	-	102	7.5 %
3.33	-	144	10.6 %
3.50	-	84	6.2 %
3.60	-	1	0.1 %
3.67	-	173	12.8 %
3.83	-	102	7.5 %
4.00	Agree	157	11.6 %
4.17	-	45	3.3 %
4.33	-	27	2.0 %
4.50	-	15	1.1 %
4.67	-	25	1.8 %
4.83	-	6	0.4 %
5.00	Strongly agree	22	1.6 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,206 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1719-1725 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00

S8ETHAFF: S8 Phinney: Ethnic Identity - Affirmation and Belonging

Affirmation & Belonging; the mean of 7 items in this subscale.

MEASURE: Multigroup Measure of Ethnic Identity (Phinney)

Sections of the Multigroup Measure of Ethnic Identity are used to determine an individual's overall sense of ethnic identity (Phinney, 1992). Items from the measure assess feelings of Affirmation & Belonging (e.g., "I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to"), and Identity Achievement (e.g., "I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs"). For this scale, participants respond to 12 items using a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree," with higher scores indicating greater ethnic identity.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Agree
- (4) Strongly Agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Disagree	3	0.2 %
1.14	-	2	0.1 %
1.29	-	1	0.1 %
1.43	-	1	0.1 %
1.57	-	1	0.1 %
1.71	-	3	0.2 %
1.86	-	7	0.5 %
2.00	Disagree	23	1.7 %
2.14	-	15	1.1 %
2.29	-	17	1.3 %
2.43	-	20	1.5 %
2.57	-	39	2.9 %
2.71	-	68	5.0 %
2.86	-	109	8.1 %
3.00	Agree	359	26.5 %
3.14	-	40	3.0 %
3.29	-	24	1.8 %
3.43	-	23	1.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.57	-	21	1.6 %
3.71	-	24	1.8 %
3.86	-	34	2.5 %
4.00	Strongly Agree	91	6.7 %
	Missing Data		
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into Phinney	278	20.5 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 925 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1726-1732 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8ETHACH: S8 Phinney: Ethnic Identity - Identity Achievement

Identity Achievement; the mean of 5 items in this subscale.

MEASURE: Multigroup Measure of Ethnic Identity (Phinney)

Sections of the Multigroup Measure of Ethnic Identity are used to determine an individual's overall sense of ethnic identity (Phinney, 1992). Items from the measure assess feelings of Affirmation & Belonging (e.g., "I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to"), and Identity Achievement (e.g., "I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs"). For this scale, participants respond to 12 items using a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree," with higher scores indicating greater ethnic identity.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Agree
- (4) Strongly Agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.0	Strongly Disagree	24	1.8 %
1.2	-	13	1.0 %
1.4	-	15	1.1 %
1.6	-	15	1.1 %
1.8	-	19	1.4 %
2.0	Disagree	205	15.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.2	-	145	10.7 %
2.4	-	116	8.6 %
2.6	-	109	8.1 %
2.8	-	80	5.9 %
3.0	Agree	99	7.3 %
3.2	-	19	1.4 %
3.4	-	12	0.9 %
3.6	-	8	0.6 %
3.8	-	9	0.7 %
4.0	Strongly Agree	36	2.7 %
Missing Data			
-300.0	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %
-202.0	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.0	Did not skip into Phinney	278	20.5 %
-9.0	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 924 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1733-1739 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.0 , -300.0 , -202.0 , -201.0 , -100.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

S8ETHID: S8 Phinney: Ethnic Identity - Overall

Ethnic Identity - overall; the mean of the 12 items in the full scale.

MEASURE: Multigroup Measure of Ethnic Identity (Phinney)

Sections of the Multigroup Measure of Ethnic Identity are used to determine an individual's overall sense of ethnic identity (Phinney, 1992). Items from the measure assess feelings of Affirmation & Belonging (e.g., "I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to"), and Identity Achievement (e.g., "I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs"). For this scale, participants respond to 12 items using a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree," with higher scores indicating greater ethnic identity.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Agree
- (4) Strongly Agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Disagree	3	0.2 %
1.17	-	2	0.1 %
1.25	-	1	0.1 %
1.33	-	2	0.1 %
1.50	-	4	0.3 %
1.55	-	1	0.1 %
1.58	-	1	0.1 %
1.67	-	2	0.1 %
1.75	-	2	0.1 %
1.83	-	5	0.4 %
1.92	-	5	0.4 %
2.00	Disagree	18	1.3 %
2.08	-	17	1.3 %
2.09	-	1	0.1 %
2.17	-	17	1.3 %
2.25	-	19	1.4 %
2.33	-	33	2.4 %
2.42	-	40	3.0 %
2.50	-	72	5.3 %
2.58	-	94	6.9 %
2.67	-	112	8.3 %
2.75	-	75	5.5 %
2.83	-	72	5.3 %
2.92	-	56	4.1 %
3.00	Agree	90	6.6 %
3.08	-	25	1.8 %
3.17	-	23	1.7 %
3.25	-	13	1.0 %
3.33	-	11	0.8 %
3.42	-	12	0.9 %
3.50	-	14	1.0 %
3.58	-	17	1.3 %
3.67	-	5	0.4 %
3.75	-	9	0.7 %
3.83	-	6	0.4 %
3.92	-	9	0.7 %
4.00	Strongly Agree	36	2.7 %
Missing Data			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into Phinney	278	20.5 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 924 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1740-1746 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8HOOD: S8 NeiCon: Neighborhood Conditions Total

Total score; the mean of all 21 items in the scale.

MEASURE: Neighborhood Conditions

The Neighborhood Conditions Measure was adapted for this study to assess the environment surrounding the adolescent's home (Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999).

Items from the self-report measure tap physical disorder of the neighborhood

(e.g., "cigarettes on the street or in the gutters," "graffiti or tags"), as well as social disorder (e.g., "adults fighting or arguing loudly," "people using needles or syringes to take drugs"). The scale contains 21 items to which participants respond on a 4- point Likert scale ranging from "Never" to "Often," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of disorder within the community.

The neighborhood of focus for this measure is the neighborhood in which the youth spent the most time in the recall period. It is not necessarily the neighborhood that is most recent to the interview date.

- (1) Never
- (2) Rarely
- (3) Sometimes
- (4) Often

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	65	4.8 %
1.05	-	23	1.7 %
1.10	-	22	1.6 %
1.14	-	14	1.0 %
1.19	-	14	1.0 %
1.24	-	17	1.3 %
1.29	-	15	1.1 %
1.33	-	10	0.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.38	-	11	0.8 %
1.43	-	17	1.3 %
1.45	-	1	0.1 %
1.48	-	13	1.0 %
1.52	-	16	1.2 %
1.57	-	13	1.0 %
1.62	-	24	1.8 %
1.67	-	18	1.3 %
1.71	-	15	1.1 %
1.76	-	17	1.3 %
1.81	-	12	0.9 %
1.86	-	20	1.5 %
1.90	-	11	0.8 %
1.95	-	21	1.6 %
2.00	Rarely	16	1.2 %
2.05	-	14	1.0 %
2.10	-	24	1.8 %
2.14	-	17	1.3 %
2.19	-	22	1.6 %
2.24	-	19	1.4 %
2.29	-	12	0.9 %
2.33	-	15	1.1 %
2.38	-	27	2.0 %
2.43	-	18	1.3 %
2.48	-	17	1.3 %
2.52	-	18	1.3 %
2.57	-	14	1.0 %
2.62	-	24	1.8 %
2.67	-	24	1.8 %
2.71	-	20	1.5 %
2.74	-	1	0.1 %
2.76	-	25	1.8 %
2.81	-	15	1.1 %
2.86	-	16	1.2 %
2.90	-	24	1.8 %
2.95	-	10	0.7 %
3.00	Sometimes	17	1.3 %
3.05	-	17	1.3 %
3.10	-	20	1.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.14	-	16	1.2 %
3.19	-	17	1.3 %
3.24	-	19	1.4 %
	Missing Data		
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into NeiCon measure	191	14.1 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,015 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1747-1753 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -800.00 , -666.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8NEIPHY: S8 NeiCon: Physical Disorder

Physical disorder; the mean of the 12 physical disorder questions.

MEASURE: Neighborhood Conditions

The Neighborhood Conditions Measure was adapted for this study to assess the environment surrounding the adolescent's home (Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999).

Items from the self-report measure tap physical disorder of the neighborhood

(e.g., "cigarettes on the street or in the gutters," "graffiti or tags"), as well as social disorder (e.g., "adults fighting or arguing loudly," "people using needles or syringes to take drugs"). The scale contains 21 items to which participants respond on a 4- point Likert scale ranging from "Never" to "Often," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of disorder within the community.

The neighborhood of focus for this measure is the neighborhood in which the youth spent the most time in the recall period. It is not necessarily the neighborhood that is most recent to the interview date.

- (1) Never
- (2) Rarely
- (3) Sometimes
- (4) Often

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	74	5.5 %
1.08	-	31	2.3 %
1.17	-	29	2.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.18	-	1	0.1 %
1.25	-	17	1.3 %
1.33	-	22	1.6 %
1.42	-	26	1.9 %
1.50	-	21	1.6 %
1.58	-	16	1.2 %
1.67	-	33	2.4 %
1.75	-	31	2.3 %
1.83	-	33	2.4 %
1.92	-	27	2.0 %
2.00	Rarely	35	2.6 %
2.08	-	35	2.6 %
2.17	-	29	2.1 %
2.25	-	28	2.1 %
2.33	-	34	2.5 %
2.42	-	37	2.7 %
2.50	-	29	2.1 %
2.58	-	36	2.7 %
2.67	-	40	3.0 %
2.75	-	38	2.8 %
2.83	-	30	2.2 %
2.92	-	30	2.2 %
3.00	Sometimes	36	2.7 %
3.08	-	18	1.3 %
3.17	-	26	1.9 %
3.25	-	30	2.2 %
3.33	-	22	1.6 %
3.36	-	1	0.1 %
3.42	-	17	1.3 %
3.50	-	18	1.3 %
3.55	-	1	0.1 %
3.58	-	14	1.0 %
3.67	-	10	0.7 %
3.75	-	16	1.2 %
3.83	-	11	0.8 %
3.92	-	6	0.4 %
4.00	Often	27	2.0 %
Missing Data			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-100.00	Did not skip into NeiCon measure	191	14.1 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,015 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1754-1760 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800.00 , -666.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8NEISOC: S8 NeiCon: Social Disorder

Social disorder; the mean of the 9 social disorder questions.

MEASURE: Neighborhood Conditions

The Neighborhood Conditions Measure was adapted for this study to assess the environment surrounding the adolescent's home (Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999). Items from the self-report measure tap physical disorder of the neighborhood (e.g., "cigarettes on the street or in the gutters," "graffiti or tags"), as well as social disorder (e.g., "adults fighting or arguing loudly," "people using needles or syringes to take drugs"). The scale contains 21 items to which participants respond on a 4- point Likert scale ranging from "Never" to "Often," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of disorder within the community.

The neighborhood of focus for this measure is the neighborhood in which the youth spent the most time in the recall period. It is not necessarily the neighborhood that is most recent to the interview date.

- (1) Never
- (2) Rarely
- (3) Sometimes
- (4) Often

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	137	10.1 %
1.11	-	30	2.2 %
1.22	-	44	3.2 %
1.33	-	28	2.1 %
1.44	-	35	2.6 %
1.56	-	37	2.7 %
1.67	-	33	2.4 %
1.78	-	25	1.8 %
1.89	-	32	2.4 %
2.00	Rarely	46	3.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.11	-	43	3.2 %
2.22	-	48	3.5 %
2.33	-	40	3.0 %
2.44	-	38	2.8 %
2.56	-	36	2.7 %
2.67	-	41	3.0 %
2.78	-	47	3.5 %
2.89	-	40	3.0 %
3.00	Sometimes	30	2.2 %
3.11	-	26	1.9 %
3.22	-	32	2.4 %
3.33	-	25	1.8 %
3.44	-	20	1.5 %
3.56	-	22	1.6 %
3.67	-	20	1.5 %
3.78	-	13	1.0 %
3.89	-	13	1.0 %
4.00	Often	34	2.5 %
Missing Data			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into NeiCon measure	191	14.1 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,015 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1761-1767 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800.00 , -666.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8NSAFE: S8 NeiCon: Neighborhood Safety

Neighborhood safety.

MEASURE: Neighborhood Conditions

The Neighborhood Conditions Measure was adapted for this study to assess the environment surrounding the adolescent's home (Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999). Items from the self-report measure tap physical disorder of the neighborhood (e.g., "cigarettes on the street or in the gutters," "graffiti or tags"), as well as social disorder (e.g., "adults fighting or arguing loudly," "people using needles or syringes to take drugs"). The scale contains 21 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Never" to "Often," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of disorder within the community.

The neighborhood of focus for this measure is the neighborhood in which the youth

spent the most time in the recall period. It is not necessarily the neighborhood that is most recent to the interview date.

- (1) Strongly Disagree (1) In danger all of the time
- (2) Disagree (2) In danger most of the time
- (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree (3) In danger some of the time
- (4) Agree (4) In danger very little of the time
- (5) Strongly Agree (5) In danger none of the time (feel safe all of the time)

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Disagree / In danger all of the time	0	0.0 %
1.43	-	1	0.1 %
1.57	-	2	0.1 %
1.86	-	2	0.1 %
2.00	Disagree / In danger most of the time	2	0.1 %
2.29	-	2	0.1 %
2.43	-	3	0.2 %
2.57	-	3	0.2 %
2.71	-	7	0.5 %
2.86	-	10	0.7 %
3.00	Neither Agree nor Disagree / In danger some of the time	15	1.1 %
3.14	-	14	1.0 %
3.29	-	19	1.4 %
3.43	-	29	2.1 %
3.57	-	37	2.7 %
3.71	-	40	3.0 %
3.86	-	74	5.5 %
4.00	Agree / In danger very little of the time	65	4.8 %
4.14	-	88	6.5 %
4.29	-	75	5.5 %
4.43	-	189	14.0 %
4.57	-	78	5.8 %
4.71	-	73	5.4 %
4.86	-	21	1.6 %
5.00	Strongly Agree / In danger none of the time	165	12.2 %
Missing Data			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into NeiCon measure	191	14.1 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,014 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1768-1774 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800.00 , -666.00 , -400.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8PAKNOW: S8 PMonit: Parental Knowledge

Parental knowledge; Mean of 5 items.

MEASURE: Parental Monitoring

The Parental Monitoring inventory (Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992) was adapted for this study to assess parenting practices related to supervision of the adolescent (i.e. study participant). Preliminary questions establish the presence of a single individual (X) who is primarily responsible for the youth. The respondent's answers to several items about their current living situation, specifically whether they live with the identified caretaker, establishes the skip pattern followed in the parental monitoring items. The scale is composed of 9 items. Five items assess parental knowledge (e.g. How much does X know about how you spend your free time) and are answered on a 4-point likert scale ranging from "doesn't know at all" to "knows everything". Even if a youth does not live with the person identified as their primary caretaker, they are asked these questions. If the youth lives with the primary caretaker, four additional items are asked to assess parental monitoring of the youth's behavior (e.g. How often do you have a set time to be home on weekend nights?). These are answered on a 4-point likert scale which ranges from "never" to "always".

- (1) Doesn't know at all
- (2) Knows a little bit
- (3) Knows a lot
- (4) Knows everything

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.0	Doesn't know at all	0	0.0 %
1.6	-	1	0.1 %
1.8	-	1	0.1 %
2.0	Knows a little bit	1	0.1 %
2.2	-	3	0.2 %
2.4	-	5	0.4 %
2.6	-	1	0.1 %
2.8	-	2	0.1 %
3.0	Knows a lot	6	0.4 %
3.4	-	2	0.1 %
3.8	-	1	0.1 %
4.0	Knows everything	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.0	Did not skip into Parental Monitoring section	1180	87.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 27 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1775-1781 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.0 , -202.0 , -201.0 , -100.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

S8PARMNT: S8 PMonit: Parental Monitoring

Parental monitoring; Mean of 4 items; only available if subject lives with supervising adult

MEASURE: Parental Monitoring

The Parental Monitoring inventory (Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992) was adapted for this study to assess parenting practices related to supervision of the adolescent (i.e. study participant). Preliminary questions establish the presence of a single individual (X) who is primarily responsible for the youth. The respondent's answers to several items about their current living situation, specifically whether they live with the identified caretaker, establishes the skip pattern followed in the parental monitoring items. The scale is composed of 9 items. Five items assess parental knowledge (e.g. How much does X know about how you spend your free time) and are answered on a 4-point likert scale ranging from "doesn't know at all" to "knows everything". Even if a youth does not live with the person identified as their primary caretaker, they are asked these questions. If the youth lives with the primary caretaker, four additional items are asked to assess parental monitoring of the youth's behavior (e.g. How often do you have a set time to be home on weekend nights?). These are answered on a 4-point likert scale which ranges from "never" to "always".

- (1) Never
- (2) Sometimes
- (3) Usually
- (4) Always

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	0	0.0 %
1.50	-	2	0.1 %
1.75	-	2	0.1 %
2.00	Sometimes	6	0.4 %
2.50	-	2	0.1 %
3.00	Usually	1	0.1 %
3.25	-	1	0.1 %
3.50	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.75	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Always	1	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into Parental Monitoring section	1189	87.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 17 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1782-1788 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -99.00 , -98.00 , -97.00

S8PORIENT_PTERM: S8 POrient: Has subject terminated parental rights

Subject has terminated parental rights.

MEASURE: Parent Orientation

The Youths Parenting Orientation scale was adapted for this study from Silverberg and Steinberg's (1990) subscale of Adult Role Orientation. The questions are asked only of youth who report having a child. The scale is used to assess the participant's view of his/her role as a parent (e.g., "Fathers/Mothers my age should devote most of their time and energy to rearing their child/children") and the degree to which this role is pervasive in his/her life. The inventory is a 6-item scale that asks participants to rank from 1 to 4 (1=Agree Strongly to 4=Disagree Strongly) the degree that each statement corresponds to their view of parenthood, with higher scores indicating greater parental orientation.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	513	37.9 %
1	Yes	13	1.0 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: unknown reason	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Skipped: Subject does not have any living children	679	50.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 526 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1789-1792 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8PARENT: S8 POrient: Youths Parenting Orientation

Youth Parenting Orientation; the mean of six items in the scale.

MEASURE: Parent Orientation

The Youths Parenting Orientation scale was adapted for this study from Silverberg and Steinberg's (1990) subscale of Adult Role Orientation. The questions are asked only of youth who report having a child. The scale is used to assess the participant's view of his/her role as a parent (e.g., "Fathers/Mothers my age should devote most of their time and energy to rearing their child/children") and the degree to which this role is pervasive in his/her life. The inventory is a 6-item scale that asks participants to rank from 1 to 4 (1=Agree Strongly to 4=Disagree Strongly) the degree that each statement corresponds to their view of parenthood, with higher scores indicating greater parental orientation.

- (1) Disagree Strongly
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Agree
- (4) Agree Strongly

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Disagree Strongly	0	0.0 %
1.83	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	Disagree	0	0.0 %
2.17	-	1	0.1 %
2.33	-	4	0.3 %
2.50	-	7	0.5 %
2.67	-	33	2.4 %
2.83	-	98	7.2 %
3.00	Agree	103	7.6 %
3.17	-	60	4.4 %
3.33	-	51	3.8 %
3.50	-	53	3.9 %
3.67	-	40	3.0 %
3.80	-	1	0.1 %
3.83	-	33	2.4 %
4.00	Agree Strongly	26	1.9 %
Missing Data			
-700.00	Data missing: Unknown reason	1	0.1 %
-300.00	Too few values for computation	2	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-100.00	Did not skip into Parental Orientation section	692	51.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 511 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1793-1799 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700.00 , -500.00 , -400.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8RQUALPARENTS_MQUA_PVIS1: S8 PQual_Mom: How often did your primary female caregiver visit you in person in the recall period

How often did your primary female caregiver visit you in person in the recall period?

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Twice a day	0	0.0 %
2	Daily	0	0.0 %
3	More than once a week	0	0.0 %
4	Once a week	2	0.1 %
5	Once every two weeks	1	0.1 %
6	Once a month	0	0.0 %
7	Once every few months	3	0.2 %
8	Never	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Subject is 20years old or older	1061	78.4 %
-102	Skipped: Subject spent majority of recall period in community	103	7.6 %
-101	Skipped: Did not live with mother figure responsible for raising them in recall period	30	2.2 %
-97	Not Applicable	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 11 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1800-1803 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98 , -97

S8RQUALPARENTS_MQUA_PVIS2: S8 PQual_Mom: Had often did you talk to your primary female caregiver by phone in the recall period

Had often did you talk to your primary female caregiver by phone in the recall period?

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Twice a day	0	0.0 %
2	Daily	1	0.1 %
3	More than once a week	5	0.4 %
4	Once a week	3	0.2 %
5	Once every two weeks	0	0.0 %
6	Once a month	1	0.1 %
7	Once every few months	1	0.1 %
8	Never	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Subject is 20years old or older	1061	78.4 %
-102	Skipped: Subject spent majority of recall period in community	103	7.6 %
-101	Skipped: Did not live with mother figure responsible for raising them in recall period	30	2.2 %
-97	Not Applicable	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 11 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1804-1807 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98 , -97

S8RQUALPARENTS_MQUA_PCTCT: S8 PQual_Mom: Have any contact with your primary female caregiver in the recall period

Did you have any contact with your primary female caregiver in the recall period?

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	2	0.1 %
1	Yes	101	7.5 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Subject is 20years old or older	1062	78.4 %
-104	Skipped: Subject spent the majority of the recall period in an institution	12	0.9 %
-101	Skipped: Did not live with mother figure responsible for raising them in recall period	30	2.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 103 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1808-1811 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8RQUALPARENTS_FQUA_PVIS1: S8 PQual_Dad: How often did your primary male caregiver visit you in person in the recall period

How often did your primary male caregiver visit you in person in the recall period?

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Twice a day	0	0.0 %
2	Daily	0	0.0 %
3	More than once a week	0	0.0 %
4	Once a week	1	0.1 %
5	Once every two weeks	2	0.1 %
6	Once a month	0	0.0 %
7	Once every few months	0	0.0 %
8	Never	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Subject is 20years old or older	1061	78.4 %
-102	Skipped: Subject spent majority of recall period in community	68	5.0 %
-101	Skipped: Did not live with father figure responsible for raising them in recall period	66	4.9 %
-97	Not Applicable	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 8 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1812-1815 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98 , -97

S8RQUALPARENTS_FQUA_PVIS2: S8 PQual_Dad: Had often did you talk to your primary male caregiver by phone in the recall period

Had often did you talk to your primary male caregiver by phone in the recall period?

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Twice a day	0	0.0 %
2	Daily	0	0.0 %
3	More than once a week	1	0.1 %
4	Once a week	2	0.1 %
5	Once every two weeks	1	0.1 %
6	Once a month	1	0.1 %
7	Once every few months	1	0.1 %
8	Never	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Subject is 20years old or older	1061	78.4 %
-102	Skipped: Subject spent majority of recall period in community	68	5.0 %
-101	Skipped: Did not live with father figure responsible for raising them in recall period	66	4.9 %
-97	Not Applicable	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 8 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1816-1819 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98 , -97

S8RQUALPARENTS_FQUA_PCTCT: S8 PQual_Dad: Have any contact with your primary male caregiver in the recall period

Did you have any contact with your primary male caregiver in the recall period?

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	19	1.4 %
1	Yes	49	3.6 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Subject is 20years old or older	1062	78.4 %
-104	Skipped: Subject spent the majority of the recall period in an institution	11	0.8 %
-101	Skipped: Did not live with father figure responsible for raising them in recall period	66	4.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 68 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1820-1823 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8MAWARM: S8 PQual: Parent Warmth - Mother

Parent Warmth - Mother; Mean of 9 items, 7 must contain valid data.

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

The Quality of Parental Relationships Inventory (Conger, Ge, Elder, Lorenz, & Simons, 1994) was adapted for this study to assess the affective tone of the parental-adolescent relationship. Items from the measure tap parental warmth - mother (e.g., "How often does your mother let you know she really cares about you?"), parental hostility - mother (e.g., "How often does your mother get angry at you?"), parental warmth - father (e.g., "How often does your father tell you he loves you?"), and parental hostility - father (e.g., "How often does your father throw things at you?"). The scale contains 42 items (21 to assess the maternal relationship and 21 to assess the paternal relationship) to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Always" to "Never," with higher scores indicating a more supportive and nurturing parental relationship.

- (1) Always
- (2) Often
- (3) Sometimes
- (4) Never

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	1	0.1 %
1.44	-	1	0.1 %
1.56	-	1	0.1 %
1.78	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	Sometimes	7	0.5 %
2.11	-	3	0.2 %
2.22	-	4	0.3 %
2.33	-	2	0.1 %
2.44	-	2	0.1 %
2.56	-	2	0.1 %
2.67	-	6	0.4 %
2.78	-	2	0.1 %
2.89	-	6	0.4 %
3.00	Often	4	0.3 %
3.11	-	9	0.7 %
3.22	-	8	0.6 %
3.33	-	2	0.1 %
3.44	-	7	0.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.56	-	4	0.3 %
3.67	-	6	0.4 %
3.78	-	3	0.2 %
3.89	-	12	0.9 %
4.00	Always	18	1.3 %
Missing Data			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into measure	1096	80.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 111 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1824-1830 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8MAHOTL: S8 PQual: Parent Hostility - Mother

Parent Hostility - Mother; Mean of 12 items, 9 must contain valid data.

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

The Quality of Parental Relationships Inventory (Conger, Ge, Elder, Lorenz, & Simons, 1994) was adapted for this study to assess the affective tone of the parental-adolescent relationship. Items from the measure tap parental warmth - mother (e.g., "How often does your mother let you know she really cares about you?"), parental hostility - mother (e.g., "How often does your mother get angry at you?"), parental warmth - father (e.g., "How often does your father tell you he loves you?"), and parental hostility - father (e.g., "How often does your father throw things at you?"). The scale contains 42 items (21 to assess the maternal relationship and 21 to assess the paternal relationship) to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Always" to "Never," with higher scores indicating a more supportive and nurturing parental relationship.

- (1) Always
- (2) Often
- (3) Sometimes
- (4) Never

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	13	1.0 %
1.08	-	12	0.9 %
1.17	-	12	0.9 %
1.25	-	21	1.6 %
1.33	-	15	1.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.42	-	10	0.7 %
1.50	-	11	0.8 %
1.58	-	4	0.3 %
1.67	-	3	0.2 %
1.75	-	4	0.3 %
1.83	-	1	0.1 %
1.92	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	Sometimes	2	0.1 %
2.25	-	1	0.1 %
2.33	-	1	0.1 %
3.00	Often	0	0.0 %
4.00	Always	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into measure	1096	80.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 111 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1831-1837 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8PAWARM: S8 PQual: Parent Warmth - Father

Parent Warmth - Father; Mean of 9 items, 7 must contain valid data.

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

The Quality of Parental Relationships Inventory (Conger, Ge, Elder, Lorenz, & Simons, 1994) was adapted for this study to assess the affective tone of the parental-adolescent relationship. Items from the measure tap parental warmth - mother (e.g., "How often does your mother let you know she really cares about you?"), parental hostility - mother (e.g., "How often does your mother get angry at you?"), parental warmth - father (e.g., "How often does your father tell you he loves you?"), and parental hostility - father (e.g., "How often does your father throw things at you?"). The scale contains 42 items (21 to assess the maternal relationship and 21 to assess the paternal relationship) to which participants respond on a 4- point Likert scale ranging from "Always" to "Never," with higher scores indicating a more supportive and nurturing parental relationship.

- (1) Always
- (2) Often
- (3) Sometimes
- (4) Never

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	1	0.1 %
1.33	-	1	0.1 %
1.67	-	1	0.1 %
1.78	-	1	0.1 %
1.89	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	Sometimes	13	1.0 %
2.11	-	2	0.1 %
2.22	-	4	0.3 %
2.44	-	2	0.1 %
2.56	-	3	0.2 %
2.67	-	1	0.1 %
2.89	-	4	0.3 %
3.00	Often	2	0.1 %
3.11	-	2	0.1 %
3.22	-	1	0.1 %
3.33	-	2	0.1 %
3.44	-	2	0.1 %
3.56	-	1	0.1 %
3.67	-	2	0.1 %
3.78	-	2	0.1 %
3.89	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Always	5	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into measure	1153	85.2 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 54 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1838-1844 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8PAHOTL: S8 PQual: Parent Hostility - Father

Parent Hostility - Father; Mean of 12 items, 9 must contain valid data.

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

The Quality of Parental Relationships Inventory (Conger, Ge, Elder, Lorenz, & Simons, 1994) was adapted for this study to assess the affective tone of the parental-adolescent relationship. Items from the measure tap parental warmth - mother (e.g., "How often does your mother let you know she really cares about you?"), parental hostility - mother (e.g., "How often does your mother get angry at you?"),

parental warmth - father (e.g., "How often does your father tell you he loves you?"), and parental hostility - father (e.g., "How often does your father throw things at you?"). The scale contains 42 items (21 to assess the maternal relationship and 21 to assess the paternal relationship) to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Always" to "Never," with higher scores indicating a more supportive and nurturing parental relationship.

- (1) Always
- (2) Often
- (3) Sometimes
- (4) Never

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	11	0.8 %
1.08	-	8	0.6 %
1.17	-	12	0.9 %
1.25	-	6	0.4 %
1.33	-	5	0.4 %
1.42	-	4	0.3 %
1.50	-	2	0.1 %
1.67	-	1	0.1 %
1.75	-	3	0.2 %
2.00	Sometimes	0	0.0 %
2.08	-	1	0.1 %
2.17	-	1	0.1 %
3.00	Often	0	0.0 %
4.00	Always	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into measure	1153	85.2 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 54 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1845-1851 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8PARENTHELP_PH01: S8 PQual: How often parents help with living expenses in recall period

How often parents help with living expenses in recall period

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	335	24.7 %
2	Once or twice	296	21.9 %
3	More than twice	397	29.3 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Interview incorrectly computed subject age	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	144	10.6 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-7	NA	30	2.2 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,028 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1852-1855 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

S8PARENTHELP_PH02: S8 PQual: How often parents loan you money in recall period

How often parents loan you money in recall period

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	462	34.1 %
2	Once or twice	309	22.8 %
3	More than twice	259	19.1 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Interview incorrectly computed subject age	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	144	10.6 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-7	NA	28	2.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,030 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1856-1859 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

S8PARENTHELP_PH03: S8 PQual: How often parents provide child care/babysitting in recall period

How often parents provide child care/babysitting in recall period

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	271	20.0 %
2	Once or twice	73	5.4 %
3	More than twice	188	13.9 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing: Interview incorrectly computed subject age	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	144	10.6 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
-7	NA: Subject has no children	525	38.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 532 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1860-1863 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

S8PARENTHELP_PH04: S8 PQual: How often parents help with transportation in recall period

How often parents help with transportation in recall period

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	416	30.7 %
2	Once or twice	186	13.7 %
3	More than twice	291	21.5 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing: Interview incorrectly computed subject age	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	144	10.6 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-7	NA: In facility entire recall period	165	12.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 893 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1864-1867 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

S8PARENTHELP_PH05: S8 PQual: How often parents help with shopping/laundry/cleaning in recall period

How often parents help with shopping/laundry/cleaning in recall period

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	449	33.2 %
2	Once or twice	188	13.9 %
3	More than twice	292	21.6 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing: Interview incorrectly computed subject age	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	144	10.6 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-7	NA	129	9.5 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 929 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1868-1871 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

S8PARENTHELP_PH06: S8 PQual: How often parents help you find a job in recall period

How often parents help you find a job in recall period

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	628	46.4 %
2	Once or twice	174	12.9 %
3	More than twice	106	7.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Interview incorrectly computed subject age	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	144	10.6 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-7	NA	150	11.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 908 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1872-1875 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

S8PARENTHELP_PH07: S8 PQual: How often parents help you with school/college in recall period

How often parents help you with school/college in recall period

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	514	38.0 %
2	Once or twice	107	7.9 %
3	More than twice	80	5.9 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Interview incorrectly computed subject age	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	144	10.6 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-7	NA: Done with school (graduated or GED)	357	26.4 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 701 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1876-1879 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

S8PARENTHELP_PH08: S8 PQual: How often parents help you to get government assistance/welfare in recall period

How often parents help you to get government assistance/welfare in recall period

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	468	34.6 %
2	Once or twice	71	5.2 %
3	More than twice	42	3.1 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing: Interview incorrectly computed subject age	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	144	10.6 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-7	NA: Didn't try to get this type of assistance	477	35.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 581 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1880-1883 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

S8PARENTHELP_PH09: S8 PQual: How often parents help you with your court cases in recall period

How often parents help you with your court cases in recall period

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	315	23.3 %
2	Once or twice	93	6.9 %
3	More than twice	118	8.7 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing: Interview incorrectly computed subject age	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	144	10.6 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-7	NA: No court case of any kind	532	39.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 526 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1884-1887 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

S8PARENTHELP_PH10: S8 PQual: How often parents help you get medical care in recall period

How often parents help you get medical care in recall period

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	434	32.1 %
2	Once or twice	113	8.3 %
3	More than twice	64	4.7 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing: Interview incorrectly computed subject age	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	144	10.6 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-7	NA: Didn't need medical care	447	33.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 611 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1888-1891 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

S8PARENTHELP_PH11: S8 PQual: How often you help parents with living expenses in recall period

How often you help parents with living expenses in recall period

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	422	31.2 %
2	Once or twice	304	22.5 %
3	More than twice	275	20.3 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing: Interview incorrectly computed subject age	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	144	10.6 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-7	NA	57	4.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,001 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1892-1895 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

S8PARENTHELP_PH12: S8 PQual: How often you loan money to parents in recall period

How often you loan money to parents in recall

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	543	40.1 %
2	Once or twice	266	19.6 %
3	More than twice	192	14.2 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing: Interview incorrectly computed subject age	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	144	10.6 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-7	NA	57	4.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,001 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1896-1899 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

S8PARENTHELP_PH13: S8 PQual: How often you provide parents with childcare/babysitting in recall period

How often you provide parents with childcare/babysitting in recall period

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	435	32.1 %
2	Once or twice	87	6.4 %
3	More than twice	120	8.9 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing: Interview incorrectly computed subject age	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	144	10.6 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-7	NA: Parents have no other children	416	30.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 642 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1900-1903 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

S8PARENTHELP_PH14: S8 PQual: How often you help parents with transportation in recall period

How often you help parents with transportation in recall period

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	589	43.5 %
2	Once or twice	171	12.6 %
3	More than twice	180	13.3 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing: Interview incorrectly computed subject age	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	144	10.6 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-7	NA	118	8.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 940 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1904-1907 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

S8PARENTHELP_PH15: S8 PQual: How often you help parents fix/repair things that are broken in recall period

How often you help parents fix/repair things that are broken in recall period

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	435	32.1 %
2	Once or twice	243	17.9 %
3	More than twice	286	21.1 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing: Interview incorrectly computed subject age	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	144	10.6 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-7	NA	94	6.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 964 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1908-1911 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

S8PARENTHELP_PH16: S8 PQual: How often you help parents with shopping/laundry/cleaning in recall period

How often you help parents with shopping/laundry/cleaning in recall period

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	397	29.3 %
2	Once or twice	236	17.4 %
3	More than twice	333	24.6 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing: Interview incorrectly computed subject age	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	144	10.6 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-7	NA	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 966 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1912-1915 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

S8PARENTHELP_PH17: S8 PQual: How often you help parents to get government assistance/welfare in recall period

How often you help parents to get government assistance/welfare in recall period

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	503	37.1 %
2	Once or twice	32	2.4 %
3	More than twice	19	1.4 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing: Interview incorrectly computed subject age	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	144	10.6 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-7	NA: Didn't try to get this type of assistance	504	37.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 554 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1916-1919 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

S8PARENTHELP_PH18: S8 PQual: How often you help parents get medical care in recall period

How often you help parents get medical care in recall period

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	550	40.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	Once or twice	48	3.5 %
3	More than twice	35	2.6 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing: Interview incorrectly computed subject age	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	144	10.6 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-7	NA: Didn't need medical care	425	31.4 %
Total			1,354 100%

Based upon 633 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1920-1923 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

S8PRBEHV: S8 PDel: Antisocial Behavior

Peer Delinquency - Antisocial behavior; the mean rating of the prevalence of friends who engage in the 12 behaviors listed in this section. Data must be contained in 9 of the 12 items in order to compute a valid mean.

MEASURE: Peer Delinquency

The Peer Delinquent Behavior items are a subset of those used by the Rochester Youth Study (Thornberry et al., 1994) to assess the degree of antisocial activity among the adolescent's peers. There are two dimensions to this scale: Antisocial Behavior (e.g., "How many of your friends have sold drugs?") and Antisocial Influence (e.g., "How many of your friends have suggested that you should sell drugs?"). The scale contains 19 items to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "None of them" to "All of them".

- (1) None of them
- (2) Very few of them
- (3) Some of them
- (4) Most of them
- (5) All of them

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	None of them	313	23.1 %
1.08	-	57	4.2 %
1.15	-	72	5.3 %
1.17	-	1	0.1 %
1.23	-	45	3.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.31	-	64	4.7 %
1.33	-	2	0.1 %
1.38	-	50	3.7 %
1.45	-	1	0.1 %
1.46	-	39	2.9 %
1.54	-	43	3.2 %
1.62	-	36	2.7 %
1.67	-	1	0.1 %
1.69	-	17	1.3 %
1.77	-	29	2.1 %
1.83	-	1	0.1 %
1.85	-	27	2.0 %
1.91	-	1	0.1 %
1.92	-	28	2.1 %
2.00	Very few of them	28	2.1 %
2.08	-	20	1.5 %
2.15	-	21	1.6 %
2.17	-	1	0.1 %
2.18	-	1	0.1 %
2.23	-	25	1.8 %
2.31	-	22	1.6 %
2.38	-	25	1.8 %
2.42	-	1	0.1 %
2.46	-	19	1.4 %
2.54	-	24	1.8 %
2.60	-	1	0.1 %
2.62	-	17	1.3 %
2.67	-	1	0.1 %
2.69	-	15	1.1 %
2.77	-	16	1.2 %
2.85	-	14	1.0 %
2.92	-	8	0.6 %
3.00	Some of them	38	2.8 %
3.08	-	7	0.5 %
3.15	-	8	0.6 %
3.23	-	8	0.6 %
3.31	-	7	0.5 %
3.38	-	7	0.5 %
3.46	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.62	-	2	0.1 %
3.69	-	6	0.4 %
3.85	-	4	0.3 %
3.90	-	1	0.1 %
3.92	-	2	0.1 %
4.00	Most of them	7	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-9.00	Dont know	9	0.7 %
-8.00	Refuse	2	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,192 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1924-1930 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8PRINFL: S8 PDel: Antisocial Influence

Peer Delinquency - Antisocial influence; the mean rating of the prevalence of friends who encourage the youth to engage in the 7 items listed in this section. Data must be contained in 5 of the 7 items in order to compute a valid mean.

MEASURE: Peer Delinquency

The Peer Delinquent Behavior items are a subset of those used by the Rochester Youth Study (Thornberry et al., 1994) to assess the degree of antisocial activity among the adolescent's peers. There are two dimensions to this scale: Antisocial Behavior (e.g., "How many of your friends have sold drugs?") and Antisocial Influence (e.g., "How many of your friends have suggested that you should sell drugs?"). The scale contains 19 items to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "None of them" to "All of them".

- (1) None of them
- (2) Very few of them
- (3) Some of them
- (4) Most of them
- (5) All of them

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	None of them	527	38.9 %
1.14	-	120	8.9 %
1.29	-	129	9.5 %
1.43	-	70	5.2 %
1.57	-	66	4.9 %
1.71	-	26	1.9 %
1.86	-	43	3.2 %
2.00	Very few of them	37	2.7 %
2.14	-	26	1.9 %
2.29	-	18	1.3 %
2.43	-	16	1.2 %
2.57	-	14	1.0 %
2.71	-	15	1.1 %
2.86	-	15	1.1 %
3.00	Some of them	28	2.1 %
3.14	-	9	0.7 %
3.29	-	11	0.8 %
3.43	-	2	0.1 %
3.57	-	6	0.4 %
3.71	-	4	0.3 %
3.86	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Most of them	7	0.5 %
4.43	-	1	0.1 %
4.57	-	1	0.1 %
4.86	-	2	0.1 %
5.00	All of them	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-9.00	Dont know	7	0.5 %
-8.00	Refuse	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,195 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1931-1937 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8OPP01A: S8 OppSucc: How important to have a good job or career

How important is it to you . . . to have a good job or career?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	17	1.3 %
2	Not too important	10	0.7 %
3	Somewhat important	75	5.5 %
4	Pretty important	164	12.1 %
5	Very important	936	69.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97	NA - already achieved	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,202 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1938-1941 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S8OPP01B: S8 OppSucc: How likely to have a good job or career

What do you think your chances are . . . to have a good job or career?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to

have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Poor	28	2.1 %
2	Fair	136	10.0 %
3	Good	311	23.0 %
4	Very Good	323	23.9 %
5	Excellent	402	29.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-99	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-97	NA - already achieved	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1942-1945 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S8OPP02A: S8 OppSucc: How important to graduate from college

How important is it to you . . . to graduate from college?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations

"fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	124	9.2 %
2	Not too important	119	8.8 %
3	Somewhat important	249	18.4 %
4	Pretty important	215	15.9 %
5	Very important	494	36.5 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97	NA - already achieved	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1946-1949 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S8OPP02B: S8 OppSucc: How likely to graduate from college

What do you think your chances are . . . to graduate from college?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Poor	191	14.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	Fair	261	19.3 %
3	Good	294	21.7 %
4	Very Good	201	14.8 %
5	Excellent	251	18.5 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-99	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
-97	NA - already achieved	2	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,198 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1950-1953 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S8OPP03A: S8 OppSucc: How important to earn a good living

How important is it to you . . . to earn a good living?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	3	0.2 %
2	Not too important	3	0.2 %
3	Somewhat important	61	4.5 %
4	Pretty important	155	11.4 %
5	Very important	979	72.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97	NA - already achieved	2	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1954-1957 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S8OPP03B: S8 OppSucc: How likely to earn a good living

What do you think your chances are . . . to earn a good living?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Poor	21	1.6 %
2	Fair	104	7.7 %
3	Good	312	23.0 %
4	Very Good	334	24.7 %
5	Excellent	427	31.5 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-99	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-97	NA - already achieved	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,198 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1958-1961 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S8OPP04A: S8 OppSucc: How important to provide a good home for your family

How important is it to you . . . to provide a good home for your family?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	6	0.4 %
2	Not too important	2	0.1 %
3	Somewhat important	23	1.7 %
4	Pretty important	101	7.5 %
5	Very important	1068	78.9 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97	NA - already achieved	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1962-1965 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S8OPP04B: S8 OppSucc: How likely to provide a good home for your family

What do you think your chances are . . . to provide a good home for your family?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Poor	14	1.0 %
2	Fair	83	6.1 %
3	Good	242	17.9 %
4	Very Good	330	24.4 %
5	Excellent	529	39.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97	NA - already achieved	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,198 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1966-1969 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S8OPP05A: S8 OppSucc: How important to have a good marriage

How important is it to you . . . to have a good marriage?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess

the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	80	5.9 %
2	Not too important	46	3.4 %
3	Somewhat important	142	10.5 %
4	Pretty important	146	10.8 %
5	Very important	785	58.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-99	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
-97	NA - already achieved	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,199 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1970-1973 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S8OPP05B: S8 OppSucc: How likely to have a good marriage

What do you think your chances are . . . to have a good marriage?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale

ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Poor	84	6.2 %
2	Fair	177	13.1 %
3	Good	280	20.7 %
4	Very Good	267	19.7 %
5	Excellent	389	28.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-99	Dont Know	5	0.4 %
-97	NA - already achieved	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,197 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1974-1977 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S8OPP06A: S8 OppSucc: How important to have a good relationship with your children

How important is it to you . . . to have a good relationship with your children?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	5	0.4 %
2	Not too important	1	0.1 %
3	Somewhat important	15	1.1 %
4	Pretty important	55	4.1 %
5	Very important	1118	82.6 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-99	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-97	NA - already achieved	8	0.6 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,194 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1978-1981 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S8OPP06B: S8 OppSucc: How likely to have a good relationship with your children

What do you think your chances are . . . to have a good relationship with your children?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Poor	11	0.8 %
2	Fair	27	2.0 %
3	Good	133	9.8 %
4	Very Good	245	18.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	Excellent	773	57.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-99	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-97	NA - already achieved	12	0.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,189 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1982-1985 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S8OPP07A: S8 OppSucc: How important to stay out of trouble with the law

How important is it to you . . . to stay out of trouble with the law?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	8	0.6 %
2	Not too important	9	0.7 %
3	Somewhat important	38	2.8 %
4	Pretty important	81	6.0 %
5	Very important	1048	77.4 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-97	NA - already achieved	19	1.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,184 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1986-1989 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S8OPP07B: S8 OppSucc: How likely to stay out of trouble with the law

What do you think your chances are . . . to stay out of trouble with the law?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Poor	31	2.3 %
2	Fair	149	11.0 %
3	Good	252	18.6 %
4	Very Good	230	17.0 %
5	Excellent	497	36.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-97	NA - already achieved	44	3.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,159 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1990-1993 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S8OPPORT: S8 OppSucc: Aspirations for Work, Family, and Law

Aspirations for Work, Family, & Law; Mean of 6 items.

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

- (1) Not at all important
- (2) Not too important
- (3) Somewhat important
- (4) Pretty important
- (5) Very important

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all important	1	0.1 %
2.00	Not too important	0	0.0 %
2.17	-	1	0.1 %
2.33	-	1	0.1 %
2.50	-	2	0.1 %
2.67	-	3	0.2 %
2.83	-	3	0.2 %
3.00	Somewhat important	18	1.3 %
3.17	-	14	1.0 %
3.33	-	18	1.3 %
3.40	-	1	0.1 %
3.50	-	25	1.8 %
3.67	-	31	2.3 %
3.80	-	1	0.1 %
3.83	-	39	2.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4.00	Pretty important	58	4.3 %
4.17	-	73	5.4 %
4.20	-	2	0.1 %
4.33	-	141	10.4 %
4.40	-	3	0.2 %
4.50	-	104	7.7 %
4.60	-	2	0.1 %
4.67	-	164	12.1 %
4.80	-	5	0.4 %
4.83	-	135	10.0 %
5.00	Very important	357	26.4 %
Missing Data			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,202 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1994-2000 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -99.00 , -98.00 , -97.00

S8EXPECT: S8 OppSucc: Expectations to have Work, Family, and Law

Expectations to have work, family, & law; Mean of 6 items.

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

- (1) Poor
- (2) Fair
- (3) Good
- (4) Very Good

(5) Excellent

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Poor	2	0.1 %
1.17	-	2	0.1 %
1.33	-	5	0.4 %
1.50	-	1	0.1 %
1.67	-	10	0.7 %
1.80	-	1	0.1 %
1.83	-	9	0.7 %
2.00	Fair	16	1.2 %
2.17	-	23	1.7 %
2.33	-	33	2.4 %
2.40	-	1	0.1 %
2.50	-	40	3.0 %
2.67	-	52	3.8 %
2.83	-	63	4.7 %
3.00	Good	71	5.2 %
3.17	-	56	4.1 %
3.20	-	1	0.1 %
3.33	-	64	4.7 %
3.40	-	6	0.4 %
3.50	-	60	4.4 %
3.60	-	2	0.1 %
3.67	-	63	4.7 %
3.80	-	4	0.3 %
3.83	-	74	5.5 %
4.00	Very good	96	7.1 %
4.17	-	70	5.2 %
4.20	-	5	0.4 %
4.33	-	57	4.2 %
4.40	-	4	0.3 %
4.50	-	54	4.0 %
4.67	-	64	4.7 %
4.80	-	4	0.3 %
4.83	-	45	3.3 %
5.00	Excellent	139	10.3 %
	Missing Data		
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	6	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,197 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2001-2007 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -99.00 , -98.00 , -97.00

S8PESSIM: S8 OppSucc: Extent to which expectations fall short

Extent to which expectations fall short; Expectation score minus aspiration score.

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-1.50	-	1	0.1 %
-1.17	-	1	0.1 %
-1.00	-	1	0.1 %
-0.83	-	3	0.2 %
-0.80	-	1	0.1 %
-0.67	-	7	0.5 %
-0.50	-	5	0.4 %
-0.47	-	1	0.1 %
-0.33	-	17	1.3 %
-0.20	-	1	0.1 %
-0.17	-	22	1.6 %
-0.10	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-0.07	-	1	0.1 %
0.00	-	211	15.6 %
0.03	-	1	0.1 %
0.10	-	1	0.1 %
0.13	-	1	0.1 %
0.17	-	72	5.3 %
0.20	-	2	0.1 %
0.27	-	1	0.1 %
0.33	-	82	6.1 %
0.40	-	3	0.2 %
0.43	-	1	0.1 %
0.50	-	81	6.0 %
0.60	-	2	0.1 %
0.67	-	90	6.6 %
0.80	-	1	0.1 %
0.83	-	101	7.5 %
1.00	-	100	7.4 %
1.17	-	71	5.2 %
1.20	-	2	0.1 %
1.23	-	1	0.1 %
1.33	-	69	5.1 %
1.37	-	1	0.1 %
1.40	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	48	3.5 %
1.60	-	2	0.1 %
1.63	-	1	0.1 %
1.67	-	50	3.7 %
1.83	-	34	2.5 %
2.00	-	34	2.5 %
2.17	-	24	1.8 %
2.33	-	10	0.7 %
2.50	-	12	0.9 %
2.67	-	6	0.4 %
2.83	-	5	0.4 %
3.00	-	6	0.4 %
3.17	-	2	0.1 %
3.33	-	2	0.1 %
3.50	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	6	0.4 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,197 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2008-2014 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -99.00 , -98.00

S8PROJUS_PJPOLI: S8 ProJus: Police picked you up and accused you of something in the recall period

Police picked you up and accused you of something in the recall period.

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability, ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they treat most people my age.")}, Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly.")}, Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	907	67.0 %
1	Yes	299	22.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,206 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2015-2018 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202, -201, -9, -8

S8PROJUS_PJPNUM: S8 ProJus: Number of times police picked you up and accused you of something in the recall period

Number of times police picked you up and accused you of something in the recall period.

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability, ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they treat most people my age.")}, Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly.")}, Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	230	17.0 %
2	-	52	3.8 %
3	-	8	0.6 %
4	-	4	0.3 %
5	-	3	0.2 %
7	-	1	0.1 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-101	Skipped: Not picked up by the police in the recall period	907	67.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 299 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2019-2022 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -202 , -201 , -101

S8PROJUS_PJCRT: S8 ProJus: Had a court appearance for something illegal you were accused of or up for review at placement in recall period

Have you had a court appearance for something illegal you were accused of doing or where you were up for review of your placement in the recall period?

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability, ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they treat most people my age."}), Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly.")}, Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	825	60.9 %
1	Yes	381	28.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,206 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2023-2026 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8PROJUS_PJCNUM: S8 ProJus: Number of times had court appearance for something accused of/up for review at placement in recall period

Number of times had court appearance for something accused of doing or where you were up for review of your placement placement in the recall period.

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability, ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they treat most people my age.")}, Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly.")}, Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	112	8.3 %
2	-	81	6.0 %
3	-	49	3.6 %
4	-	36	2.7 %
5	-	26	1.9 %
6	-	20	1.5 %
7	-	12	0.9 %
8	-	10	0.7 %
9	-	7	0.5 %
10	-	12	0.9 %
11	-	1	0.1 %
12	-	4	0.3 %
13	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	3	0.2 %
18	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	4	0.3 %
28	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-102	Skipped: Did not have a court appearance in the recall period	825	60.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 381 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2027-2030 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -202 , -201 , -102

S8PJCOP: S8 ProJus: Procedural Justice - Police

Summary procedural justice indices for police; Mean of 19 items.

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability, ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they treat most people my age.")}, Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly.")}, Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	-	10	0.7 %
1.25	-	2	0.1 %
1.33	-	1	0.1 %
1.36	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	5	0.4 %
1.51	-	1	0.1 %
1.61	-	4	0.3 %
1.62	-	1	0.1 %
1.64	-	1	0.1 %
1.67	-	4	0.3 %
1.75	-	7	0.5 %
1.76	-	1	0.1 %
1.79	-	2	0.1 %
1.82	-	1	0.1 %
1.83	-	3	0.2 %
1.86	-	2	0.1 %
1.88	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.89	-	6	0.4 %
1.93	-	2	0.1 %
1.95	-	2	0.1 %
1.96	-	1	0.1 %
1.97	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	-	57	4.2 %
2.02	-	2	0.1 %
2.04	-	5	0.4 %
2.07	-	10	0.7 %
2.11	-	1	0.1 %
2.13	-	2	0.1 %
2.16	-	1	0.1 %
2.17	-	10	0.7 %
2.18	-	20	1.5 %
2.21	-	16	1.2 %
2.23	-	4	0.3 %
2.25	-	20	1.5 %
2.26	-	4	0.3 %
2.27	-	1	0.1 %
2.29	-	6	0.4 %
2.31	-	1	0.1 %
2.32	-	10	0.7 %
2.33	-	29	2.1 %
2.34	-	6	0.4 %
2.35	-	2	0.1 %
2.36	-	36	2.7 %
2.37	-	1	0.1 %
2.38	-	1	0.1 %
2.39	-	3	0.2 %
2.40	-	3	0.2 %
2.42	-	4	0.3 %
2.43	-	1	0.1 %
2.44	-	7	0.5 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,206 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2031-2037 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00 , -7.00

S8PJJUDG: S8 ProJus: Procedural Justice - Judge

Summary procedural justice indices for judges; Mean of 19 items.

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability, ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they treat most people my age.")}, Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly.")}, Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	-	3	0.2 %
1.50	-	2	0.1 %
1.60	-	1	0.1 %
1.61	-	1	0.1 %
1.64	-	1	0.1 %
1.67	-	1	0.1 %
1.68	-	1	0.1 %
1.75	-	5	0.4 %
1.79	-	5	0.4 %
1.83	-	2	0.1 %
1.89	-	1	0.1 %
1.90	-	1	0.1 %
1.92	-	1	0.1 %
1.95	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.97	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	-	40	3.0 %
2.04	-	2	0.1 %
2.05	-	1	0.1 %
2.06	-	1	0.1 %
2.07	-	7	0.5 %
2.08	-	1	0.1 %
2.15	-	1	0.1 %
2.17	-	7	0.5 %
2.18	-	10	0.7 %
2.20	-	1	0.1 %
2.21	-	7	0.5 %
2.22	-	1	0.1 %
2.25	-	17	1.3 %
2.27	-	1	0.1 %
2.29	-	1	0.1 %
2.30	-	1	0.1 %
2.31	-	1	0.1 %
2.32	-	2	0.1 %
2.33	-	17	1.3 %
2.36	-	27	2.0 %
2.39	-	1	0.1 %
2.40	-	2	0.1 %
2.41	-	2	0.1 %
2.42	-	2	0.1 %
2.43	-	1	0.1 %
2.46	-	12	0.9 %
2.48	-	4	0.3 %
2.50	-	32	2.4 %
2.51	-	1	0.1 %
2.52	-	2	0.1 %
2.53	-	2	0.1 %
2.54	-	11	0.8 %
2.56	-	2	0.1 %
2.57	-	3	0.2 %
2.58	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,206 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2038-2044 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00 , -7.00

S8PJCOPU: S8 ProJus: Procedural Justice - You - Police

Procedural justice scales for police - direct experience; Mean of 14 items.

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability, ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they treat most people my age.")}, Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly.")}, Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	-	8	0.6 %
1.37	-	2	0.1 %
1.50	-	6	0.4 %
1.51	-	2	0.1 %
1.70	-	1	0.1 %
1.73	-	1	0.1 %
1.80	-	1	0.1 %
1.87	-	3	0.2 %
1.94	-	2	0.1 %
2.00	-	46	3.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.01	-	4	0.3 %
2.08	-	4	0.3 %
2.10	-	1	0.1 %
2.13	-	1	0.1 %
2.15	-	4	0.3 %
2.17	-	1	0.1 %
2.23	-	7	0.5 %
2.24	-	2	0.1 %
2.27	-	1	0.1 %
2.30	-	3	0.2 %
2.35	-	2	0.1 %
2.37	-	6	0.4 %
2.38	-	1	0.1 %
2.39	-	2	0.1 %
2.40	-	2	0.1 %
2.42	-	1	0.1 %
2.44	-	10	0.7 %
2.45	-	1	0.1 %
2.47	-	1	0.1 %
2.48	-	1	0.1 %
2.49	-	2	0.1 %
2.50	-	44	3.2 %
2.51	-	7	0.5 %
2.52	-	1	0.1 %
2.53	-	6	0.4 %
2.54	-	1	0.1 %
2.56	-	6	0.4 %
2.57	-	2	0.1 %
2.58	-	6	0.4 %
2.60	-	1	0.1 %
2.63	-	1	0.1 %
2.64	-	1	0.1 %
2.65	-	7	0.5 %
2.67	-	7	0.5 %
2.70	-	3	0.2 %
2.71	-	5	0.4 %
2.73	-	8	0.6 %
2.74	-	4	0.3 %
2.76	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.77	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	166	12.3 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,040 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2045-2051 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00 , -7.00

S8PJCOPO: S8 ProJus: Procedural Justice - Others - Police

Procedural justice scales for police - others experience; Mean of 5 items.

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability, ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they treat most people my age.")}, Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly.")}, Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	-	15	1.1 %
1.05	-	7	0.5 %
1.25	-	5	0.4 %
1.30	-	11	0.8 %
1.45	-	6	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.50	-	17	1.3 %
1.65	-	4	0.3 %
1.70	-	7	0.5 %
1.75	-	14	1.0 %
1.80	-	2	0.1 %
1.85	-	69	5.1 %
1.90	-	4	0.3 %
2.00	-	128	9.5 %
2.05	-	10	0.7 %
2.10	-	92	6.8 %
2.15	-	4	0.3 %
2.20	-	1	0.1 %
2.25	-	70	5.2 %
2.30	-	25	1.8 %
2.35	-	32	2.4 %
2.40	-	3	0.2 %
2.45	-	10	0.7 %
2.50	-	111	8.2 %
2.55	-	8	0.6 %
2.60	-	21	1.6 %
2.65	-	17	1.3 %
2.70	-	9	0.7 %
2.75	-	48	3.5 %
2.80	-	9	0.7 %
2.85	-	2	0.1 %
2.90	-	36	2.7 %
2.95	-	12	0.9 %
3.00	-	119	8.8 %
3.05	-	16	1.2 %
3.10	-	8	0.6 %
3.15	-	14	1.0 %
3.20	-	6	0.4 %
3.25	-	11	0.8 %
3.30	-	22	1.6 %
3.35	-	3	0.2 %
3.40	-	7	0.5 %
3.45	-	20	1.5 %
3.50	-	28	2.1 %
3.55	-	14	1.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.70	-	23	1.7 %
3.75	-	10	0.7 %
3.80	-	11	0.8 %
3.90	-	2	0.1 %
3.95	-	9	0.7 %
4.00	-	34	2.5 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,206 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2052-2058 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8PJJUDU: S8 ProJus: Procedural Justice - You - Court

Procedural justice scales for court - direct experience; Mean of 14 items.

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability, ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they treat most people my age.")}, Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly.")}, Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	-	8	0.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.50	-	9	0.7 %
1.51	-	1	0.1 %
1.65	-	1	0.1 %
1.73	-	1	0.1 %
1.85	-	1	0.1 %
1.93	-	1	0.1 %
1.95	-	1	0.1 %
1.96	-	1	0.1 %
1.99	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	-	59	4.4 %
2.01	-	1	0.1 %
2.12	-	1	0.1 %
2.13	-	1	0.1 %
2.17	-	1	0.1 %
2.19	-	1	0.1 %
2.23	-	1	0.1 %
2.24	-	1	0.1 %
2.27	-	1	0.1 %
2.30	-	3	0.2 %
2.33	-	1	0.1 %
2.35	-	3	0.2 %
2.37	-	1	0.1 %
2.42	-	2	0.1 %
2.43	-	1	0.1 %
2.44	-	3	0.2 %
2.50	-	25	1.8 %
2.51	-	2	0.1 %
2.52	-	4	0.3 %
2.54	-	3	0.2 %
2.56	-	1	0.1 %
2.58	-	2	0.1 %
2.60	-	1	0.1 %
2.61	-	2	0.1 %
2.63	-	1	0.1 %
2.65	-	1	0.1 %
2.66	-	1	0.1 %
2.67	-	7	0.5 %
2.68	-	1	0.1 %
2.70	-	6	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.72	-	1	0.1 %
2.73	-	1	0.1 %
2.74	-	2	0.1 %
2.75	-	1	0.1 %
2.76	-	1	0.1 %
2.77	-	1	0.1 %
2.79	-	6	0.4 %
2.80	-	1	0.1 %
2.81	-	3	0.2 %
2.83	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	165	12.2 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,041 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2059-2065 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00 , -7.00

S8PJJUDO: S8 ProJus: Procedural Justice - Others - Court

Procedural justice scales for court - others experience; Mean of 7 items.

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability, ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they treat most people my age.")}, Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly.")}, Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	-	5	0.4 %
1.05	-	2	0.1 %
1.17	-	1	0.1 %
1.30	-	8	0.6 %
1.35	-	1	0.1 %
1.45	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	4	0.3 %
1.55	-	2	0.1 %
1.58	-	2	0.1 %
1.65	-	1	0.1 %
1.70	-	5	0.4 %
1.74	-	3	0.2 %
1.75	-	7	0.5 %
1.76	-	1	0.1 %
1.80	-	2	0.1 %
1.85	-	19	1.4 %
1.90	-	1	0.1 %
1.92	-	2	0.1 %
1.98	-	4	0.3 %
1.99	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	-	73	5.4 %
2.01	-	2	0.1 %
2.05	-	2	0.1 %
2.10	-	59	4.4 %
2.13	-	1	0.1 %
2.15	-	4	0.3 %
2.17	-	2	0.1 %
2.19	-	1	0.1 %
2.20	-	3	0.2 %
2.24	-	1	0.1 %
2.25	-	31	2.3 %
2.26	-	4	0.3 %
2.30	-	13	1.0 %
2.31	-	3	0.2 %
2.33	-	14	1.0 %
2.35	-	17	1.3 %
2.39	-	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.40	-	1	0.1 %
2.42	-	1	0.1 %
2.43	-	1	0.1 %
2.44	-	5	0.4 %
2.45	-	1	0.1 %
2.46	-	1	0.1 %
2.48	-	1	0.1 %
2.49	-	4	0.3 %
2.50	-	66	4.9 %
2.51	-	14	1.0 %
2.54	-	1	0.1 %
2.55	-	9	0.7 %
2.56	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,206 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2066-2072 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8LEGIT: S8 ProJus: Procedural Justice - Legitimacy

Legitimacy index; Mean of 11 items.

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability, ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they treat most people my age.")}, Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly.")},

Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Somewhat disagree
- (3) Somewhat agree
- (4) Strongly agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly disagree	23	1.7 %
1.09	-	13	1.0 %
1.13	-	1	0.1 %
1.17	-	3	0.2 %
1.18	-	7	0.5 %
1.27	-	23	1.7 %
1.29	-	1	0.1 %
1.33	-	9	0.7 %
1.36	-	11	0.8 %
1.45	-	16	1.2 %
1.50	-	8	0.6 %
1.55	-	25	1.8 %
1.56	-	1	0.1 %
1.57	-	1	0.1 %
1.60	-	2	0.1 %
1.64	-	31	2.3 %
1.67	-	7	0.5 %
1.70	-	4	0.3 %
1.71	-	1	0.1 %
1.73	-	20	1.5 %
1.75	-	3	0.2 %
1.78	-	3	0.2 %
1.80	-	2	0.1 %
1.82	-	44	3.2 %
1.83	-	3	0.2 %
1.88	-	2	0.1 %
1.89	-	1	0.1 %
1.90	-	3	0.2 %
1.91	-	33	2.4 %
2.00	Somewhat disagree	52	3.8 %
2.09	-	54	4.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.17	-	6	0.4 %
2.18	-	41	3.0 %
2.20	-	4	0.3 %
2.25	-	1	0.1 %
2.27	-	47	3.5 %
2.33	-	18	1.3 %
2.36	-	65	4.8 %
2.38	-	1	0.1 %
2.40	-	2	0.1 %
2.44	-	2	0.1 %
2.45	-	40	3.0 %
2.50	-	18	1.3 %
2.55	-	59	4.4 %
2.56	-	3	0.2 %
2.60	-	4	0.3 %
2.64	-	60	4.4 %
2.67	-	16	1.2 %
2.70	-	3	0.2 %
2.73	-	60	4.4 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,205 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2073-2079 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00 , -7.00

S8CYNIC: S8 ProJus: Procedural Justice - Legal Cynicism

Legal cynicism index; Mean of 5 items.

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability,

ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they treat most people my age."}), Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly."}), Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Somewhat disagree
- (3) Somewhat agree
- (4) Strongly agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly disagree	135	10.0 %
1.20	-	67	4.9 %
1.40	-	101	7.5 %
1.60	-	114	8.4 %
1.75	-	2	0.1 %
1.80	-	99	7.3 %
2.00	Somewhat disagree	178	13.1 %
2.20	-	181	13.4 %
2.25	-	1	0.1 %
2.33	-	1	0.1 %
2.40	-	130	9.6 %
2.60	-	66	4.9 %
2.75	-	1	0.1 %
2.80	-	61	4.5 %
3.00	Somewhat agree	33	2.4 %
3.20	-	15	1.1 %
3.40	-	11	0.8 %
3.60	-	4	0.3 %
3.80	-	2	0.1 %
4.00	Strongly agree	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,205 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2080-2086 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00 , -7.00

S8PROPTIMEALLSETTINGS: S8 Recall Period - Proportion of time in all settings

Recall Period - Proportion of time in all settings.

MEASURE: Proportion of Time in Community and Facility and Probation Marker

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	618	45.6 %
0.01	-	27	2.0 %
0.02	-	18	1.3 %
0.03	-	6	0.4 %
0.04	-	7	0.5 %
0.05	-	6	0.4 %
0.06	-	2	0.1 %
0.07	-	4	0.3 %
0.08	-	8	0.6 %
0.09	-	5	0.4 %
0.10	-	6	0.4 %
0.11	-	2	0.1 %
0.13	-	7	0.5 %
0.14	-	1	0.1 %
0.15	-	7	0.5 %
0.16	-	8	0.6 %
0.17	-	5	0.4 %
0.18	-	2	0.1 %
0.19	-	8	0.6 %
0.20	-	3	0.2 %
0.21	-	9	0.7 %
0.22	-	4	0.3 %
0.23	-	5	0.4 %
0.24	-	9	0.7 %
0.25	-	5	0.4 %
0.26	-	4	0.3 %
0.27	-	1	0.1 %
0.28	-	6	0.4 %
0.29	-	5	0.4 %
0.30	-	3	0.2 %
0.31	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.32	-	3	0.2 %
0.33	-	5	0.4 %
0.34	-	4	0.3 %
0.35	-	2	0.1 %
0.36	-	4	0.3 %
0.37	-	4	0.3 %
0.38	-	7	0.5 %
0.39	-	4	0.3 %
0.40	-	4	0.3 %
0.41	-	4	0.3 %
0.42	-	3	0.2 %
0.43	-	4	0.3 %
0.44	-	2	0.1 %
0.45	-	4	0.3 %
0.46	-	3	0.2 %
0.47	-	4	0.3 %
0.48	-	3	0.2 %
0.49	-	4	0.3 %
0.50	-	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,207 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2087-2093 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202.00 , -201.00

S8PROPTIMESTREETS: S8 Recall Period - Proportion of time in streets using all settings

Recall Period - Proportion of time in streets using all settings.

MEASURE: Proportion of Time in Community and Facility and Probation Marker

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	116	8.6 %
0.01	-	42	3.1 %
0.02	-	27	2.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.03	-	4	0.3 %
0.04	-	5	0.4 %
0.06	-	2	0.1 %
0.07	-	2	0.1 %
0.08	-	4	0.3 %
0.09	-	4	0.3 %
0.10	-	3	0.2 %
0.11	-	1	0.1 %
0.12	-	3	0.2 %
0.13	-	3	0.2 %
0.14	-	3	0.2 %
0.15	-	4	0.3 %
0.16	-	1	0.1 %
0.17	-	2	0.1 %
0.18	-	4	0.3 %
0.19	-	2	0.1 %
0.20	-	2	0.1 %
0.21	-	4	0.3 %
0.22	-	7	0.5 %
0.23	-	1	0.1 %
0.24	-	5	0.4 %
0.25	-	3	0.2 %
0.26	-	1	0.1 %
0.27	-	1	0.1 %
0.28	-	4	0.3 %
0.29	-	3	0.2 %
0.30	-	2	0.1 %
0.31	-	3	0.2 %
0.32	-	5	0.4 %
0.33	-	3	0.2 %
0.34	-	6	0.4 %
0.35	-	5	0.4 %
0.36	-	4	0.3 %
0.37	-	5	0.4 %
0.38	-	4	0.3 %
0.39	-	2	0.1 %
0.40	-	7	0.5 %
0.41	-	3	0.2 %
0.42	-	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.43	-	6	0.4 %
0.44	-	2	0.1 %
0.45	-	1	0.1 %
0.46	-	2	0.1 %
0.47	-	3	0.2 %
0.48	-	2	0.1 %
0.49	-	2	0.1 %
0.50	-	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,207 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2094-2100 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202.00 , -201.00

S8PROPTIMESECURESETTINGS: S8 Recall Period - Proportion of time in settings with no community access

Recall Period - Proportion of time in settings with no community access.

MEASURE: Proportion of Time in Community and Facility and Probation Marker

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	626	46.2 %
0.01	-	27	2.0 %
0.02	-	17	1.3 %
0.03	-	6	0.4 %
0.04	-	7	0.5 %
0.05	-	4	0.3 %
0.06	-	2	0.1 %
0.07	-	5	0.4 %
0.08	-	8	0.6 %
0.09	-	5	0.4 %
0.10	-	6	0.4 %
0.11	-	2	0.1 %
0.13	-	6	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.14	-	1	0.1 %
0.15	-	7	0.5 %
0.16	-	8	0.6 %
0.17	-	5	0.4 %
0.18	-	3	0.2 %
0.19	-	8	0.6 %
0.20	-	3	0.2 %
0.21	-	8	0.6 %
0.22	-	4	0.3 %
0.23	-	5	0.4 %
0.24	-	7	0.5 %
0.25	-	5	0.4 %
0.26	-	4	0.3 %
0.27	-	1	0.1 %
0.28	-	7	0.5 %
0.29	-	5	0.4 %
0.30	-	3	0.2 %
0.31	-	1	0.1 %
0.32	-	3	0.2 %
0.33	-	4	0.3 %
0.34	-	4	0.3 %
0.35	-	3	0.2 %
0.36	-	5	0.4 %
0.37	-	4	0.3 %
0.38	-	8	0.6 %
0.39	-	4	0.3 %
0.40	-	4	0.3 %
0.41	-	4	0.3 %
0.42	-	3	0.2 %
0.43	-	4	0.3 %
0.44	-	2	0.1 %
0.45	-	5	0.4 %
0.46	-	4	0.3 %
0.47	-	4	0.3 %
0.48	-	4	0.3 %
0.49	-	4	0.3 %
0.50	-	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,207 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2101-2107 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -202.00 , -201.00

S8PROPTIMESTREETS_SECURE: S8 Recall Period - Proportion of time in streets using settings with no community access

Recall Period - Proportion of time in streets using settings with no community access.

MEASURE: Proportion of Time in Community and Facility and Probation Marker

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	113	8.3 %
0.01	-	41	3.0 %
0.02	-	26	1.9 %
0.03	-	3	0.2 %
0.04	-	5	0.4 %
0.06	-	1	0.1 %
0.07	-	2	0.1 %
0.08	-	4	0.3 %
0.09	-	3	0.2 %
0.10	-	3	0.2 %
0.11	-	1	0.1 %
0.12	-	2	0.1 %
0.13	-	2	0.1 %
0.14	-	3	0.2 %
0.15	-	3	0.2 %
0.16	-	1	0.1 %
0.17	-	2	0.1 %
0.18	-	4	0.3 %
0.19	-	2	0.1 %
0.20	-	2	0.1 %
0.21	-	5	0.4 %
0.22	-	7	0.5 %
0.23	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.24	-	5	0.4 %
0.25	-	3	0.2 %
0.26	-	1	0.1 %
0.27	-	1	0.1 %
0.28	-	4	0.3 %
0.29	-	3	0.2 %
0.30	-	2	0.1 %
0.31	-	5	0.4 %
0.32	-	4	0.3 %
0.33	-	3	0.2 %
0.34	-	6	0.4 %
0.35	-	5	0.4 %
0.36	-	3	0.2 %
0.37	-	5	0.4 %
0.38	-	4	0.3 %
0.39	-	2	0.1 %
0.40	-	8	0.6 %
0.41	-	3	0.2 %
0.42	-	3	0.2 %
0.43	-	6	0.4 %
0.44	-	2	0.1 %
0.45	-	1	0.1 %
0.46	-	2	0.1 %
0.47	-	3	0.2 %
0.48	-	2	0.1 %
0.49	-	2	0.1 %
0.50	-	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,207 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2108-2114 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202.00 , -201.00

S8PROBATION: S8 Recall Period - Been on probation/parole

Recall Period - Been on probation/parole.

MEASURE: Proportion of Time in Community and Facility and Probation Marker

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	871	64.3 %
1	Yes	331	24.4 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	147	10.9 %
-9	Dont Know	4	0.3 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,202 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2115-2120 (width: 6; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -9999 , -9998 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8PSMI: S8 PSMI: Overall

PSMI - overall; the mean of all 30 items in the inventory.

MEASURE: Psychosocial Maturity Inventory (PSMI)

The Psychosocial Maturity Inventory (PSMI Form D; Greenberger, Josselson, Knerr, & Knerr, 1974) has been used in previous research and shown excellent validity and psychometric properties (Greenberger & Bond, 1976). Items on the personal responsibility subscale tap self-reliance (i.e., feelings of internal control and the ability to make decisions without extreme reliance on others, e.g., "Luck decides most things that happen to me" {reverse coded}), identity (i.e., self-esteem, clarity of the self, and consideration of life goals, e.g., "I change the way I feel and act so often that I sometimes wonder who the 'real' me is" {reverse coded}), and work orientation (i.e., pride in the successful completion of tasks, e.g., "I hate to admit it, but I give up on my work when things go wrong" {reverse coded}). The scale contains 30 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree". All items in the PSMI except one item are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more responsible behavior.

- (1) Strongly Agree
- (2) Slightly Agree
- (3) Slightly Disagree
- (4) Strongly Disagree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Agree	0	0.0 %
1.70	-	2	0.1 %
1.90	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.00	Slightly Agree	2	0.1 %
2.07	-	4	0.3 %
2.10	-	4	0.3 %
2.13	-	1	0.1 %
2.17	-	1	0.1 %
2.20	-	1	0.1 %
2.23	-	2	0.1 %
2.30	-	4	0.3 %
2.33	-	3	0.2 %
2.34	-	1	0.1 %
2.37	-	4	0.3 %
2.40	-	4	0.3 %
2.43	-	4	0.3 %
2.45	-	1	0.1 %
2.47	-	5	0.4 %
2.50	-	10	0.7 %
2.52	-	1	0.1 %
2.53	-	10	0.7 %
2.55	-	1	0.1 %
2.57	-	7	0.5 %
2.59	-	1	0.1 %
2.60	-	15	1.1 %
2.63	-	11	0.8 %
2.67	-	8	0.6 %
2.70	-	19	1.4 %
2.72	-	1	0.1 %
2.73	-	18	1.3 %
2.76	-	1	0.1 %
2.77	-	20	1.5 %
2.79	-	1	0.1 %
2.80	-	21	1.6 %
2.83	-	29	2.1 %
2.86	-	1	0.1 %
2.87	-	21	1.6 %
2.90	-	40	3.0 %
2.93	-	45	3.3 %
2.97	-	55	4.1 %
3.00	Slightly Disagree	28	2.1 %
3.03	-	25	1.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.04	-	1	0.1 %
3.07	-	18	1.3 %
3.10	-	18	1.3 %
3.13	-	25	1.8 %
3.14	-	3	0.2 %
3.17	-	17	1.3 %
3.20	-	22	1.6 %
3.21	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-700.00	Data missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,202 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2121-2127 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8PSMISR: S8 PSMI: Self Reliance

PSMI - self reliance; the mean of the 10 items in this subscale.

MEASURE: Psychosocial Maturity Inventory (PSMI)

The Psychosocial Maturity Inventory (PSMI Form D; Greenberger, Josselson, Knerr, & Knerr, 1974) has been used in previous research and shown excellent validity and psychometric properties (Greenberger & Bond, 1976). Items on the personal responsibility subscale tap self-reliance (i.e., feelings of internal control and the ability to make decisions without extreme reliance on others, e.g., "Luck decides most things that happen to me" {reverse coded}), identity (i.e., self-esteem, clarity of the self, and consideration of life goals, e.g., "I change the way I feel and act so often that I sometimes wonder who the 'real' me is" {reverse coded}), and work orientation (i.e., pride in the successful completion of tasks, e.g., "I hate to admit it, but I give up on my work when things go wrong" {reverse coded}). The scale contains 30 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree". All items in the PSMI except one item are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more responsible behavior.

- (1) Strongly Agree
- (2) Slightly Agree
- (3) Slightly Disagree
- (4) Strongly Disagree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Agree	0	0.0 %
1.60	-	2	0.1 %
1.70	-	2	0.1 %
2.00	Slightly Agree	4	0.3 %
2.10	-	5	0.4 %
2.20	-	5	0.4 %
2.30	-	16	1.2 %
2.40	-	15	1.1 %
2.50	-	18	1.3 %
2.60	-	27	2.0 %
2.70	-	33	2.4 %
2.80	-	61	4.5 %
2.90	-	68	5.0 %
3.00	Slightly Disagree	133	9.8 %
3.10	-	55	4.1 %
3.20	-	60	4.4 %
3.30	-	54	4.0 %
3.33	-	1	0.1 %
3.40	-	74	5.5 %
3.50	-	86	6.4 %
3.60	-	69	5.1 %
3.67	-	1	0.1 %
3.70	-	85	6.3 %
3.78	-	1	0.1 %
3.80	-	93	6.9 %
3.90	-	77	5.7 %
4.00	Strongly Disagree	155	11.4 %
Missing Data			
-700.00	Data missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	2	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2128-2134 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8PSMIID: S8 PSMI: Identity

PSMI - identity; the mean of the 10 items in this subscale.

MEASURE: Psychosocial Maturity Inventory (PSMI)

The Psychosocial Maturity Inventory (PSMI Form D; Greenberger, Josselson, Knerr, & Knerr, 1974) has been used in previous research and shown excellent validity and psychometric properties (Greenberger & Bond, 1976). Items on the personal responsibility subscale tap self-reliance (i.e., feelings of internal control and the ability to make decisions without extreme reliance on others, e.g., "Luck decides most things that happen to me" {reverse coded}), identity (i.e., self-esteem, clarity of the self, and consideration of life goals, e.g., "I change the way I feel and act so often that I sometimes wonder who the 'real' me is" {reverse coded}), and work orientation (i.e., pride in the successful completion of tasks, e.g., "I hate to admit it, but I give up on my work when things go wrong" {reverse coded}). The scale contains 30 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree". All items in the PSMI except one item are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more responsible behavior.

- (1) Strongly Agree
- (2) Slightly Agree
- (3) Slightly Disagree
- (4) Strongly Disagree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Agree	0	0.0 %
1.30	-	1	0.1 %
1.40	-	1	0.1 %
1.70	-	1	0.1 %
1.80	-	2	0.1 %
1.90	-	2	0.1 %
2.00	Slightly Agree	1	0.1 %
2.10	-	3	0.2 %
2.20	-	9	0.7 %
2.30	-	10	0.7 %
2.40	-	12	0.9 %
2.50	-	13	1.0 %
2.60	-	18	1.3 %
2.70	-	36	2.7 %
2.80	-	59	4.4 %
2.90	-	72	5.3 %
3.00	Slightly Disagree	124	9.2 %
3.10	-	59	4.4 %
3.20	-	55	4.1 %
3.30	-	62	4.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.40	-	69	5.1 %
3.50	-	71	5.2 %
3.60	-	71	5.2 %
3.70	-	79	5.8 %
3.78	-	2	0.1 %
3.80	-	85	6.3 %
3.90	-	53	3.9 %
4.00	Strongly Disagree	230	17.0 %
Missing Data			
-700.00	Data missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	2	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2135-2141 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8PSMIWK: S8 PSMI: Work Orientation

PSMI - work orientation; the mean of the 10 items in this subscale.

MEASURE: Psychosocial Maturity Inventory (PSMI)

The Psychosocial Maturity Inventory (PSMI Form D; Greenberger, Josselson, Knerr, & Knerr, 1974) has been used in previous research and shown excellent validity and psychometric properties (Greenberger & Bond, 1976). Items on the personal responsibility subscale tap self-reliance (i.e., feelings of internal control and the ability to make decisions without extreme reliance on others, e.g., "Luck decides most things that happen to me" {reverse coded}), identity (i.e., self-esteem, clarity of the self, and consideration of life goals, e.g., "I change the way I feel and act so often that I sometimes wonder who the 'real' me is" {reverse coded}), and work orientation (i.e., pride in the successful completion of tasks, e.g., "I hate to admit it, but I give up on my work when things go wrong" {reverse coded}). The scale contains 30 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree". All items in the PSMI except one item are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more responsible behavior.

- (1) Strongly Agree
- (2) Slightly Agree
- (3) Slightly Disagree
- (4) Strongly Disagree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Agree	1	0.1 %
1.30	-	3	0.2 %
1.50	-	1	0.1 %
1.60	-	5	0.4 %
1.78	-	1	0.1 %
1.80	-	3	0.2 %
1.90	-	7	0.5 %
2.00	Slightly Agree	9	0.7 %
2.10	-	10	0.7 %
2.11	-	1	0.1 %
2.20	-	16	1.2 %
2.22	-	1	0.1 %
2.30	-	21	1.6 %
2.40	-	29	2.1 %
2.44	-	4	0.3 %
2.50	-	52	3.8 %
2.56	-	5	0.4 %
2.60	-	58	4.3 %
2.67	-	3	0.2 %
2.70	-	63	4.7 %
2.78	-	7	0.5 %
2.80	-	89	6.6 %
2.89	-	10	0.7 %
2.90	-	114	8.4 %
3.00	Slightly Disagree	70	5.2 %
3.10	-	86	6.4 %
3.11	-	9	0.7 %
3.20	-	44	3.2 %
3.22	-	3	0.2 %
3.30	-	69	5.1 %
3.33	-	3	0.2 %
3.40	-	92	6.8 %
3.44	-	3	0.2 %
3.50	-	59	4.4 %
3.60	-	62	4.6 %
3.67	-	3	0.2 %
3.70	-	109	8.1 %
3.78	-	1	0.1 %
3.80	-	34	2.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.90	-	22	1.6 %
4.00	Strongly Disagree	20	1.5 %
	Missing Data		
-700.00	Data missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,202 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2142-2148 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8RELQLT: S8 RQual: Quality of Relationship - Quality

Romantic Relationship - Quality of Relationship; Mean of 7 items.

MEASURE: Quality of Romantic Relationships

The Quality of Romantic Relationships inventory was adapted for this study to evaluate the support, conflict, and depth of the adolescent's romantic relationships (Pierce, 1994; Pierce, Sarason, Sarason, Solky-Butzel, & Nagle, 1997). This scale assess the relationship along 5 dimensions: Quality of Relationship (e.g., "In general, how happy are you with your relationship?"), Knowledge of Behavior and Deviance (e.g., "How much does {Name} know who you spend time with?"), Tolerance of Deviance (e.g., "Would {Name} know if you have been using drugs?"), Antisocial Influence (e.g., "Has X suggested that you should sell drugs?"), and Antisocial Behavior (e.g., "Has X damaged/destroyed property?". The fourth and fifth subscales were derived from items mirroring the ones asked regarding peer delinquency; but using the romantic partner, not the peers, as the referent person. For the first three subscales, higher scores indicate a more symbiotic romantic relationship and for the last two subscales, more antisocial influence, antisocial behavior and more monitoring respectively.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.29	-	1	0.1 %
1.43	-	1	0.1 %
1.57	-	2	0.1 %
1.71	-	2	0.1 %
1.86	-	2	0.1 %
2.00	-	5	0.4 %
2.14	-	4	0.3 %
2.29	-	5	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.43	-	5	0.4 %
2.57	-	6	0.4 %
2.71	-	13	1.0 %
2.86	-	10	0.7 %
3.00	-	20	1.5 %
3.14	-	17	1.3 %
3.29	-	16	1.2 %
3.43	-	32	2.4 %
3.57	-	42	3.1 %
3.67	-	1	0.1 %
3.71	-	38	2.8 %
3.86	-	48	3.5 %
4.00	-	52	3.8 %
4.14	-	67	4.9 %
4.17	-	1	0.1 %
4.29	-	73	5.4 %
4.43	-	66	4.9 %
4.57	-	74	5.5 %
4.71	-	59	4.4 %
4.86	-	49	3.6 %
5.00	-	26	1.9 %
Missing Data			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into RQual measure	470	34.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 737 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2149-2155 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8RELDEV: S8 RQual: Quality of Relationship - Deviance

Romantic Relationship - Tolerance of Deviance; Mean of 2 items.

MEASURE: Quality of Romantic Relationships

The Quality of Romantic Relationships inventory was adapted for this study to evaluate the support, conflict, and depth of the adolescent's romantic relationships (Pierce, 1994; Pierce, Sarason, Sarason, Solky-Butzel, & Nagle, 1997). This scale assess the relationship along 5 dimensions: Quality of Relationship (e.g., "In general, how happy are you with your relationship?"), Knowledge of Behavior and Deviance (e.g., "How much does {Name} know who you spend time with?"), Tolerance of Deviance (e.g., "Would {Name} know if you have been using drugs?"), Antisocial

Influence (e.g., "Has X suggested that you should sell drugs?"), and Antisocial Behavior (e.g., "Has X damaged/destroyed property?". The fourth and fifth subscales were derived from items mirroring the ones asked regarding peer delinquency; but using the romantic partner, not the peers, as the referent person. For the first three subscales, higher scores indicate a more symbiotic romantic relationship and for the last two subscales, more antisocial influence, antisocial behavior and more monitoring respectively.

- (1) Would not care at all
- (2) Would be bothered, but would not say anything to me about it
- (3) Would be bothered and would talk to me about it
- (4) Would get very upset with me

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.0	Would not care at all	23	1.7 %
1.5	-	5	0.4 %
2.0	Would be bothered, but would not say anything to me about it	31	2.3 %
2.5	-	54	4.0 %
3.0	Would be bothered and would talk to me about it	144	10.6 %
3.5	-	81	6.0 %
4.0	Would get very upset with me	398	29.4 %
Missing Data			
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.0	Did not skip into RQual measure	470	34.7 %
-9.0	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 736 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2156-2162 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.0 , -202.0 , -201.0 , -100.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

S8RELCON: S8 RQual: Quality of Relationship - Monitoring

Romantic Relationship - Monitoring; Mean of 5 items.

MEASURE: Quality of Romantic Relationships

The Quality of Romantic Relationships inventory was adapted for this study to evaluate the support, conflict, and depth of the adolescent's romantic relationships (Pierce, 1994; Pierce, Sarason, Sarason, Solky-Butzel, & Nagle, 1997). This scale assess the relationship along 5 dimensions: Quality of Relationship (e.g., "In general, how happy are you with your relationship?"), Knowledge of Behavior and Deviance (e.g., "How much does {Name} know who you spend time with?"), Tolerance of Deviance (e.g., "Would {Name} know if you have been using drugs?"), Antisocial Influence (e.g., "Has X suggested that you should sell drugs?"), and Antisocial Behavior (e.g., "Has X damaged/destroyed property?". The fourth and fifth subscales were derived from items mirroring the ones asked regarding peer delinquency; but

using the romantic partner, not the peers, as the referent person. For the first three subscales, higher scores indicate a more symbiotic romantic relationship and for the last two subscales, more antisocial influence, antisocial behavior and more monitoring respectively.

- (1) Doesn't know at all
- (2) Knows a little bit
- (3) Knows a lot
- (4) Knows everything

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.0	Doesn't know at all	20	1.5 %
1.2	-	4	0.3 %
1.4	-	9	0.7 %
1.6	-	12	0.9 %
1.8	-	19	1.4 %
2.0	Knows a little bit	60	4.4 %
2.2	-	30	2.2 %
2.4	-	35	2.6 %
2.6	-	35	2.6 %
2.8	-	45	3.3 %
3.0	Knows a lot	104	7.7 %
3.2	-	35	2.6 %
3.4	-	33	2.4 %
3.6	-	38	2.8 %
3.8	-	32	2.4 %
4.0	Knows everything	224	16.5 %
Missing Data			
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.0	Did not skip into RQual measure	470	34.7 %
-9.0	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 735 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2163-2169 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.0 , -202.0 , -201.0 , -100.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

S8DEL: S8 RQual: Antisocial Influence - Count of items endorsed

Romantic Relationship - Antisocial Influence, relies on items from the peer delinquency section to assess the antisocial influence from the romantic partner; Count of the 7 items endorsed.

MEASURE: Quality of Romantic Relationships

The Quality of Romantic Relationships inventory was adapted for this study to evaluate the support, conflict, and depth of the adolescent's romantic relationships (Pierce, 1994; Pierce, Sarason, Sarason, Solky-Butzel, & Nagle, 1997). This scale assesses the relationship along 5 dimensions: Quality of Relationship (e.g., "In general, how happy are you with your relationship?"), Knowledge of Behavior and Deviance (e.g., "How much does {Name} know who you spend time with?"), Tolerance of Deviance (e.g., "Would {Name} know if you have been using drugs?"), Antisocial Influence (e.g., "Has X suggested that you should sell drugs?"), and Antisocial Behavior (e.g., "Has X damaged/destroyed property?"). The fourth and fifth subscales were derived from items mirroring the ones asked regarding peer delinquency; but using the romantic partner, not the peers, as the referent person. For the first three subscales, higher scores indicate a more symbiotic romantic relationship and for the last two subscales, more antisocial influence, antisocial behavior and more monitoring respectively.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	629	46.5 %
1	-	74	5.5 %
2	-	16	1.2 %
3	-	6	0.4 %
4	-	5	0.4 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
6	-	1	0.1 %
7	-	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Did not skip into RQual measure	470	34.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 735 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2170-2173 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8SIGOTHER_DEL: S8 RQual: Antisocial Behavior - Count of items endorsed

Romantic Relationship - Antisocial Behavior, relies on items from the peer delinquency section to assess the antisocial behavior of the romantic partner
Count of 13 items

MEASURE: Quality of Romantic Relationships

The Quality of Romantic Relationships inventory was adapted for this study to evaluate the support, conflict, and depth of the adolescent's romantic relationships

(Pierce, 1994; Pierce, Sarason, Sarason, Solky-Butzel, & Nagle, 1997). This scale assess the relationship along 5 dimensions: Quality of Relationship (e.g., "In general, how happy are you with your relationship?"), Knowledge of Behavior and Deviance (e.g., "How much does {Name} know who you spend time with?"), Tolerance of Deviance (e.g., "Would {Name} know if you have been using drugs?"), Antisocial Influence (e.g., "Has X suggested that you should sell drugs?"), and Antisocial Behavior (e.g., "Has X damaged/destroyed property?". The fourth and fifth subscales were derived from items mirroring the ones asked regarding peer delinquency; but using the romantic partner, not the peers, as the referent person. For the first three subscales, higher scores indicate a more symbiotic romantic relationship and for the last two subscales, more antisocial influence, antisocial behavior and more monitoring respectively.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	512	37.8 %
1	-	95	7.0 %
2	-	48	3.5 %
3	-	32	2.4 %
4	-	22	1.6 %
5	-	7	0.5 %
6	-	4	0.3 %
7	-	3	0.2 %
8	-	3	0.2 %
9	-	2	0.1 %
10	-	3	0.2 %
11	-	1	0.1 %
13	-	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Did not skip into RQual measure	470	34.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 735 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2174-2177 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8PEERPR: S8 PEI: Resistance to Peer Influence

Resistance to peer influence; mean across 10 dimensions.

MEASURE: Resistance to Peer Influence

The Resistance to Peer Influence (Steinberg, 2000) measure was developed

for this study to assess the degree to which adolescents act autonomously in interactions with their peer group. Participants are first presented with two conflicting scenarios (e.g., "Some people go along with their friends just to keep their friends happy" and "Other people refuse to go along with what their friends want to do, even though they know it will make their friends unhappy") and are then asked to choose the scenario which most closely reflects their behavior. Finally, the participant is asked to rate the degree to which the statement is accurate (i.e. "sort of true" or "really true"). Ten such sequences are presented to the participant, each exploring a different dimension of potential influence: go along with friends, fitting in with friends, changing their mind, knowingly do something wrong, hiding true opinion, breaking the law, changing the way you usually act, taking risks, saying things don't really believe, and going against the crowd.

- (1) It's really true I'm influenced by my peers
- (2) It's sort of true I'm influenced by my peers
- (3) It's sort of true I prefer to be an individual
- (4) It's really true I prefer to be an individual

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	It's really true I'm influenced by my peers	1	0.1 %
1.40	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	1	0.1 %
1.70	-	2	0.1 %
1.80	-	2	0.1 %
1.90	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	It's sort of true I'm influenced by my peers	10	0.7 %
2.10	-	6	0.4 %
2.20	-	13	1.0 %
2.30	-	20	1.5 %
2.40	-	18	1.3 %
2.50	-	20	1.5 %
2.60	-	25	1.8 %
2.70	-	28	2.1 %
2.80	-	42	3.1 %
2.90	-	56	4.1 %
3.00	It's sort of true I prefer to be an individual	68	5.0 %
3.10	-	59	4.4 %
3.20	-	51	3.8 %
3.30	-	59	4.4 %
3.40	-	85	6.3 %
3.50	-	77	5.7 %
3.60	-	80	5.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.63	-	1	0.1 %
3.70	-	108	8.0 %
3.80	-	74	5.5 %
3.90	-	83	6.1 %
4.00	It's really true I prefer to be an individual	211	15.6 %
	Missing Data		
-700.00	Data missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,202 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2178-2184 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8ROUT: S8 Rout: Unsupervised Routine Activities

Unsupervised routine activities; the mean of all four questions.

MEASURE: Routine Activities

Items from the Routine Activities measure were drawn from the "Monitoring the Future Questionnaire" (Osgood, Wilson, O'Malley, Bachman, and Johnston, 1996) and are used to assess the frequency of unstructured socializing. Items specifically tap activities that occur in the absence of an authority figure (e.g., "How often did you get together with friends informally?"). The scale contains 3 items to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Never" to "Almost every day". Higher scores indicate a greater involvement in unstructured activities. A fourth item is asked to specify the number of evenings in a typical week the participant spends on "fun" activities.

- (1) Never (1) Less than one time
- (2) A few times a year (2) One
- (3) Once or twice a month (3) Two
- (4) At least once a week (4) Three
- (5) Almost every day (5) Four or More

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	28	2.1 %
1.25	-	40	3.0 %
1.50	-	38	2.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.75	-	58	4.3 %
2.00	A few times a year	76	5.6 %
2.25	-	73	5.4 %
2.50	-	86	6.4 %
2.75	-	101	7.5 %
3.00	Once or twice a month	99	7.3 %
3.25	-	81	6.0 %
3.50	-	78	5.8 %
3.75	-	82	6.1 %
4.00	At least once a week	62	4.6 %
4.25	-	49	3.6 %
4.50	-	36	2.7 %
4.75	-	15	1.1 %
5.00	Almost every day	12	0.9 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into Routine Activities measure	191	14.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,014 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2185-2191 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -666.00 , -400.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8SRO_DESTPROP: S8 SRO: Destroyed/damaged property - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [purposely destroyed or damaged property that did not belong to you] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1115	82.3 %
1	Yes	86	6.4 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-8	Refusal	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2192-2195 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_DESTPROP_NUM: S8 SRO: Destroyed/damaged property - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [purposely destroyed or damaged property that did not belong to you] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1115	82.3 %
1	-	32	2.4 %
2	-	16	1.2 %
3	-	9	0.7 %
4	-	10	0.7 %
5	-	4	0.3 %
6	-	3	0.2 %
8	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
10	-	3	0.2 %
12	-	2	0.1 %
15	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	1	0.1 %
150	-	1	0.1 %
400	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2196-2199 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S8SRO_DESTPROP_GROUP: S8 SRO: Destroyed/damaged property - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [purposely destroyed or damaged property that did not belong to you].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	45	3.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Yes	41	3.0 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1116	82.4 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 86 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2200-2203 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_SETFIRE: S8 SRO: Set fire to house/building/car/vacant lot - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [purposely set fire to a house, building, car or vacant lot] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1193	88.1 %
1	Yes	8	0.6 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-8	Refusal	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2204-2207 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_SETFIRE_NUM: S8 SRO: Set fire to house/building/car/vacant lot - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [purposely set fire to a house, building, car or vacant lot] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1193	88.1 %
1	-	5	0.4 %
2	-	2	0.1 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2208-2211 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S8SRO_SETFIRE_GROUP: S8 SRO: Set fire to house/building/car/vacant lot - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [purposely set fire to a house, building, car or vacant lot].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	3	0.2 %
1	Yes	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1194	88.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 8 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2212-2215 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_ENTBLDSTEAL: S8 SRO: Entered building to steal - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [entered or broke into a building (home or business) to steal something] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1173	86.6 %
1	Yes	28	2.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-8	Refusal	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2216-2219 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_ENTBLDSTEAL_NUM: S8 SRO: Entered building to steal - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [entered or broke into a building (home or business) to steal something] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1173	86.6 %
1	-	18	1.3 %
2	-	4	0.3 %
3	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	2	0.1 %
12	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
300	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2220-2223 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S8SRO_ENTBLDSTEAL_GROUP: S8 SRO: Entered building to steal - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [entered or broke into a building (home or business) to steal something].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	12	0.9 %
1	Yes	16	1.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1174	86.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 28 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2224-2227 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_SHOPLIFT: S8 SRO: Shoplifted - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [stole something from a store (shoplifted)] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1142	84.3 %
1	Yes	59	4.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-8	Refusal	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2228-2231 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_SHOPLIFT_NUM: S8 SRO: Shoplift - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [stole something from a store (shoplifted)] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1142	84.3 %
1	-	18	1.3 %
2	-	10	0.7 %
3	-	5	0.4 %
4	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	7	0.5 %
10	-	6	0.4 %
20	-	2	0.1 %
24	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	1	0.1 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
52	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	1	0.1 %
70	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	2	0.1 %
120	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2232-2235 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S8SRO_SHOPLIFT_GROUP: S8 SRO: Shoplift - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [stole something from a store (shoplifted)].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	30	2.2 %
1	Yes	29	2.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1143	84.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 59 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2236-2239 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_BSTOLEN: S8 SRO: Bought/received/sold stolen property - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [bought, received, or sold something that you knew was stolen] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done

this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1074	79.3 %
1	Yes	126	9.3 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-8	Refusal	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2240-2243 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_BSTOLEN_NUM: S8 SRO: Bought/received/sold stolen property - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [bought, received, or sold something that you knew was stolen] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1074	79.3 %
1	-	23	1.7 %
2	-	34	2.5 %
3	-	9	0.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	-	5	0.4 %
5	-	11	0.8 %
6	-	2	0.1 %
7	-	2	0.1 %
8	-	2	0.1 %
10	-	11	0.8 %
12	-	4	0.3 %
15	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	8	0.6 %
44	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	4	0.3 %
52	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	2	0.1 %
200	-	1	0.1 %
300	-	2	0.1 %
350	-	1	0.1 %
500	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2244-2247 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S8SRO_BSTOLEN_GROUP: S8 SRO: Bought/received/sold stolen property - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [bought, received, or sold something that you knew was stolen].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The

SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	75	5.5 %
1	Yes	51	3.8 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1076	79.5 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 126 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2248-2251 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_ILLCREDIT: S8 SRO: Used checks/credit cards illegally - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [used checks or credit cards illegally] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1180	87.1 %
1	Yes	21	1.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-8	Refusal	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2252-2255 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_ILLCREDIT_NUM: S8 SRO: Used checks/credit cards illegally - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [used checks or credit cards illegally] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1180	87.1 %
1	-	7	0.5 %
2	-	4	0.3 %
4	-	2	0.1 %
5	-	2	0.1 %
6	-	1	0.1 %
7	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	2	0.1 %
20	-	1	0.1 %
70	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2256-2259 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S8SRO_ILLCREDIT_GROUP: S8 SRO: Used checks credit cards illegally - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [used checks or credit cards illegally].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	4	0.3 %
1	Yes	17	1.3 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1181	87.2 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 21 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2260-2263 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_STOLECAR: S8 SRO: Stolen car/motorcycle - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [stole a car or motorcycle to keep or sell] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1174	86.7 %
1	Yes	27	2.0 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-8	Refusal	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2264-2267 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_STOLECAR_NUM: S8 SRO: Stole car/motorcycle - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [stole a car or motorcycle to keep or sell] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says

that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1174	86.7 %
1	-	9	0.7 %
2	-	6	0.4 %
3	-	3	0.2 %
4	-	2	0.1 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
9	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	1	0.1 %
12	-	1	0.1 %
13	-	1	0.1 %
28	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2268-2271 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S8SRO_STOLECAR_GROUP: S8 SRO: Stole car/motorcycle - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [stole a car or motorcycle to keep or sell].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of

more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	11	0.8 %
1	Yes	16	1.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1175	86.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 27 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2272-2275 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_SOLDMAR: S8 SRO: Sold marijuana - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [sold marijuana] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1055	77.9 %
1	Yes	146	10.8 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-8	Refusal	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2276-2279 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_SOLDMAR_NUM: S8 SRO: Sold marijuana - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [sold marijuana] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1055	77.9 %
1	-	5	0.4 %
2	-	2	0.1 %
3	-	3	0.2 %
4	-	5	0.4 %
5	-	6	0.4 %
6	-	3	0.2 %
7	-	1	0.1 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	4	0.3 %
12	-	4	0.3 %
15	-	2	0.1 %
20	-	2	0.1 %
25	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
28	-	2	0.1 %
30	-	8	0.6 %
34	-	1	0.1 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	2	0.1 %
45	-	2	0.1 %
50	-	4	0.3 %
52	-	2	0.1 %
60	-	8	0.6 %
61	-	1	0.1 %
70	-	2	0.1 %
78	-	1	0.1 %
90	-	14	1.0 %
100	-	6	0.4 %
104	-	1	0.1 %
120	-	3	0.2 %
135	-	1	0.1 %
144	-	1	0.1 %
150	-	5	0.4 %
160	-	1	0.1 %
180	-	8	0.6 %
200	-	6	0.4 %
240	-	1	0.1 %
290	-	1	0.1 %
300	-	7	0.5 %
340	-	1	0.1 %
350	-	1	0.1 %
360	-	3	0.2 %
365	-	7	0.5 %
995	Maximum value permitted	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2280-2283 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -999, -998, -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101)

S8SRO_SOLDMAR_GROUP: S8 SRO: Sold marijuana - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [sold marijuana].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	89	6.6 %
1	Yes	57	4.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1056	78.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 146 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2284-2287 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101, -9, -8)

S8SRO_SOLDOTHDR: S8 SRO: Sold other illegal drugs - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [sold other illegal drugs (cocaine, crack, heroin)] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1074	79.3 %
1	Yes	126	9.3 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-8	Refusal	2	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2288-2291 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -9, -8

S8SRO_SOLDOTHDR_NUM: S8 SRO: Sold other illegal drugs - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [sold other illegal drugs (cocaine, crack, heroin)] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1074	79.3 %
1	-	1	0.1 %
2	-	5	0.4 %
3	-	5	0.4 %
4	-	2	0.1 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
6	-	2	0.1 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
9	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	5	0.4 %
12	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	1	0.1 %
19	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	4	0.3 %
21	-	1	0.1 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	6	0.4 %
40	-	3	0.2 %
45	-	1	0.1 %
48	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	8	0.6 %
70	-	1	0.1 %
75	-	2	0.1 %
78	-	1	0.1 %
80	-	1	0.1 %
90	-	6	0.4 %
100	-	7	0.5 %
104	-	3	0.2 %
120	-	2	0.1 %
125	-	1	0.1 %
135	-	1	0.1 %
140	-	2	0.1 %
144	-	1	0.1 %
150	-	6	0.4 %
175	-	1	0.1 %
180	-	5	0.4 %
200	-	7	0.5 %
220	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
270	-	2	0.1 %
290	-	1	0.1 %
300	-	7	0.5 %
340	-	2	0.1 %
350	-	1	0.1 %
360	-	2	0.1 %
365	-	5	0.4 %
995	Maximum value permitted	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,199 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2292-2295 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S8SRO_SOLDOTHDR_GROUP: S8 SRO: Sold other illegal drugs - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [sold other illegal drugs (cocaine, crack, heroin)].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	73	5.4 %
1	Yes	53	3.9 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1076	79.5 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 126 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2296-2299 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_CARJACK: S8 SRO: Carjacked someone - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [carjacked someone] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1195	88.3 %
1	Yes	6	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-8	Refusal	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2300-2303 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_CARJACK_NUM: S8 SRO: Carjack someone - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [carjacked someone] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Measure: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1195	88.3 %
1	-	4	0.3 %
2	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2304-2307 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S8SRO_CARJACK_GROUP: S8 SRO: Carjack someone - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [carjacked someone].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	4	0.3 %
1	Yes	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1196	88.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 6 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2308-2311 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_CARJACK_GUN: S8 SRO: Carjack someone - Did you have a gun the last time

Whether the subject had a gun with them the last time they [carjacked someone].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1	0.1 %
1	Yes	5	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1196	88.3 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 6 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2312-2315 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_DROVEDRUNK: S8 SRO: Drove drunk or high - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [driven while you were drunk or high] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1008	74.4 %
1	Yes	193	14.3 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-8	Refusal	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2316-2319 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_DROVEDRUNK_NUM: S8 SRO: Drove drunk or high - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [driven while you were drunk or high] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1008	74.4 %
1	-	29	2.1 %
2	-	32	2.4 %
3	-	17	1.3 %
4	-	11	0.8 %
5	-	14	1.0 %
6	-	2	0.1 %
7	-	2	0.1 %
8	-	2	0.1 %
10	-	18	1.3 %
12	-	5	0.4 %
15	-	4	0.3 %
20	-	6	0.4 %
24	-	1	0.1 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
26	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	3	0.2 %
35	-	3	0.2 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	8	0.6 %
51	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
52	-	2	0.1 %
60	-	5	0.4 %
70	-	1	0.1 %
90	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	6	0.4 %
125	-	1	0.1 %
150	-	2	0.1 %
180	-	1	0.1 %
200	-	2	0.1 %
250	-	1	0.1 %
290	-	1	0.1 %
300	-	5	0.4 %
333	-	1	0.1 %
360	-	2	0.1 %
395	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2320-2323 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S8SRO_DROVEDRUNK_GROUP: S8 SRO: Drove drunk or high - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [drove while you were drunk or high].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency,

and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	73	5.4 %
1	Yes	120	8.9 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1009	74.5 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 193 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2324-2327 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_PAIDSEX: S8 SRO: Paid to have sexual relations - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [been paid by someone for having sexual relations with them] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1192	88.0 %
1	Yes	9	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-8	Refusal	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2328-2331 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_PAIDSEX_NUM: S8 SRO: Paid to have sexual relations - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [been paid by someone for having sexual relations with them] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1192	88.0 %
1	-	4	0.3 %
2	-	2	0.1 %
4	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
48	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2332-2335 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S8SRO_FORCEDSEX: S8 SRO: Forced someone to have sex - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [forced someone to have sex with you] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1354	100.0 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,354 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2336-2340 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

S8SRO_FORCEDSEX_NUM: S8 SRO: Forced sex - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [forced someone to have sex with you] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1354	100.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,354 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2341-2345 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

S8SRO_FORCEDSEX_GROUP: S8 SRO: Forced sex - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [forced someone to have sex with you].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1354	100.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,354 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2346-2350 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

S8SRO_FORCEDSEX_GUN: S8 SRO: Forced sex - Did you have a gun the last time

Whether the subject had a gun with them the last time they [forced someone to have sex with you].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done

this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1354	100.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,354 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2351-2355 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

S8SRO_KILLED: S8 SRO: Killed someone - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [killed someone] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1354	100.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,354 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2356-2360 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

S8SRO_KILLED_NUM: S8 SRO: Killed someone - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [killed someone] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says

that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1354	100.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,354 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2361-2365 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

S8SRO_KILLED_GROUP: S8 SRO: Killed someone - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [killed someone].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1354	100.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,354 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2366-2370 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

S8SRO_KILLED_GUN: S8 SRO: Killed someone - Did you have a gun the last time

Whether the subject had a gun with them the last time they [killed someone].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier

instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1354	100.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,354 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2371-2375 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

S8SRO_SHOT: S8 SRO: Shot someone (where bullet hit the victim) - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [shot someone (where bullet hit the victim)] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1189	87.8 %
1	Yes	12	0.9 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-8	Refusal	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2376-2379 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_SHOT_NUM: S8 SRO: Shot someone (where bullet hit) - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [shot someone (where bullet hit the victim)] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1189	87.8 %
1	-	2	0.1 %
2	-	4	0.3 %
3	-	3	0.2 %
4	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
7	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2380-2383 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S8SRO_SHOT_GROUP: S8 SRO: Shot someone (where bullet hit) - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [shot someone (where bullet hit the victim)].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	4	0.3 %
1	Yes	8	0.6 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1190	87.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 12 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2384-2387 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_SHOTAT: S8 SRO: Shot at someone (pulled trigger) - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [shot AT someone (where you pulled the trigger)] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up

questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1169	86.3 %
1	Yes	31	2.3 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-8	Refusal	2	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2388-2391 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_SHOTAT_NUM: S8 SRO: Shot at someone (pulled trigger) - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [shot AT someone (where you pulled the trigger)] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1169	86.3 %
1	-	14	1.0 %
2	-	10	0.7 %
3	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
6	-	1	0.1 %
7	-	1	0.1 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2392-2395 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S8SRO_SHOTAT_GROUP: S8 SRO: Shot at someone (pulled trigger) - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [shot AT someone (where you pulled the trigger)].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	11	0.8 %
1	Yes	20	1.5 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1171	86.5 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 31 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2396-2399 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_ROBWEAPON: S8 SRO: Robbery with weapon - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [took something from another person by force, using a weapon] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1167	86.2 %
1	Yes	32	2.4 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-8	Refusal	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,199 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2400-2403 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -9, -8

S8SRO_ROBWEAPON_NUM: S8 SRO: Robbery with weapon - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [took something from another person by force, using a weapon] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1167	86.2 %
1	-	9	0.7 %
2	-	9	0.7 %
3	-	2	0.1 %
4	-	5	0.4 %
5	-	2	0.1 %
10	-	1	0.1 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	1	0.1 %
300	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,199 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2404-2407 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999, -998, -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101

S8SRO_ROBWEAPON_GROUP: S8 SRO: Robbery with weapon - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [took something from another person by force, using a weapon].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	13	1.0 %
1	Yes	19	1.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1170	86.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 32 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2408-2411 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_ROBWEAPON_GUN: S8 SRO: Robbery with weapon - Did you have a gun the last time

Whether the subject had a gun with them the last time they [took something from another person by force, using a weapon].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up

questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	13	1.0 %
1	Yes	19	1.4 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1170	86.4 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 32 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2412-2415 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_ROBNOWEAPON: S8 SRO: Robbery no weapon - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [took something from another person by force, without a weapon] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1163	85.9 %
1	Yes	38	2.8 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-8	Refusal	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2416-2419 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_ROBNOWEAPON_NUM: S8 SRO: Robbery no weapon - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [took something from another person by force, without a weapon] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1163	85.9 %
1	-	18	1.3 %
2	-	6	0.4 %
4	-	2	0.1 %
5	-	4	0.3 %
6	-	2	0.1 %
7	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	2	0.1 %
20	-	2	0.1 %
75	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2420-2423 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999, -998, -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101

S8SRO_ROBNOWEAPON_GROUP: S8 SRO: Robbery no weapon - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [took something from another person by force, without a weapon].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	22	1.6 %
1	Yes	16	1.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1164	86.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 38 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2424-2427 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101, -9, -8

S8SRO_BEATENUP: S8 SRO: Beaten up somebody badly needed doctor - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [beat up or physically attacked somebody so badly that they probably needed a doctor] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1123	82.9 %
1	Yes	78	5.8 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-8	Refusal	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2428-2431 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -9, -8

S8SRO_BEATENUP_NUM: S8 SRO: Beaten up somebody badly needed doctor - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [beat up or physically attacked somebody so badly that they probably needed a doctor] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up

questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1123	82.9 %
1	-	48	3.5 %
2	-	14	1.0 %
3	-	4	0.3 %
4	-	3	0.2 %
5	-	4	0.3 %
7	-	2	0.1 %
10	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	1	0.1 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2432-2435 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S8SRO_BEATENUP_GROUP: S8 SRO: Beaten up somebody badly needed doctor - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [beat up or physically attacked somebody so badly that they probably needed a doctor].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done

this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	39	2.9 %
1	Yes	38	2.8 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1124	83.0 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 77 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2436-2439 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_INFIGHT: S8 SRO: Been in fight - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [been in a fight] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	865	63.9 %
1	Yes	336	24.8 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-8	Refusal	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2440-2443 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_INFIGHT_NUM: S8 SRO: Been in fight - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [been in a fight] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	865	63.9 %
1	-	142	10.5 %
2	-	80	5.9 %
3	-	36	2.7 %
4	-	23	1.7 %
5	-	16	1.2 %
6	-	12	0.9 %
7	-	3	0.2 %
8	-	3	0.2 %
10	-	7	0.5 %
11	-	1	0.1 %
12	-	2	0.1 %
14	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	2	0.1 %
20	-	3	0.2 %
30	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
40	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
70	-	1	0.1 %
340	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2444-2447 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999, -998, -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101

S8SRO_INFIGHT_GROUP: S8 SRO: Been in fight - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [were in a fight].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	198	14.6 %
1	Yes	137	10.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	866	64.0 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 335 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2448-2451 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_FIGHTGANG: S8 SRO: Fight part of gang - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [beat up, threatened, or physically attacked someone as part of a gang] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1165	86.0 %
1	Yes	36	2.7 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-8	Refusal	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2452-2455 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_FIGHTGANG_NUM: S8 SRO: Fight part of gang - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [beat up, threatened, or physically attacked someone as part of a gang] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1165	86.0 %
1	-	13	1.0 %
2	-	10	0.7 %
3	-	4	0.3 %
4	-	3	0.2 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
6	-	1	0.1 %
12	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	2	0.1 %
340	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2456-2459 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999, -998, -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101

S8SRO_FIGHTGANG_GROUP: S8 SRO: Fight part of gang - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [beat up, threatened, or physically attacked someone as part of a gang].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	9	0.7 %
1	Yes	27	2.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1166	86.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 36 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2460-2463 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_FIGHTGANG_GUN: S8 SRO: Fight part of gang - Did you have a gun the last time

Whether the subject had a gun with them the last time they [beat up, threatened, or physically attacked someone as part of a gang].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	24	1.8 %
1	Yes	12	0.9 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1166	86.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 36 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2464-2467 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_CARRGUN: S8 SRO: Carried a gun - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [carried a gun] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1049	77.5 %
1	Yes	152	11.2 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-8	Refusal	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2468-2471 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_CARRGUN_NUM: S8 SRO: Carried a gun - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [carried a gun] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1049	77.5 %
1	-	8	0.6 %
2	-	10	0.7 %
3	-	3	0.2 %
4	-	4	0.3 %
5	-	5	0.4 %
6	-	2	0.1 %
7	-	2	0.1 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	5	0.4 %
12	-	1	0.1 %
13	-	1	0.1 %
14	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	2	0.1 %
20	-	3	0.2 %
21	-	2	0.1 %
25	-	2	0.1 %
30	-	8	0.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
34	-	1	0.1 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
36	-	1	0.1 %
38	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	2	0.1 %
50	-	5	0.4 %
52	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	13	1.0 %
70	-	3	0.2 %
75	-	1	0.1 %
90	-	4	0.3 %
100	-	6	0.4 %
120	-	2	0.1 %
130	-	1	0.1 %
150	-	7	0.5 %
175	-	1	0.1 %
180	-	3	0.2 %
196	-	1	0.1 %
200	-	2	0.1 %
210	-	1	0.1 %
220	-	1	0.1 %
240	-	1	0.1 %
270	-	2	0.1 %
290	-	1	0.1 %
300	-	7	0.5 %
330	-	1	0.1 %
335	-	1	0.1 %
350	-	2	0.1 %
360	-	5	0.4 %
365	-	10	0.7 %
395	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2472-2475 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S8SRO_ENTCARSTEAL: S8 SRO: Broke into car to steal something - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [entered or broke into a car to steal something from it] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1173	86.6 %
1	Yes	28	2.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-8	Refusal	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2476-2479 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_ENTCARSTEAL_NUM: S8 SRO: Broke into car to steal something - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [entered or broke into a car to steal something from it] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1173	86.6 %
1	-	9	0.7 %
2	-	3	0.2 %
3	-	2	0.1 %
4	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	2	0.1 %
10	-	2	0.1 %
15	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	3	0.2 %
30	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	1	0.1 %
200	-	1	0.1 %
300	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2480-2483 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999, -998, -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101

S8SRO_ENTCARSTEAL_GROUP: S8 SRO: Broke into car to steal something - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [entered or broke into a car to steal something from it].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	10	0.7 %
1	Yes	18	1.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1174	86.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 28 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2484-2487 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_JOYRIDING: S8 SRO: Gone joy-riding (stole car to ride around) - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [gone joy-riding (stole a car or motorcycle to ride around)] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1171	86.5 %
1	Yes	30	2.2 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-8	Refusal	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2488-2491 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S8SRO_JOYRIDING_NUM: S8 SRO: Gone joy riding - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [gone joy-riding (stole a car or motorcycle to ride around)] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1171	86.5 %
1	-	12	0.9 %
2	-	5	0.4 %
3	-	3	0.2 %
4	-	2	0.1 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
7	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
8	-	1	0.1 %
9	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	1	0.1 %
21	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
300	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2492-2495 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S8SRO_JOYRIDING_GROUP: S8 SRO: Gone joyriding - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [went joy-riding (stole a car or motorcycle to ride around)].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	7	0.5 %
1	Yes	23	1.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-106	Skipped: Interview conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-104	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in a federal facility	3	0.2 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1172	86.6 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 30 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2496-2499 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S8SROPRV: S8 SRO: Total Offending Variety Proportion - Recall Period - recall period

Total Offending Variety Proportion Recall Period; A proportion score in which the numerator is the number of acts which were committed in the recall period and the denominator is the number of SRO questions answered.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added to the Pathways research battery after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. Every subject at the follow-up interviews will have responses for 'ever broke into a car to steal' while only some will have values for 'ever went joyriding'. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, it was decided that all SRO scores would be based on 22-items instead of the full, 24-item measure administered. Thus, although 24 items are administered for the vast proportion of the interviews, the calculation of the SRO score uses only 22 of these items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	672	49.6 %
0.05	-	227	16.8 %
0.09	-	96	7.1 %
0.14	-	61	4.5 %
0.16	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.18	-	38	2.8 %
0.23	-	27	2.0 %
0.24	-	1	0.1 %
0.27	-	24	1.8 %
0.32	-	18	1.3 %
0.36	-	10	0.7 %
0.41	-	8	0.6 %
0.45	-	5	0.4 %
0.55	-	1	0.1 %
0.59	-	5	0.4 %
0.64	-	5	0.4 %
0.77	-	1	0.1 %
0.86	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into section	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2500-2506 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00

S8SRSEND: S8 SRO: Total Offending Variety Proportion - Recall Period - No Drug - recall period

Total Offending Variety Proportion No Drug-Recall Period; A proportion score calculated in the same way as the Total Offending Variety Proportion - Recall Period variable, except that the items included in the calculation exclude three drug-related offenses. The numerator is the number of acts endorsed and the denominator is the SRO items answered. Both numerator and denominator calculations are made using a set of items that excluded the three drug items.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal")

were added to the Pathways research battery after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. Every subject at the follow-up interviews will have responses for 'ever broke into a car to steal' while only some will have values for 'ever went joyriding'. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, it was decided that all SRO scores would be based on 22-items instead of the full, 24-item measure administered. Thus, although 24 items are administered for the vast proportion of the interviews, the calculation of the SRO score uses only 22 of these items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	743	54.9 %
0.05	-	235	17.4 %
0.06	-	1	0.1 %
0.11	-	82	6.1 %
0.12	-	1	0.1 %
0.16	-	52	3.8 %
0.21	-	28	2.1 %
0.22	-	1	0.1 %
0.26	-	17	1.3 %
0.32	-	17	1.3 %
0.37	-	8	0.6 %
0.42	-	2	0.1 %
0.47	-	2	0.1 %
0.53	-	5	0.4 %
0.58	-	4	0.3 %
0.63	-	1	0.1 %
0.74	-	1	0.1 %
0.84	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into section	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2507-2513 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00

S8SROFRQ: S8 SRO: Frequency of Offending - recall period - recall period

Frequency of Offending-Recall Period; Sum of the frequencies reported across 22 acts.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added to the Pathways research battery after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. Every subject at the follow-up interviews will have responses for 'ever broke into a car to steal' while only some will have values for 'ever went joyriding'. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, it was decided that all SRO scores would be based on 22-items instead of the full, 24-item measure administered. Thus, although 24 items are administered for the vast proportion of the interviews, the calculation of the SRO score uses only 22 of these items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	672	49.6 %
1	-	97	7.2 %
2	-	67	4.9 %
3	-	32	2.4 %
4	-	14	1.0 %
5	-	12	0.9 %
6	-	10	0.7 %
7	-	11	0.8 %
8	-	9	0.7 %
9	-	3	0.2 %
10	-	10	0.7 %
11	-	7	0.5 %
12	-	7	0.5 %
13	-	3	0.2 %
15	-	5	0.4 %
16	-	2	0.1 %
17	-	1	0.1 %
18	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	11	0.8 %
21	-	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
22	-	1	0.1 %
23	-	1	0.1 %
24	-	1	0.1 %
25	-	4	0.3 %
26	-	3	0.2 %
27	-	4	0.3 %
28	-	2	0.1 %
30	-	1	0.1 %
31	-	2	0.1 %
32	-	2	0.1 %
33	-	5	0.4 %
34	-	1	0.1 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
37	-	1	0.1 %
42	-	2	0.1 %
43	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	3	0.2 %
47	-	2	0.1 %
48	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	2	0.1 %
51	-	1	0.1 %
52	-	3	0.2 %
53	-	1	0.1 %
54	-	1	0.1 %
55	-	1	0.1 %
58	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	1	0.1 %
61	-	2	0.1 %
62	-	1	0.1 %
63	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Did not skip into section	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2514-2517 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

S8SROFRQND: S8 SRO: Frequency of Offending - recall - No Drug - recall period

Frequency of Offending-No Drug-Recall Period; Sum of the frequencies reported across 19 non-drug items.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added to the Pathways research battery after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. Every subject at the follow-up interviews will have responses for 'ever broke into a car to steal' while only some will have values for 'ever went joyriding'. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, it was decided that all SRO scores would be based on 22-items instead of the full, 24-item measure administered. Thus, although 24 items are administered for the vast proportion of the interviews, the calculation of the SRO score uses only 22 of these items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	743	54.9 %
1	-	108	8.0 %
2	-	68	5.0 %
3	-	34	2.5 %
4	-	21	1.6 %
5	-	14	1.0 %
6	-	12	0.9 %
7	-	10	0.7 %
8	-	9	0.7 %
9	-	3	0.2 %
10	-	11	0.8 %
11	-	5	0.4 %
12	-	6	0.4 %
13	-	2	0.1 %
14	-	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
15	-	6	0.4 %
17	-	2	0.1 %
18	-	1	0.1 %
19	-	3	0.2 %
20	-	2	0.1 %
21	-	6	0.4 %
22	-	4	0.3 %
23	-	2	0.1 %
24	-	2	0.1 %
25	-	3	0.2 %
27	-	1	0.1 %
29	-	2	0.1 %
30	-	4	0.3 %
32	-	1	0.1 %
33	-	1	0.1 %
34	-	1	0.1 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
37	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	2	0.1 %
43	-	2	0.1 %
44	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	1	0.1 %
46	-	1	0.1 %
47	-	1	0.1 %
48	-	1	0.1 %
49	-	1	0.1 %
51	-	1	0.1 %
52	-	1	0.1 %
53	-	1	0.1 %
55	-	1	0.1 %
56	-	1	0.1 %
58	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	2	0.1 %
61	-	2	0.1 %
62	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Did not skip into section	5	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2518-2521 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

S8SROAGG: S8 SRO: Aggressive Offending Variety Proportion - Recall Period - recall period

Aggressive Offending Variety Proportion Recall Period; A proportion in which the numerator is the number of aggressive acts which were committed in the recall period and the denominator is the number of aggressive offense items which are not missing.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added to the Pathways research battery after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. Every subject at the follow-up interviews will have responses for 'ever broke into a car to steal' while only some will have values for 'ever went joyriding'. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, it was decided that all SRO scores would be based on 22-items instead of the full, 24-item measure administered. Thus, although 24 items are administered for the vast proportion of the interviews, the calculation of the SRO score uses only 22 of these items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	816	60.3 %
0.09	-	243	17.9 %
0.10	-	1	0.1 %
0.11	-	1	0.1 %
0.18	-	80	5.9 %
0.27	-	28	2.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.36	-	11	0.8 %
0.45	-	9	0.7 %
0.55	-	6	0.4 %
0.64	-	4	0.3 %
0.73	-	1	0.1 %
0.82	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	Partial Interview -data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into section	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2522-2528 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00

S8AGGFRQ: S8 SRO: Aggressive Offending Frequency - recall period - recall period

Aggressive Offending Frequency-Recall Period; Sum of the frequencies reported across the 11 aggressive offenses.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added to the Pathways research battery after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. Every subject at the follow-up interviews will have responses for 'ever broke into a car to steal' while only some will have values for 'ever went joyriding'. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, it was decided that all SRO scores would be based on 22-items instead of the full, 24-item measure administered. Thus, although 24 items are administered for the vast proportion of the interviews, the calculation of the SRO score uses only 22 of these items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	816	60.3 %
1	-	126	9.3 %
2	-	80	5.9 %
3	-	39	2.9 %
4	-	30	2.2 %
5	-	20	1.5 %
6	-	10	0.7 %
7	-	9	0.7 %
8	-	9	0.7 %
9	-	4	0.3 %
10	-	9	0.7 %
11	-	4	0.3 %
12	-	6	0.4 %
13	-	2	0.1 %
14	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	2	0.1 %
16	-	1	0.1 %
17	-	1	0.1 %
18	-	3	0.2 %
19	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	1	0.1 %
21	-	4	0.3 %
22	-	2	0.1 %
26	-	1	0.1 %
27	-	2	0.1 %
28	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	3	0.2 %
32	-	1	0.1 %
33	-	1	0.1 %
34	-	1	0.1 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
41	-	1	0.1 %
44	-	1	0.1 %
73	-	1	0.1 %
78	-	1	0.1 %
102	-	1	0.1 %
137	-	1	0.1 %
173	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
313	-	1	0.1 %
1190	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Did not skip into section	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2529-2532 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

S8SROINC: S8 SRO: Income Offending Variety Proportion - Recall Period - recall period

Income Offending Variety Proportion Recall Period; A proportion in which the numerator is the number of income offenses which were committed in the recall period and the denominator is the items which are considered income generating offenses that are not missing.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added to the Pathways research battery after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. Every subject at the follow-up interviews will have responses for 'ever broke into a car to steal' while only some will have values for 'ever went joyriding'. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, it was decided that all SRO scores would be based on 22-items instead of the full, 24-item measure administered. Thus, although 24 items are administered for the vast proportion of the interviews, the calculation of the SRO score uses only 22 of these items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	925	68.3 %
0.10	-	121	8.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.11	-	1	0.1 %
0.13	-	1	0.1 %
0.20	-	76	5.6 %
0.30	-	29	2.1 %
0.40	-	25	1.8 %
0.50	-	7	0.5 %
0.60	-	7	0.5 %
0.70	-	3	0.2 %
0.80	-	2	0.1 %
0.90	-	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into section	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2533-2539 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00

S8SROIND: S8 SRO: Income Offending Variety Proportion - Recall Period - No Drug - recall period

Income Offending Variety Proportion No Drug-Recall Period; A proportion in which the numerator is the number of income offenses, exclusive of the 3 drug items, which were committed in the recall period and the denominator is the items which are non-drug related income generating offenses that are not missing.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added to the Pathways research battery after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. Every subject at the follow-up interviews will have responses for 'ever broke into a car to steal' while only some will have values for 'ever went joyriding'. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, it was

decided that all SRO scores would be based on 22-items instead of the full, 24-item measure administered. Thus, although 24 items are administered for the vast proportion of the interviews, the calculation of the SRO score uses only 22 of these items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	1017	75.1 %
0.13	-	103	7.6 %
0.14	-	1	0.1 %
0.25	-	43	3.2 %
0.38	-	19	1.4 %
0.50	-	8	0.6 %
0.63	-	3	0.2 %
0.75	-	3	0.2 %
0.88	-	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into section	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2540-2546 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00

S8INCFRQ: S8 SRO: Income Offending Frequency - recall period - recall period

Income Offending Frequency-Recall Period; Sum of the frequencies reported across the 10 income offenses.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added to the Pathways research battery after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. Every subject at the follow-up interviews will have responses for 'ever broke into a car to steal' while only some will have values for 'ever went joyriding'. The introduction of these items

produced a large amount of missing data making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, it was decided that all SRO scores would be based on 22-items instead of the full, 24-item measure administered. Thus, although 24 items are administered for the vast proportion of the interviews, the calculation of the SRO score uses only 22 of these items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	925	68.3 %
1	-	35	2.6 %
2	-	16	1.2 %
3	-	8	0.6 %
4	-	9	0.7 %
5	-	6	0.4 %
6	-	2	0.1 %
7	-	7	0.5 %
8	-	2	0.1 %
9	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	8	0.6 %
11	-	1	0.1 %
12	-	5	0.4 %
13	-	1	0.1 %
14	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	8	0.6 %
18	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	4	0.3 %
21	-	1	0.1 %
23	-	1	0.1 %
24	-	3	0.2 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
26	-	1	0.1 %
27	-	1	0.1 %
28	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	5	0.4 %
31	-	1	0.1 %
33	-	2	0.1 %
34	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	2	0.1 %
44	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	3	0.2 %
48	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
50	-	1	0.1 %
52	-	3	0.2 %
56	-	2	0.1 %
60	-	4	0.3 %
63	-	1	0.1 %
70	-	2	0.1 %
72	-	1	0.1 %
77	-	2	0.1 %
80	-	1	0.1 %
90	-	6	0.4 %
92	-	2	0.1 %
94	-	1	0.1 %
95	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	6	0.4 %
101	-	1	0.1 %
105	-	1	0.1 %
106	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Did not skip into section	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2547-2550 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

S8ICFQND: S8 SRO: Income Offending Frequency - recall - No Drug - recall period

Income Offending Frequency-No Drug-Recall Period; Sum of the frequencies reported across the 8 non-drug income offenses.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency,

and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added to the Pathways research battery after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. Every subject at the follow-up interviews will have responses for 'ever broke into a car to steal' while only some will have values for 'ever went joyriding'. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, it was decided that all SRO scores would be based on 22-items instead of the full, 24-item measure administered. Thus, although 24 items are administered for the vast proportion of the interviews, the calculation of the SRO score uses only 22 of these items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1017	75.1 %
1	-	37	2.7 %
2	-	31	2.3 %
3	-	13	1.0 %
4	-	13	1.0 %
5	-	7	0.5 %
6	-	3	0.2 %
7	-	8	0.6 %
8	-	5	0.4 %
9	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	11	0.8 %
11	-	1	0.1 %
12	-	5	0.4 %
13	-	1	0.1 %
14	-	3	0.2 %
15	-	3	0.2 %
17	-	2	0.1 %
20	-	5	0.4 %
21	-	2	0.1 %
24	-	1	0.1 %
26	-	1	0.1 %
28	-	1	0.1 %
31	-	2	0.1 %
32	-	1	0.1 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	2	0.1 %
48	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
52	-	1	0.1 %
56	-	2	0.1 %
58	-	1	0.1 %
65	-	1	0.1 %
67	-	2	0.1 %
75	-	1	0.1 %
96	-	1	0.1 %
99	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	2	0.1 %
101	-	2	0.1 %
120	-	1	0.1 %
150	-	1	0.1 %
210	-	1	0.1 %
300	-	1	0.1 %
301	-	1	0.1 %
385	-	1	0.1 %
503	-	1	0.1 %
630	-	1	0.1 %
1197	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100	Did not skip into section	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,201 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2551-2554 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

S8SCCLINT: S8 SocCap: Closure and Integration

Social Capital - Closure + Integration; mean of 8 items.

MEASURE: Social Capital

The Social Capital Inventory measures the connectedness an adolescent feels to his/her community (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). This concept is explored along three dimensions: intergenerational closure (e.g., "How many of the parents of your friends know your parents?"), social integration (e.g., "How many of your teachers do your parents know by

name?"), and perceived opportunity for work (e.g. "Employers around here often hire young people from this neighborhood?"). The measure contains 19 items; however, only 13 are considered in scoring. Higher scores indicate greater degree of community connectedness.

- (1) None
- (2) A few
- (3) Many
- (4) Most

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information(www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	None	23	1.7 %
1.13	-	2	0.1 %
1.14	-	11	0.8 %
1.17	-	1	0.1 %
1.25	-	7	0.5 %
1.29	-	12	0.9 %
1.33	-	4	0.3 %
1.38	-	3	0.2 %
1.40	-	3	0.2 %
1.43	-	21	1.6 %
1.50	-	12	0.9 %
1.57	-	33	2.4 %
1.60	-	6	0.4 %
1.63	-	1	0.1 %
1.67	-	6	0.4 %
1.71	-	44	3.2 %
1.75	-	9	0.7 %
1.80	-	2	0.1 %
1.83	-	8	0.6 %
1.86	-	51	3.8 %
1.88	-	11	0.8 %
2.00	A Few	96	7.1 %
2.13	-	8	0.6 %
2.14	-	60	4.4 %
2.17	-	8	0.6 %
2.20	-	4	0.3 %
2.25	-	21	1.6 %
2.29	-	53	3.9 %
2.33	-	8	0.6 %
2.38	-	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.43	-	50	3.7 %
2.50	-	27	2.0 %
2.57	-	48	3.5 %
2.60	-	6	0.4 %
2.63	-	12	0.9 %
2.67	-	11	0.8 %
2.71	-	53	3.9 %
2.75	-	12	0.9 %
2.80	-	5	0.4 %
2.83	-	12	0.9 %
2.86	-	54	4.0 %
2.88	-	4	0.3 %
3.00	Many	53	3.9 %
3.13	-	5	0.4 %
3.14	-	38	2.8 %
3.17	-	9	0.7 %
3.20	-	6	0.4 %
3.25	-	5	0.4 %
3.29	-	20	1.5 %
3.33	-	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.00	Did not skip into SocCap measure	191	14.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,016 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2555-2561 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800.00 , -666.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -99.00 , -98.00 , -97.00

S8SOCAP2: S8 SocCap: Social Integration

Social Capital - Social integration; mean of 5 items.

MEASURE: Social Capital

The Social Capital Inventory measures the connectedness an adolescent feels to his/her community (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). This concept is explored along three dimensions: intergenerational closure (e.g., "How many of the parents of your friends know your parents?"), social integration (e.g., "How many of your teachers do your parents know by

name?"), and perceived opportunity for work (e.g. "Employers around here often hire young people from this neighborhood?"). The measure contains 19 items; however, only 13 are considered in scoring. Higher scores indicate greater degree of community connectedness.

- (1) None/Never
- (2) A few/Rarely
- (3) Many/Sometimes
- (4) Most/Often

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information(www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	None	55	4.1 %
1.20	-	3	0.2 %
1.25	-	43	3.2 %
1.33	-	15	1.1 %
1.40	-	4	0.3 %
1.50	-	94	6.9 %
1.60	-	11	0.8 %
1.67	-	18	1.3 %
1.75	-	116	8.6 %
1.80	-	17	1.3 %
2.00	A Few	205	15.1 %
2.20	-	16	1.2 %
2.25	-	120	8.9 %
2.33	-	21	1.6 %
2.40	-	10	0.7 %
2.50	-	96	7.1 %
2.60	-	10	0.7 %
2.67	-	18	1.3 %
2.75	-	45	3.3 %
2.80	-	5	0.4 %
3.00	Many	47	3.5 %
3.25	-	11	0.8 %
3.33	-	4	0.3 %
3.40	-	1	0.1 %
3.50	-	5	0.4 %
3.75	-	5	0.4 %
4.00	Most	15	1.1 %
Missing Data			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	5	0.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-100.00	Did not skip into SocCap measure	191	14.1 %
-97.00	NA	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,010 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2562-2568 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800.00 , -666.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -99.00 , -98.00 , -97.00

S8SOCAP3: S8 SocCap: Perceived Opportunity for Work

Social Capital - Perceived opportunity for work; mean of 5 items.

MEASURE: Social Capital

The Social Capital Inventory measures the connectedness an adolescent feels to his/her community (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). This concept is explored along three dimensions: intergenerational closure (e.g., "How many of the parents of your friends know your parents?"), social integration (e.g., "How many of your teachers do your parents know by name?"), and perceived opportunity for work (e.g. "Employers around here often hire young people from this neighborhood?"). The measure contains 19 items; however, only 13 are considered in scoring. Higher scores indicate greater degree of community connectedness.

- (1) Strongly Agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
- (4) Disagree
- (5) Strongly Disagree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information(www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.0	Strongly Disagree	6	0.4 %
1.2	-	2	0.1 %
1.6	-	1	0.1 %
1.8	-	4	0.3 %
2.0	Disagree	20	1.5 %
2.2	-	9	0.7 %
2.4	-	21	1.6 %
2.6	-	15	1.1 %
2.8	-	20	1.5 %
3.0	Neither Agree nor Disagree	88	6.5 %
3.2	-	66	4.9 %
3.4	-	72	5.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.5	-	1	0.1 %
3.6	-	120	8.9 %
3.8	-	112	8.3 %
4.0	Agree	332	24.5 %
4.2	-	38	2.8 %
4.4	-	17	1.3 %
4.6	-	23	1.7 %
4.8	-	11	0.8 %
5.0	Strongly Agree	37	2.7 %
Missing Data			
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-100.0	Did not skip into SocCap measure	191	14.1 %
-9.0	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,015 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2569-2575 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800.0 , -666.0 , -300.0 , -202.0 , -201.0 , -100.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

S8SUBUSE1: S8 SubUse: How often had alcohol to drink in recall period

How often have you had alcohol to drink in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	506	37.4 %
2	1-5 times	160	11.8 %
3	6-11 times	63	4.7 %
4	1X per month	71	5.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	2-3X per month	129	9.5 %
6	1X per week	87	6.4 %
7	2-3X per week	133	9.8 %
8	4-5X per week	28	2.1 %
9	Every day	23	1.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-110	Skipped: Interview was conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-109	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in federal facility	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2576-2579 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S8SUBUSE2: S8 SubUse: Num alcoholic drinks usually consumed

When you drink, about how many drinks do you usually have (as defined as a 12 oz. Can of beer, glass of wine, shot of hard liquor either alone or in a mixed drink)?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	506	37.4 %
1	-	49	3.6 %
2	-	134	9.9 %
3	-	99	7.3 %
4	-	94	6.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	73	5.4 %
6	-	66	4.9 %
7	-	18	1.3 %
8	-	29	2.1 %
9	-	3	0.2 %
10	-	37	2.7 %
11	-	1	0.1 %
12	-	35	2.6 %
13	-	2	0.1 %
15	-	19	1.4 %
16	-	2	0.1 %
18	-	6	0.4 %
19	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	14	1.0 %
24	-	3	0.2 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	6	0.4 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-110	Skipped: Interview was conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-109	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in federal facility	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2580-2583 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -101 , -99 , -98

S8SUBUSE3: S8 SubUse: How often had 5+ drinks at one time in recall period

How often did you have five or more drinks at one time in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with

family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	727	53.7 %
2	1-5 times	147	10.9 %
3	6-11 times	50	3.7 %
4	1X per month	51	3.8 %
5	2-3X per month	66	4.9 %
6	1X per week	57	4.2 %
7	2-3X per week	82	6.1 %
8	4-5X per week	10	0.7 %
9	Every day	10	0.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-110	Skipped: Interview was conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-109	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in federal facility	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2584-2587 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S8SUBUSE4: S8 SubUse: Num times been drunk on alcohol during recall period

How many times have you been drunk in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	691	51.0 %
2	1-5 times	226	16.7 %
3	6-11 times	60	4.4 %
4	1X per month	47	3.5 %
5	2-3X per month	53	3.9 %
6	1X per week	55	4.1 %
7	2-3X per week	57	4.2 %
8	4-5X per week	5	0.4 %
9	Every day	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-110	Skipped: Interview was conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-109	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in federal facility	3	0.2 %
-99	Dont know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,199 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2588-2591 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S8SUBUSE6: S8 SubUse: Num times used marijuana/hashish during recall period

How many times did you use marijuana or hashish in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	757	55.9 %
2	1-5 times	96	7.1 %
3	6-11 times	32	2.4 %
4	1X per month	20	1.5 %
5	2-3X per month	31	2.3 %
6	1X per week	24	1.8 %
7	2-3X per week	51	3.8 %
8	4-5X per week	44	3.2 %
9	Every day	145	10.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-110	Skipped: Interview was conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-109	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in federal facility	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2592-2595 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S8SUBUSE8: S8 SubUse: Num times used sedative/tranquilizers during recall period

How many times have you used sedatives or tranquilizers in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1140	84.2 %
2	1-5 times	18	1.3 %
3	6-11 times	8	0.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	1X per month	8	0.6 %
5	2-3X per month	6	0.4 %
6	1X per week	4	0.3 %
7	2-3X per week	11	0.8 %
8	4-5X per week	1	0.1 %
9	Every day	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-110	Skipped: Interview was conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-109	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in federal facility	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2596-2599 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S8SUBUSE10: S8 SubUse: Num times used stimulants/amphetamines during recall period

How many times have you used stimulants or amphetamines in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1132	83.6 %
2	1-5 times	15	1.1 %
3	6-11 times	8	0.6 %
4	1X per month	8	0.6 %
5	2-3X per month	9	0.7 %
6	1X per week	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
7	2-3X per week	4	0.3 %
8	4-5X per week	9	0.7 %
9	Every day	11	0.8 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-110	Skipped: Interview was conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-109	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in federal facility	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2600-2603 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S8SUBUSE12: S8 SubUse: Num times used cocaine during recall period

How many times have you used cocaine (including powder, crack, free base, cocoa leaves, or paste) in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1142	84.3 %
2	1-5 times	26	1.9 %
3	6-11 times	5	0.4 %
4	1X per month	8	0.6 %
5	2-3X per month	8	0.6 %
6	1X per week	6	0.4 %
7	2-3X per week	2	0.1 %
8	4-5X per week	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
9	Every day	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-110	Skipped: Interview was conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-109	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in federal facility	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2604-2607 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S8SUBUSE14: S8 SubUse: Num times used opiates during recall period

How many times have you used opiates in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1159	85.6 %
2	1-5 times	17	1.3 %
3	6-11 times	3	0.2 %
4	1X per month	5	0.4 %
5	2-3X per month	4	0.3 %
6	1X per week	5	0.4 %
7	2-3X per week	4	0.3 %
8	4-5X per week	0	0.0 %
9	Every day	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-110	Skipped: Interview was conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-109	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in federal facility	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2608-2611 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S8SUBUSE16: S8 SubUse: Num times used ecstasy during recall period

How many times have you used ecstasy in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1158	85.5 %
2	1-5 times	27	2.0 %
3	6-11 times	4	0.3 %
4	1X per month	2	0.1 %
5	2-3X per month	6	0.4 %
6	1X per week	1	0.1 %
7	2-3X per week	0	0.0 %
8	4-5X per week	0	0.0 %
9	Every day	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-110	Skipped: Interview was conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-109	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in federal facility	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2612-2615 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S8SUBUSE18: S8 SubUse: Num times used hallucinogens during recall period

How many times have you used hallucinogens to get high in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1166	86.1 %
2	1-5 times	18	1.3 %
3	6-11 times	3	0.2 %
4	1X per month	3	0.2 %
5	2-3X per month	5	0.4 %
6	1X per week	2	0.1 %
7	2-3X per week	1	0.1 %
8	4-5X per week	1	0.1 %
9	Every day	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-110	Skipped: Interview was conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-109	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in federal facility	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2616-2619 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S8SUBUSE20: S8 SubUse: Num times used inhalants during recall period

How many times have you used inhalants to get high in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1189	87.8 %
2	1-5 times	8	0.6 %
3	6-11 times	0	0.0 %
4	1X per month	0	0.0 %
5	2-3X per month	2	0.1 %
6	1X per week	0	0.0 %
7	2-3X per week	0	0.0 %
8	4-5X per week	0	0.0 %
9	Every day	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-110	Skipped: Interview was conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-109	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in federal facility	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2620-2623 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S8SUBUSE22: S8 SubUse: Num times used amyl nitrate/odorizers/rush during recall period

How many times have you used amyl nitrate, odorizers, or rush to get high in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1195	88.3 %
2	1-5 times	1	0.1 %
3	6-11 times	0	0.0 %
4	1X per month	0	0.0 %
5	2-3X per month	3	0.2 %
6	1X per week	0	0.0 %
7	2-3X per week	0	0.0 %
8	4-5X per week	0	0.0 %
9	Every day	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-110	Skipped: Interview was conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-109	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in federal facility	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2624-2627 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S8SUBUSE24: S8 SubUse: Used other drugs during recall period [Y/N]

Have you used any other drugs in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1199	88.6 %
1	Yes	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-110	Skipped: Interview was conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-109	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in federal facility	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2628-2631 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -108 , -107 , -106 , -104 , -103 , -9 , -8

S8SUBUSE26: S8 SubUse: Num times used other drugs during recall period

How many times did you use these other drugs in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1199	88.6 %
2	1-5 times	1	0.1 %
3	6-11 times	0	0.0 %
4	1X per month	0	0.0 %
5	2-3X per month	0	0.0 %
6	1X per week	0	0.0 %
7	2-3X per week	0	0.0 %
8	4-5X per week	0	0.0 %
9	Every day	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-110	Skipped: Interview was conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-109	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in federal facility	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2632-2635 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S8SUBUSE28: S8 SubUse: Num times abused prescribed medications (own or someone else's) during recall period

How many times have you abused prescribed medications (own or someone else's) in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	1-5 times	0	0.0 %
3	6-11 times	0	0.0 %
4	1X per month	0	0.0 %
5	2-3X per month	0	0.0 %
6	1X per week	0	0.0 %
7	2-3X per week	0	0.0 %
8	4-5X per week	0	0.0 %
9	Every day	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-800	Question not asked for this subject	1200	88.6 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-110	Skipped: Interview was conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-109	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in federal facility	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 0 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2636-2639 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S8SUBUSE30: S8 SubUse: Num times smoked cigarettes during recall period

How often have you smoked cigarettes in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	524	38.7 %
2	1-5 times	20	1.5 %
3	6-11 times	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	1X per month	5	0.4 %
5	2-3X per month	12	0.9 %
6	1X per week	11	0.8 %
7	2-3X per week	44	3.2 %
8	4-5X per week	23	1.7 %
9	Every day	556	41.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-110	Skipped: Interview was conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-109	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in federal facility	3	0.2 %
-99	Dont know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,199 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2640-2643 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S8SUBUSE31: S8 SubUse: Num cigarettes smoke per day during recall period

How many cigarettes did you smoke in a typical day in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	0 cigarettes	542	40.0 %
2	1-4 cigarettes	193	14.3 %
3	5-9 cigarettes	167	12.3 %
4	10-15 cigarettes	158	11.7 %
5	16-20 cigarettes	116	8.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
6	More than a pack a day cigarettes	22	1.6 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
-110	Skipped: Interview was conducted in federal facility	1	0.1 %
-109	Skipped: Interviewer incorrectly indicated subject was in federal facility	3	0.2 %
-9	Dont know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,198 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2644-2647 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -105 , -9 , -8

S8QFBRMO: S8 SubUse: Quant/freq used beer/wine/liquor - recall period

Quantity/Frequency of alcohol use - recall period; Frequency times quantity.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	506	37.4 %
1	-	27	2.0 %
2	-	56	4.1 %
3	-	20	1.5 %
4	-	38	2.8 %
5	-	15	1.1 %
6	-	40	3.0 %
7	-	1	0.1 %
8	-	37	2.7 %
9	-	13	1.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
10	-	18	1.3 %
12	-	56	4.1 %
14	-	5	0.4 %
15	-	31	2.3 %
16	-	29	2.1 %
18	-	25	1.8 %
20	-	32	2.4 %
21	-	4	0.3 %
24	-	28	2.1 %
25	-	10	0.7 %
28	-	10	0.7 %
30	-	27	2.0 %
32	-	12	0.9 %
35	-	8	0.6 %
36	-	17	1.3 %
39	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	20	1.5 %
42	-	7	0.5 %
45	-	1	0.1 %
48	-	19	1.4 %
49	-	2	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
52	-	1	0.1 %
54	-	4	0.3 %
55	-	1	0.1 %
56	-	3	0.2 %
60	-	25	1.8 %
70	-	2	0.1 %
72	-	12	0.9 %
75	-	3	0.2 %
80	-	2	0.1 %
90	-	9	0.7 %
95	-	1	0.1 %
96	-	4	0.3 %
100	-	2	0.1 %
105	-	2	0.1 %
108	-	2	0.1 %
120	-	6	0.4 %
125	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
150	-	1	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-300	Too few answers for computation	4	0.3 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2648-2651 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S86MOUSE: S8 SubUse: Number drugs used - recall period

Number of drugs used in the recall period; Count of endorsed items.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	729	53.8 %
1	-	323	23.9 %
2	-	81	6.0 %
3	-	32	2.4 %
4	-	17	1.3 %
5	-	8	0.6 %
6	-	3	0.2 %
7	-	3	0.2 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
9	-	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
-300	Too few answers for computation	4	0.3 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2652-2655 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S8QFSMK6: S8 SubUse: Quant/freq used cigarettes - recall period

Quantity/Frequency of cigarette use in the recall period.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.0	-	542	40.0 %
2.5	-	13	1.0 %
5.0	-	1	0.1 %
7.5	-	2	0.1 %
10.0	-	6	0.4 %
12.5	-	8	0.6 %
15.0	-	28	2.1 %
17.5	-	13	1.0 %
20.0	-	123	9.1 %
25.0	-	1	0.1 %
28.0	-	3	0.2 %
37.5	-	1	0.1 %
42.0	-	9	0.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
49.0	-	4	0.3 %
50.0	-	1	0.1 %
54.0	-	1	0.1 %
56.0	-	151	11.2 %
75.0	-	4	0.3 %
87.5	-	2	0.1 %
90.0	-	1	0.1 %
100.0	-	148	10.9 %
126.0	-	3	0.2 %
140.0	-	1	0.1 %
144.0	-	111	8.2 %
160.0	-	21	1.6 %
Missing Data			
-300.0	Too few answers for computation	6	0.4 %
-202.0	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,198 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2656-2662 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.0 , -202.0 , -201.0 , -100.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

S8A6SC2: S8 SubUse: Recall period alcohol consequences

Recall period Alcohol Consequences; Count of social consequences in the recall period attributed to alcohol.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	950	70.2 %
1	-	94	6.9 %
2	-	45	3.3 %
3	-	28	2.1 %
4	-	29	2.1 %
5	-	18	1.3 %
6	-	16	1.2 %
7	-	13	1.0 %
8	-	3	0.2 %
9	-	4	0.3 %
10	-	2	0.1 %
11	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2663-2666 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201

S8D6SC2: S8 SubUse: Recall period drug consequences

Recall period Drug Consequences; Count of social consequences in the recall period and attributed to drugs.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	992	73.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	66	4.9 %
2	-	41	3.0 %
3	-	29	2.1 %
4	-	11	0.8 %
5	-	14	1.0 %
6	-	13	1.0 %
7	-	10	0.7 %
8	-	8	0.6 %
9	-	8	0.6 %
10	-	6	0.4 %
12	-	3	0.2 %
14	-	2	0.1 %
16	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2667-2670 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201

S8A6DP2: S8 SubUse: Recall period alcohol dependence symptoms

Recall period Alcohol Dependence Symptoms; Count of symptoms in the recall period attributed to alcohol use.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1084	80.1 %
1	-	48	3.5 %
2	-	23	1.7 %
3	-	21	1.6 %
4	-	9	0.7 %
5	-	10	0.7 %
6	-	2	0.1 %
7	-	5	0.4 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
9	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2671-2674 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201

S8D6DP2: S8 SubUse: Recall period drug dependence symptoms

Recall period Drug Dependence Symptoms; Count of symptoms in the recall period attributed to drug use.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1046	77.3 %
1	-	42	3.1 %
2	-	31	2.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	-	23	1.7 %
4	-	15	1.1 %
5	-	8	0.6 %
6	-	7	0.5 %
7	-	12	0.9 %
8	-	10	0.7 %
9	-	7	0.5 %
10	-	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2675-2678 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201

S8TOTSC6: S8 SubUse: Recall period total substance use consequences

Recall period Total Substance Use Consequences; Count of consequences in the recall period attributed to either drugs or alcohol.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	861	63.6 %
1	-	103	7.6 %
2	-	63	4.7 %
3	-	42	3.1 %
4	-	29	2.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	32	2.4 %
6	-	15	1.1 %
7	-	21	1.6 %
8	-	8	0.6 %
9	-	12	0.9 %
10	-	8	0.6 %
11	-	3	0.2 %
12	-	4	0.3 %
14	-	2	0.1 %
16	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2679-2682 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201

S8TOTDS6: S8 SubUse: Recall period total substance use dependency symp

Recall period Total Substance Use Dependency Symptoms; Count of dependency symptoms attributed to drugs or alcohol that have occurred in the recall period.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	996	73.6 %
1	-	59	4.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	-	38	2.8 %
3	-	35	2.6 %
4	-	17	1.3 %
5	-	16	1.2 %
6	-	9	0.7 %
7	-	13	1.0 %
8	-	10	0.7 %
9	-	8	0.6 %
10	-	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2683-2686 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201

S8ALTRTM: S8 SubUse: Recall period alcohol treatment

Recall period Alcohol Treatment.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1156	85.4 %
1	Yes	48	3.5 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2687-2690 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201

S8DGTRTM: S8 SubUse: Recall period drug treatment

Recall period Drug Treatment.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1156	85.4 %
1	Yes	48	3.5 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2691-2694 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201

S8TRTM: S8 SubUse: Recall period alcohol or drug treatment

Recall period Alcohol or Drug Treatment.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of

children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1131	83.5 %
1	Yes	73	5.4 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2695-2698 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201

S8TCO1: S8 TCO: Past 7 days mind dominated by forces beyond control

During the past seven days (including today) . . . how often have you felt that your mind was dominated by forces beyond your control?

MEASURE: Threat Control Override (TCO)

The Threat/Control Override Psychotic Symptoms Scale (TCO; Link, Stueve, and Phelan, 1998) is used to measure the presence of three specific psychotic-like symptoms that have been found to have an association with violence in prior research of the link between mental illness and violence. Items from the measure assess the belief that others are seeking to do the adolescent harm, or that outside forces are in control of the adolescent's mind. The adolescent responds to these three items on a 5-point likert scale ranging from "Never" to "Very Often," with higher scores indicating greater delusional symptoms.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	1163	85.9 %
2	Almost never	16	1.2 %
3	Sometimes	12	0.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	Often	5	0.4 %
5	Very often	7	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2699-2702 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8TCO2: S8 TCO: Past 7 days how often thoughts in head not own

During the past seven days (including today) . . . how often have you felt that thoughts were put into your head that were not your own?

MEASURE: Threat Control Override (TCO)

The Threat/Control Override Psychotic Symptoms Scale (TCO; Link, Stueve, and Phelan, 1998) is used to measure the presence of three specific psychotic-like symptoms that have been found to have an association with violence in prior research of the link between mental illness and violence. Items from the measure assess the belief that others are seeking to do the adolescent harm, or that outside forces are in control of the adolescent's mind. The adolescent responds to these three items on a 5-point likert scale ranging from "Never" to "Very Often," with higher scores indicating greater delusional symptoms.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	1153	85.2 %
2	Almost never	23	1.7 %
3	Sometimes	19	1.4 %
4	Often	1	0.1 %
5	Very often	7	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2703-2706 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8TCO3: S8 TCO: Past 7 days how often people wished you to do harm

During the past seven days (including today) . . . how often have you felt that there were people who wished to do you harm?

MEASURE: Threat Control Override (TCO)

The Threat/Control Override Psychotic Symptoms Scale (TCO; Link, Stueve, and Phelan, 1998) is used to measure the presence of three specific psychotic-like symptoms that have been found to have an association with violence in prior research of the link between mental illness and violence. Items from the measure assess the belief that others are seeking to do the adolescent harm, or that outside forces are in control of the adolescent's mind. The adolescent responds to these three items on a 5-point likert scale ranging from "Never" to "Very Often," with higher scores indicating greater delusional symptoms.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	1038	76.7 %
2	Almost never	56	4.1 %
3	Sometimes	68	5.0 %
4	Often	25	1.8 %
5	Very often	16	1.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2707-2710 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8TCOCNT: S8 TCO: Count based on 3 variables

Count of the number of items endorsed at a level higher than "never"..

MEASURE: Threat Control Override (TCO)

The Threat/Control Override Psychotic Symptoms Scale (TCO; Link, Stueve, and Phelan, 1998) is used to measure the presence of three specific psychotic-like symptoms that have been found to have an association with violence in prior research of the link between mental illness and violence. Items from the measure assess the belief that others are seeking to do the adolescent harm, or that outside forces are in control of the adolescent's mind. The adolescent responds to these three items

on a 5-point likert scale ranging from "Never" to "Very Often," with higher scores indicating greater delusional symptoms.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1023	75.6 %
1	-	128	9.5 %
2	-	29	2.1 %
3	-	23	1.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2711-2714 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8IMPULS: S8 WAI: Impulse Control

Impulse control; the mean of 8 items which comprise the scale. Seven of the eight items are reverse coded.

MEASURE: Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI)

The Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI; Weinberger and Schwartz, 1990) is an assessment of an individual's social-emotional adjustment within the context of external constraints. There are 4 subscales: Impulse control (e.g., "I say the first thing that comes into my mind without thinking enough about it".), suppression of aggression (e.g. "People who get me angry better watch out".), consideration of others (e.g., "Doing things to help other people is more important to me than almost anything else".) and temperance. The measure asks participants to rank how much (1=False to 5=True) their behavior in the past six months matches a series of statements. Higher scores on each of the subscales delineated below indicate more positive behavior (i.e. more impulse control, greater temperance and greater consideration for others).

- (1) False
- (2) Somewhat False
- (3) Not Sure
- (4) Somewhat True
- (5) True

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	False	5	0.4 %
1.13	-	10	0.7 %
1.25	-	10	0.7 %
1.38	-	6	0.4 %
1.50	-	30	2.2 %
1.63	-	16	1.2 %
1.75	-	16	1.2 %
1.88	-	15	1.1 %
2.00	Somewhat False	27	2.0 %
2.13	-	30	2.2 %
2.25	-	56	4.1 %
2.38	-	39	2.9 %
2.50	-	53	3.9 %
2.63	-	45	3.3 %
2.75	-	45	3.3 %
2.88	-	41	3.0 %
3.00	Not sure	68	5.0 %
3.13	-	41	3.0 %
3.25	-	50	3.7 %
3.38	-	48	3.5 %
3.50	-	61	4.5 %
3.63	-	52	3.8 %
3.75	-	66	4.9 %
3.88	-	34	2.5 %
4.00	Somewhat True	48	3.5 %
4.13	-	40	3.0 %
4.25	-	41	3.0 %
4.38	-	34	2.5 %
4.50	-	58	4.3 %
4.63	-	35	2.6 %
4.75	-	12	0.9 %
4.88	-	17	1.3 %
5.00	True	55	4.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2715-2721 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8SUPAGG: S8 WAI: Suppression of Aggression

Suppression of aggression; the mean of 7 items which comprise the score.
Each item is reverse scored.

MEASURE: Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI)

The Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI; Weinberger and Schwartz, 1990) is an assessment of an individual's social-emotional adjustment within the context of external constraints. There are 4 subscales: Impulse control (e.g., "I say the first thing that comes into my mind without thinking enough about it".), suppression of aggression (e.g. "People who get me angry better watch out".), consideration of others (e.g., "Doing things to help other people is more important to me than almost anything else".) and temperance. The measure asks participants to rank how much (1=False to 5=True) their behavior in the past six months matches a series of statements. Higher scores on each of the subscales delineated below indicate more positive behavior (i.e. more impulse control, greater temperance and greater consideration for others).

- (1) False
- (2) Somewhat False
- (3) Not Sure
- (4) Somewhat True
- (5) True

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	False	15	1.1 %
1.14	-	7	0.5 %
1.29	-	9	0.7 %
1.43	-	10	0.7 %
1.57	-	17	1.3 %
1.71	-	36	2.7 %
1.86	-	46	3.4 %
2.00	Somewhat False	44	3.2 %
2.14	-	57	4.2 %
2.29	-	59	4.4 %
2.43	-	59	4.4 %
2.57	-	61	4.5 %
2.71	-	66	4.9 %
2.86	-	59	4.4 %
3.00	Not sure	68	5.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.14	-	45	3.3 %
3.29	-	60	4.4 %
3.43	-	63	4.7 %
3.57	-	48	3.5 %
3.71	-	44	3.2 %
3.86	-	60	4.4 %
4.00	Somewhat True	45	3.3 %
4.14	-	38	2.8 %
4.29	-	33	2.4 %
4.43	-	62	4.6 %
4.57	-	30	2.2 %
4.71	-	10	0.7 %
4.86	-	17	1.3 %
5.00	True	36	2.7 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2722-2728 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8CONSID: S8 WAI: Consideration of Others

Consideration of others; the mean of 7 items which comprise the score.

MEASURE: Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI)

The Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI; Weinberger and Schwartz, 1990) is an assessment of an individual's social-emotional adjustment within the context of external constraints. There are 4 subscales: Impulse control (e.g., "I say the first thing that comes into my mind without thinking enough about it".), suppression of aggression (e.g. "People who get me angry better watch out".), consideration of others (e.g., "Doing things to help other people is more important to me than almost anything else".) and temperance. The measure asks participants to rank how much (1=False to 5=True) their behavior in the past six months matches a series of statements. Higher scores on each of the subscales delineated below indicate more positive behavior (i.e. more impulse control, greater temperance and greater consideration for others).

- (1) False
- (2) Somewhat False
- (3) Not Sure

(4) Somewhat True

(5) True

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	False	3	0.2 %
1.14	-	1	0.1 %
1.29	-	3	0.2 %
1.43	-	3	0.2 %
1.57	-	7	0.5 %
1.71	-	4	0.3 %
1.86	-	9	0.7 %
2.00	Somewhat False	8	0.6 %
2.14	-	14	1.0 %
2.29	-	16	1.2 %
2.43	-	16	1.2 %
2.57	-	22	1.6 %
2.71	-	27	2.0 %
2.86	-	35	2.6 %
3.00	Not sure	39	2.9 %
3.14	-	58	4.3 %
3.29	-	59	4.4 %
3.43	-	73	5.4 %
3.57	-	61	4.5 %
3.71	-	74	5.5 %
3.86	-	98	7.2 %
4.00	Somewhat True	120	8.9 %
4.14	-	100	7.4 %
4.29	-	68	5.0 %
4.43	-	74	5.5 %
4.57	-	50	3.7 %
4.71	-	43	3.2 %
4.86	-	58	4.3 %
5.00	True	61	4.5 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2729-2735 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8TEMPER: S8 WAI: Temperance

Temperance score; calculated by combining the 15 items from the impulse control and suppression of aggression subscales. The score represents the mean of these 15 items.

MEASURE: Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI)

The Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI; Weinberger and Schwartz, 1990) is an assessment of an individual's social-emotional adjustment within the context of external constraints. There are 4 subscales: Impulse control (e.g., "I say the first thing that comes into my mind without thinking enough about it".), suppression of aggression (e.g. "People who get me angry better watch out".), consideration of others (e.g., "Doing things to help other people is more important to me than almost anything else".) and temperance. The measure asks participants to rank how much (1=False to 5=True) their behavior in the past six months matches a series of statements. Higher scores on each of the subscales delineated below indicate more positive behavior (i.e. more impulse control, greater temperance and greater consideration for others).

- (1) False
- (2) Somewhat False
- (3) Not Sure
- (4) Somewhat True
- (5) True

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	False	0	0.0 %
1.07	-	2	0.1 %
1.13	-	4	0.3 %
1.27	-	4	0.3 %
1.40	-	2	0.1 %
1.47	-	6	0.4 %
1.53	-	7	0.5 %
1.60	-	7	0.5 %
1.67	-	15	1.1 %
1.73	-	14	1.0 %
1.80	-	12	0.9 %
1.87	-	13	1.0 %
1.93	-	6	0.4 %
2.00	Somewhat False	14	1.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.07	-	23	1.7 %
2.13	-	17	1.3 %
2.20	-	27	2.0 %
2.27	-	26	1.9 %
2.33	-	19	1.4 %
2.40	-	31	2.3 %
2.47	-	32	2.4 %
2.53	-	21	1.6 %
2.60	-	36	2.7 %
2.67	-	28	2.1 %
2.73	-	22	1.6 %
2.80	-	25	1.8 %
2.87	-	41	3.0 %
2.93	-	29	2.1 %
3.00	Not sure	38	2.8 %
3.07	-	36	2.7 %
3.13	-	44	3.2 %
3.20	-	27	2.0 %
3.27	-	28	2.1 %
3.33	-	26	1.9 %
3.40	-	43	3.2 %
3.47	-	29	2.1 %
3.53	-	30	2.2 %
3.60	-	26	1.9 %
3.67	-	32	2.4 %
3.73	-	31	2.3 %
3.80	-	21	1.6 %
3.87	-	19	1.4 %
3.93	-	20	1.5 %
4.00	Somewhat True	27	2.0 %
4.07	-	36	2.7 %
4.13	-	22	1.6 %
4.20	-	33	2.4 %
4.27	-	19	1.4 %
4.33	-	21	1.6 %
4.40	-	18	1.3 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,204 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2736-2742 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S8CHARM: S8 YPI: Dishonest Charm

The sum of the 5 items contained in the dishonest charm subscale.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	293	21.6 %
6	-	65	4.8 %
7	-	94	6.9 %
8	-	82	6.1 %
9	-	87	6.4 %
10	-	167	12.3 %
11	-	116	8.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
12	-	66	4.9 %
13	-	45	3.3 %
14	-	60	4.4 %
15	-	46	3.4 %
16	-	28	2.1 %
17	-	21	1.6 %
18	-	7	0.5 %
19	-	10	0.7 %
20	-	15	1.1 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2743-2746 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8GRAND: S8 YPI: Grandiosity

The sum of the 5 items contained in the grandiosity subscale.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	96	7.1 %
6	-	43	3.2 %
7	-	75	5.5 %
8	-	116	8.6 %
9	-	95	7.0 %
10	-	164	12.1 %
11	-	177	13.1 %
12	-	113	8.3 %
13	-	105	7.8 %
14	-	91	6.7 %
15	-	39	2.9 %
16	-	32	2.4 %
17	-	22	1.6 %
18	-	16	1.2 %
19	-	8	0.6 %
20	-	10	0.7 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2747-2750 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8LYING: S8 YPI: Lying

The sum of the 5 items contained in the lying

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually

feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	478	35.3 %
6	-	106	7.8 %
7	-	120	8.9 %
8	-	88	6.5 %
9	-	81	6.0 %
10	-	173	12.8 %
11	-	57	4.2 %
12	-	35	2.6 %
13	-	30	2.2 %
14	-	13	1.0 %
15	-	7	0.5 %
16	-	5	0.4 %
17	-	1	0.1 %
18	-	2	0.1 %
19	-	2	0.1 %
20	-	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2751-2754 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8MANIP: S8 YPI: Manipulation

The sum of the 5 items contained in the manipulation subscale.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	382	28.2 %
6	-	73	5.4 %
7	-	95	7.0 %
8	-	76	5.6 %
9	-	93	6.9 %
10	-	179	13.2 %
11	-	76	5.6 %
12	-	65	4.8 %
13	-	50	3.7 %
14	-	33	2.4 %
15	-	32	2.4 %
16	-	15	1.1 %
17	-	10	0.7 %
18	-	6	0.4 %
19	-	6	0.4 %
20	-	11	0.8 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-700	Data missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2755-2758 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8REMOR: S8 YPI: Remorselessness

The sum of the 5 items contained in the remorselessness subscale.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	268	19.8 %
6	-	91	6.7 %
7	-	111	8.2 %
8	-	110	8.1 %
9	-	93	6.9 %
10	-	172	12.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	-	148	10.9 %
12	-	77	5.7 %
13	-	48	3.5 %
14	-	37	2.7 %
15	-	19	1.4 %
16	-	11	0.8 %
17	-	6	0.4 %
19	-	2	0.1 %
20	-	9	0.7 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2759-2762 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8UNEMO: S8 YPI: Unemotionality

The sum of the 5 items contained in the unemotionality subscale.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	70	5.2 %
6	-	26	1.9 %
7	-	100	7.4 %
8	-	118	8.7 %
9	-	112	8.3 %
10	-	118	8.7 %
11	-	162	12.0 %
12	-	158	11.7 %
13	-	128	9.5 %
14	-	88	6.5 %
15	-	62	4.6 %
16	-	22	1.6 %
17	-	13	1.0 %
18	-	10	0.7 %
19	-	8	0.6 %
20	-	7	0.5 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2763-2766 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8CALLOS: S8 YPI: Callousness

The sum of the 5 items contained in the callousness subscale.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have

done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	21	1.6 %
6	-	22	1.6 %
7	-	55	4.1 %
8	-	80	5.9 %
9	-	93	6.9 %
10	-	144	10.6 %
11	-	184	13.6 %
12	-	196	14.5 %
13	-	149	11.0 %
14	-	140	10.3 %
15	-	61	4.5 %
16	-	29	2.1 %
17	-	21	1.6 %
18	-	2	0.1 %
19	-	4	0.3 %
20	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2767-2770 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8THRILL: S8 YPI: Thrill Seeking

The sum of the 5 items contained in the thrill seeking subscale.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	44	3.2 %
6	-	17	1.3 %
7	-	60	4.4 %
8	-	64	4.7 %
9	-	85	6.3 %
10	-	82	6.1 %
11	-	115	8.5 %
12	-	125	9.2 %
13	-	148	10.9 %
14	-	128	9.5 %
15	-	117	8.6 %
16	-	78	5.8 %
17	-	45	3.3 %
18	-	36	2.7 %
19	-	23	1.7 %
20	-	35	2.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2771-2774 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8YPIIMP: S8 YPI: Impulsiveness

The sum of the 5 items contained in the impulsiveness subscale.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	129	9.5 %
6	-	51	3.8 %
7	-	87	6.4 %
8	-	92	6.8 %
9	-	104	7.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
10	-	137	10.1 %
11	-	122	9.0 %
12	-	104	7.7 %
13	-	98	7.2 %
14	-	106	7.8 %
15	-	67	4.9 %
16	-	39	2.9 %
17	-	32	2.4 %
18	-	13	1.0 %
19	-	6	0.4 %
20	-	15	1.1 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2775-2778 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8IRRESP: S8 YPI: Irresponsibility

The sum of the 5 items contained in the irresponsibility subscale.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotional (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that

higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	-	1	0.1 %
3	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	171	12.6 %
6	-	81	6.0 %
7	-	141	10.4 %
8	-	133	9.8 %
9	-	115	8.5 %
10	-	135	10.0 %
11	-	124	9.2 %
12	-	81	6.0 %
13	-	71	5.2 %
14	-	66	4.9 %
15	-	27	2.0 %
16	-	24	1.8 %
17	-	15	1.1 %
18	-	5	0.4 %
19	-	5	0.4 %
20	-	7	0.5 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2779-2782 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8GRANMA: S8 YPI: Grandiose-Manipulative Dimension

Grandiose-Manipulative Dimension; Sum of 20 items in this dimension.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost

everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
10	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	54	4.0 %
21	-	22	1.6 %
22	-	36	2.7 %
23	-	55	4.1 %
24	-	48	3.5 %
25	-	51	3.8 %
26	-	52	3.8 %
27	-	36	2.7 %
28	-	46	3.4 %
29	-	33	2.4 %
30	-	19	1.4 %
31	-	27	2.0 %
32	-	30	2.2 %
33	-	24	1.8 %
34	-	29	2.1 %
35	-	34	2.5 %
36	-	28	2.1 %
37	-	27	2.0 %
38	-	30	2.2 %
39	-	31	2.3 %
40	-	68	5.0 %
41	-	54	4.0 %
42	-	49	3.6 %
43	-	30	2.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
44	-	34	2.5 %
45	-	22	1.6 %
46	-	29	2.1 %
47	-	29	2.1 %
48	-	23	1.7 %
49	-	23	1.7 %
50	-	13	1.0 %
51	-	10	0.7 %
52	-	13	1.0 %
53	-	15	1.1 %
54	-	10	0.7 %
55	-	12	0.9 %
56	-	9	0.7 %
57	-	5	0.4 %
58	-	4	0.3 %
59	-	3	0.2 %
60	-	4	0.3 %
61	-	5	0.4 %
62	-	3	0.2 %
63	-	5	0.4 %
64	-	4	0.3 %
65	-	2	0.1 %
66	-	2	0.1 %
67	-	3	0.2 %
69	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2783-2786 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8CALUNE: S8 YPI: Callous-Unemotional Dimension

Callous-Unemotional Dimension; Sum of 15 items in this dimension.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	1	0.1 %
16	-	1	0.1 %
17	-	6	0.4 %
18	-	14	1.0 %
19	-	10	0.7 %
20	-	16	1.2 %
21	-	34	2.5 %
22	-	43	3.2 %
23	-	50	3.7 %
24	-	68	5.0 %
25	-	52	3.8 %
26	-	65	4.8 %
27	-	62	4.6 %
28	-	55	4.1 %
29	-	61	4.5 %
30	-	42	3.1 %
31	-	51	3.8 %
32	-	72	5.3 %
33	-	65	4.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
34	-	85	6.3 %
35	-	64	4.7 %
36	-	55	4.1 %
37	-	46	3.4 %
38	-	43	3.2 %
39	-	26	1.9 %
40	-	23	1.7 %
41	-	14	1.0 %
42	-	17	1.3 %
43	-	9	0.7 %
44	-	10	0.7 %
45	-	11	0.8 %
46	-	3	0.2 %
47	-	8	0.6 %
48	-	4	0.3 %
49	-	2	0.1 %
50	-	3	0.2 %
51	-	1	0.1 %
52	-	1	0.1 %
53	-	3	0.2 %
54	-	2	0.1 %
56	-	1	0.1 %
57	-	2	0.1 %
58	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2787-2790 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8IMPIRR: S8 YPI: Impulsive-Irresponsible Dimension

Impulsive-Irresponsible Dimension; Sum of 15 items in this dimension.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
11	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	21	1.6 %
16	-	6	0.4 %
17	-	22	1.6 %
18	-	22	1.6 %
19	-	33	2.4 %
20	-	21	1.6 %
21	-	30	2.2 %
22	-	30	2.2 %
23	-	32	2.4 %
24	-	30	2.2 %
25	-	33	2.4 %
26	-	41	3.0 %
27	-	39	2.9 %
28	-	41	3.0 %
29	-	46	3.4 %
30	-	53	3.9 %
31	-	44	3.2 %
32	-	58	4.3 %
33	-	51	3.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
34	-	55	4.1 %
35	-	55	4.1 %
36	-	56	4.1 %
37	-	41	3.0 %
38	-	43	3.2 %
39	-	37	2.7 %
40	-	42	3.1 %
41	-	39	2.9 %
42	-	37	2.7 %
43	-	24	1.8 %
44	-	17	1.3 %
45	-	19	1.4 %
46	-	13	1.0 %
47	-	11	0.8 %
48	-	14	1.0 %
49	-	6	0.4 %
50	-	9	0.7 %
51	-	6	0.4 %
52	-	5	0.4 %
53	-	2	0.1 %
54	-	4	0.3 %
55	-	5	0.4 %
56	-	3	0.2 %
57	-	4	0.3 %
59	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2791-2794 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S8YPI: S8 YPI: Total Score

YPI Total score: Sum of all 50 items in the measure.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
26	-	1	0.1 %
56	-	2	0.1 %
57	-	7	0.5 %
58	-	1	0.1 %
59	-	11	0.8 %
60	-	3	0.2 %
61	-	6	0.4 %
62	-	9	0.7 %
63	-	15	1.1 %
64	-	10	0.7 %
65	-	13	1.0 %
66	-	8	0.6 %
67	-	16	1.2 %
68	-	21	1.6 %
69	-	17	1.3 %
70	-	13	1.0 %
71	-	18	1.3 %
72	-	18	1.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
73	-	20	1.5 %
74	-	16	1.2 %
75	-	14	1.0 %
76	-	18	1.3 %
77	-	16	1.2 %
78	-	17	1.3 %
79	-	18	1.3 %
80	-	18	1.3 %
81	-	18	1.3 %
82	-	16	1.2 %
83	-	11	0.8 %
84	-	13	1.0 %
85	-	12	0.9 %
86	-	7	0.5 %
87	-	15	1.1 %
88	-	21	1.6 %
89	-	10	0.7 %
90	-	12	0.9 %
91	-	13	1.0 %
92	-	9	0.7 %
93	-	16	1.2 %
94	-	15	1.1 %
95	-	14	1.0 %
96	-	15	1.1 %
97	-	13	1.0 %
98	-	11	0.8 %
99	-	7	0.5 %
100	-	15	1.1 %
101	-	22	1.6 %
102	-	13	1.0 %
103	-	16	1.2 %
104	-	24	1.8 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	147	10.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2795-2798 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8