

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 24 Month Follow-up Data

Inter-university Consortium for  
Political and Social Research  
P.O. Box 1248  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106  
[www.icpsr.umich.edu](http://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.

# 24 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: S4 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

## S4INTCOMPSTAT: S4 IntInfo: Interview completion status

Completion status of the interview.

MEASURE: Interview Information

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Complete	1223	90.3 %
2	Partial	8	0.6 %
4	Incomplete	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

## S4QVERSION: S4 IntInfo: Version number associated with programming changes to the interview

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
01.11	-	41	3.0 %
01.12	-	268	19.8 %
01.14	-	520	38.4 %
01.15	-	396	29.2 %
01.16	-	6	0.4 %
INC	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Inc	-	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

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

*Variable Type:* character

## S4INTYR: S4 IntInfo: Year of Interview

What year did the interview take place in?

MEASURE: Interview Information

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2002	-	27	2.0 %
2003	-	644	47.6 %
2004	-	556	41.1 %
2005	-	4	0.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,231 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -201

## S4INTLOC: S4 IntInfo: Interview location

Where did this interview take place?

MEASURE: Interview Information

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Subject's home	665	49.1 %
2	At the placement	376	27.8 %
3	Somewhere else	190	14.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,231 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -201

---

### S4PLCCOD: S4 IntInfo: Interview location - facility code

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	376	27.8 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	NA: Interview not conducted at the placement	855	63.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 376 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

---

### S4PLCTYPE: S4 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)	54	4.0 %
14	Secure	52	3.8 %
15	Jail / Prison	232	17.1 %
16	Detention	27	2.0 %
20	Other	11	0.8 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	NA: Interview conducted not at placement	855	63.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 376 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

---

### S4NMONTHS: S4 IntInfo: Number of months covered in the recall period

Number of months in the recall period.

MEASURE: Interview Information

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	-	2	0.1 %
3	-	9	0.7 %
4	-	70	5.2 %
5	-	283	20.9 %
6	-	566	41.8 %
7	-	223	16.5 %
8	-	78	5.8 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,231 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -201

## S4DAY SINRP: S4 IntInfo: Number of days covered in the recall period

Number of days in the recall period.

MEASURE: Interview Information

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
61	-	1	0.1 %
62	-	1	0.1 %
77	-	1	0.1 %
89	-	1	0.1 %
91	-	3	0.2 %
92	-	4	0.3 %
97	-	1	0.1 %
105	-	1	0.1 %
106	-	1	0.1 %
107	-	2	0.1 %
108	-	1	0.1 %
110	-	2	0.1 %
112	-	1	0.1 %
113	-	2	0.1 %
114	-	1	0.1 %
115	-	1	0.1 %
116	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
117	-	2	0.1 %
119	-	3	0.2 %
120	-	12	0.9 %
121	-	2	0.1 %
122	-	26	1.9 %
123	-	10	0.7 %
133	-	1	0.1 %
136	-	3	0.2 %
137	-	3	0.2 %
138	-	4	0.3 %
139	-	4	0.3 %
140	-	5	0.4 %
141	-	2	0.1 %
142	-	7	0.5 %
143	-	5	0.4 %
144	-	8	0.6 %
145	-	7	0.5 %
146	-	9	0.7 %
147	-	5	0.4 %
148	-	6	0.4 %
149	-	10	0.7 %
150	-	14	1.0 %
151	-	48	3.5 %
152	-	38	2.8 %
153	-	104	7.7 %
156	-	1	0.1 %
158	-	1	0.1 %
162	-	1	0.1 %
163	-	1	0.1 %
164	-	2	0.1 %
165	-	2	0.1 %
166	-	2	0.1 %
167	-	9	0.7 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,231 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -201

---

## S4SITE: S4 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 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

---

## S4SGEND: S4 DEM: Subject gender

Subject's gender.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Male	1061	78.4 %
2	Female	170	12.6 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,231 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

---

## S4AGE: S4 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	%
16	-	148	10.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
17	-	245	18.1 %
18	-	377	27.8 %
19	-	360	26.6 %
20	-	100	7.4 %
21	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,231 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -201

## S4CTAGE: S4 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	1231	90.9 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,231 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -201

## S4BL\_ETH: S4 DEM: Ethnicity stated at Baseline

Ethnicity (from baseline).

MEASURE: Demographics

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

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

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

---

## S4ETHN\_R: S4 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 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

---

## S4JOBQ\_MIL01: S4 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	4	0.3 %
1	Yes	0	0.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-147	Skipped: Subject under age 18	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 4 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

---

## S4JOBQ\_MIL02: S4 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	4	0.3 %
1	Yes	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-147	Skipped: Subject under age 18	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 4 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

## **S4JOBQ\_VOT01: S4 Voting: Is registered to vote**

Are you registered to vote?

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1	0.1 %
1	Yes	2	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-147	Skipped: Subject under age 18	1	0.1 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 3 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

## **S4JOBQ\_VOT02: S4 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	1	0.1 %
1	Yes	1	0.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-148	Skipped: Not registered to vote	2	0.1 %
-147	Skipped: Subject under age 18	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 2 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

## S4DEMO\_PARDTH: S4 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	1222	90.3 %
1	Yes - Mom	3	0.2 %
2	Yes - Dad	4	0.3 %
3	Yes - Both	0	0.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 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

## S4DEMO\_PMONDTN: S4 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	553	40.8 %
1	Yes	5	0.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Subject didnt have a primary caregiver	673	49.7 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 558 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

## S4ARMSA\_MEXAM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	914	67.5 %
1	Yes	317	23.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,231 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

## S4AOS: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	Not at all	0	0.0 %
2.00	Very little or not very often	0	0.0 %
2.27	-	2	0.1 %
2.36	-	1	0.1 %
2.55	-	1	0.1 %
2.64	-	2	0.1 %
2.73	-	3	0.2 %
2.82	-	1	0.1 %
2.91	-	3	0.2 %
3.00	Moderately	9	0.7 %
3.09	-	4	0.3 %
3.18	-	8	0.6 %
3.27	-	6	0.4 %
3.36	-	10	0.7 %
3.45	-	9	0.7 %
3.55	-	10	0.7 %
3.60	-	1	0.1 %
3.64	-	15	1.1 %
3.73	-	14	1.0 %
3.82	-	14	1.0 %
3.91	-	29	2.1 %
4.00	More or very often	18	1.3 %
4.09	-	14	1.0 %
4.18	-	14	1.0 %
4.20	-	1	0.1 %
4.27	-	19	1.4 %
4.36	-	16	1.2 %

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
4.45	-	16	1.2 %
4.55	-	14	1.0 %
4.64	-	24	1.8 %
4.73	-	12	0.9 %
4.82	-	9	0.7 %
4.91	-	8	0.6 %
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	10	0.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into ARSMA	914	67.5 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 317 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

## S4ANGAFF: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	Not at all	25	1.8 %
1.33	-	15	1.1 %
1.67	-	16	1.2 %
2.00	Very little or not very often	29	2.1 %
2.33	-	32	2.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.67	-	35	2.6 %
3.00	Moderately	40	3.0 %
3.33	-	30	2.2 %
3.67	-	37	2.7 %
4.00	More or very often	20	1.5 %
4.33	-	10	0.7 %
4.67	-	9	0.7 %
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	19	1.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into ARSMA	914	67.5 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 317 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

## S4ENGLNG: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all	0	0.0 %
1.75	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	Very little or not very often	0	0.0 %
2.75	-	2	0.1 %

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
2.88	-	2	0.1 %
3.00	Moderately	4	0.3 %
3.13	-	3	0.2 %
3.25	-	9	0.7 %
3.38	-	4	0.3 %
3.50	-	7	0.5 %
3.63	-	9	0.7 %
3.75	-	14	1.0 %
3.88	-	10	0.7 %
4.00	More or very often	13	1.0 %
4.13	-	17	1.3 %
4.25	-	18	1.3 %
4.38	-	11	0.8 %
4.50	-	26	1.9 %
4.63	-	20	1.5 %
4.71	-	1	0.1 %
4.75	-	19	1.4 %
4.88	-	14	1.0 %
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	113	8.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into ARSMA	914	67.5 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 317 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

## S4MOS: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	Not at all	0	0.0 %
1.33	-	3	0.2 %
1.42	-	3	0.2 %
1.50	-	1	0.1 %
1.58	-	10	0.7 %
1.67	-	8	0.6 %
1.75	-	5	0.4 %
1.83	-	15	1.1 %
1.92	-	10	0.7 %
2.00	Very little or not very often	17	1.3 %
2.08	-	8	0.6 %
2.09	-	1	0.1 %
2.17	-	7	0.5 %
2.25	-	10	0.7 %
2.33	-	11	0.8 %
2.42	-	14	1.0 %
2.50	-	10	0.7 %
2.58	-	8	0.6 %
2.67	-	10	0.7 %
2.75	-	7	0.5 %
2.83	-	8	0.6 %
2.92	-	9	0.7 %
3.00	Moderately	11	0.8 %
3.08	-	4	0.3 %
3.17	-	6	0.4 %
3.25	-	5	0.4 %
3.33	-	6	0.4 %
3.42	-	6	0.4 %
3.50	-	8	0.6 %
3.55	-	1	0.1 %
3.58	-	4	0.3 %
3.67	-	8	0.6 %
3.75	-	3	0.2 %
3.83	-	5	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.92	-	6	0.4 %
4.00	More or very often	5	0.4 %
4.08	-	5	0.4 %
4.17	-	3	0.2 %
4.25	-	5	0.4 %
4.33	-	8	0.6 %
4.42	-	2	0.1 %
4.50	-	6	0.4 %
4.58	-	2	0.1 %
4.67	-	1	0.1 %
4.75	-	4	0.3 %
4.83	-	4	0.3 %
4.92	-	4	0.3 %
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	20	1.5 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into ARSMA	914	67.5 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 317 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

## S4MEXAFF: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	Not at all	0	0.0 %
2.00	Very little or not very often	5	0.4 %
2.33	-	5	0.4 %
2.67	-	5	0.4 %
3.00	Moderately	20	1.5 %
3.33	-	27	2.0 %
3.67	-	36	2.7 %
4.00	More or very often	43	3.2 %
4.33	-	31	2.3 %
4.67	-	33	2.4 %
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	112	8.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into ARSMA	914	67.5 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 317 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

## S4SPALNG: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	Not at all	33	2.4 %
1.11	-	13	1.0 %
1.22	-	14	1.0 %
1.33	-	11	0.8 %
1.44	-	14	1.0 %
1.56	-	7	0.5 %
1.67	-	11	0.8 %
1.78	-	10	0.7 %
1.89	-	13	1.0 %
2.00	Very little or not very often	7	0.5 %
2.11	-	13	1.0 %
2.22	-	11	0.8 %
2.33	-	11	0.8 %
2.44	-	7	0.5 %
2.56	-	6	0.4 %
2.67	-	4	0.3 %
2.78	-	6	0.4 %
2.89	-	3	0.2 %
3.00	Moderately	11	0.8 %
3.11	-	5	0.4 %
3.22	-	10	0.7 %
3.33	-	8	0.6 %
3.44	-	5	0.4 %
3.56	-	4	0.3 %
3.63	-	1	0.1 %
3.67	-	5	0.4 %
3.78	-	6	0.4 %
3.89	-	6	0.4 %
4.00	More or very often	7	0.5 %
4.11	-	4	0.3 %
4.22	-	6	0.4 %
4.33	-	7	0.5 %
4.44	-	2	0.1 %
4.56	-	3	0.2 %
4.67	-	4	0.3 %
4.78	-	3	0.2 %
4.89	-	3	0.2 %
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	23	1.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into ARSMA	914	67.5 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 317 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

## S4BSISOM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	Not at all	454	33.5 %
0.14	-	123	9.1 %
0.29	-	80	5.9 %
0.43	-	71	5.2 %
0.57	-	25	1.8 %
0.71	-	18	1.3 %
0.86	-	23	1.7 %
1.00	A little bit	16	1.2 %
1.14	-	17	1.3 %

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.29	-	5	0.4 %
1.43	-	7	0.5 %
1.57	-	7	0.5 %
1.86	-	2	0.1 %
2.00	Moderately	2	0.1 %
2.14	-	5	0.4 %
2.29	-	3	0.2 %
2.43	-	2	0.1 %
2.57	-	1	0.1 %
2.71	-	2	0.1 %
2.86	-	1	0.1 %
3.00	Quite a bit	1	0.1 %
3.14	-	1	0.1 %
3.43	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Extremely	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97.00	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 868 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

## S4SOM\_T: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	not clinically significant	840	62.0 %
1	clinical range	28	2.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 868 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

## S4BSIOC: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	Not at all	246	18.2 %
0.17	-	127	9.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.33	-	93	6.9 %
0.50	-	71	5.2 %
0.67	-	65	4.8 %
0.83	-	53	3.9 %
1.00	A little bit	47	3.5 %
1.17	-	29	2.1 %
1.33	-	23	1.7 %
1.50	-	23	1.7 %
1.67	-	27	2.0 %
1.83	-	14	1.0 %
2.00	Moderately	10	0.7 %
2.17	-	6	0.4 %
2.33	-	7	0.5 %
2.50	-	2	0.1 %
2.67	-	9	0.7 %
2.83	-	5	0.4 %
3.00	Quite a bit	2	0.1 %
3.17	-	3	0.2 %
3.33	-	1	0.1 %
3.50	-	2	0.1 %
3.67	-	2	0.1 %
4.00	Extremely	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97.00	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 868 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

## S4OC\_T: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	not clinically significant	818	60.4 %
1	clinical range	50	3.7 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 868 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

## S4BSIIS: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	Not at all	473	34.9 %
0.25	-	141	10.4 %
0.50	-	84	6.2 %
0.75	-	57	4.2 %
1.00	A little bit	36	2.7 %
1.25	-	24	1.8 %
1.50	-	16	1.2 %
1.75	-	5	0.4 %
2.00	Moderately	14	1.0 %
2.25	-	7	0.5 %
2.50	-	1	0.1 %
2.75	-	3	0.2 %
3.00	Quite a bit	2	0.1 %
3.25	-	1	0.1 %
3.50	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Extremely	3	0.2 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97.00	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 868 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

## S4IS\_T: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	not clinically significant	850	62.8 %
1	clinical range	18	1.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 868 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

## S4BSIDEP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	Not at all	398	29.4 %
0.17	-	114	8.4 %
0.33	-	78	5.8 %
0.50	-	60	4.4 %
0.67	-	41	3.0 %
0.83	-	30	2.2 %
1.00	A little bit	34	2.5 %
1.17	-	21	1.6 %
1.33	-	17	1.3 %
1.50	-	17	1.3 %
1.67	-	12	0.9 %
1.83	-	11	0.8 %
2.00	Moderately	9	0.7 %
2.17	-	5	0.4 %
2.33	-	6	0.4 %
2.50	-	4	0.3 %
2.67	-	3	0.2 %
3.00	Quite a bit	4	0.3 %
3.17	-	1	0.1 %
3.20	-	1	0.1 %
3.50	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Extremely	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97.00	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 868 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

## S4DEP\_T: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	not clinically significant	833	61.5 %
1	clinical range	35	2.6 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 868 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

## S4BSIANX: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	Not at all	376	27.8 %
0.17	-	143	10.6 %
0.33	-	82	6.1 %
0.50	-	81	6.0 %
0.67	-	46	3.4 %
0.83	-	38	2.8 %
1.00	A little bit	23	1.7 %
1.17	-	23	1.7 %
1.33	-	11	0.8 %
1.50	-	9	0.7 %
1.67	-	6	0.4 %
1.83	-	6	0.4 %
2.00	Moderately	6	0.4 %
2.17	-	4	0.3 %
2.33	-	5	0.4 %
2.50	-	4	0.3 %
2.67	-	1	0.1 %
2.83	-	1	0.1 %
3.00	Quite a bit	0	0.0 %
3.17	-	1	0.1 %
3.83	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Extremely	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97.00	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 868 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

## S4ANX\_T: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	not clinically significant	838	61.9 %
1	clinical range	30	2.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 868 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

## S4BSIHOS: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.0	Not at all	261	19.3 %
0.2	-	158	11.7 %
0.4	-	102	7.5 %
0.6	-	88	6.5 %
0.8	-	61	4.5 %
1.0	A little bit	43	3.2 %
1.2	-	41	3.0 %
1.4	-	32	2.4 %
1.6	-	15	1.1 %
1.8	-	14	1.0 %
2.0	Moderately	6	0.4 %
2.2	-	11	0.8 %
2.4	-	12	0.9 %
2.6	-	10	0.7 %
2.8	-	5	0.4 %
3.0	Quite a bit	4	0.3 %
3.2	-	2	0.1 %
3.4	-	1	0.1 %
3.8	-	1	0.1 %
4.0	Extremely	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.0	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97.0	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 868 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

## S4HOS\_T: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	not clinically significant	829	61.2 %
1	clinical range	39	2.9 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 868 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

---

#### S4BSIPHB: S4 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.

- (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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.0	Not at all	600	44.3 %
0.2	-	93	6.9 %
0.4	-	44	3.2 %
0.6	-	44	3.2 %
0.8	-	40	3.0 %
1.0	A little bit	10	0.7 %
1.2	-	13	1.0 %
1.4	-	3	0.2 %
1.6	-	4	0.3 %
1.8	-	5	0.4 %
2.0	Moderately	1	0.1 %
2.2	-	6	0.4 %
2.4	-	1	0.1 %
2.6	-	2	0.1 %
3.0	Quite a bit	0	0.0 %
3.2	-	1	0.1 %
3.8	-	1	0.1 %
4.0	Extremely	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.0	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97.0	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 868 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

## S4PHB\_T: S4 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 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	not clinically significant	846	62.5 %
1	clinical range	22	1.6 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 868 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

## S4BSIPAR: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.0	Not at all	231	17.1 %
0.2	-	124	9.2 %
0.4	-	97	7.2 %
0.6	-	93	6.9 %
0.8	-	98	7.2 %
1.0	A little bit	52	3.8 %
1.2	-	32	2.4 %
1.4	-	32	2.4 %
1.6	-	29	2.1 %
1.8	-	25	1.8 %
2.0	Moderately	18	1.3 %
2.2	-	12	0.9 %
2.4	-	10	0.7 %
2.6	-	8	0.6 %
2.8	-	2	0.1 %
3.0	Quite a bit	1	0.1 %
3.2	-	2	0.1 %
3.4	-	1	0.1 %
3.8	-	1	0.1 %
4.0	Extremely	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.0	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97.0	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 868 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

## S4PAR\_T: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	not clinically significant	841	62.1 %
1	clinical range	27	2.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 868 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

## S4BSIPSY: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.0	Not at all	429	31.7 %
0.2	-	131	9.7 %
0.4	-	86	6.4 %
0.6	-	61	4.5 %
0.8	-	55	4.1 %
1.0	A little bit	28	2.1 %
1.2	-	21	1.6 %
1.4	-	10	0.7 %
1.6	-	20	1.5 %
1.8	-	7	0.5 %
2.0	Moderately	3	0.2 %
2.2	-	6	0.4 %
2.4	-	3	0.2 %
2.6	-	3	0.2 %
2.8	-	1	0.1 %
3.0	Quite a bit	1	0.1 %
3.4	-	1	0.1 %
4.0	Extremely	2	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.0	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97.0	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 868 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

## S4PSY\_T: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	not clinically significant	841	62.1 %
1	clinical range	27	2.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 868 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

## S4BSIGSI: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
0.00	Not at all	0	0.0 %
0.02	-	51	3.8 %
0.04	-	56	4.1 %
0.06	-	38	2.8 %
0.08	-	43	3.2 %
0.09	-	48	3.5 %
0.11	-	40	3.0 %
0.13	-	28	2.1 %
0.15	-	18	1.3 %
0.17	-	26	1.9 %
0.19	-	25	1.8 %
0.21	-	22	1.6 %
0.23	-	19	1.4 %
0.25	-	16	1.2 %
0.26	-	22	1.6 %
0.28	-	21	1.6 %
0.30	-	16	1.2 %
0.32	-	17	1.3 %
0.34	-	18	1.3 %
0.36	-	14	1.0 %
0.38	-	11	0.8 %
0.40	-	16	1.2 %
0.42	-	11	0.8 %
0.43	-	14	1.0 %
0.45	-	5	0.4 %
0.47	-	9	0.7 %
0.49	-	10	0.7 %
0.51	-	9	0.7 %
0.53	-	10	0.7 %
0.55	-	11	0.8 %
0.57	-	7	0.5 %
0.58	-	9	0.7 %
0.60	-	6	0.4 %
0.62	-	9	0.7 %
0.64	-	4	0.3 %

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
0.66	-	6	0.4 %
0.68	-	6	0.4 %
0.70	-	7	0.5 %
0.72	-	10	0.7 %
0.74	-	7	0.5 %
0.75	-	5	0.4 %
0.77	-	5	0.4 %
0.79	-	6	0.4 %
0.81	-	8	0.6 %
0.83	-	8	0.6 %
0.85	-	5	0.4 %
0.87	-	5	0.4 %
0.89	-	2	0.1 %
0.91	-	4	0.3 %
0.92	-	4	0.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97.00	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 868 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

## S4GSI\_T: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	not clinically significant	843	62.3 %
1	clinical range	25	1.8 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 868 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

## S4BSIPST: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	85	6.3 %
2	-	61	4.5 %
3	-	58	4.3 %
4	-	51	3.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	58	4.3 %
6	-	44	3.2 %
7	-	26	1.9 %
8	-	38	2.8 %
9	-	34	2.5 %
10	-	22	1.6 %
11	-	28	2.1 %
12	-	26	1.9 %
13	-	32	2.4 %
14	-	28	2.1 %
15	-	17	1.3 %
16	-	10	0.7 %
17	-	17	1.3 %
18	-	15	1.1 %
19	-	16	1.2 %
20	-	11	0.8 %
21	-	11	0.8 %
22	-	15	1.1 %
23	-	19	1.4 %
24	-	16	1.2 %
25	-	14	1.0 %
26	-	13	1.0 %
27	-	7	0.5 %
28	-	4	0.3 %
29	-	9	0.7 %
30	-	13	1.0 %
31	-	9	0.7 %
32	-	4	0.3 %
33	-	2	0.1 %
34	-	6	0.4 %
35	-	6	0.4 %
36	-	3	0.2 %
37	-	4	0.3 %
38	-	2	0.1 %
39	-	5	0.4 %
40	-	6	0.4 %
41	-	5	0.4 %
42	-	4	0.3 %
43	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
44	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	1	0.1 %
46	-	2	0.1 %
47	-	1	0.1 %
48	-	2	0.1 %
49	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 868 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

## S4BSIPSD: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	Not at all	0	0.0 %
1.00	A little bit	218	16.1 %
1.03	-	1	0.1 %
1.04	-	1	0.1 %
1.05	-	1	0.1 %
1.06	-	4	0.3 %
1.07	-	3	0.2 %
1.08	-	6	0.4 %
1.09	-	2	0.1 %
1.11	-	4	0.3 %
1.13	-	9	0.7 %
1.14	-	5	0.4 %
1.15	-	3	0.2 %
1.16	-	1	0.1 %
1.17	-	8	0.6 %
1.18	-	2	0.1 %
1.19	-	1	0.1 %
1.20	-	15	1.1 %
1.21	-	2	0.1 %
1.22	-	8	0.6 %
1.23	-	5	0.4 %
1.24	-	1	0.1 %
1.25	-	16	1.2 %
1.26	-	5	0.4 %
1.27	-	4	0.3 %
1.28	-	1	0.1 %
1.29	-	7	0.5 %
1.30	-	3	0.2 %
1.31	-	5	0.4 %
1.32	-	4	0.3 %
1.33	-	23	1.7 %
1.35	-	4	0.3 %
1.36	-	6	0.4 %
1.37	-	4	0.3 %
1.38	-	7	0.5 %
1.39	-	1	0.1 %
1.40	-	17	1.3 %
1.41	-	2	0.1 %
1.42	-	3	0.2 %

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.43	-	4	0.3 %
1.44	-	3	0.2 %
1.45	-	3	0.2 %
1.46	-	5	0.4 %
1.47	-	4	0.3 %
1.48	-	1	0.1 %
1.49	-	2	0.1 %
1.50	-	25	1.8 %
1.52	-	2	0.1 %
1.53	-	8	0.6 %
1.54	-	4	0.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97.00	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 868 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

## S4BSIDX1: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	757	55.9 %
1	-	47	3.5 %
2	-	30	2.2 %
3	-	10	0.7 %
4	-	9	0.7 %
5	-	3	0.2 %
6	-	5	0.4 %
7	-	1	0.1 %
8	-	3	0.2 %
9	-	3	0.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 868 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

## S4BSIDX: S4 BSI: Clinically Significant

Marker for cases which reach clinical significance on 2 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	not clinically significant	804	59.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	clinical range	64	4.7 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97	Invalid Test	358	26.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 868 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

## S4CADPRE: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	142	10.5 %
1	-	33	2.4 %
2	-	36	2.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	-	43	3.2 %
4	-	57	4.2 %
5	-	74	5.5 %
6	-	138	10.2 %
7	-	450	33.2 %
8	-	257	19.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 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

## S4CADFM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	88	6.5 %
1	-	58	4.3 %
2	-	70	5.2 %
3	-	61	4.5 %
4	-	78	5.8 %
5	-	91	6.7 %
6	-	154	11.4 %
7	-	322	23.8 %
8	-	166	12.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Did not skip into CaringAdlt measure	142	10.5 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,088 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

## S4CADNFM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	711	52.5 %
1	-	138	10.2 %
2	-	62	4.6 %
3	-	31	2.3 %
4	-	33	2.4 %
5	-	37	2.7 %
6	-	21	1.6 %
7	-	35	2.6 %
8	-	20	1.5 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Did not skip into CaringAdlt measure	142	10.5 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,088 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

## S4CADETH: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	33	2.4 %
2	-	36	2.7 %
3	-	43	3.2 %
4	-	58	4.3 %
5	-	78	5.8 %
6	-	134	9.9 %
7	-	451	33.3 %
8	-	255	18.8 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Did not skip into CaringAdlt measure	142	10.5 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,088 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

## S4CADRNG: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	21	1.6 %
2	-	20	1.5 %
3	-	29	2.1 %
4	-	34	2.5 %
5	-	37	2.7 %
6	-	47	3.5 %
7	-	88	6.5 %
8	-	108	8.0 %
9	-	53	3.9 %
10	-	40	3.0 %
11	-	53	3.9 %
12	-	46	3.4 %
13	-	28	2.1 %
14	-	63	4.7 %
15	-	38	2.8 %
16	-	32	2.4 %
17	-	23	1.7 %
18	-	32	2.4 %
19	-	16	1.2 %
20	-	27	2.0 %
21	-	28	2.1 %
22	-	26	1.9 %
23	-	17	1.3 %
24	-	16	1.2 %
25	-	12	0.9 %
26	-	11	0.8 %
27	-	12	0.9 %
28	-	10	0.7 %
29	-	13	1.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
30	-	9	0.7 %
31	-	4	0.3 %
32	-	6	0.4 %
33	-	7	0.5 %
34	-	6	0.4 %
35	-	10	0.7 %
36	-	9	0.7 %
37	-	4	0.3 %
38	-	2	0.1 %
39	-	2	0.1 %
40	-	3	0.2 %
42	-	4	0.3 %
43	-	2	0.1 %
44	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	2	0.1 %
46	-	3	0.2 %
48	-	1	0.1 %
49	-	3	0.2 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
51	-	1	0.1 %
52	-	3	0.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Did not skip into CaringAdlt measure	142	10.5 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,088 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

## S4CADMDV: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	222	16.4 %
2	-	262	19.4 %
3	-	205	15.1 %
4	-	103	7.6 %
5	-	112	8.3 %
6	-	43	3.2 %
7	-	9	0.7 %
8	-	14	1.0 %
9	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	78	5.8 %
11	-	2	0.1 %
12	-	4	0.3 %
14	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	7	0.5 %
16	-	1	0.1 %
17	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	14	1.0 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	2	0.1 %
50	-	2	0.1 %
67	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
80	-	2	0.1 %
90	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Did not skip into CaringAdlt measure	142	10.5 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,088 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

## S4CADDIV: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	142	10.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	385	28.4 %
2	-	389	28.7 %
3	-	211	15.6 %
4	-	69	5.1 %
5	-	24	1.8 %
6	-	9	0.7 %
7	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4DEPSUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	291	21.5 %
1	-	857	63.3 %
2	-	82	6.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4CADNFD: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	855	63.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	269	19.9 %
2	-	72	5.3 %
3	-	23	1.7 %
4	-	8	0.6 %
5	-	3	0.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4DEPNFS: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1080	79.8 %
1	-	148	10.9 %
2	-	2	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4DEMO\_FMCRIM: S4 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	1039	76.7 %
1	Yes	183	13.5 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	9	0.7 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,222 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

## S4DEMO\_FAMCRIM1\_FCREL: S4 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)	25	1.8 %
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	88	6.5 %
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)	61	4.5 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	7	0.5 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1048	77.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 183 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

## **S4DEMO\_FAMCRIM1\_FCARR: S4 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	44	3.2 %
1	Yes	139	10.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1048	77.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 183 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

## **S4DEMO\_FAMCRIM1\_FCJAI: S4 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	14	1.0 %
1	Yes	124	9.2 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-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	1048	77.4 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 138 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

---

## S4DEMO\_FAMCRIM1\_FCATH: S4 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	134	9.9 %
1	Yes	47	3.5 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1048	77.4 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 181 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

---

## S4DEMO\_FAMCRIM2\_FCREL: S4 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)	3	0.2 %
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	14	1.0 %
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)	28	2.1 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	4	0.3 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	4	0.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1048	77.4 %
-97	Not Applicable	130	9.6 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 53 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

## **S4DEMO\_FAMCRIM2\_FCARR: S4 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	12	0.9 %
1	Yes	41	3.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	130	9.6 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1048	77.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 53 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

## **S4DEMO\_FAMCRIM2\_FCJAI: S4 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	4	0.3 %
1	Yes	37	2.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-103	Skipped: Subject doesn't know if this family member was arrested	12	0.9 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	130	9.6 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1048	77.4 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

## S4DEMO\_FAMCRIM2\_FCATH: S4 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	41	3.0 %
1	Yes	12	0.9 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	130	9.6 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1048	77.4 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 53 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

## S4DEMO\_FAMCRIM3\_FCREL: S4 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)	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)	13	1.0 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	1	0.1 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	130	9.6 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1048	77.4 %
-97	Not Applicable	37	2.7 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 15 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

---

## S4DEMO\_FAMCRIM3\_FCARR: S4 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	4	0.3 %
1	Yes	11	0.8 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	167	12.3 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1048	77.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 15 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

---

## S4DEMO\_FAMCRIM3\_FCJAI: S4 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	11	0.8 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-103	Skipped: Subject doesnt know if this family member was arrested	4	0.3 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	167	12.3 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1048	77.4 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 11 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

---

## S4DEMO\_FAMCRIM3\_FCATH: S4 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	13	1.0 %
1	Yes	2	0.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	167	12.3 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1048	77.4 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 15 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

## S4DEMO\_FAMCRIM4\_FCREL: S4 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)	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)	2	0.1 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	1	0.1 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	167	12.3 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1048	77.4 %
-97	Not Applicable	8	0.6 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 7 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

## S4DEMO\_FAMCRIM4\_FCARR: S4 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	3	0.2 %
1	Yes	4	0.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	175	12.9 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1048	77.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 7 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

## S4DEMO\_FAMCRIM4\_FCJAI: S4 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	0	0.0 %
1	Yes	4	0.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-103	Skipped: Subject doesn't know if this family member was arrested	3	0.2 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	175	12.9 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1048	77.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

## S4DEMO\_FAMCRIM4\_FCATH: S4 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	5	0.4 %
1	Yes	2	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	175	12.9 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1048	77.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 7 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

---

## S4DEMO\_FAMCRIM5\_FCREL: S4 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)	1	0.1 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	0	0.0 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	175	12.9 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1048	77.4 %
-97	Not Applicable	5	0.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 2 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

---

## S4DEMO\_FAMCRIM5\_FCARR: S4 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	1	0.1 %
1	Yes	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	180	13.3 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1048	77.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 2 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

#### S4DEMO\_FAMCRIM5\_FCJAI: S4 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	1	0.1 %
1	Yes	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-103	Skipped: Subject doesnt know if this family member was arrested	1	0.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	180	13.3 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1048	77.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1 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

#### S4DEMO\_FAMCRIM5\_FCATH: S4 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	2	0.1 %
1	Yes	0	0.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	180	13.3 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1048	77.4 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 2 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

## S4CRIMEATH: S4 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	77	5.7 %
1	Yes - at least one family member involved in crime also lives at subj home address	33	2.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	384	28.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	3	0.2 %
-100	No family members involved in crime	734	54.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 110 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

## S4FCATH: S4 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	-	77	5.7 %
1	-	27	2.0 %
2	-	5	0.4 %
4	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	384	28.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	3	0.2 %
-100	No family members involved in crime	734	54.2 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 110 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

## S4CRIMEATH\_REL1: S4 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)	4	0.3 %
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	17	1.3 %
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)	8	0.6 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	0	0.0 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	384	28.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-105	Family involved in crime, but this relative doesn't live at subject's home address	79	5.8 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	3	0.2 %
-100	Skipped: No family members involved in crime	734	54.2 %
-9	Subject doesn't know living situation of this relative	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 30 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

## S4CRIMEATH\_REL2: S4 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)	5	0.4 %
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)	0	0.0 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	384	28.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-105	Family involved in crime, but this relative doesn't live at subject's home address	26	1.9 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	3	0.2 %
-100	Skipped: No family members involved in crime	734	54.2 %
-97	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	76	5.6 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 8 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

## S4CRIMEATH\_REL3: S4 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)	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 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	1	0.1 %
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	384	28.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-105	Family involved in crime, but this relative doesn't live at subject's home address	10	0.7 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	3	0.2 %
-100	Skipped: No family members involved in crime	734	54.2 %
-97	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	98	7.2 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

---

## S4CRIMEATH\_REL4: S4 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)	1	0.1 %
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 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	1	0.1 %
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	384	28.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-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	3	0.2 %
-100	Skipped: No family members involved in crime	734	54.2 %
-97	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	104	7.7 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 2 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

## S4CRIMEATH\_REL5: S4 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 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	1	0.1 %
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	384	28.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-105	Family involved in crime, but this relative doesn't live at subject's home address	1	0.1 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	3	0.2 %
-100	Skipped: No family members involved in crime	734	54.2 %
-97	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	108	8.0 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

---

## S4PCRIMEATH: S4 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	-	77	5.7 %
0.25	-	1	0.1 %
0.33	-	1	0.1 %
0.50	-	5	0.4 %
0.80	-	1	0.1 %
1.00	-	25	1.8 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-500.00	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	384	28.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101.00	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	3	0.2 %
-100.00	No family members involved in crime	734	54.2 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 110 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

---

## S4FAMJAILATH\_COUNT: S4 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	-	38	2.8 %
1	-	53	3.9 %
2	-	14	1.0 %
3	-	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	384	28.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	3	0.2 %
-100	No family members involved in crime	734	54.2 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 110 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

## S4PJAILEDATH: S4 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	%
0.0	-	38	2.8 %
0.4	-	1	0.1 %
0.5	-	6	0.4 %
1.0	-	65	4.8 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-500.0	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	384	28.4 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101.0	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	3	0.2 %
-100.0	No family members involved in crime	734	54.2 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 110 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -500.0 , -202.0 , -201.0 , -101.0 , -100.0

## S4ARRDAD: S4 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	101	7.5 %
1	Biological father was arrested or jailed	9	0.7 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	384	28.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	3	0.2 %
-100	No family members involved in crime	734	54.2 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 110 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

## S4ARRMOM: S4 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	110	8.1 %
1	Biological mother was arrested or jailed	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	384	28.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	3	0.2 %
-100	No family members involved in crime	734	54.2 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 110 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

## S4ARRBTH: S4 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	101	7.5 %
1	Both biological parents were arrested or jailed	0	0.0 %
2	Biological mother or biological father arrested or jailed, but not both	9	0.7 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	384	28.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	3	0.2 %
-100	No family members involved in crime	734	54.2 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 110 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

## S4LIVCAL\_MAINFREEID: S4 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	964	71.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-112	Unknown: Main community location mistakenly set to an institution	3	0.2 %
-102	Skipped: No community locations mentioned on the calendar	264	19.5 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 964 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

## S4LIVCAL\_MAINFREETYPE: S4 LivCal: Recall Period - Main community location type

Recall Period - Main community location type.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Own place	99	7.3 %
2	Private home: birth/adoptive family/partners home	652	48.2 %
3	Private home: foster family	7	0.5 %
4	Private home: friends/partners family	54	4.0 %
5	Private home: other relatives	121	8.9 %
7	Group home, supervised living in community	9	0.7 %
11	Shelter/emergency shelter	3	0.2 %
12	Place to place, different people	6	0.4 %
13	Streets/homeless	3	0.2 %
17	College Dorm	4	0.3 %
18	Community Location NOS	2	0.1 %
96	Other (specify)	4	0.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-112	Unknown: Main community location mistakenly set to an institution	3	0.2 %
-102	Skipped: No community locations mentioned on the calendar	264	19.5 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 964 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

---

### S4HOMEQ\_HHNUM: S4 HHComp: Recall Period - Number of people (other than subj) living in the household (associated w/location stored in S4LivCal\_MainLocID)

Recall Period - Number of people (other than subj) living in the household (associated w/location stored in S4LivCal\_MainLocID).

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	20	1.5 %
1	-	107	7.9 %
2	-	177	13.1 %
3	-	173	12.8 %
4	-	167	12.3 %
5	-	89	6.6 %
6	-	48	3.5 %
7	-	22	1.6 %
8	-	14	1.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
9	9 or More	15	1.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	391	28.9 %
-99	Dont Know	5	0.4 %
-98	Refused	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 832 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

## S4HOMEQ\_BIOFATHER: S4 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	669	49.4 %
1	Yes	163	12.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	6	0.4 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	391	28.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 832 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

## S4HOMEQ\_BIOMOTHER: S4 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	351	25.9 %
1	Yes	481	35.5 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	6	0.4 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	391	28.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 832 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

## S4HOMEQ\_BIOSISTER: S4 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	527	38.9 %
1	Yes	305	22.5 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	6	0.4 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	391	28.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 832 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

## S4HOMEQ\_BIOBROTHER: S4 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	524	38.7 %
1	Yes	308	22.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	6	0.4 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	391	28.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 832 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

## S4HOMEQ\_BIOGRANDMOTHER: S4 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	737	54.4 %
1	Yes	95	7.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	6	0.4 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	391	28.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 832 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

## S4HOMEQ\_BIOGRANDFATHER: S4 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	804	59.4 %
1	Yes	28	2.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	6	0.4 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	391	28.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 832 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

## S4HOMEQ\_OTHDAD: S4 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	732	54.1 %
1	Yes	100	7.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	6	0.4 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	391	28.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 832 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

## S4HOMEQ\_OTHMOM: S4 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	798	58.9 %
1	Yes	34	2.5 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	6	0.4 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	391	28.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 832 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

## S4HOMEQ\_OTH SIB: S4 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	802	59.2 %
1	Yes	30	2.2 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	6	0.4 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	391	28.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 832 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

## S4HOMEQ SIGOTH: S5 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	702	51.8 %
1	Yes	130	9.6 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	6	0.4 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	391	28.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 832 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

## S4HOMEQ\_CHILD: S5 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	748	55.2 %
1	Yes	84	6.2 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	6	0.4 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	391	28.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 832 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

## S4HOMEQ\_RELATIVE: S4 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	643	47.5 %
1	Yes	189	14.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	6	0.4 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	391	28.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 832 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

## S4HOMEQ\_FRIEND: S4 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	759	56.1 %
1	Yes	73	5.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	6	0.4 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	391	28.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 832 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

## S4HOMEQ\_OTHERS: S4 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	725	53.5 %
1	Yes	107	7.9 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	6	0.4 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	391	28.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 832 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

## S4PEERCHAR\_NFRND: S4 CharFriends: Number of close friends

How many close friends subject has.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	119	8.8 %
1	-	247	18.2 %
2	-	311	23.0 %
3	-	212	15.7 %
4	-	149	11.0 %
5	-	81	6.0 %
6	-	36	2.7 %
7	-	19	1.4 %
8	-	6	0.4 %
9	-	4	0.3 %
10	-	21	1.6 %
12	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	5	0.4 %
17	-	2	0.1 %
20	-	10	0.7 %
23	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	2	0.1 %
50	-	2	0.1 %
90	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
95	-	1	0.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-99	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 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

## S4FRIENDS1\_SAMEAS: S4 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	362	26.7 %
2	Same friend as friend 2 from previous interview	145	10.7 %
3	Same friend as friend 3 from previous interview	46	3.4 %
4	Same friend as friend 4 from previous interview	34	2.5 %
5	No, this is not one of those people (this is a new friend)	524	38.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	120	8.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,111 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

## S4FRIENDS1\_GENFR: S4 CharFriends: Friend1 - Gender (male/female)

Gender of friend 1 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Male	805	59.5 %
2	Female	306	22.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	120	8.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,111 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

## S4FRIENDS1\_AGEFR: S4 CharFriends: Friend1 - Age

Age of friend 1 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1	0.1 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	1	0.1 %
13	-	4	0.3 %
14	-	6	0.4 %
15	-	37	2.7 %
16	-	118	8.7 %
17	-	161	11.9 %
18	-	213	15.7 %
19	-	160	11.8 %
20	-	110	8.1 %
21	-	67	4.9 %
22	-	43	3.2 %
23	-	38	2.8 %
24	-	34	2.5 %
25	-	10	0.7 %
26	-	14	1.0 %
27	-	11	0.8 %
28	-	7	0.5 %
29	-	4	0.3 %
30	-	3	0.2 %
31	-	3	0.2 %
32	-	5	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
33	-	3	0.2 %
34	-	2	0.1 %
35	-	4	0.3 %
36	-	1	0.1 %
37	-	5	0.4 %
38	-	5	0.4 %
39	-	4	0.3 %
40	-	4	0.3 %
41	-	2	0.1 %
42	-	1	0.1 %
43	-	4	0.3 %
44	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	4	0.3 %
46	-	3	0.2 %
50	-	2	0.1 %
51	-	1	0.1 %
52	-	2	0.1 %
54	-	1	0.1 %
55	-	1	0.1 %
56	-	1	0.1 %
57	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	1	0.1 %
61	-	1	0.1 %
70	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-999	Dont Know	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	120	8.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,106 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

## **S4FR1\_ARRESTREC: S4 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	539	39.8 %
1	Yes - friend has been arrested	565	41.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	120	8.9 %
-9	Subject DK if friend was ever arrested	7	0.5 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,104 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

## S4FR1\_JAILEDREC: S4 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	643	47.5 %
1	Yes - friend has been in jail	460	34.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	120	8.9 %
-9	Subject DK if friend was ever in jail	8	0.6 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,103 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

## S4FRIENDS1\_CONT: S4 CharFriends: Friend1 - Frequency of contact

Contact frequency with friend 1.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	610	45.1 %
2	3-6 times per week	174	12.9 %
3	2 times per week	72	5.3 %
4	1 time per week	94	6.9 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	42	3.1 %
6	1 time per month	42	3.1 %
7	Less than monthly	76	5.6 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	120	8.9 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,110 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4FR1\_DRUGUSEREC: S4 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	2	0.1 %
1	Yes - friend has used drugs	3	0.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Variable not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Did not have this many friends	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -400 , -201 , -100

## S4FRIENDS2\_SAMEAS: S4 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	152	11.2 %
2	Same friend as friend 2 from previous interview	131	9.7 %
3	Same friend as friend 3 from previous interview	56	4.1 %
4	Same friend as friend 4 from previous interview	23	1.7 %
5	No, this is not one of those people (this is a new friend)	502	37.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	247	18.2 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	120	8.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 864 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4FRIENDS2\_GENFR: S4 CharFriends: Friend2 - Gender (male/female)

Gender of friend 2 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Male	631	46.6 %
2	Female	233	17.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	247	18.2 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	120	8.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 864 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

## S4FRIENDS2\_AGEFR: S4 CharFriends: Friend2 - Age

Age of friend 2 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
13	-	2	0.1 %
14	-	3	0.2 %
15	-	31	2.3 %
16	-	85	6.3 %
17	-	134	9.9 %
18	-	169	12.5 %
19	-	139	10.3 %
20	-	77	5.7 %
21	-	60	4.4 %
22	-	36	2.7 %
23	-	18	1.3 %
24	-	19	1.4 %
25	-	13	1.0 %
26	-	14	1.0 %
27	-	5	0.4 %
28	-	4	0.3 %
29	-	4	0.3 %
30	-	4	0.3 %
31	-	2	0.1 %
32	-	3	0.2 %
33	-	2	0.1 %
34	-	2	0.1 %
35	-	3	0.2 %
36	-	4	0.3 %
37	-	5	0.4 %
38	-	2	0.1 %
39	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	5	0.4 %
41	-	2	0.1 %
42	-	1	0.1 %
43	-	1	0.1 %
44	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	2	0.1 %
46	-	2	0.1 %
48	-	1	0.1 %
49	-	2	0.1 %
54	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
77	-	1	0.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-999	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	247	18.2 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	120	8.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 861 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## **S4FR2\_ARRESTREC: S4 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	464	34.3 %
1	Yes - friend has been arrested	396	29.2 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	367	27.1 %
-9	Subject DK if friend was ever arrested	4	0.3 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 860 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## **S4FR2\_JAILEDREC: S4 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	540	39.9 %
1	Yes - friend has been in jail	316	23.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	367	27.1 %
-9	Subject DK if friend was ever in jail	8	0.6 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 856 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

## S4FRIENDS2\_CONT: S4 CharFriends: Friend2 - Frequency of contact

Contact frequency with friend 2.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	393	29.0 %
2	3-6 times per week	158	11.7 %
3	2 times per week	84	6.2 %
4	1 time per week	68	5.0 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	45	3.3 %
6	1 time per month	54	4.0 %
7	Less than monthly	62	4.6 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	247	18.2 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	120	8.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 864 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 566-569 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4FR2\_DRUGUSEREC: S4 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	3	0.2 %
1	Yes - friend has used drugs	2	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Variable not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Did not have this many friends	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 570-573 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -400 , -201 , -100

## **S4FRIENDS3\_SAMEAS: S4 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	60	4.4 %
2	Same friend as friend 2 from previous interview	49	3.6 %
3	Same friend as friend 3 from previous interview	57	4.2 %
4	Same friend as friend 4 from previous interview	20	1.5 %
5	No, this is not one of those people (this is a new friend)	367	27.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	558	41.2 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	120	8.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 553 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

## **S4FRIENDS3\_GENFR: S4 CharFriends: Friend3 - Gender (male/female)**

Gender of friend 3 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Male	428	31.6 %
2	Female	125	9.2 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	558	41.2 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	120	8.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 553 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 578-581 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4FRIENDS3\_AGEFR: S4 CharFriends: Friend3 - Age

Age of friend 3 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	-	1	0.1 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
11	-	1	0.1 %
13	-	2	0.1 %
14	-	4	0.3 %
15	-	19	1.4 %
16	-	59	4.4 %
17	-	96	7.1 %
18	-	101	7.5 %
19	-	66	4.9 %
20	-	47	3.5 %
21	-	34	2.5 %
22	-	21	1.6 %
23	-	24	1.8 %
24	-	13	1.0 %
25	-	7	0.5 %
26	-	5	0.4 %
27	-	5	0.4 %
28	-	8	0.6 %
29	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
30	-	3	0.2 %
31	-	3	0.2 %
32	-	1	0.1 %
33	-	3	0.2 %
34	-	3	0.2 %
35	-	3	0.2 %
36	-	2	0.1 %
37	-	1	0.1 %
38	-	2	0.1 %
40	-	4	0.3 %
41	-	1	0.1 %
42	-	1	0.1 %
43	-	2	0.1 %
45	-	2	0.1 %
47	-	1	0.1 %
48	-	1	0.1 %
49	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
51	-	1	0.1 %
56	-	1	0.1 %
62	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	558	41.2 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	120	8.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 553 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 582-585 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## **S4FR3\_ARRESTREC: S4 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	292	21.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Yes - friend has been arrested	259	19.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	678	50.1 %
-9	Subject DK if friend was ever arrested	2	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 551 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 586-589 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4FR3\_JAILEDREC: S4 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	345	25.5 %
1	Yes - friend has been in jail	206	15.2 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	678	50.1 %
-9	Subject DK if friend was ever in jail	2	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 551 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 590-593 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4FRIENDS3\_CONT: S4 CharFriends: Friend3 - Frequency of contact

Contact frequency with friend 3.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	253	18.7 %
2	3-6 times per week	104	7.7 %
3	2 times per week	47	3.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	1 time per week	42	3.1 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	38	2.8 %
6	1 time per month	26	1.9 %
7	Less than monthly	42	3.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	558	41.2 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	120	8.9 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 552 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 594-597 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

### S4FR3\_DRUGUSEREC: S4 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	1	0.1 %
1	Yes - friend has used drugs	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Variable not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Did not have this many friends	4	0.3 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 2 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 598-601 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -400, -201, -100

### S4FRIENDS4\_SAMEAS: S4 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	22	1.6 %
2	Same friend as friend 2 from previous interview	27	2.0 %
3	Same friend as friend 3 from previous interview	21	1.6 %
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)	256	18.9 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	770	56.9 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	120	8.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 602-605 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4FRIENDS4\_GENFR: S4 CharFriends: Friend4 - Gender (male/female)

Gender of friend 4 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Male	273	20.2 %
2	Female	68	5.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	770	56.9 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	120	8.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 341 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

## S4FRIENDS4\_AGEFR: S4 CharFriends: Friend4 - Age

Age of friend 4 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	1	0.1 %
3	-	1	0.1 %
6	-	1	0.1 %
9	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	1	0.1 %
12	-	3	0.2 %
13	-	3	0.2 %
14	-	4	0.3 %
15	-	16	1.2 %
16	-	36	2.7 %
17	-	59	4.4 %
18	-	52	3.8 %
19	-	40	3.0 %
20	-	23	1.7 %
21	-	17	1.3 %
22	-	12	0.9 %
23	-	21	1.6 %
24	-	10	0.7 %
25	-	7	0.5 %
26	-	5	0.4 %
27	-	1	0.1 %
29	-	4	0.3 %
30	-	2	0.1 %
32	-	2	0.1 %
33	-	2	0.1 %
34	-	1	0.1 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
36	-	1	0.1 %
37	-	1	0.1 %
39	-	2	0.1 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
43	-	2	0.1 %
44	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
55	-	1	0.1 %
57	-	2	0.1 %
60	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-999	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	770	56.9 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	120	8.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 340 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 610-613 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4FR4\_ARRESTREC: S4 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	185	13.7 %
1	Yes - friend has been arrested	156	11.5 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	890	65.7 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 614-617 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4FR4\_JAILEDREC: S4 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	214	15.8 %
1	Yes - friend has been in jail	127	9.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	890	65.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 618-621 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4FRIENDS4\_CONT: S4 CharFriends: Friend4 - Frequency of contact

Contact frequency with friend 4.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	146	10.8 %
2	3-6 times per week	62	4.6 %
3	2 times per week	32	2.4 %
4	1 time per week	35	2.6 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	13	1.0 %
6	1 time per month	20	1.5 %
7	Less than monthly	33	2.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	770	56.9 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	120	8.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 622-625 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4FR4\_DRUGUSEREC: S4 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	0	0.0 %
1	Yes - friend has used drugs	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-400	Variable not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Did not have this many friends	5	0.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 626-629 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -400 , -201 , -100

## S4FRARR: S4 CharFriends: Count of 4 closest friends ever arrested

Count of 4 closest friends ever arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	356	26.3 %
1	-	353	26.1 %
2	-	239	17.7 %
3	-	107	7.9 %
4	-	56	4.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	120	8.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,111 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

## S4ARRDEN: S4 CharFriends: Denominator for number of friends mentioned-arrest

Denominator for number of friends mentioned-arrest.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	247	18.2 %
2	-	311	23.0 %
3	-	212	15.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	-	341	25.2 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	120	8.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,111 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 634-637 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4PFRARR: S4 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	-	356	26.3 %
0.25	-	65	4.8 %
0.33	-	55	4.1 %
0.50	-	204	15.1 %
0.67	-	60	4.4 %
0.75	-	66	4.9 %
1.00	-	305	22.5 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	120	8.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,111 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 638-644 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4FRJAIL: S4 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	-	451	33.3 %
1	-	361	26.7 %
2	-	188	13.9 %
3	-	72	5.3 %
4	-	39	2.9 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	120	8.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,111 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 645-648 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4JAIDEN: S4 CharFriends: Denominator for number of friends mentioned-jailed

Denominator for number of friends mentioned-jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	247	18.2 %
2	-	311	23.0 %
3	-	212	15.7 %
4	-	341	25.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	120	8.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,111 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 649-652 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4PFRJAI: S4 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	-	451	33.3 %
0.25	-	91	6.7 %
0.33	-	64	4.7 %
0.50	-	176	13.0 %
0.67	-	45	3.3 %
0.75	-	42	3.1 %
1.00	-	242	17.9 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	120	8.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,111 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 653-659 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4FRDRUG: S4 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	-	1	0.1 %
1	-	3	0.2 %
4	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Drug question not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 660-663 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

## S4DRUDEN: S4 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	%
2	-	3	0.2 %
3	-	1	0.1 %
4	-	1	0.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Drug question not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 664-667 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -800 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

## S4PFRDRU: S4 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	-	1	0.1 %
0.33	-	1	0.1 %
0.50	-	2	0.1 %
1.00	-	1	0.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400.00	Drug question not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 668-675 (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

## S4WALDEN: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	Not at all like me	6	0.4 %
1.22	-	5	0.4 %
1.33	-	11	0.8 %
1.44	-	9	0.7 %
1.56	-	10	0.7 %
1.67	-	23	1.7 %
1.78	-	26	1.9 %
1.88	-	1	0.1 %
1.89	-	18	1.3 %
2.00	A little bit like me	44	3.2 %
2.11	-	47	3.5 %
2.22	-	53	3.9 %
2.33	-	58	4.3 %
2.44	-	65	4.8 %
2.56	-	71	5.2 %
2.67	-	77	5.7 %
2.78	-	86	6.4 %
2.89	-	92	6.8 %
3.00	Kind of like me	116	8.6 %
3.11	-	49	3.6 %
3.22	-	51	3.8 %
3.25	-	1	0.1 %
3.33	-	45	3.3 %
3.44	-	33	2.4 %
3.56	-	25	1.8 %
3.63	-	1	0.1 %
3.67	-	58	4.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.78	-	24	1.8 %
3.89	-	24	1.8 %
4.00	Really like me	101	7.5 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 676-682 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4COM6MO: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	836	61.7 %
1	-	94	6.9 %
2	-	20	1.5 %
3	-	10	0.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-666	Data deleted due to overlap - data in other tp	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Did not skip into ComInv measure	266	19.6 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 960 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 683-686 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -666 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

## S4DV\_VICTIM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	4	0.3 %
1	Yes	1	0.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

Location: 687-690 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -900 , -800 , -500 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

## S4DV\_PERPETRATOR: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	4	0.3 %
1	Yes	1	0.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

Location: 691-694 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999, -998, -900, -800, -500, -400, -300, -202, -201, -100

## S4DV\_VIC\_PHYS: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	5	0.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 695-698 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -900 , -800 , -500 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

---

## S4DV\_VIC\_EMOT: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	4	0.3 %
1	-	1	0.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 699-702 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -900 , -800 , -500 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

## S4DV\_VIC\_SEXUAL: S4 DV: Count of victim - sexual items endorsed

Victim of domestic violence - sexual; count of sexual domestic violence items endorsed where subject is the victim

MEASRE: 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	5	0.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 703-706 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -900 , -800 , -500 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

## S4DV\_PERP\_PHYS: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	5	0.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 707-710 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -900 , -800 , -500 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

## S4DV\_PERP\_EMOT: S4 DV: Count of perpetrator - emotional items endorsed

Perpetrator of domestic violence - emotional; count of emotional domestic violence items endorsed where subject is the perpetrator

MEASRE: 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	4	0.3 %
1	-	1	0.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 711-714 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -900 , -800 , -500 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

## S4DV\_PERP\_SEXUAL: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	5	0.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 715-718 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -900 , -800 , -500 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

---

## S4PERP\_PHYS\_MRP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	0	0.0 %
1	Yes	0	0.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-103	DVSum1 skipped: sub didnt physically abuse partner	3	0.2 %
-102	Did not have romantic partner - question skipped	2	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 719-722 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -900 , -800 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -120 , -103 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

## S4VIC\_PHYS\_MRP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	0	0.0 %
1	Yes	0	0.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-104	DVSum2 skipped: partner didnt physically abuse subject	3	0.2 %
-102	Did not have romantic partner - question skipped	2	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 723-726 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -900 , -800 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -120 , -104 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

---

## S4PERP\_EMO\_MRP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	0	0.0 %
1	Yes	1	0.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-105	DVSum3 skipped: sub didnt emotionally abuse partner	2	0.1 %
-102	Did not have romantic partner - question skipped	2	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 727-730 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -900, -800, -500, -400, -202, -201, -120, -105, -102, -101, -9, -8

---

## S4VIC\_EMO\_MRP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	0	0.0 %
1	Yes	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-106	DVSum4 skipped: Partner did not emotionally abuse subject	2	0.1 %
-102	Did not have romantic partner - question skipped	2	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 731-734 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -900, -800, -500, -400, -202, -201, -120, -106, -102, -101, -9, -8

---

## S4PERP\_SEX\_MRP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	0	0.0 %
1	Yes	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-107	DVSum5 skipped: Subject did not sexually abuse partner	3	0.2 %
-102	Did not have romantic partner - question skipped	2	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 735-738 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -900 , -800 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -120 , -107 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

## S4VIC\_SEX\_MRP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	0	0.0 %
1	Yes	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-108	DVSum6 skipped: Partner has not sexually abused subject	3	0.2 %
-102	Did not have romantic partner - question skipped	2	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

**Location:** 739-742 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

**Variable Type:** numeric

**(Range of) Missing Values:** -900 , -800 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -120 , -108 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

---

## S4SCHCAL\_MAINSCHOOLID: S4 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	670	49.5 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	2	0.1 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	559	41.3 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 670 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 743-747 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -114 , -109 , -107 , -102

---

## S4SCHCAL\_MAINSCHOOLTYPE: S4 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	132	9.7 %
2	Parochial/private	2	0.1 %
3	Private approved	4	0.3 %
4	Institution school	292	21.6 %
5	Alternative public	50	3.7 %
6	Trade/vocation	38	2.8 %
7	College/junior college	37	2.7 %
8	Charter school	83	6.1 %
9	Home-schooling	5	0.4 %
10	GED program	23	1.7 %
96	Other (specify)	4	0.3 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	2	0.1 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	559	41.3 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 670 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 748-751 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -114 , -107 , -102 , -99 , -98

## S4SCHCAL\_MAINSCHOOLTYPE\_SPEC: S4 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	2	0.1 %
2	Institution: College	10	0.7 %
3	Institution: GED/ HSD/ High School Continuation	112	8.3 %
4	Institution: Unspecified	168	12.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	2	0.1 %
-108	NA: This is a community based school	378	27.9 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	559	41.3 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 292 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 752-755 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -114 , -108 , -107 , -102 , -99 , -98

## S4SCHCAL\_MAINSCHOOLCOUNT: S4 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	-	50	3.7 %
2	-	65	4.8 %
3	-	115	8.5 %
4	-	131	9.7 %
5	-	127	9.4 %
6	-	134	9.9 %
7	-	30	2.2 %
8	-	12	0.9 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	2	0.1 %
-107	Data missing: Subject was enrolled in a GED program but months unknown	6	0.4 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	559	41.3 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 664 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 756-759 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -114 , -109 , -107 , -102

## S4SCHCAL\_MAINFREEID: S4 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	415	30.6 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-117	Skipped: Not enrolled in any community based schools	255	18.8 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	2	0.1 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	559	41.3 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 415 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 760-764 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -117 , -114 , -107 , -102

## S4SCHCAL\_MAINFREETYPE: S4 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	141	10.4 %
2	Parochial/private	2	0.1 %
3	Private approved	4	0.3 %
4	Institution school	0	0.0 %
5	Alternative public	61	4.5 %
6	Trade/vocation	45	3.3 %
7	College/junior college	39	2.9 %
8	Charter school	86	6.4 %
9	Home-schooling	5	0.4 %
10	GED program	28	2.1 %
96	Other (specify)	4	0.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-117	Skipped: Not enrolled in any community based schools	255	18.8 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	2	0.1 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	559	41.3 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 415 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 765-768 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -117 , -114 , -107 , -102 , -99 , -98

## S4SCHCAL\_MAINFREECOUNT: S4 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	-	48	3.5 %
2	-	47	3.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	-	70	5.2 %
4	-	75	5.5 %
5	-	72	5.3 %
6	-	80	5.9 %
7	-	13	1.0 %
8	-	6	0.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-117	Skipped: Not enrolled in any community based schools	255	18.8 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	2	0.1 %
-107	Data missing: Subject was enrolled in a GED program but months unknown	4	0.3 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	559	41.3 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 411 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 769-772 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -117 , -114 , -107 , -102

---

## S4SCH\_REGQHOMEWORK: S4 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	45	3.3 %
1	Less than one hour	35	2.6 %
2	One to five hours	106	7.8 %
3	Six to ten hours	24	1.8 %
4	More than ten hours	18	1.3 %
7	NA (No homework assigned)	172	12.7 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	7	0.5 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	822	60.7 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 400 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 773-776 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -112 , -9 , -8

---

## S4SCH\_REGQ\_SCHQ18: S4 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	-	394	29.1 %
1	-	2	0.1 %
3	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	2	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	7	0.5 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	824	60.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 399 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 777-780 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -112 , -9 , -8

---

## S4SCH\_REGQ\_SCHQ19: S4 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	-	352	26.0 %
1	-	4	0.3 %
2	-	2	0.1 %
3	-	7	0.5 %
4	-	7	0.5 %
5	-	21	1.6 %
6	-	3	0.2 %
7	-	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	7	0.5 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	824	60.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 399 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 781-784 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -112 , -9 , -8

## S4SCH\_REGQ\_SCHQ20: S4 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	-	394	29.1 %
2	-	2	0.1 %
5	-	3	0.2 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	7	0.5 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	824	60.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 399 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 785-788 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -112 , -9 , -8

## S4SCH\_REGQ\_SCHQ21: S4 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	-	394	29.1 %
1	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	3	0.2 %
7	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	7	0.5 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	824	60.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 399 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 789-792 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800, -202, -201, -112, -9, -8

## S4SCH\_REGQ\_SCHQ22: S4 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	-	390	28.8 %
1	-	4	0.3 %
2	-	2	0.1 %
5	-	3	0.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	7	0.5 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	824	60.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 399 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 793-796 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800, -202, -201, -112, -9, -8

## S4SCH\_REGQ\_SCHQ23: S4 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	-	398	29.4 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	7	0.5 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	824	60.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 399 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 797-800 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -112 , -9 , -8

---

## S4SCH\_REGQ\_SCHQ24: S4 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	-	395	29.2 %
1	-	2	0.1 %
2	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	7	0.5 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	824	60.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 399 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 801-804 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -112 , -9 , -8

---

## S4SCH\_REGQ\_SCHQ25: S4 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	-	366	27.0 %
1	-	19	1.4 %
2	-	8	0.6 %
3	-	3	0.2 %
4	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	2	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	7	0.5 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	824	60.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 399 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

---

## S4SCH\_REGQ\_SCHQ26: S4 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	5	0.4 %
2	Not too important	11	0.8 %
3	Somewhat important	17	1.3 %
4	Pretty important	14	1.0 %
5	Very important	35	2.6 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	7	0.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-113	Skipped: Not involved in any school activities	318	23.5 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	824	60.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 82 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 , -113 , -112 , -9 , -8

## S4TTOTEXA: S4 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	-	317	23.4 %
1	-	61	4.5 %
2	-	16	1.2 %
3	-	4	0.3 %
4	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	7	0.5 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	824	60.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 399 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 813-816 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

## S4SCHTCH: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	Strongly Disagree	3	0.2 %
1.33	-	1	0.1 %
1.67	-	2	0.1 %
2.00	Disagree	14	1.0 %
2.33	-	11	0.8 %
2.67	-	30	2.2 %
3.00	Neither Agree or Disagree	50	3.7 %
3.33	-	71	5.2 %
3.67	-	37	2.7 %
4.00	Agree	134	9.9 %
4.33	-	14	1.0 %
4.67	-	14	1.0 %
5.00	Strongly Agree	13	1.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-800.00	Data missing: Data cleaning	7	0.5 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	824	60.9 %
-9.00	Dont Know	5	0.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 394 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 817-823 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

## S4SCHATC: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0 %
1.57	-	1	0.1 %
1.86	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	Disagree	0	0.0 %
2.14	-	1	0.1 %
2.29	-	2	0.1 %
2.43	-	2	0.1 %
2.57	-	6	0.4 %
2.71	-	7	0.5 %
2.86	-	10	0.7 %
3.00	Neither Agree or Disagree	13	1.0 %
3.14	-	15	1.1 %
3.29	-	8	0.6 %
3.43	-	20	1.5 %
3.57	-	25	1.8 %
3.71	-	33	2.4 %
3.86	-	42	3.1 %
4.00	Agree	102	7.5 %
4.14	-	22	1.6 %
4.20	-	1	0.1 %
4.29	-	20	1.5 %
4.43	-	14	1.0 %
4.57	-	19	1.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4.71	-	10	0.7 %
4.86	-	5	0.4 %
5.00	Strongly Agree	18	1.3 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-800.00	Data missing: Data cleaning	7	0.5 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	824	60.9 %
-9.00	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 397 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 824-830 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

## S4SCH\_HSSATISFACTION: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.0	Strongly disagree	4	0.3 %
1.5	-	3	0.2 %
2.0	Disagree	20	1.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.5	-	24	1.8 %
3.0	Neither agree nor disagree	63	4.7 %
3.5	-	62	4.6 %
4.0	Agree	176	13.0 %
4.5	-	26	1.9 %
5.0	Strongly agree	19	1.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-800.0	Data missing: Data cleaning	7	0.5 %
-202.0	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.0	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	824	60.9 %
-9.0	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 397 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 831-837 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800.0 , -202.0 , -201.0 , -100.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

---

## S4SCH\_HSENGAGEMENT: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly disagree	0	0.0 %
1.25	-	2	0.1 %
2.00	Disagree	2	0.1 %
2.25	-	3	0.2 %
2.50	-	12	0.9 %
2.75	-	10	0.7 %
3.00	Neither agree nor disagree	24	1.8 %
3.25	-	16	1.2 %
3.50	-	41	3.0 %
3.75	-	45	3.3 %
4.00	Agree	150	11.1 %
4.25	-	20	1.5 %
4.50	-	30	2.2 %
4.75	-	15	1.1 %
5.00	Strongly agree	27	2.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-800.00	Data missing: Data cleaning	7	0.5 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	824	60.9 %
-9.00	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 397 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 838-844 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

## S4SCHCAL\_MAINDETID: S4 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	315	23.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-116	Skipped: Not enrolled in any institution schools	355	26.2 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	2	0.1 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	559	41.3 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 315 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 845-849 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -116 , -114 , -108 , -107 , -102

## S4SCHCAL\_MAINDETTYPE: S4 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	315	23.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-116	Skipped: Not enrolled in any institution schools	355	26.2 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	2	0.1 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	559	41.3 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 315 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 850-853 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -116 , -114 , -108 , -107 , -102

## S4SCHCAL\_MAINDETTYPE\_SPEC: S4 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	2	0.1 %
2	Institution: College	10	0.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	Institution: GED/ HSD/ High School Continuation	115	8.5 %
4	Institution: Unspecified	188	13.9 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-116	Skipped: Not enrolled in any institution schools	355	26.2 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	2	0.1 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	559	41.3 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 315 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 854-857 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -116 , -114 , -108 , -107 , -102 , -99 , -98

## S4SCHCAL\_MAINDETCount: S4 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	-	33	2.4 %
2	-	44	3.2 %
3	-	48	3.5 %
4	-	56	4.1 %
5	-	55	4.1 %
6	-	54	4.0 %
7	-	17	1.3 %
8	-	6	0.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-116	Skipped: Not enrolled in any institution schools	355	26.2 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	2	0.1 %
-107	Data missing: Subject was enrolled in a GED program but months unknown	2	0.1 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	559	41.3 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 313 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 858-861 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -116 , -114 , -108 , -107 , -102

## S4SCH\_DETQ\_DETHWRK: S4 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	156	11.5 %
1	Less than one hour	19	1.4 %
2	One to Five hours	36	2.7 %
3	One to ten hours	8	0.6 %
4	More than 10 hours	2	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	18	1.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-110	Skipped: Enrolled in institutional school but for less than three months	74	5.5 %
-109	Skipped: Not enrolled in institutional school	915	67.6 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-8	Refuse	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 221 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 862-865 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

## S4SCH\_DETQ\_DETACT0: S4 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	162	12.0 %
1	Yes	61	4.5 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	19	1.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-110	Skipped: Enrolled in institutional school but for less than three months	74	5.5 %
-109	Skipped: Not enrolled in institutional school	915	67.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 223 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 866-869 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

## S4SCH\_DETQ\_DETDYS1: S4 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	-	10	0.7 %
2	-	4	0.3 %
3	-	7	0.5 %
4	-	4	0.3 %
5	-	20	1.5 %
6	-	3	0.2 %
7	-	12	0.9 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	19	1.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-111	Skipped: Not involved in any school activities	162	12.0 %
-110	Skipped: Enrolled in institutional school but for less than three months	74	5.5 %
-109	Skipped: Not enrolled in institutional school	915	67.6 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 60 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 870-873 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -111 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

## S4SCH\_DETQ\_DETDYS2: S4 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	%
1	-	2	0.1 %
2	-	1	0.1 %
3	-	4	0.3 %
4	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	2	0.1 %
6	-	1	0.1 %
7	-	4	0.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	19	1.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-114	Skipped: Only involved in one school activity	46	3.4 %
-111	Skipped: Not involved in any school activities	162	12.0 %
-110	Skipped: Enrolled in institutional school but for less than three months	74	5.5 %
-109	Skipped: Not enrolled in institutional school	915	67.6 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 15 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 874-877 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800, -202, -201, -114, -111, -110, -109, -9, -8

## **S4SCH\_DETQ\_DETDYS3: S4 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	%
1	-	1	0.1 %
2	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	2	0.1 %
7	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	19	1.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-115	Skipped: Only involved in two school activities	10	0.7 %
-114	Skipped: Only involved in one school activity	46	3.4 %
-111	Skipped: Not involved in any school activities	162	12.0 %
-110	Skipped: Enrolled in institutional school but for less than three months	74	5.5 %
-109	Skipped: Not enrolled in institutional school	915	67.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 878-881 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -115 , -114 , -111 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

## S4SCH\_DETQ\_DETQ26: S4 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	4	0.3 %
2	Not too important	2	0.1 %
3	Somewhat important	10	0.7 %
4	Pretty important	12	0.9 %
5	Very important	33	2.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	19	1.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-111	Skipped: Not involved in any school activities	162	12.0 %
-110	Skipped: Enrolled in institutional school but for less than three months	74	5.5 %
-109	Skipped: Not enrolled in institutional school	915	67.6 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 61 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 882-885 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -111 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

## S4DETTCH: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	Strongly Disagree	1	0.1 %
1.33	-	2	0.1 %
1.67	-	3	0.2 %
2.00	Disagree	10	0.7 %
2.33	-	9	0.7 %
2.67	-	23	1.7 %
3.00	Neither Agree or Disagree	23	1.7 %
3.33	-	55	4.1 %
3.67	-	26	1.9 %
4.00	Agree	64	4.7 %
4.33	-	5	0.4 %
4.67	-	2	0.1 %
5.00	Strongly Agree	3	0.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-800.00	Data missing: Data cleaning	15	1.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Skipped: Did not skip into institutional school section	990	73.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 226 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 886-892 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -800.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

## S4DETATC: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0 %
2.00	Disagree	3	0.2 %
2.14	-	2	0.1 %
2.29	-	4	0.3 %
2.43	-	2	0.1 %
2.57	-	8	0.6 %
2.71	-	1	0.1 %
2.86	-	6	0.4 %
3.00	Neither Agree or Disagree	11	0.8 %
3.14	-	4	0.3 %
3.29	-	6	0.4 %
3.43	-	17	1.3 %
3.57	-	8	0.6 %
3.67	-	1	0.1 %
3.71	-	24	1.8 %
3.86	-	19	1.4 %
4.00	Agree	62	4.6 %
4.14	-	14	1.0 %
4.29	-	1	0.1 %
4.43	-	7	0.5 %
4.57	-	9	0.7 %
4.71	-	6	0.4 %
4.86	-	4	0.3 %
5.00	Strongly Agree	7	0.5 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-800.00	Data missing: Data cleaning	15	1.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Skipped: Did not skip into institutional school section	990	73.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 226 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 893-899 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

## S4SCH\_DETSATISFACTION: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.0	Strongly disagree	1	0.1 %
1.5	-	1	0.1 %
2.0	Disagree	22	1.6 %
2.5	-	16	1.2 %
3.0	Neither agree nor disagree	41	3.0 %
3.5	-	37	2.7 %
4.0	Agree	93	6.9 %
4.5	-	10	0.7 %
5.0	Strongly agree	5	0.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-800.0	Data missing: Data cleaning	15	1.1 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.0	Skipped: Did not skip into institutional school section	990	73.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 226 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 900-906 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800.0 , -202.0 , -201.0 , -100.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

## S4SCH\_DETENGAGEMENT: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly disagree	0	0.0 %
2.00	Disagree	6	0.4 %
2.25	-	5	0.4 %
2.50	-	6	0.4 %
2.75	-	6	0.4 %
3.00	Neither agree nor disagree	21	1.6 %
3.25	-	10	0.7 %
3.33	-	1	0.1 %
3.50	-	19	1.4 %
3.75	-	29	2.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4.00	Agree	86	6.4 %
4.25	-	7	0.5 %
4.50	-	14	1.0 %
4.75	-	7	0.5 %
5.00	Strongly agree	9	0.7 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-800.00	Data missing: Data cleaning	15	1.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Skipped: Did not skip into institutional school section	990	73.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 226 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 907-913 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

## S4SCHOOL\_PERFORMANCE: S4 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	55	4.1 %
2	About half A's and half B's	148	10.9 %
3	Mostly B's	81	6.0 %
4	About half B's and half C's	105	7.8 %
5	Mostly C's	58	4.3 %
6	About half C's and half D's	43	3.2 %
7	Mostly D's	5	0.4 %
8	Mostly below D's	23	1.7 %
9	No grades given	145	10.7 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-104	01.14+: Skipped if not enrolled in school in recall period	559	41.3 %
-99	Dont Know	8	0.6 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 663 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 914-917 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -700 , -500 , -202 , -201 , -104 , -99 , -98

---

## S4SCH\_BEHAVIOR: S4 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	-	558	41.2 %
1	-	179	13.2 %
2	-	12	0.9 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-108	Skipped: Not enrolled in school in recall period	482	35.6 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 749 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 918-921 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -202 , -201 , -108

---

## S4JOBCAL\_NWEEKSF: S4 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	-	1079	79.7 %
2.17	-	26	1.9 %
4.33	-	22	1.6 %
6.50	-	8	0.6 %
8.67	-	15	1.1 %
10.83	-	11	0.8 %
13.00	-	13	1.0 %
15.17	-	12	0.9 %
17.33	-	10	0.7 %
19.50	-	11	0.8 %
21.67	-	10	0.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
23.83	-	11	0.8 %
26.00	-	2	0.1 %
30.33	-	1	0.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,231 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 922-928 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -888.00 , -201.00

## S4JOBCAL\_NWEEKSCU: S4 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	-	685	50.6 %
2.17	-	84	6.2 %
4.33	-	69	5.1 %
6.50	-	39	2.9 %
8.67	-	53	3.9 %
9.75	-	1	0.1 %
10.83	-	30	2.2 %
13.00	-	27	2.0 %
14.08	-	2	0.1 %
15.17	-	44	3.2 %
16.25	-	1	0.1 %
17.33	-	34	2.5 %
18.42	-	1	0.1 %
19.50	-	31	2.3 %
20.58	-	1	0.1 %
21.67	-	37	2.7 %
22.75	-	1	0.1 %
23.83	-	34	2.5 %
26.00	-	37	2.7 %
27.08	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
28.17	-	4	0.3 %
30.33	-	10	0.7 %
32.50	-	2	0.1 %
34.67	-	2	0.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-166.00	Unknown - under-the-table work	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 929-935 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -888.00 , -201.00 , -167.00 , -166.00

## S4EXPWIT: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	758	56.0 %
1	-	197	14.5 %
2	-	128	9.5 %
3	-	66	4.9 %
4	-	45	3.3 %
5	-	25	1.8 %
6	-	8	0.6 %
7	-	2	0.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 936-939 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4EXPVIC: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1095	80.9 %
1	-	90	6.6 %
2	-	30	2.2 %
3	-	11	0.8 %
4	-	3	0.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 940-943 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4EXPTOT: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	731	54.0 %
1	-	202	14.9 %
2	-	123	9.1 %
3	-	65	4.8 %
4	-	43	3.2 %
5	-	29	2.1 %
6	-	14	1.0 %
7	-	12	0.9 %
8	-	6	0.4 %
9	-	3	0.2 %
10	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 944-947 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4FRDQLT: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	Not at all	0	0.0 %
1.20	-	1	0.1 %
1.56	-	1	0.1 %
1.60	-	2	0.1 %
1.80	-	2	0.1 %
1.90	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	A little	2	0.1 %
2.10	-	6	0.4 %
2.20	-	11	0.8 %
2.22	-	1	0.1 %
2.30	-	21	1.6 %
2.33	-	1	0.1 %
2.40	-	14	1.0 %
2.50	-	25	1.8 %
2.56	-	1	0.1 %
2.60	-	32	2.4 %
2.70	-	33	2.4 %
2.75	-	1	0.1 %
2.78	-	2	0.1 %
2.80	-	40	3.0 %
2.89	-	1	0.1 %
2.90	-	67	4.9 %
3.00	Quite a bit	49	3.6 %
3.10	-	69	5.1 %
3.11	-	1	0.1 %
3.20	-	61	4.5 %
3.22	-	2	0.1 %
3.30	-	62	4.6 %
3.33	-	3	0.2 %
3.40	-	71	5.2 %
3.44	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.50	-	85	6.3 %
3.56	-	1	0.1 %
3.60	-	82	6.1 %
3.70	-	100	7.4 %
3.78	-	1	0.1 %
3.80	-	86	6.4 %
3.89	-	1	0.1 %
3.90	-	66	4.9 %
4.00	Very much	104	7.7 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into FriendQuality section	120	8.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,111 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 948-954 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4FUTURE: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never True	3	0.2 %
1.25	-	4	0.3 %
1.38	-	5	0.4 %
1.50	-	11	0.8 %
1.63	-	19	1.4 %
1.75	-	42	3.1 %
1.88	-	54	4.0 %
2.00	Rarely True	68	5.0 %
2.13	-	87	6.4 %
2.25	-	85	6.3 %
2.38	-	100	7.4 %
2.50	-	116	8.6 %
2.63	-	107	7.9 %
2.75	-	96	7.1 %
2.88	-	107	7.9 %
3.00	Often True	76	5.6 %
3.13	-	61	4.5 %
3.25	-	58	4.3 %
3.38	-	39	2.9 %
3.50	-	28	2.1 %
3.63	-	30	2.2 %
3.75	-	7	0.5 %
3.88	-	7	0.5 %
4.00	Always True	16	1.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,226 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 955-961 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## **S4GANG\_OGNG1: S4 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	35	2.6 %
1	Yes	95	7.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Not in a gang during last interview	1096	80.9 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 130 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 962-965 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -202 , -201 , -101 , -9 , -8

## S4GANG\_LASTGANG\_CODE: S4 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	35	2.6 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-106	Skipped: Subject responded DK to still in gang item	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 35 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 966-970 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -9992 , -9991 , -9982 , -9981 , -9972 , -9971 , -202 , -201 , -107 , -106 , -102 , -101

## S4GANG\_LASTGANG\_WHENLEFT: S4 Gang: Recall period month (s4m#) 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	-	9	0.7 %
IntCompStat = 2	-	4	0.3 %
IntCompStat = 4	-	123	9.1 %
NA: DK if still member	-	1	0.1 %
NA: Has not left gang	-	95	7.0 %
NA: Not in gang last RP	-	1096	80.9 %
REFUSED	-	2	0.1 %
S4M01	-	10	0.7 %
S4M02	-	5	0.4 %
S4M03	-	3	0.2 %
S4M04	-	4	0.3 %
S4M06	-	2	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

*Location:* 971-995 (width: 25; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* character

## S4GANG\_NGNG1: S4 Gang: Join a gang during this recall period

Join a gang during this recall period.

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1107	81.8 %
1	Yes	25	1.8 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	95	7.0 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,132 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 996-999 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4GANG\_CURRENT\_CODE: S4 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	114	8.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-9982	AZ: Subj refused to provide name of gang	4	0.3 %
-9981	PA: Subj refused to provide name of gang	1	0.1 %
-9971	PA: Gang does not have a name	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 114 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1000-1004 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -9992 , -9991 , -9982 , -9981 , -9972 , -9971 , -202 , -201 , -109 , -108 , -103

---

## S4GANG\_GANG5: S4 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	%
3	-	1	0.1 %
4	-	1	0.1 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	3	0.2 %
30	-	2	0.1 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
70	-	1	0.1 %
80	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	1	0.1 %
180	-	1	0.1 %
200	-	4	0.3 %
255	-	1	0.1 %
2000	-	2	0.1 %
6000	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-9999	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-9998	Refused	2	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1107	81.8 %
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	95	7.0 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 22 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1005-1009 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -9999 , -9998 , -202 , -201 , -109 , -108 , -103 , -102

## S4GANG\_GANG6: S4 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	%
19	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	1	0.1 %
22	-	1	0.1 %
23	-	1	0.1 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
27	-	1	0.1 %
29	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	1	0.1 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
36	-	1	0.1 %
38	-	2	0.1 %
40	-	5	0.4 %
44	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	2	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
58	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	1	0.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1107	81.8 %
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	95	7.0 %
-98	Refused	2	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 23 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1010-1013 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -202 , -201 , -109 , -108 , -103 , -102 , -99 , -98

## S4GANG\_GANG7: S4 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	9	0.7 %
1	Yes	15	1.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1107	81.8 %
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	95	7.0 %
-8	Refused	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 24 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1014-1017 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -202 , -201 , -109 , -108 , -103 , -102 , -9 , -8

## S4GANG\_GANG8: S4 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	11	0.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Yes	13	1.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1107	81.8 %
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	95	7.0 %
-8	Refused	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 24 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1018-1021 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -202 , -201 , -109 , -108 , -103 , -102 , -9 , -8

## S4GANG\_GANG9: S4 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	8	0.6 %
1	Yes	16	1.2 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1107	81.8 %
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	95	7.0 %
-8	Refused	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 24 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1022-1025 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -202 , -201 , -109 , -108 , -103 , -102 , -9 , -8

## S4GANG\_GANG10: S4 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	5	0.4 %
1	Yes	19	1.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1107	81.8 %
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	95	7.0 %
-8	Refused	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 24 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1026-1029 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -202 , -201 , -109 , -108 , -103 , -102 , -9 , -8

## S4GANG\_GANG11: S4 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	10	0.7 %
1	Yes	14	1.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1107	81.8 %
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	95	7.0 %
-8	Refused	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 24 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1030-1033 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -202 , -201 , -109 , -108 , -103 , -102 , -9 , -8

## S4GANG\_GANG12: S4 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	36	2.7 %
2	3-6 times per week	8	0.6 %
3	twice per week	12	0.9 %
4	Once per week	9	0.7 %
5	Less weekly, ore than monthly	5	0.4 %
6	Once per month	11	0.8 %
7	Less than monthly	34	2.5 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1107	81.8 %
-9	Dont Know	4	0.3 %
-8	Refuse	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 115 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1034-1037 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -202 , -201 , -109 , -108 , -103 , -9 , -8

## S4GANG\_GNGNOW: S4 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	5	0.4 %
1	Yes	115	8.5 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1107	81.8 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 120 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1038-1041 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -202 , -201 , -109 , -108 , -103 , -9 , -8

---

## S4GANG\_CURRENT\_WHENLEFT: S4 Gang: Recall period month (s4m#) 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	%
DATE UNKNOWN	-	1	0.1 %
IntCompStat = 2	-	4	0.3 %
IntCompStat = 4	-	123	9.1 %
NA: Has not left new gang	-	115	8.5 %
NA: Not in any gang in RP	-	1107	81.8 %
REFUSED	-	2	0.1 %
S4M04	-	1	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: 1042-1066 (width: 25; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: character

---

## S4GANG\_GANG13: S4 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	10	0.7 %
2	Not leader, but one of the top people	16	1.2 %
3	Member	91	6.7 %
4	Something else (other)	1	0.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1107	81.8 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-8	Refuse	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 118 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1067-1070 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -202, -201, -109, -108, -103, -9, -8

---

## S4GANG\_GANG16: S4 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	24	1.8 %
1	A little bit	27	2.0 %
2	Moderately	23	1.7 %
3	Quite a bit	24	1.8 %
4	Extremely	21	1.6 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1107	81.8 %
-8	Refuse	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 119 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1071-1074 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -202, -201, -109, -108, -103, -9, -8

---

## S4GANG\_GANG17: S4 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)	20	1.5 %
2	A few are not	57	4.2 %
3	Half are not	21	1.6 %
4	Most are not	16	1.2 %
5	All (none are members)	4	0.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1107	81.8 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-8	Refuse	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 118 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1075-1078 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -202 , -201 , -109 , -108 , -103 , -9 , -8

## S4GNGINV: S4 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	1107	81.8 %
1	Yes	120	8.9 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,227 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1079-1082 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4SOCCAP17: S4 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	97	7.2 %
2	Agree	458	33.8 %
3	Neither Agree nor Disagree	187	13.8 %
4	Disagree	150	11.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	Strongly Disagree	56	4.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-666	Data missing due to overlap - data in other tp	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Subject locked up for entire recall period	266	19.6 %
-9	Dont Know	14	1.0 %
-8	Refused	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 948 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1083-1086 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -666 , -202 , -201 , -101 , -9 , -8

## S4SOCCAP18: S4 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	%
2	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	1	0.1 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	5	0.4 %
45	-	2	0.1 %
50	-	26	1.9 %
60	-	7	0.5 %
65	-	1	0.1 %
70	-	3	0.2 %
75	-	7	0.5 %
80	-	14	1.0 %
85	-	1	0.1 %
90	-	5	0.4 %
100	-	91	6.7 %
110	-	1	0.1 %
120	-	7	0.5 %
125	-	5	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
150	-	65	4.8 %
157	-	1	0.1 %
160	-	1	0.1 %
165	-	1	0.1 %
175	-	4	0.3 %
180	-	1	0.1 %
200	-	71	5.2 %
225	-	3	0.2 %
230	-	1	0.1 %
250	-	61	4.5 %
260	-	1	0.1 %
275	-	2	0.1 %
300	-	42	3.1 %
350	-	30	2.2 %
375	-	5	0.4 %
400	-	35	2.6 %
450	-	17	1.3 %
500	-	21	1.6 %
550	-	1	0.1 %
600	-	5	0.4 %
650	-	1	0.1 %
700	-	3	0.2 %
800	-	2	0.1 %
850	-	1	0.1 %
900	-	3	0.2 %
995	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-999	Dont Know	404	29.8 %
-998	Refused	1	0.1 %
-666	Data missing due to overlap - data in other tp	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Subject locked up for entire recall period	266	19.6 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 558 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1087-1090 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -800 , -666 , -202 , -201 , -101

---

## S4SOCCAP19: S4 GunAccess: How much to buy a .38

How much would it cost to buy a .38?

MEASURE: Gun Accessibility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	3	0.2 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	7	0.5 %
45	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	23	1.7 %
60	-	16	1.2 %
65	-	2	0.1 %
70	-	2	0.1 %
75	-	15	1.1 %
80	-	19	1.4 %
85	-	1	0.1 %
90	-	7	0.5 %
100	-	84	6.2 %
120	-	9	0.7 %
125	-	13	1.0 %
140	-	1	0.1 %
150	-	70	5.2 %
160	-	3	0.2 %
165	-	1	0.1 %
170	-	2	0.1 %
175	-	8	0.6 %
180	-	2	0.1 %
200	-	73	5.4 %
225	-	4	0.3 %
250	-	45	3.3 %
270	-	1	0.1 %
275	-	7	0.5 %
300	-	36	2.7 %
325	-	1	0.1 %
350	-	29	2.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
375	-	2	0.1 %
400	-	11	0.8 %
450	-	3	0.2 %
500	-	11	0.8 %
550	-	2	0.1 %
600	-	3	0.2 %
700	-	3	0.2 %
750	-	1	0.1 %
900	-	1	0.1 %
995	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-999	Dont Know	436	32.2 %
-998	Refused	1	0.1 %
-666	Data missing due to overlap - data in other tp	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Subject locked up for entire recall period	266	19.6 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 526 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1091-1094 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -800 , -666 , -202 , -201 , -101

## S4HEADIN: S4 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	1200	88.6 %
1	Yes	29	2.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1095-1098 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

---

## S4HEADINJ\_HEADN: S4 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	-	1200	88.6 %
1	-	26	1.9 %
2	-	3	0.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1099-1102 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

---

## S4HC1: S4 HC: Have health insurance

Do you have health insurance?

MEASURE: Health Care

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Yes, on my own	0	0.0 %
2	Yes, through college	0	0.0 %
3	Yes, through my job	0	0.0 %
4	Yes, through my parents plan	2	0.1 %
5	Yes, through my spouses plan	0	0.0 %
6	Yes, qualified for medical assistance	1	0.1 %
7	No	2	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1103-1106 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

---

## S4HC2: S4 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	1	0.1 %
2	Private Doctors office	1	0.1 %
3	Student Health Center (if youth is in school)	0	0.0 %
4	Hospital Clinic	1	0.1 %
5	Another clinic (not a hospital)	2	0.1 %
6	I dont have any place to go	0	0.0 %
97	NA - in secure setting entire recall period	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1107-1110 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -400 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98

---

## S4HC3: S4 HC: Rate overall health

Generally speaking, how would you rate your overall health?

MEASURE: Health Care

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Execellent	2	0.1 %
2	Good	2	0.1 %
3	Fair	1	0.1 %
4	Poor	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1111-1114 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -400 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

## S4HIV1: S4 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	-	4	0.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-999	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1115-1118 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -107

## S4HIV2: S4 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	%
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Had unprotected sex one or fewer times	5	0.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1119-1122 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric  
*(Range of) Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -107 , -101

---

### S4HIV3: S4 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	-	5	0.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1123-1126 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -107

---

### S4HIV4: S4 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	%
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Injected drugs 0 times	5	0.4 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1127-1130 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -107 , -103 , -102

---

### S4HIV5: S4 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	%
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Injected drugs 0 times	5	0.4 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1131-1134 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -107 , -103 , -102

## S4HIV6: S4 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	5	0.4 %
1	Yes	0	0.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1135-1138 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -400 , -202 , -201 , -107 , -9 , -8

## S4HIV7: S4 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	5	0.4 %
1	Yes	0	0.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1139-1142 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -400 , -202 , -201 , -107 , -9 , -8

## S4HIV8: S4 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	%
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-104	Skipped: Did not trade sex for drugs/other	5	0.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1143-1146 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -107 , -104

## S4HIV9: S4 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	%
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-104	Skipped: Did not trade sex for drugs/other	5	0.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1147-1150 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric  
*(Range of) Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -107 , -104

---

## S4HIV10: S4 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	5	0.4 %
1	Yes	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1151-1154 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

---

## S4HIV11: S4 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	%
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-105	Skipped: Sex partner did not say they had HIV	5	0.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1155-1158 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -105

---

## S4HIV12: S4 HIV: Ever been tested for HIV

Have you ever been tested for HIV?

MEASURE: HIV Risk Behaviors

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1	0.1 %
1	Yes	4	0.3 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1159-1162 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4HIV13: S4 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	1	0.1 %
1	Yes	4	0.3 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Measure not asked in this version	1226	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1163-1166 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4RLG1: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	766	56.6 %
2	Several times a year	136	10.0 %
3	Once or twice per month	113	8.3 %
4	Once a week	167	12.3 %
5	Several times per week	41	3.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,223 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1167-1170 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4RLG2: S4 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, Levine, 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	227	16.8 %
2	Not too important	211	15.6 %
3	Somewhat important	331	24.4 %
4	Pretty important	212	15.7 %
5	Very important	245	18.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,226 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1171-1174 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## **S4RLG3: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all true	203	15.0 %
2	Not very true	187	13.8 %
3	Somewhat true	357	26.4 %
4	Pretty true	227	16.8 %
5	Completely true	250	18.5 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,224 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1175-1178 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4RLG4: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all true	214	15.8 %
2	Not very true	211	15.6 %
3	Somewhat true	353	26.1 %
4	Pretty true	223	16.5 %
5	Completely true	222	16.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,223 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1179-1182 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4RLG5: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all true	297	21.9 %
2	Not very true	230	17.0 %
3	Somewhat true	308	22.7 %
4	Pretty true	187	13.8 %
5	Completely true	202	14.9 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,224 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1183-1186 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

---

## **S4RELIGN: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	Not at all true	181	13.4 %
1.33	-	18	1.3 %
1.67	-	35	2.6 %
2.00	Not very true	130	9.6 %
2.33	-	79	5.8 %
2.67	-	80	5.9 %
3.00	Somewhat true	200	14.8 %
3.33	-	73	5.4 %
3.67	-	69	5.1 %
4.00	Pretty true	119	8.8 %
4.33	-	48	3.5 %
4.50	-	1	0.1 %
4.67	-	34	2.5 %
5.00	Completely true	157	11.6 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,224 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1187-1193 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## **S4PUNOTH: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	No chance	24	1.8 %
0.29	-	1	0.1 %
0.43	-	2	0.1 %
0.57	-	3	0.2 %
0.71	-	3	0.2 %
0.86	-	4	0.3 %
1.00	-	2	0.1 %
1.14	-	3	0.2 %
1.29	-	3	0.2 %
1.43	-	9	0.7 %
1.57	-	4	0.3 %
1.71	-	6	0.4 %
1.86	-	3	0.2 %
2.00	-	11	0.8 %
2.14	-	11	0.8 %
2.29	-	11	0.8 %
2.43	-	8	0.6 %
2.57	-	7	0.5 %
2.71	-	18	1.3 %
2.86	-	18	1.3 %
3.00	-	15	1.1 %
3.14	-	18	1.3 %
3.29	-	18	1.3 %
3.33	-	1	0.1 %
3.43	-	18	1.3 %
3.57	-	24	1.8 %
3.71	-	21	1.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.86	-	29	2.1 %
4.00	-	23	1.7 %
4.14	-	22	1.6 %
4.29	-	29	2.1 %
4.43	-	24	1.8 %
4.57	-	23	1.7 %
4.60	-	1	0.1 %
4.71	-	36	2.7 %
4.86	-	28	2.1 %
5.00	-	67	4.9 %
5.14	-	28	2.1 %
5.29	-	17	1.3 %
5.43	-	24	1.8 %
5.57	-	37	2.7 %
5.71	-	32	2.4 %
5.83	-	1	0.1 %
5.86	-	32	2.4 %
6.00	-	20	1.5 %
6.14	-	21	1.6 %
6.29	-	21	1.6 %
6.43	-	18	1.3 %
6.57	-	24	1.8 %
6.71	-	21	1.6 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-99.00	Dont Know	27	2.0 %
-98.00	Refuse	2	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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:* 1194-1200 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -99.00 , -98.00

## S4PUNYOU: S4 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 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	No chance	60	4.4 %
0.14	-	7	0.5 %
0.29	-	6	0.4 %
0.43	-	3	0.2 %
0.57	-	7	0.5 %
0.71	-	5	0.4 %
0.86	-	4	0.3 %
1.00	-	6	0.4 %
1.14	-	5	0.4 %
1.29	-	5	0.4 %
1.43	-	12	0.9 %
1.57	-	5	0.4 %
1.71	-	9	0.7 %
1.86	-	13	1.0 %
2.00	-	12	0.9 %
2.14	-	11	0.8 %
2.29	-	18	1.3 %
2.43	-	10	0.7 %
2.57	-	13	1.0 %
2.71	-	12	0.9 %
2.86	-	20	1.5 %
3.00	-	19	1.4 %
3.14	-	12	0.9 %
3.29	-	17	1.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.40	-	1	0.1 %
3.43	-	15	1.1 %
3.57	-	21	1.6 %
3.71	-	10	0.7 %
3.86	-	15	1.1 %
4.00	-	12	0.9 %
4.14	-	8	0.6 %
4.29	-	37	2.7 %
4.43	-	15	1.1 %
4.57	-	18	1.3 %
4.71	-	25	1.8 %
4.86	-	24	1.8 %
5.00	-	59	4.4 %
5.14	-	13	1.0 %
5.29	-	29	2.1 %
5.43	-	22	1.6 %
5.57	-	10	0.7 %
5.71	-	31	2.3 %
5.86	-	12	0.9 %
6.00	-	26	1.9 %
6.14	-	16	1.2 %
6.29	-	12	0.9 %
6.43	-	19	1.4 %
6.57	-	14	1.0 %
6.71	-	16	1.2 %
6.86	-	19	1.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-99.00	Dont Know	26	1.9 %
-98.00	Refuse	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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:* 1201-1207 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -99.00 , -98.00

## S4SOCCST: S4 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 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) 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Very unlikely	23	1.7 %
1.17	-	10	0.7 %
1.20	-	1	0.1 %
1.33	-	11	0.8 %
1.40	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	26	1.9 %
1.60	-	5	0.4 %
1.67	-	41	3.0 %
1.80	-	4	0.3 %
1.83	-	28	2.1 %
2.00	Somewhat unlikely	45	3.3 %
2.17	-	36	2.7 %
2.20	-	8	0.6 %
2.33	-	54	4.0 %
2.40	-	4	0.3 %
2.50	-	54	4.0 %
2.60	-	4	0.3 %
2.67	-	60	4.4 %
2.80	-	2	0.1 %

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
2.83	-	54	4.0 %
3.00	Neither likely or unlikely	93	6.9 %
3.17	-	85	6.3 %
3.20	-	6	0.4 %
3.25	-	1	0.1 %
3.33	-	104	7.7 %
3.40	-	4	0.3 %
3.50	-	91	6.7 %
3.60	-	4	0.3 %
3.67	-	98	7.2 %
3.80	-	5	0.4 %
3.83	-	57	4.2 %
4.00	Somewhat likely	67	4.9 %
4.17	-	46	3.4 %
4.20	-	2	0.1 %
4.33	-	27	2.0 %
4.50	-	20	1.5 %
4.60	-	1	0.1 %
4.67	-	18	1.3 %
4.80	-	1	0.1 %
4.83	-	6	0.4 %
5.00	Very likely	22	1.6 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1208-1214 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## **S4WGTCST: S4 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 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) 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	Not at all	47	3.5 %
1.17	-	1	0.1 %
1.18	-	1	0.1 %
1.25	-	1	0.1 %
1.33	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	8	0.6 %
1.63	-	2	0.1 %
1.67	-	2	0.1 %
1.75	-	2	0.1 %
1.80	-	4	0.3 %
1.83	-	2	0.1 %
1.94	-	2	0.1 %
2.00	A little	63	4.7 %
2.08	-	1	0.1 %
2.11	-	2	0.1 %
2.13	-	3	0.2 %
2.14	-	2	0.1 %
2.17	-	1	0.1 %
2.19	-	1	0.1 %
2.20	-	2	0.1 %
2.22	-	3	0.2 %
2.25	-	5	0.4 %
2.28	-	1	0.1 %
2.29	-	1	0.1 %
2.31	-	1	0.1 %
2.33	-	9	0.7 %
2.36	-	3	0.2 %
2.38	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.39	-	1	0.1 %
2.40	-	3	0.2 %
2.43	-	1	0.1 %
2.44	-	1	0.1 %
2.47	-	1	0.1 %
2.50	-	18	1.3 %
2.57	-	2	0.1 %
2.59	-	1	0.1 %
2.60	-	5	0.4 %
2.61	-	1	0.1 %
2.62	-	1	0.1 %
2.64	-	3	0.2 %
2.67	-	4	0.3 %
2.69	-	3	0.2 %
2.71	-	2	0.1 %
2.72	-	1	0.1 %
2.75	-	3	0.2 %
2.76	-	1	0.1 %
2.77	-	1	0.1 %
2.78	-	1	0.1 %
2.79	-	2	0.1 %
2.80	-	6	0.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into section	588	43.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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:* 1215-1221 (*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

## S4VARCST: S4 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 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	108	8.0 %
1	-	72	5.3 %
2	-	32	2.4 %
3	-	20	1.5 %
4	-	24	1.8 %
5	-	27	2.0 %
6	-	14	1.0 %
7	-	5	0.4 %
8	-	9	0.7 %
9	-	7	0.5 %
10	-	12	0.9 %
11	-	12	0.9 %
12	-	18	1.3 %
13	-	26	1.9 %
14	-	52	3.8 %
15	-	64	4.7 %
16	-	54	4.0 %
17	-	61	4.5 %
18	-	132	9.7 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Did not skip into section	480	35.5 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 749 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1222-1225 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4MATCST: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	238	17.6 %
1	-	43	3.2 %
2	-	13	1.0 %
3	-	12	0.9 %
4	-	6	0.4 %
5	-	8	0.6 %
6	-	12	0.9 %
7	-	20	1.5 %
8	-	27	2.0 %
9	-	40	3.0 %
10	-	63	4.7 %
11	-	63	4.7 %
12	-	50	3.7 %
13	-	154	11.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Did not skip into section	480	35.5 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 749 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1226-1229 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

---

## S4FRECST: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	109	8.1 %
1	-	81	6.0 %
2	-	41	3.0 %
3	-	42	3.1 %
4	-	99	7.3 %
5	-	377	27.8 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Did not skip into section	480	35.5 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 749 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1230-1233 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

---

## S4STLRWD: S4 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 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	Strongly disagree	274	20.2 %
1.20	-	34	2.5 %
1.40	-	45	3.3 %
1.60	-	51	3.8 %
1.75	-	1	0.1 %
1.80	-	64	4.7 %
2.00	Somewhat disagree	419	30.9 %
2.20	-	174	12.9 %
2.25	-	2	0.1 %
2.40	-	79	5.8 %
2.60	-	45	3.3 %
2.80	-	24	1.8 %
3.00	Somewhat agree	13	1.0 %
3.20	-	2	0.1 %
3.40	-	2	0.1 %
4.00	Strongly agree	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1234-1240 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -600.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

## **S4FGTRWD: S4 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 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly disagree	233	17.2 %
1.20	-	13	1.0 %
1.40	-	27	2.0 %
1.60	-	22	1.6 %
1.75	-	1	0.1 %
1.80	-	39	2.9 %
2.00	Somewhat disagree	367	27.1 %
2.20	-	136	10.0 %
2.25	-	1	0.1 %
2.40	-	130	9.6 %
2.50	-	1	0.1 %
2.60	-	113	8.3 %
2.67	-	1	0.1 %
2.80	-	70	5.2 %
3.00	Somewhat agree	45	3.3 %
3.20	-	12	0.9 %
3.40	-	7	0.5 %
3.60	-	4	0.3 %
3.80	-	3	0.2 %
4.00	Strongly agree	4	0.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1241-1247 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -600.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

## S4ROBRWD: S4 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 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly disagree	304	22.5 %
1.20	-	24	1.8 %
1.40	-	33	2.4 %
1.60	-	40	3.0 %
1.80	-	37	2.7 %
2.00	Somewhat disagree	486	35.9 %
2.20	-	138	10.2 %
2.25	-	1	0.1 %
2.40	-	78	5.8 %
2.60	-	46	3.4 %
2.80	-	20	1.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.00	Somewhat agree	15	1.1 %
3.20	-	2	0.1 %
3.40	-	4	0.3 %
3.60	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Strongly agree	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1248-1254 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -600.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

## S4PERRWD: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	No fun or kick at all	437	32.3 %
0.14	-	13	1.0 %
0.29	-	30	2.2 %
0.43	-	28	2.1 %
0.57	-	16	1.2 %
0.71	-	60	4.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.86	-	22	1.6 %
1.00	-	30	2.2 %
1.14	-	29	2.1 %
1.29	-	9	0.7 %
1.43	-	50	3.7 %
1.57	-	15	1.1 %
1.71	-	9	0.7 %
1.86	-	15	1.1 %
2.00	-	13	1.0 %
2.14	-	14	1.0 %
2.29	-	17	1.3 %
2.43	-	17	1.3 %
2.57	-	15	1.1 %
2.71	-	8	0.6 %
2.86	-	30	2.2 %
3.00	-	15	1.1 %
3.14	-	10	0.7 %
3.29	-	15	1.1 %
3.43	-	9	0.7 %
3.57	-	12	0.9 %
3.71	-	10	0.7 %
3.86	-	13	1.0 %
4.00	-	18	1.3 %
4.14	-	12	0.9 %
4.29	-	17	1.3 %
4.43	-	16	1.2 %
4.57	-	10	0.7 %
4.71	-	7	0.5 %
4.86	-	8	0.6 %
5.00	-	21	1.6 %
5.14	-	12	0.9 %
5.29	-	5	0.4 %
5.43	-	12	0.9 %
5.57	-	7	0.5 %
5.71	-	13	1.0 %
5.86	-	9	0.7 %
6.00	-	9	0.7 %
6.14	-	8	0.6 %
6.29	-	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
6.43	-	9	0.7 %
6.57	-	6	0.4 %
6.71	-	7	0.5 %
6.86	-	5	0.4 %
7.00	-	3	0.2 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1255-1261 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -99.00 , -98.00

## S4DEMO\_PRGNOW: S4 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	151	11.2 %
1	Yes	17	1.3 %
7	Suspected but not confirmed	2	0.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Subject is male	1061	78.4 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 170 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1262-1265 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4DEMO\_HOWPRG: S4 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	5	0.4 %
2	4-6 months	2	0.1 %
3	7-9 months	10	0.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Not currently pregnant	153	11.3 %
-101	Skipped: Subject is male	1061	78.4 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 17 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1266-1269 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

---

## S4DEMO\_PREGRP: S4 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	142	10.5 %
1	Yes	28	2.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Subject is male	1061	78.4 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 170 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1270-1273 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -400 , -202 , -201 , -101 , -9 , -8

---

## S4DEMO\_PRGENDRP: S4 Pregnancy: How did pregnancy end (refers to pregnancy from SS4Demo\_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	20	1.5 %
2	Still birth, miscarriage or abortion	8	0.6 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-103	Skipped: Was not pregnant any other time during recall period	142	10.5 %
-101	Skipped: Subject is male	1061	78.4 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1274-1277 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -400 , -202 , -201 , -103 , -101 , -9 , -8

## S4DEMO\_GFPRG: S4 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	977	72.2 %
1	Yes	78	5.8 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-104	Skipped: Subject is female	170	12.6 %
-9	Dont Know	6	0.4 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,055 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1278-1281 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -202 , -201 , -104 , -9 , -8

## S4DEMO\_GFPRN: S4 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	-	74	5.5 %
2	-	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-107	Skipped: Subject doesnt know if girlfriend is pregnant	6	0.4 %
-106	Skipped: Girlfriend is not pregnant	977	72.2 %
-104	Skipped: Subject is female	170	12.6 %
-99	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 77 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1282-1285 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -202 , -201 , -107 , -106 , -104 , -99 , -98

## S4DEMO\_GFHWFR: S4 Pregnancy: Number of months along wife/girlfriend is in current pregnancy

How many months pregnant is she? (males only)

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1-3 months	27	2.0 %
2	4-6 months	24	1.8 %
3	7-9 months	26	1.9 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-107	Skipped: Subject doesnt know if girlfriend is pregnant	6	0.4 %
-106	Skipped: Girlfriend is not pregnant	977	72.2 %
-104	Skipped: Subject is female	170	12.6 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 77 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1286-1289 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -202 , -201 , -107 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

## S4CHLD01 OMIT: S4 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	73	5.4 %
1	Yes	4	0.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	1	0.1 %
-650	No child reported	297	21.9 %
-400	Not asked in this version	852	62.9 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	4	0.3 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 77 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1290-1293 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

## S4CHLD01 OMITWHY: S4 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	3	0.2 %
2	Parental rights terminated or child given up for adoption	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	1	0.1 %
-650	No child reported	297	21.9 %
-400	Not asked in this version	852	62.9 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	77	5.7 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1294-1297 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100

## S4CHLD01 ALIVE: S4 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	6	0.4 %
1	Yes	274	20.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-811	Child omitted--questions not asked	1	0.1 %
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	4	0.3 %
-650	No child reported	946	69.9 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 280 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1298-1301 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -202, -201, -9, -8

## S4CHLD01\_AGE: S4 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	161	11.9 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-811	Child omitted--questions not asked	4	0.3 %
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	4	0.3 %
-650	No child reported	946	69.9 %
-601	Incorrectly omitted by interviewer	1	0.1 %
-526	Age unknown	28	2.1 %
-400	Not asked in this version	65	4.8 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	6	0.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 161 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1302-1306 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -526, -400, -202, -201, -100, -99, -98

## S4CHLD01\_BIO: S4 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	12	0.9 %
1	Yes	265	19.6 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	4	0.3 %
-650	No child reported	946	69.9 %
-506	Biological relationship unknown	4	0.3 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 277 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1307-1310 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -506, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8)

## S4CHLD01\_LIVWNW: S4 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	33	2.4 %
1	Yes	32	2.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	4	0.3 %
-650	No child reported	946	69.9 %
-400	Not asked in this version	216	16.0 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 65 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1311-1314 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8)

## S4CHLD01\_LIVWRP: S4 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	130	9.6 %
1	Yes	73	5.4 %
6	Omit	4	0.3 %
7	Deceased	6	0.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	4	0.3 %
-650	No child reported	946	69.9 %
-601	Incorrectly omitted by interviewer	1	0.1 %
-400	Not asked in this version	65	4.8 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
-9	Don't Know	2	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 213 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1315-1318 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

## **S4CHLD01\_CONTNW: S4 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	46	3.4 %
2	3-6 times per week	7	0.5 %
3	2 times per week	2	0.1 %
4	1 time per week	4	0.3 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	1	0.1 %
6	1 time per month	1	0.1 %
7	Less than monthly	3	0.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	4	0.3 %
-650	No child reported	946	69.9 %
-400	Not asked in this version	216	16.0 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
-9	Don't Know	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1319-1322 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

## S4CHLD01\_CONTRP: S4 Children: Child01 - Frequency of contact with child in the recall periods

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	84	6.2 %
2	3-6 times per week	31	2.3 %
3	2 times per week	16	1.2 %
4	1 time per week	10	0.7 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	9	0.7 %
6	1 time per month	4	0.3 %
7	Less than monthly	46	3.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-811	Child omitted--questions not asked	1	0.1 %
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	4	0.3 %
-650	No child reported	946	69.9 %
-400	Not asked in this version	65	4.8 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	6	0.4 %
-9	Don't Know	9	0.7 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 200 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1323-1326 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

## S4CHLD02 OMIT: S4 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	12	0.9 %
1	Yes	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-650	No child reported	378	27.9 %
-400	Not asked in this version	840	62.0 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 13 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1327-1330 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

## S4CHLD02 OMITWHY: S4 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	1	0.1 %
2	Parental rights terminated or child given up for adoption	0	0.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-650	No child reported	378	27.9 %
-400	Not asked in this version	840	62.0 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	12	0.9 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1331-1334 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100

## S4CHLD02 ALIVE: S4 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	1	0.1 %
1	Yes	55	4.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	1	0.1 %
-650	No child reported	1174	86.7 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 56 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1335-1338 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -202, -201, -9, -8

## S4CHLD02\_AGE: S4 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	30	2.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-811	Child omitted--questions not asked	1	0.1 %
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	1	0.1 %
-650	No child reported	1174	86.7 %
-526	Age unknown	3	0.2 %
-400	Not asked in this version	21	1.6 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 30 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1339-1343 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -526, -400, -202, -201, -100, -99, -98

## S4CHLD02\_BIO: S4 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	1	0.1 %
1	Yes	53	3.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	1	0.1 %
-650	No child reported	1174	86.7 %
-506	Biological relationship unknown	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 54 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1344-1347 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -506 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

## S4CHLD02\_LIVWNW: S4 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	13	1.0 %
1	Yes	8	0.6 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	1	0.1 %
-650	No child reported	1174	86.7 %
-400	Not asked in this version	35	2.6 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1348-1351 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

## S4CHLD02\_LIVWRP: S4 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	18	1.3 %
1	Yes	15	1.1 %
6	Omit	1	0.1 %
7	Deceased	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	1	0.1 %
-650	No child reported	1174	86.7 %
-400	Not asked in this version	21	1.6 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 35 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1352-1355 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

## S4CHLD02\_CONTNW: S4 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	12	0.9 %
2	3-6 times per week	3	0.2 %
3	2 times per week	1	0.1 %
4	1 time per week	2	0.1 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	1	0.1 %
6	1 time per month	1	0.1 %
7	Less than monthly	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	1	0.1 %
-650	No child reported	1174	86.7 %
-400	Not asked in this version	35	2.6 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1356-1359 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

## S4CHLD02\_CONTRP: S4 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	14	1.0 %
2	3-6 times per week	5	0.4 %
3	2 times per week	5	0.4 %
4	1 time per week	1	0.1 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	2	0.1 %
6	1 time per month	0	0.0 %
7	Less than monthly	6	0.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	1	0.1 %
-650	No child reported	1174	86.7 %
-400	Not asked in this version	21	1.6 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	1	0.1 %
-9	Don't Know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 33 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1360-1363 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

## S4CHLD03 OMIT: S4 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	1	0.1 %
1	Yes	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-650	No child reported	399	29.5 %
-400	Not asked in this version	831	61.4 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1364-1367 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

## **S4CHLD03 OMITWHY: S4 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	0	0.0 %
2	Parental rights terminated or child given up for adoption	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-650	No child reported	399	29.5 %
-400	Not asked in this version	831	61.4 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1368-1371 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100

## **S4CHLD03 ALIVE: S4 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	9	0.7 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-650	No child reported	1222	90.3 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 9 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1372-1375 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -202, -201, -9, -8

---

### S4CHLD03\_AGE: S4 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	2	0.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-650	No child reported	1222	90.3 %
-400	Not asked in this version	7	0.5 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 2 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1376-1380 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -526, -400, -202, -201, -100, -99, -98

---

### S4CHLD03\_BIO: S4 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	0	0.0 %
1	Yes	9	0.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-650	No child reported	1222	90.3 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 9 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1381-1384 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -506, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

---

### S4CHLD03\_LIVWNW: S4 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	2	0.1 %
1	Yes	5	0.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-650	No child reported	1222	90.3 %
-400	Not asked in this version	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 7 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1385-1388 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

---

## S4CHLD03\_LIVWRP: S4 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	2	0.1 %
1	Yes	0	0.0 %
6	Omit	0	0.0 %
7	Deceased	0	0.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-650	No child reported	1222	90.3 %
-400	Not asked in this version	7	0.5 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 2 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1389-1392 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

---

## S4CHLD03\_CONTNW: S4 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	5	0.4 %
2	3-6 times per week	1	0.1 %
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 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-650	No child reported	1222	90.3 %
-400	Not asked in this version	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 7 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1393-1396 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

---

## S4CHLD03\_CONTRP: S4 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	0	0.0 %
2	3-6 times per week	1	0.1 %
3	2 times per week	0	0.0 %
4	1 time per week	0	0.0 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	1	0.1 %
6	1 time per month	0	0.0 %
7	Less than monthly	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-650	No child reported	1222	90.3 %
-400	Not asked in this version	7	0.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201	IntCompStat 4	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 2 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1397-1400 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

## S4CHLD\_COUNT: S4 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	-	957	70.7 %
1	-	220	16.2 %
2	-	48	3.5 %
3	-	6	0.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,231 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1401-1404 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -201

## S4MORDIS: S4 MorThk: Moral Disengagement Overall

Moral Disengagement Overall.

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.").

- (1) Disagree
- (2) Neither Agree nor Disagree
- (3) Agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	Disagree	23	1.7 %
1.03	-	15	1.1 %
1.06	-	100	7.4 %
1.09	-	35	2.6 %
1.13	-	60	4.4 %
1.16	-	34	2.5 %
1.19	-	55	4.1 %
1.22	-	36	2.7 %
1.25	-	66	4.9 %
1.28	-	36	2.7 %
1.31	-	54	4.0 %
1.34	-	32	2.4 %
1.38	-	45	3.3 %
1.41	-	28	2.1 %
1.44	-	49	3.6 %
1.47	-	26	1.9 %
1.50	-	37	2.7 %
1.53	-	30	2.2 %
1.56	-	33	2.4 %
1.59	-	25	1.8 %
1.63	-	26	1.9 %
1.66	-	31	2.3 %
1.69	-	27	2.0 %
1.72	-	21	1.6 %
1.75	-	28	2.1 %
1.78	-	29	2.1 %
1.81	-	25	1.8 %
1.84	-	15	1.1 %
1.88	-	20	1.5 %
1.91	-	13	1.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.94	-	21	1.6 %
1.97	-	19	1.4 %
2.00	Neither Agree nor disagree	28	2.1 %
2.03	-	15	1.1 %
2.06	-	17	1.3 %
2.09	-	8	0.6 %
2.13	-	8	0.6 %
2.16	-	6	0.4 %
2.19	-	7	0.5 %
2.22	-	7	0.5 %
2.25	-	4	0.3 %
2.28	-	2	0.1 %
2.31	-	3	0.2 %
2.34	-	1	0.1 %
2.38	-	1	0.1 %
2.41	-	3	0.2 %
2.44	-	1	0.1 %
2.47	-	1	0.1 %
2.50	-	4	0.3 %
2.53	-	2	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,228 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1405-1411 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4MORAL: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	82	6.1 %
1	-	262	19.4 %
2	-	177	13.1 %
3	-	111	8.2 %
4	-	107	7.9 %
5	-	84	6.2 %
6	-	66	4.9 %
7	-	58	4.3 %
8	-	59	4.4 %
9	-	41	3.0 %
10	-	28	2.1 %
11	-	28	2.1 %
12	-	25	1.8 %
13	-	22	1.6 %
14	-	20	1.5 %
15	-	8	0.6 %
16	-	6	0.4 %
17	-	11	0.8 %
18	-	5	0.4 %
19	-	6	0.4 %
20	-	5	0.4 %
21	-	3	0.2 %
22	-	1	0.1 %
23	-	3	0.2 %
24	-	1	0.1 %
25	-	2	0.1 %
26	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
27	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	2	0.1 %
31	-	1	0.1 %
32	-	2	0.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1412-1415 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4SCH\_SCH40: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	67	4.9 %
2	Disagree	266	19.6 %
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	291	21.5 %
4	Agree	528	39.0 %
5	Strongly Agree	76	5.6 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-8	Refused	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,228 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1416-1419 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

---

## S4SCH\_SCH41: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	39	2.9 %
2	Disagree	259	19.1 %
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	254	18.8 %
4	Agree	583	43.1 %
5	Strongly Agree	92	6.8 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-8	Refused	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,227 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1420-1423 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

---

## S4SCH\_SCH42: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	106	7.8 %
2	Disagree	488	36.0 %
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	280	20.7 %
4	Agree	314	23.2 %
5	Strongly Agree	36	2.7 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	5	0.4 %
-8	Refused	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,224 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1424-1427 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4SCH\_SCH43: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	88	6.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	Disagree	398	29.4 %
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	296	21.9 %
4	Agree	394	29.1 %
5	Strongly Agree	47	3.5 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	6	0.4 %
-8	Refused	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,223 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1428-1431 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4SCH\_SCH44: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	206	15.2 %
2	Disagree	680	50.2 %
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	215	15.9 %
4	Agree	110	8.1 %
5	Strongly Agree	16	1.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,227 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1432-1435 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4SCH\_SCH45: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	260	19.2 %
2	Disagree	717	53.0 %
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	155	11.4 %
4	Agree	87	6.4 %
5	Strongly Agree	11	0.8 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1436-1439 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4SCH\_SCH46: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Drop out before graduation	20	1.5 %
2	Graduate from high school	305	22.5 %
3	Go to a business, technical school or junior college	261	19.3 %
4	Graduate from college	510	37.7 %
5	Go to graduate or professional school	129	9.5 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	5	0.4 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,225 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1440-1443 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## **S4SCH\_SCH47: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Drop out before graduation	49	3.6 %
2	Graduate from high school	360	26.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	Go to a business, technical school or junior college	282	20.8 %
4	Graduate from college	437	32.3 %
5	Go to graduate or professional school	90	6.6 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	12	0.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,218 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1444-1447 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4MOTSUC: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly disagree	2	0.1 %
1.33	-	2	0.1 %
1.40	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	1	0.1 %
1.67	-	7	0.5 %
1.83	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.00	Disagree	18	1.3 %
2.17	-	14	1.0 %
2.33	-	32	2.4 %
2.50	-	22	1.6 %
2.67	-	69	5.1 %
2.80	-	1	0.1 %
2.83	-	55	4.1 %
3.00	Neither agree nor disagree	134	9.9 %
3.17	-	111	8.2 %
3.20	-	1	0.1 %
3.25	-	1	0.1 %
3.33	-	116	8.6 %
3.40	-	2	0.1 %
3.50	-	95	7.0 %
3.60	-	1	0.1 %
3.67	-	161	11.9 %
3.83	-	82	6.1 %
4.00	Agree	156	11.5 %
4.17	-	49	3.6 %
4.25	-	1	0.1 %
4.33	-	28	2.1 %
4.50	-	16	1.2 %
4.67	-	20	1.5 %
4.83	-	14	1.0 %
5.00	Strongly agree	15	1.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-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	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,228 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1448-1454 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00

## S4ETHAFF: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Disagree	15	1.1 %
1.14	-	1	0.1 %
1.29	-	1	0.1 %
1.43	-	3	0.2 %
1.57	-	4	0.3 %
1.71	-	7	0.5 %
1.86	-	10	0.7 %
2.00	Disagree	28	2.1 %
2.14	-	20	1.5 %
2.29	-	30	2.2 %
2.33	-	1	0.1 %
2.43	-	43	3.2 %
2.57	-	45	3.3 %
2.60	-	1	0.1 %
2.67	-	1	0.1 %
2.71	-	89	6.6 %
2.86	-	139	10.3 %
3.00	Agree	379	28.0 %
3.14	-	55	4.1 %
3.29	-	37	2.7 %
3.43	-	42	3.1 %
3.57	-	36	2.7 %
3.71	-	29	2.1 %
3.86	-	64	4.7 %
4.00	Strongly Agree	144	10.6 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into Phinney	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,224 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1455-1461 (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

## S4ETHACH: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Disagree	39	2.9 %
1.20	-	16	1.2 %
1.40	-	26	1.9 %
1.60	-	41	3.0 %
1.80	-	43	3.2 %
2.00	Disagree	203	15.0 %
2.20	-	187	13.8 %
2.25	-	2	0.1 %
2.40	-	143	10.6 %
2.60	-	129	9.5 %
2.80	-	124	9.2 %
3.00	Agree	129	9.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.20	-	39	2.9 %
3.40	-	20	1.5 %
3.60	-	17	1.3 %
3.80	-	10	0.7 %
4.00	Strongly Agree	56	4.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into Phinney	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,224 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1462-1468 (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

## S4ETHID: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Disagree	13	1.0 %
1.08	-	2	0.1 %
1.25	-	2	0.1 %
1.33	-	3	0.2 %
1.42	-	5	0.4 %

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.50	-	5	0.4 %
1.58	-	5	0.4 %
1.67	-	2	0.1 %
1.75	-	9	0.7 %
1.83	-	5	0.4 %
1.92	-	2	0.1 %
2.00	Disagree	31	2.3 %
2.08	-	17	1.3 %
2.17	-	41	3.0 %
2.25	-	36	2.7 %
2.33	-	28	2.1 %
2.42	-	45	3.3 %
2.44	-	1	0.1 %
2.45	-	3	0.2 %
2.50	-	81	6.0 %
2.58	-	110	8.1 %
2.67	-	102	7.5 %
2.70	-	1	0.1 %
2.73	-	1	0.1 %
2.75	-	94	6.9 %
2.83	-	79	5.8 %
2.92	-	93	6.9 %
3.00	Agree	111	8.2 %
3.08	-	35	2.6 %
3.17	-	28	2.1 %
3.25	-	30	2.2 %
3.33	-	34	2.5 %
3.42	-	23	1.7 %
3.50	-	33	2.4 %
3.58	-	10	0.7 %
3.67	-	20	1.5 %
3.75	-	12	0.9 %
3.83	-	13	1.0 %
3.92	-	5	0.4 %
4.00	Strongly Agree	54	4.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-100.00	Did not skip into Phinney	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,224 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1469-1475 (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

## S4HOOD: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	50	3.7 %
1.05	-	9	0.7 %
1.10	-	13	1.0 %
1.14	-	11	0.8 %
1.19	-	15	1.1 %
1.24	-	16	1.2 %
1.29	-	15	1.1 %
1.33	-	14	1.0 %
1.38	-	17	1.3 %
1.43	-	20	1.5 %
1.48	-	9	0.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.52	-	23	1.7 %
1.57	-	15	1.1 %
1.62	-	16	1.2 %
1.67	-	16	1.2 %
1.71	-	17	1.3 %
1.76	-	14	1.0 %
1.81	-	22	1.6 %
1.86	-	13	1.0 %
1.90	-	12	0.9 %
1.95	-	13	1.0 %
2.00	Rarely	22	1.6 %
2.05	-	17	1.3 %
2.10	-	12	0.9 %
2.14	-	12	0.9 %
2.19	-	19	1.4 %
2.24	-	18	1.3 %
2.29	-	20	1.5 %
2.33	-	18	1.3 %
2.38	-	13	1.0 %
2.40	-	1	0.1 %
2.43	-	19	1.4 %
2.48	-	20	1.5 %
2.52	-	19	1.4 %
2.57	-	21	1.6 %
2.62	-	17	1.3 %
2.67	-	11	0.8 %
2.71	-	23	1.7 %
2.76	-	13	1.0 %
2.81	-	12	0.9 %
2.86	-	16	1.2 %
2.90	-	16	1.2 %
2.95	-	19	1.4 %
3.00	Sometimes	22	1.6 %
3.05	-	23	1.7 %
3.10	-	13	1.0 %
3.14	-	23	1.7 %
3.19	-	13	1.0 %
3.24	-	13	1.0 %
3.29	-	16	1.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-666.00	Data deleted due to overlap - data in other tp	1	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into NeiCon measure	266	19.6 %
-9.00	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 961 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1476-1482 (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

## S4NEIPHY: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	60	4.4 %
1.08	-	18	1.3 %
1.17	-	23	1.7 %
1.25	-	23	1.7 %

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.33	-	18	1.3 %
1.42	-	34	2.5 %
1.50	-	30	2.2 %
1.58	-	21	1.6 %
1.67	-	25	1.8 %
1.75	-	21	1.6 %
1.83	-	21	1.6 %
1.92	-	26	1.9 %
2.00	Rarely	31	2.3 %
2.08	-	28	2.1 %
2.17	-	26	1.9 %
2.18	-	1	0.1 %
2.25	-	29	2.1 %
2.33	-	37	2.7 %
2.42	-	27	2.0 %
2.50	-	34	2.5 %
2.58	-	31	2.3 %
2.67	-	30	2.2 %
2.75	-	30	2.2 %
2.83	-	34	2.5 %
2.92	-	22	1.6 %
3.00	Sometimes	38	2.8 %
3.08	-	27	2.0 %
3.17	-	29	2.1 %
3.18	-	2	0.1 %
3.25	-	35	2.6 %
3.27	-	1	0.1 %
3.33	-	20	1.5 %
3.36	-	1	0.1 %
3.42	-	18	1.3 %
3.50	-	27	2.0 %
3.58	-	18	1.3 %
3.67	-	13	1.0 %
3.75	-	16	1.2 %
3.83	-	8	0.6 %
3.92	-	9	0.7 %
4.00	Often	19	1.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-666.00	Data deleted due to overlap - data in other tp	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into NeiCon measure	266	19.6 %
-9.00	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 961 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1483-1489 (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

## S4NEISOC: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	93	6.9 %
1.11	-	26	1.9 %
1.22	-	38	2.8 %
1.33	-	35	2.6 %
1.44	-	41	3.0 %
1.56	-	39	2.9 %
1.63	-	1	0.1 %
1.67	-	45	3.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.78	-	24	1.8 %
1.89	-	27	2.0 %
2.00	Rarely	40	3.0 %
2.11	-	32	2.4 %
2.22	-	43	3.2 %
2.25	-	2	0.1 %
2.33	-	44	3.2 %
2.44	-	48	3.5 %
2.56	-	42	3.1 %
2.67	-	43	3.2 %
2.78	-	29	2.1 %
2.89	-	28	2.1 %
3.00	Sometimes	33	2.4 %
3.11	-	34	2.5 %
3.22	-	29	2.1 %
3.33	-	40	3.0 %
3.44	-	17	1.3 %
3.56	-	15	1.1 %
3.67	-	25	1.8 %
3.78	-	17	1.3 %
3.89	-	6	0.4 %
4.00	Often	25	1.8 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-666.00	Data deleted due to overlap - data in other tp	1	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into NeiCon measure	266	19.6 %
-9.00	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 961 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1490-1496 (*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

## S4NSAFE: S4 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](http://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 %
1.86	-	4	0.3 %
2.00	Disagree / In danger most of the time	1	0.1 %
2.14	-	1	0.1 %
2.29	-	3	0.2 %
2.43	-	2	0.1 %
2.57	-	6	0.4 %
2.71	-	10	0.7 %
2.86	-	3	0.2 %
3.00	Neither Agree nor Disagree / In danger some of the time	19	1.4 %
3.14	-	17	1.3 %
3.29	-	13	1.0 %
3.43	-	28	2.1 %
3.57	-	30	2.2 %
3.71	-	34	2.5 %
3.86	-	69	5.1 %
4.00	Agree / In danger very little of the time	56	4.1 %
4.14	-	82	6.1 %
4.29	-	66	4.9 %
4.43	-	181	13.4 %
4.57	-	81	6.0 %
4.71	-	78	5.8 %
4.86	-	41	3.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5.00	Strongly Agree / In danger none of the time	133	9.8 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-666.00	Data deleted due to overlap - data in other tp	1	0.1 %
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	3	0.2 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into NeiCon measure	266	19.6 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 959 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1497-1503 (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

## S4NTOT: S4 NEO: Neuroticism - Total

Neuroticism; mean of 15 items, 11 items required to compute the mean

MEASURE: NEO Personality Inventory

The NEO-PI-SF (Costa P. & McCrae, R. 1989; McCrae, R. & Costa, P. 2004) is a widely used personality inventory. It taps the "Big 5" dimensions of personality (i.e., neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness). It provides an assessment of emotional, interpersonal, experiential, attitudinal and motivational personality styles. It is a self-report measure in which the participant rates the degree to which he/she thinks the statement is true about themselves (e.g. I shy away from crowds of people) on a 5 point likert scale (1=disagree strongly to 5=agree strongly).

- (1) Disagree strongly
- (2) Disagree a little
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Agree a little
- (5) Agree strongly

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Disagree Strongly	2	0.1 %
1.07	-	6	0.4 %
1.13	-	3	0.2 %
1.20	-	7	0.5 %
1.27	-	11	0.8 %
1.33	-	7	0.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.40	-	10	0.7 %
1.47	-	12	0.9 %
1.53	-	17	1.3 %
1.60	-	17	1.3 %
1.67	-	19	1.4 %
1.73	-	22	1.6 %
1.80	-	37	2.7 %
1.87	-	38	2.8 %
1.93	-	40	3.0 %
2.00	Disagree a little	36	2.7 %
2.07	-	52	3.8 %
2.13	-	51	3.8 %
2.20	-	60	4.4 %
2.27	-	67	4.9 %
2.33	-	56	4.1 %
2.36	-	1	0.1 %
2.40	-	70	5.2 %
2.47	-	47	3.5 %
2.53	-	63	4.7 %
2.58	-	1	0.1 %
2.60	-	65	4.8 %
2.67	-	48	3.5 %
2.73	-	54	4.0 %
2.80	-	42	3.1 %
2.87	-	48	3.5 %
2.93	-	31	2.3 %
3.00	Neither agree nor disagree	31	2.3 %
3.07	-	25	1.8 %
3.13	-	29	2.1 %
3.20	-	13	1.0 %
3.27	-	10	0.7 %
3.33	-	8	0.6 %
3.40	-	3	0.2 %
3.47	-	3	0.2 %
3.53	-	2	0.1 %
3.60	-	4	0.3 %
3.67	-	3	0.2 %
3.73	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Agree a little	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4.27	-	3	0.2 %
4.40	-	1	0.1 %
4.47	-	1	0.1 %
4.53	-	1	0.1 %
5.00	Agree Strongly	0	0.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-700.00	Missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-400.00	Measure does not exist for this version	40	3.0 %
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	5	0.4 %
-202.00	Partial interview-data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat 4	122	9.0 %
-9.00	Dont Know	4	0.3 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,178 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1504-1510 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700.00 , -400.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

## S4ETOT: S4 NEO: Extraversion - Total

Extraversion; mean of 19 items, 14 items required to compute the mean

MEASURE: NEO Personality Inventory

The NEO-PI-SF (Costa P. & McCrae, R. 1989; McCrae, R. & Costa, P. 2004) is a widely used personality inventory. It taps the "Big 5" dimensions of personality (i.e., neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness). It provides an assessment of emotional, interpersonal, experiential, attitudinal and motivational personality styles. It is a self-report measure in which the participant rates the degree to which he/she thinks the statement is true about themselves (e.g. I shy away from crowds of people) on a 5 point likert scale (1=disagree strongly to 5=agree strongly).

- (1) Disagree strongly
- (2) Disagree a little
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Agree a little
- (5) Agree strongly

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Disagree Strongly	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.78	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	Disagree a little	1	0.1 %
2.05	-	2	0.1 %
2.16	-	2	0.1 %
2.37	-	2	0.1 %
2.42	-	3	0.2 %
2.47	-	2	0.1 %
2.53	-	1	0.1 %
2.58	-	5	0.4 %
2.63	-	7	0.5 %
2.68	-	7	0.5 %
2.72	-	2	0.1 %
2.74	-	4	0.3 %
2.79	-	9	0.7 %
2.84	-	12	0.9 %
2.89	-	15	1.1 %
2.95	-	22	1.6 %
3.00	Neither agree nor disagree	22	1.6 %
3.05	-	32	2.4 %
3.11	-	26	1.9 %
3.16	-	37	2.7 %
3.21	-	35	2.6 %
3.26	-	47	3.5 %
3.28	-	1	0.1 %
3.32	-	50	3.7 %
3.37	-	56	4.1 %
3.42	-	51	3.8 %
3.47	-	67	4.9 %
3.53	-	51	3.8 %
3.57	-	1	0.1 %
3.58	-	53	3.9 %
3.63	-	37	2.7 %
3.68	-	56	4.1 %
3.74	-	45	3.3 %
3.79	-	41	3.0 %
3.84	-	46	3.4 %
3.89	-	47	3.5 %
3.95	-	38	2.8 %
4.00	Agree a little	39	2.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4.05	-	24	1.8 %
4.11	-	27	2.0 %
4.16	-	22	1.6 %
4.21	-	20	1.5 %
4.26	-	21	1.6 %
4.32	-	17	1.3 %
4.37	-	13	1.0 %
4.42	-	11	0.8 %
4.47	-	11	0.8 %
4.53	-	6	0.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-700.00	Missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-400.00	Measure does not exist for this version	40	3.0 %
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	5	0.4 %
-202.00	Partial interview-data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat 4	122	9.0 %
-9.00	Dont Know	4	0.3 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,178 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1511-1517 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700.00 , -400.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

## S4TOT: S4 NEO: Openness to Experience - Total

Openness to experience; mean of 10 items, 7 items required to compute the mean

MEASURE: NEO Personality Inventory

The NEO-PI-SF (Costa P. & McCrae, R. 1989; McCrae, R. & Costa, P. 2004) is a widely used personality inventory. It taps the "Big 5" dimensions of personality (i.e., neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness). It provides an assessment of emotional, interpersonal, experiential, attitudinal and motivational personality styles. It is a self-report measure in which the participant rates the degree to which he/she thinks the statement is true about themselves (e.g. I shy away from crowds of people) on a 5 point likert scale (1=disagree strongly to 5=agree strongly).

- (1) Disagree strongly
- (2) Disagree a little
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Agree a little
- (5) Agree strongly

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Disagree Strongly	2	0.1 %
1.10	-	1	0.1 %
1.20	-	1	0.1 %
1.30	-	1	0.1 %
1.40	-	2	0.1 %
1.50	-	3	0.2 %
1.60	-	3	0.2 %
1.70	-	2	0.1 %
1.80	-	5	0.4 %
1.90	-	9	0.7 %
2.00	Disagree a little	14	1.0 %
2.10	-	14	1.0 %
2.20	-	31	2.3 %
2.30	-	33	2.4 %
2.40	-	38	2.8 %
2.50	-	49	3.6 %
2.57	-	1	0.1 %
2.60	-	67	4.9 %
2.70	-	77	5.7 %
2.78	-	4	0.3 %
2.80	-	79	5.8 %
2.90	-	80	5.9 %
3.00	Neither agree nor disagree	77	5.7 %
3.10	-	79	5.8 %
3.13	-	1	0.1 %
3.20	-	74	5.5 %
3.22	-	1	0.1 %
3.30	-	62	4.6 %
3.33	-	1	0.1 %
3.40	-	70	5.2 %
3.50	-	56	4.1 %
3.60	-	46	3.4 %
3.70	-	31	2.3 %
3.78	-	1	0.1 %
3.80	-	38	2.8 %
3.90	-	30	2.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4.00	Agree a little	24	1.8 %
4.10	-	14	1.0 %
4.20	-	15	1.1 %
4.30	-	11	0.8 %
4.40	-	5	0.4 %
4.50	-	10	0.7 %
4.60	-	12	0.9 %
4.70	-	1	0.1 %
4.90	-	2	0.1 %
5.00	Agree Strongly	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-700.00	Missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-400.00	Measure does not exist for this version	40	3.0 %
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	5	0.4 %
-202.00	Partial interview-data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat 4	122	9.0 %
-9.00	Dont Know	4	0.3 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,178 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1518-1524 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700.00 , -400.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

## S4ATOT: S4 NEO: Agreeableness - Total

Agreeableness; mean of 14 items, 11 items required to compute the mean

MEASURE: NEO Personality Inventory

The NEO-PI-SF (Costa P. & McCrae, R. 1989; McCrae, R. & Costa, P. 2004) is a widely used personality inventory. It taps the "Big 5" dimensions of personality (i.e., neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness). It provides an assessment of emotional, interpersonal, experiential, attitudinal and motivational personality styles. It is a self-report measure in which the participant rates the degree to which he/she thinks the statement is true about themselves (e.g. I shy away from crowds of people) on a 5 point likert scale (1=disagree strongly to 5=agree strongly).

- (1) Disagree strongly
- (2) Disagree a little
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Agree a little
- (5) Agree strongly

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Disagree Strongly	0	0.0 %
1.57	-	1	0.1 %
1.64	-	1	0.1 %
1.71	-	2	0.1 %
1.86	-	1	0.1 %
1.93	-	3	0.2 %
2.00	Disagree a little	3	0.2 %
2.07	-	6	0.4 %
2.14	-	5	0.4 %
2.21	-	7	0.5 %
2.29	-	10	0.7 %
2.36	-	18	1.3 %
2.43	-	16	1.2 %
2.50	-	16	1.2 %
2.57	-	22	1.6 %
2.64	-	30	2.2 %
2.71	-	31	2.3 %
2.79	-	42	3.1 %
2.86	-	47	3.5 %
2.93	-	55	4.1 %
3.00	Neither agree nor disagree	65	4.8 %
3.07	-	67	4.9 %
3.14	-	76	5.6 %
3.21	-	58	4.3 %
3.23	-	1	0.1 %
3.29	-	93	6.9 %
3.36	-	54	4.0 %
3.43	-	63	4.7 %
3.46	-	1	0.1 %
3.50	-	50	3.7 %
3.57	-	59	4.4 %
3.64	-	48	3.5 %
3.71	-	41	3.0 %
3.79	-	27	2.0 %
3.86	-	30	2.2 %
3.93	-	25	1.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4.00	Agree a little	15	1.1 %
4.07	-	16	1.2 %
4.14	-	15	1.1 %
4.21	-	13	1.0 %
4.29	-	7	0.5 %
4.36	-	12	0.9 %
4.43	-	9	0.7 %
4.50	-	8	0.6 %
4.64	-	2	0.1 %
4.71	-	4	0.3 %
4.79	-	1	0.1 %
5.00	Agree Strongly	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-700.00	Missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-400.00	Measure does not exist for this version	40	3.0 %
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	6	0.4 %
-202.00	Partial interview-data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat 4	122	9.0 %
-9.00	Dont Know	4	0.3 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,177 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1525-1531 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700.00 , -400.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

## S4CTOT: S4 NEO: Conscientiousness - Total

Conscientiousness; mean of 13 items, 11 items required to compute the mean

MEASURE: NEO Personality Inventory

The NEO-PI-SF (Costa P. & McCrae, R. 1989; McCrae, R. & Costa, P. 2004) is a widely used personality inventory. It taps the "Big 5" dimensions of personality (i.e., neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness). It provides an assessment of emotional, interpersonal, experiential, attitudinal and motivational personality styles. It is a self-report measure in which the participant rates the degree to which he/she thinks the statement is true about themselves (e.g. I shy away from crowds of people) on a 5 point likert scale (1=disagree strongly to 5=agree strongly).

- (1) Disagree strongly
- (2) Disagree a little

- (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- (4) Agree a little
- (5) Agree strongly

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	Disagree Strongly	0	0.0 %
2.00	Disagree a little	0	0.0 %
2.22	-	1	0.1 %
2.26	-	2	0.1 %
2.30	-	3	0.2 %
2.35	-	2	0.1 %
2.39	-	1	0.1 %
2.43	-	2	0.1 %
2.52	-	3	0.2 %
2.57	-	4	0.3 %
2.61	-	1	0.1 %
2.65	-	1	0.1 %
2.70	-	2	0.1 %
2.74	-	4	0.3 %
2.77	-	1	0.1 %
2.78	-	5	0.4 %
2.83	-	10	0.7 %
2.87	-	13	1.0 %
2.91	-	17	1.3 %
2.96	-	11	0.8 %
3.00	Neither agree nor disagree	21	1.6 %
3.04	-	12	0.9 %
3.09	-	27	2.0 %
3.13	-	19	1.4 %
3.17	-	26	1.9 %
3.22	-	26	1.9 %
3.26	-	42	3.1 %
3.30	-	31	2.3 %
3.35	-	31	2.3 %
3.39	-	54	4.0 %
3.43	-	36	2.7 %
3.48	-	49	3.6 %
3.52	-	36	2.7 %
3.57	-	50	3.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.61	-	34	2.5 %
3.65	-	53	3.9 %
3.70	-	54	4.0 %
3.73	-	1	0.1 %
3.74	-	35	2.6 %
3.78	-	38	2.8 %
3.83	-	32	2.4 %
3.86	-	1	0.1 %
3.87	-	38	2.8 %
3.91	-	36	2.7 %
3.96	-	27	2.0 %
4.00	Agree a little	27	2.0 %
4.04	-	22	1.6 %
4.09	-	20	1.5 %
4.13	-	23	1.7 %
4.17	-	18	1.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-700.00	Missing due to bug in interview	1	0.1 %
-400.00	Measure does not exist for this version	40	3.0 %
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	5	0.4 %
-202.00	Partial interview-data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat 4	122	9.0 %
-9.00	Dont Know	4	0.3 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,178 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1532-1538 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700.00 , -400.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

## S4PAKNOW: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	Doesn't know at all	24	1.8 %
1.20	-	8	0.6 %
1.40	-	9	0.7 %
1.60	-	18	1.3 %
1.80	-	17	1.3 %
2.00	Knows a little bit	70	5.2 %
2.20	-	32	2.4 %
2.40	-	37	2.7 %
2.50	-	2	0.1 %
2.60	-	30	2.2 %
2.80	-	42	3.1 %
3.00	Knows a lot	84	6.2 %
3.20	-	30	2.2 %
3.25	-	1	0.1 %
3.40	-	24	1.8 %
3.60	-	15	1.1 %
3.80	-	10	0.7 %
4.00	Knows everything	103	7.6 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into Parental Monitoring section	673	49.7 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 556 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1539-1545 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4PARMNT: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	17	1.3 %
1.25	-	28	2.1 %
1.50	-	39	2.9 %
1.75	-	41	3.0 %
2.00	Sometimes	42	3.1 %
2.25	-	29	2.1 %
2.50	-	47	3.5 %
2.75	-	21	1.6 %
3.00	Usually	18	1.3 %
3.25	-	12	0.9 %
3.50	-	23	1.7 %
3.75	-	13	1.0 %
4.00	Always	50	3.7 %
Missing Data			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	4	0.3 %

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into Parental Monitoring section	845	62.4 %
-97.00	NA	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 380 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1546-1552 (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

## S4PORIENT\_PTERM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
0	No	201	14.8 %
1	Yes	13	1.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-700	Data missing: unknown reason	2	0.1 %
-400	Not asked in this version	309	22.8 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Subject does not have any living children	705	52.1 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 214 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1553-1556 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -700 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

## S4PARENT: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Disagree Strongly	0	0.0 %
2.00	Disagree	1	0.1 %
2.17	-	1	0.1 %
2.33	-	2	0.1 %
2.50	-	3	0.2 %
2.67	-	17	1.3 %
2.80	-	1	0.1 %
2.83	-	45	3.3 %
3.00	Agree	41	3.0 %
3.17	-	31	2.3 %
3.33	-	33	2.4 %
3.40	-	1	0.1 %
3.50	-	29	2.1 %
3.60	-	1	0.1 %
3.67	-	17	1.3 %
3.80	-	1	0.1 %
3.83	-	8	0.6 %
4.00	Agree Strongly	22	1.6 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-700.00	Data missing: Unknown reason	2	0.1 %
-300.00	Too few values for computation	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into Parental Orientation section	968	71.5 %
-9.00	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
-8.00	Refuse	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 254 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1557-1563 (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

## S4RQUALPARENTS\_MQUA\_PVIS1: S4 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	5	0.4 %
4	Once a week	15	1.1 %
5	Once every two weeks	20	1.5 %
6	Once a month	24	1.8 %
7	Once every few months	44	3.2 %
8	Never	85	6.3 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Subject spent majority of recall period in community	846	62.5 %
-101	Skipped: Did not live with mother figure responsible for raising them in recall period	190	14.0 %
-97	Not Applicable	2	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 193 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1564-1567 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98 , -97

## S4RQUALPARENTS\_MQUA\_PVIS2: S4 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	28	2.1 %
3	More than once a week	35	2.6 %
4	Once a week	51	3.8 %
5	Once every two weeks	17	1.3 %
6	Once a month	12	0.9 %
7	Once every few months	16	1.2 %
8	Never	35	2.6 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Subject spent majority of recall period in community	846	62.5 %
-101	Skipped: Did not live with mother figure responsible for raising them in recall period	190	14.0 %
-97	Not Applicable	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1568-1571 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98 , -97

---

## S4RQUALPARENTS\_MQUA\_PCTCT: S4 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	18	1.3 %
1	Yes	591	43.6 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Not available in this version	304	22.5 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-104	Skipped: Subject spent the majority of the recall period in an institution	164	12.1 %
-101	Skipped: Did not live with mother figure responsible for raising them in recall period	152	11.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 609 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1572-1575 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

## **S4RQUALPARENTS\_FQUA\_PVIS1: S4 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	1	0.1 %
4	Once a week	8	0.6 %
5	Once every two weeks	6	0.4 %
6	Once a month	9	0.7 %
7	Once every few months	16	1.2 %
8	Never	70	5.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Subject spent majority of recall period in community	507	37.4 %
-101	Skipped: Did not live with father figure responsible for raising them in recall period	611	45.1 %
-97	Not Applicable	3	0.2 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 110 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1576-1579 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98 , -97

## **S4RQUALPARENTS\_FQUA\_PVIS2: S4 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	14	1.0 %
3	More than once a week	12	0.9 %
4	Once a week	19	1.4 %
5	Once every two weeks	11	0.8 %
6	Once a month	2	0.1 %
7	Once every few months	10	0.7 %
8	Never	42	3.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Subject spent majority of recall period in community	507	37.4 %
-101	Skipped: Did not live with father figure responsible for raising them in recall period	611	45.1 %
-97	Not Applicable	3	0.2 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 110 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1580-1583 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98 , -97

---

## S4RQUALPARENTS\_FQUA\_PCTCT: S4 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	61	4.5 %
1	Yes	321	23.7 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Not available in this version	306	22.6 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-104	Skipped: Subject spent the majority of the recall period in an institution	100	7.4 %
-101	Skipped: Did not live with father figure responsible for raising them in recall period	441	32.6 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 382 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1584-1587 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

## S4MAWARM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	8	0.6 %
1.11	-	1	0.1 %
1.22	-	3	0.2 %
1.33	-	7	0.5 %
1.44	-	8	0.6 %
1.56	-	5	0.4 %
1.67	-	5	0.4 %
1.78	-	8	0.6 %
1.89	-	19	1.4 %
2.00	Sometimes	40	3.0 %
2.11	-	27	2.0 %
2.22	-	26	1.9 %
2.33	-	28	2.1 %
2.44	-	31	2.3 %
2.56	-	36	2.7 %
2.67	-	43	3.2 %
2.78	-	30	2.2 %
2.89	-	47	3.5 %
3.00	Often	62	4.6 %
3.11	-	51	3.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.22	-	33	2.4 %
3.33	-	44	3.2 %
3.44	-	39	2.9 %
3.50	-	1	0.1 %
3.56	-	51	3.8 %
3.67	-	47	3.5 %
3.78	-	75	5.5 %
3.89	-	56	4.1 %
4.00	Always	145	10.7 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into measure	255	18.8 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 976 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1588-1594 (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

## S4MAHOTL: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	119	8.8 %

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.08	-	86	6.4 %
1.17	-	117	8.6 %
1.25	-	130	9.6 %
1.33	-	117	8.6 %
1.42	-	86	6.4 %
1.50	-	72	5.3 %
1.58	-	56	4.1 %
1.67	-	39	2.9 %
1.75	-	35	2.6 %
1.83	-	28	2.1 %
1.92	-	19	1.4 %
2.00	Sometimes	13	1.0 %
2.08	-	15	1.1 %
2.17	-	10	0.7 %
2.25	-	10	0.7 %
2.33	-	5	0.4 %
2.42	-	3	0.2 %
2.50	-	4	0.3 %
2.58	-	2	0.1 %
2.67	-	2	0.1 %
2.75	-	1	0.1 %
2.83	-	3	0.2 %
3.00	Often	0	0.0 %
3.17	-	1	0.1 %
3.33	-	1	0.1 %
3.42	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Always	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into measure	255	18.8 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 976 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1595-1601 (*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

## **S4PAWARM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	17	1.3 %
1.11	-	4	0.3 %
1.22	-	5	0.4 %
1.33	-	5	0.4 %
1.44	-	8	0.6 %
1.56	-	5	0.4 %
1.67	-	10	0.7 %
1.78	-	11	0.8 %
1.89	-	19	1.4 %
2.00	Sometimes	34	2.5 %
2.11	-	25	1.8 %
2.22	-	17	1.3 %
2.33	-	25	1.8 %
2.44	-	11	0.8 %
2.56	-	17	1.3 %
2.67	-	16	1.2 %
2.78	-	21	1.6 %
2.89	-	16	1.2 %
3.00	Often	31	2.3 %
3.11	-	22	1.6 %
3.22	-	20	1.5 %
3.33	-	19	1.4 %
3.44	-	21	1.6 %
3.56	-	17	1.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.67	-	19	1.4 %
3.78	-	13	1.0 %
3.89	-	19	1.4 %
4.00	Always	57	4.2 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into measure	726	53.6 %
-8.00	Refuse	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 504 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1602-1608 (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

## S4PAHOTL: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	112	8.3 %
1.08	-	60	4.4 %
1.09	-	1	0.1 %
1.17	-	59	4.4 %
1.25	-	57	4.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.30	-	1	0.1 %
1.33	-	55	4.1 %
1.42	-	44	3.2 %
1.50	-	32	2.4 %
1.58	-	17	1.3 %
1.67	-	10	0.7 %
1.75	-	14	1.0 %
1.83	-	11	0.8 %
1.92	-	6	0.4 %
2.00	Sometimes	5	0.4 %
2.08	-	10	0.7 %
2.17	-	3	0.2 %
2.25	-	3	0.2 %
2.33	-	1	0.1 %
2.42	-	2	0.1 %
2.67	-	1	0.1 %
3.00	Often	0	0.0 %
4.00	Always	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into measure	726	53.6 %
-8.00	Refuse	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 504 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1609-1615 (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

---

## **S4PARENTHELP\_PH01: S4 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	0	0.0 %
2	Once or twice	0	0.0 %
3	More than twice	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Early V01.16 not asked if subject under age 18	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1616-1619 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

## **S4PARENTHELP\_PH02: S4 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	3	0.2 %
2	Once or twice	0	0.0 %
3	More than twice	1	0.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Early V01.16 not asked if subject under age 18	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1620-1623 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

## **S4PARENTHELP\_PH03: S4 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	1	0.1 %
2	Once or twice	0	0.0 %
3	More than twice	2	0.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Early V01.16 not asked if subject under age 18	1	0.1 %
-7	NA: Subject has no children	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1624-1627 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

## S4PARENTHELP\_PH04: S4 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	1	0.1 %
2	Once or twice	1	0.1 %
3	More than twice	0	0.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Early V01.16 not asked if subject under age 18	1	0.1 %
-7	NA: In facility entire recall period	2	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 2 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1628-1631 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

## S4PARENTHELP\_PH05: S4 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	0	0.0 %
2	Once or twice	1	0.1 %
3	More than twice	2	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Early V01.16 not asked if subject under age 18	1	0.1 %
-7	NA	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1632-1635 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

---

## S4PARENTHELP\_PH06: S4 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	2	0.1 %
2	Once or twice	1	0.1 %
3	More than twice	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Early V01.16 not asked if subject under age 18	1	0.1 %
-7	NA	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1636-1639 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

---

## S4PARENTHELP\_PH07: S4 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	2	0.1 %
2	Once or twice	0	0.0 %
3	More than twice	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Early V01.16 not asked if subject under age 18	1	0.1 %
-7	NA: Done with school (graduated or GED)	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

Location: 1640-1643 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

---

## S4PARENTHELP\_PH08: S4 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	3	0.2 %
2	Once or twice	0	0.0 %
3	More than twice	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Early V01.16 not asked if subject under age 18	1	0.1 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1644-1647 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

## **S4PARENTHELP\_PH09: S4 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	1	0.1 %
2	Once or twice	0	0.0 %
3	More than twice	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Early V01.16 not asked if subject under age 18	1	0.1 %
-7	NA: No court case of any kind	3	0.2 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1648-1651 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

## **S4PARENTHELP\_PH10: S4 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	3	0.2 %
2	Once or twice	1	0.1 %
3	More than twice	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Early V01.16 not asked if subject under age 18	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1652-1655 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

## **S4PARENTHELP\_PH11: S4 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	2	0.1 %
2	Once or twice	2	0.1 %
3	More than twice	0	0.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Early V01.16 not asked if subject under age 18	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1656-1659 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

## **S4PARENTHELP\_PH12: S4 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	3	0.2 %
2	Once or twice	1	0.1 %
3	More than twice	0	0.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Early V01.16 not asked if subject under age 18	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1660-1663 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

#### **S4PARENTHELP\_PH13: S4 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	2	0.1 %
2	Once or twice	0	0.0 %
3	More than twice	0	0.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Early V01.16 not asked if subject under age 18	1	0.1 %
-7	NA: Parents have no other children	2	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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:* -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

#### **S4PARENTHELP\_PH14: S4 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	0	0.0 %
2	Once or twice	1	0.1 %
3	More than twice	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Early V01.16 not asked if subject under age 18	1	0.1 %
-7	NA	3	0.2 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1668-1671 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

## S4PARENTHELP\_PH15: S4 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	0	0.0 %
2	Once or twice	1	0.1 %
3	More than twice	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Early V01.16 not asked if subject under age 18	1	0.1 %
-7	NA	3	0.2 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1672-1675 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

---

## S4PARENTHELP\_PH16: S4 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	1	0.1 %
2	Once or twice	1	0.1 %
3	More than twice	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Early V01.16 not asked if subject under age 18	1	0.1 %
-7	NA	2	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 2 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1676-1679 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

---

## S4PARENTHELP\_PH17: S4 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	3	0.2 %
2	Once or twice	0	0.0 %
3	More than twice	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-400	Not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Early V01.16 not asked if subject under age 18	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-7	NA: Didn't try to get this type of assistance	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1680-1683 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

---

## S4PARENTHELP\_PH18: S4 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	3	0.2 %
2	Once or twice	0	0.0 %
3	More than twice	0	0.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-400	Not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Later V01.16+ not asked if subject under age 20	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Early V01.16 not asked if subject under age 18	1	0.1 %
-7	NA: Didn't need medical care	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1684-1687 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8 , -7

---

## S4PRBEHV: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	None of them	350	25.8 %
1.08	-	67	4.9 %
1.09	-	1	0.1 %
1.17	-	67	4.9 %
1.25	-	40	3.0 %
1.27	-	1	0.1 %
1.31	-	2	0.1 %
1.33	-	38	2.8 %
1.42	-	43	3.2 %
1.44	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	45	3.3 %
1.55	-	1	0.1 %
1.58	-	27	2.0 %
1.64	-	2	0.1 %
1.67	-	45	3.3 %
1.75	-	33	2.4 %
1.83	-	31	2.3 %
1.90	-	1	0.1 %
1.91	-	1	0.1 %
1.92	-	30	2.2 %
2.00	Very few of them	26	1.9 %
2.08	-	31	2.3 %
2.09	-	1	0.1 %
2.17	-	30	2.2 %
2.25	-	19	1.4 %
2.33	-	14	1.0 %
2.42	-	18	1.3 %
2.50	-	34	2.5 %
2.58	-	29	2.1 %
2.67	-	22	1.6 %
2.75	-	11	0.8 %

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
2.83	-	27	2.0 %
2.92	-	12	0.9 %
3.00	Some of them	24	1.8 %
3.08	-	7	0.5 %
3.17	-	15	1.1 %
3.22	-	1	0.1 %
3.25	-	11	0.8 %
3.33	-	8	0.6 %
3.36	-	1	0.1 %
3.42	-	10	0.7 %
3.50	-	4	0.3 %
3.55	-	1	0.1 %
3.58	-	6	0.4 %
3.67	-	6	0.4 %
3.75	-	2	0.1 %
3.83	-	2	0.1 %
3.92	-	2	0.1 %
4.00	Most of them	5	0.4 %
4.08	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	6	0.4 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9.00	Dont know	6	0.4 %
-8.00	Refuse	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,215 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1688-1694 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4PRINFL: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	None of them	599	44.2 %
1.14	-	102	7.5 %
1.29	-	92	6.8 %
1.43	-	54	4.0 %
1.57	-	58	4.3 %
1.71	-	38	2.8 %
1.86	-	28	2.1 %
2.00	Very few of them	28	2.1 %
2.14	-	31	2.3 %
2.29	-	29	2.1 %
2.43	-	23	1.7 %
2.57	-	25	1.8 %
2.71	-	19	1.4 %
2.86	-	18	1.3 %
3.00	Some of them	31	2.3 %
3.14	-	9	0.7 %
3.29	-	6	0.4 %
3.43	-	6	0.4 %
3.57	-	4	0.3 %
3.71	-	4	0.3 %
3.86	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Most of them	4	0.3 %
4.14	-	1	0.1 %
4.29	-	1	0.1 %
4.57	-	2	0.1 %
4.86	-	1	0.1 %
5.00	All of them	8	0.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	4	0.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9.00	Dont know	4	0.3 %
-8.00	Refuse	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,222 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1695-1701 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4OPP01A: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	19	1.4 %
2	Not too important	12	0.9 %
3	Somewhat important	89	6.6 %
4	Pretty important	208	15.4 %
5	Very important	898	66.3 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,226 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1702-1705 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

---

## S4OPP01B: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Poor	39	2.9 %
2	Fair	145	10.7 %
3	Good	373	27.5 %
4	Very Good	358	26.4 %
5	Excellent	310	22.9 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97	NA - already achieved	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,225 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1706-1709 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

---

## S4OPP02A: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	100	7.4 %
2	Not too important	126	9.3 %
3	Somewhat important	211	15.6 %
4	Pretty important	218	16.1 %
5	Very important	570	42.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97	NA - already achieved	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,225 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1710-1713 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

---

#### S4OPP02B: S4\_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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Poor	169	12.5 %
2	Fair	267	19.7 %
3	Good	285	21.0 %
4	Very Good	263	19.4 %
5	Excellent	241	17.8 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-99	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,225 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1714-1717 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

---

## S4OPP03A: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	10	0.7 %
2	Not too important	7	0.5 %
3	Somewhat important	52	3.8 %
4	Pretty important	238	17.6 %
5	Very important	919	67.9 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,226 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1718-1721 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

## S4OPP03B: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Poor	20	1.5 %
2	Fair	128	9.5 %
3	Good	359	26.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	Very Good	355	26.2 %
5	Excellent	364	26.9 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,226 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1722-1725 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

## S4OPP04A: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	6	0.4 %
2	Not too important	4	0.3 %
3	Somewhat important	31	2.3 %
4	Pretty important	177	13.1 %
5	Very important	1008	74.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,226 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1726-1729 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

---

## S4OPP04B: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Poor	15	1.1 %
2	Fair	100	7.4 %
3	Good	294	21.7 %
4	Very Good	369	27.3 %
5	Excellent	446	32.9 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-99	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-97	NA - already achieved	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,224 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1730-1733 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

---

## S4OPP05A: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	91	6.7 %
2	Not too important	52	3.8 %
3	Somewhat important	115	8.5 %
4	Pretty important	225	16.6 %
5	Very important	738	54.5 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-99	Dont Know	4	0.3 %
-97	NA - already achieved	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,221 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1734-1737 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

---

## S4OPP05B: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Poor	91	6.7 %
2	Fair	169	12.5 %
3	Good	286	21.1 %
4	Very Good	325	24.0 %
5	Excellent	348	25.7 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-99	Dont Know	6	0.4 %
-97	NA - already achieved	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,219 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1738-1741 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

---

## S4OPP06A: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	8	0.6 %
2	Not too important	2	0.1 %
3	Somewhat important	19	1.4 %
4	Pretty important	111	8.2 %
5	Very important	1082	79.9 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-99	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
-97	NA - already achieved	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,222 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1742-1745 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

---

## S4OPP06B: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Poor	11	0.8 %
2	Fair	34	2.5 %
3	Good	147	10.9 %
4	Very Good	301	22.2 %
5	Excellent	727	53.7 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-99	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
-97	NA - already achieved	3	0.2 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,220 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1746-1749 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

## S4OPP07A: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	13	1.0 %
2	Not too important	3	0.2 %
3	Somewhat important	49	3.6 %
4	Pretty important	158	11.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	Very important	1000	73.9 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97	NA - already achieved	3	0.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,223 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1750-1753 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

## S4OPP07B: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Poor	42	3.1 %
2	Fair	150	11.1 %
3	Good	276	20.4 %
4	Very Good	296	21.9 %
5	Excellent	456	33.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-97	NA - already achieved	6	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,220 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1754-1757 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

## S4OPPORT: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all important	3	0.2 %
1.17	-	1	0.1 %
1.67	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	Not too important	0	0.0 %
2.17	-	2	0.1 %
2.33	-	3	0.2 %
2.50	-	2	0.1 %
2.67	-	3	0.2 %
2.83	-	6	0.4 %
3.00	Somewhat important	18	1.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.17	-	16	1.2 %
3.33	-	22	1.6 %
3.40	-	2	0.1 %
3.50	-	25	1.8 %
3.67	-	35	2.6 %
3.83	-	57	4.2 %
4.00	Pretty important	62	4.6 %
4.17	-	84	6.2 %
4.20	-	1	0.1 %
4.33	-	112	8.3 %
4.50	-	114	8.4 %
4.67	-	140	10.3 %
4.83	-	141	10.4 %
5.00	Very important	376	27.8 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,226 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1758-1764 (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

## S4EXPECT: S4\_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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	Poor	5	0.4 %
1.17	-	3	0.2 %
1.33	-	2	0.1 %
1.50	-	3	0.2 %
1.67	-	3	0.2 %
1.83	-	18	1.3 %
2.00	Fair	24	1.8 %
2.17	-	26	1.9 %
2.33	-	39	2.9 %
2.40	-	1	0.1 %
2.50	-	41	3.0 %
2.67	-	67	4.9 %
2.83	-	66	4.9 %
3.00	Good	90	6.6 %
3.17	-	61	4.5 %
3.20	-	2	0.1 %
3.33	-	68	5.0 %
3.50	-	61	4.5 %
3.60	-	1	0.1 %
3.67	-	56	4.1 %
3.80	-	1	0.1 %
3.83	-	71	5.2 %
4.00	Very good	92	6.8 %
4.17	-	74	5.5 %
4.20	-	2	0.1 %
4.33	-	63	4.7 %
4.40	-	1	0.1 %
4.50	-	68	5.0 %
4.67	-	42	3.1 %
4.80	-	1	0.1 %
4.83	-	41	3.0 %
5.00	Excellent	131	9.7 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,224 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1765-1771 (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

## S4PESSIM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-1.17	-	1	0.1 %
-1.00	-	2	0.1 %
-0.83	-	1	0.1 %
-0.67	-	9	0.7 %
-0.50	-	8	0.6 %
-0.33	-	6	0.4 %
-0.17	-	19	1.4 %
0.00	-	194	14.3 %
0.17	-	78	5.8 %
0.20	-	1	0.1 %
0.33	-	80	5.9 %
0.40	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.50	-	106	7.8 %
0.60	-	1	0.1 %
0.63	-	1	0.1 %
0.67	-	98	7.2 %
0.73	-	1	0.1 %
0.83	-	95	7.0 %
1.00	-	110	8.1 %
1.17	-	78	5.8 %
1.20	-	1	0.1 %
1.30	-	1	0.1 %
1.33	-	47	3.5 %
1.40	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	68	5.0 %
1.63	-	1	0.1 %
1.67	-	52	3.8 %
1.83	-	34	2.5 %
2.00	-	52	3.8 %
2.17	-	25	1.8 %
2.27	-	1	0.1 %
2.33	-	14	1.0 %
2.50	-	10	0.7 %
2.67	-	11	0.8 %
2.83	-	10	0.7 %
3.00	-	1	0.1 %
3.17	-	2	0.1 %
3.50	-	1	0.1 %
3.83	-	2	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	2	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,224 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1772-1778 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -99.00 , -98.00

## S4PROJUS\_PJPOLI: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	978	72.2 %
1	Yes	252	18.6 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1779-1782 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

---

## S4PROJUS\_PJPNUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	215	15.9 %
2	-	31	2.3 %
3	-	4	0.3 %
4	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Not picked up by the police in the recall period	978	72.2 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 252 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1783-1786 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

---

## **S4PROJUS\_PJCRT: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	828	61.2 %
1	Yes	402	29.7 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1787-1790 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4PROJUS\_PJCNUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	183	13.5 %
2	-	101	7.5 %
3	-	51	3.8 %
4	-	25	1.8 %
5	-	14	1.0 %
6	-	16	1.2 %
7	-	2	0.1 %
8	-	3	0.2 %
9	-	1	0.1 %
11	-	1	0.1 %
14	-	1	0.1 %
19	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	1	0.1 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-999	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-102	Skipped: Did not have a court appearance in the recall period	828	61.2 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 401 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1791-1794 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4PJCOP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	-	6	0.4 %
1.17	-	2	0.1 %
1.25	-	4	0.3 %
1.36	-	1	0.1 %
1.39	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	2	0.1 %
1.61	-	5	0.4 %
1.64	-	3	0.2 %
1.67	-	5	0.4 %
1.72	-	1	0.1 %
1.75	-	1	0.1 %
1.79	-	5	0.4 %
1.83	-	3	0.2 %
1.89	-	7	0.5 %
1.92	-	1	0.1 %
1.93	-	3	0.2 %
1.96	-	1	0.1 %
1.97	-	2	0.1 %
2.00	-	28	2.1 %
2.03	-	1	0.1 %
2.04	-	8	0.6 %
2.07	-	11	0.8 %
2.08	-	1	0.1 %
2.09	-	1	0.1 %
2.11	-	2	0.1 %
2.12	-	1	0.1 %
2.13	-	1	0.1 %
2.14	-	2	0.1 %
2.15	-	1	0.1 %
2.17	-	5	0.4 %
2.18	-	22	1.6 %
2.19	-	1	0.1 %
2.21	-	8	0.6 %
2.22	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.23	-	2	0.1 %
2.25	-	9	0.7 %
2.26	-	1	0.1 %
2.27	-	2	0.1 %
2.29	-	5	0.4 %
2.31	-	3	0.2 %
2.32	-	5	0.4 %
2.33	-	47	3.5 %
2.34	-	3	0.2 %
2.35	-	4	0.3 %
2.36	-	32	2.4 %
2.37	-	1	0.1 %
2.39	-	8	0.6 %
2.40	-	5	0.4 %
2.41	-	1	0.1 %
2.42	-	4	0.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1795-1801 (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

## S4PJJUDG: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	-	4	0.3 %
1.33	-	1	0.1 %
1.42	-	1	0.1 %
1.46	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	1	0.1 %
1.61	-	4	0.3 %
1.67	-	3	0.2 %
1.75	-	2	0.1 %
1.79	-	3	0.2 %
1.83	-	1	0.1 %
1.88	-	1	0.1 %
1.89	-	4	0.3 %
1.90	-	1	0.1 %
1.93	-	2	0.1 %
1.96	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	-	21	1.6 %
2.02	-	1	0.1 %
2.07	-	7	0.5 %
2.11	-	1	0.1 %
2.12	-	2	0.1 %
2.14	-	2	0.1 %
2.15	-	1	0.1 %
2.16	-	1	0.1 %
2.17	-	4	0.3 %
2.18	-	9	0.7 %
2.19	-	1	0.1 %
2.21	-	5	0.4 %
2.24	-	1	0.1 %
2.25	-	9	0.7 %
2.26	-	1	0.1 %
2.28	-	1	0.1 %
2.29	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.31	-	1	0.1 %
2.32	-	10	0.7 %
2.33	-	22	1.6 %
2.34	-	1	0.1 %
2.36	-	18	1.3 %
2.37	-	1	0.1 %
2.38	-	2	0.1 %
2.39	-	2	0.1 %
2.40	-	2	0.1 %
2.42	-	1	0.1 %
2.43	-	2	0.1 %
2.44	-	1	0.1 %
2.45	-	2	0.1 %
2.46	-	12	0.9 %
2.48	-	3	0.2 %
2.49	-	1	0.1 %
2.50	-	22	1.6 %
2.52	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1802-1808 (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

## S4PJCOUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	-	7	0.5 %
1.09	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	9	0.7 %
1.87	-	1	0.1 %
1.97	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	-	76	5.6 %
2.01	-	2	0.1 %
2.04	-	1	0.1 %
2.08	-	1	0.1 %
2.10	-	1	0.1 %
2.13	-	2	0.1 %
2.15	-	6	0.4 %
2.19	-	1	0.1 %
2.22	-	1	0.1 %
2.23	-	4	0.3 %
2.24	-	2	0.1 %
2.27	-	2	0.1 %
2.30	-	5	0.4 %
2.32	-	1	0.1 %
2.34	-	1	0.1 %
2.36	-	2	0.1 %
2.37	-	5	0.4 %
2.39	-	2	0.1 %
2.40	-	2	0.1 %
2.41	-	1	0.1 %
2.42	-	1	0.1 %
2.43	-	2	0.1 %
2.44	-	8	0.6 %
2.46	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.48	-	3	0.2 %
2.49	-	2	0.1 %
2.50	-	39	2.9 %
2.51	-	3	0.2 %
2.52	-	1	0.1 %
2.53	-	2	0.1 %
2.54	-	1	0.1 %
2.55	-	2	0.1 %
2.56	-	1	0.1 %
2.57	-	1	0.1 %
2.58	-	5	0.4 %
2.60	-	2	0.1 %
2.62	-	1	0.1 %
2.63	-	1	0.1 %
2.64	-	2	0.1 %
2.65	-	8	0.6 %
2.67	-	4	0.3 %
2.70	-	1	0.1 %
2.71	-	3	0.2 %
2.72	-	2	0.1 %
2.73	-	6	0.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	94	6.9 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,136 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1809-1815 (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

## S4PJCOPO: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	-	23	1.7 %
1.05	-	9	0.7 %
1.25	-	5	0.4 %
1.30	-	13	1.0 %
1.45	-	4	0.3 %
1.50	-	8	0.6 %
1.55	-	2	0.1 %
1.65	-	8	0.6 %
1.70	-	7	0.5 %
1.75	-	8	0.6 %
1.80	-	2	0.1 %
1.81	-	1	0.1 %
1.85	-	51	3.8 %
1.90	-	7	0.5 %
1.95	-	2	0.1 %
2.00	-	118	8.7 %
2.05	-	10	0.7 %
2.10	-	72	5.3 %
2.15	-	5	0.4 %
2.20	-	2	0.1 %
2.25	-	56	4.1 %
2.30	-	29	2.1 %
2.35	-	33	2.4 %
2.40	-	5	0.4 %
2.45	-	6	0.4 %
2.50	-	118	8.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.55	-	13	1.0 %
2.60	-	31	2.3 %
2.65	-	18	1.3 %
2.70	-	24	1.8 %
2.75	-	58	4.3 %
2.80	-	5	0.4 %
2.81	-	1	0.1 %
2.85	-	6	0.4 %
2.90	-	52	3.8 %
2.95	-	13	1.0 %
3.00	-	96	7.1 %
3.05	-	11	0.8 %
3.10	-	13	1.0 %
3.15	-	23	1.7 %
3.20	-	7	0.5 %
3.25	-	14	1.0 %
3.30	-	19	1.4 %
3.35	-	7	0.5 %
3.40	-	10	0.7 %
3.45	-	11	0.8 %
3.50	-	36	2.7 %
3.55	-	12	0.9 %
3.60	-	6	0.4 %
3.65	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1816-1822 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4PJJUDU: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	-	9	0.7 %
1.50	-	9	0.7 %
1.58	-	1	0.1 %
1.70	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	-	94	6.9 %
2.01	-	2	0.1 %
2.04	-	1	0.1 %
2.05	-	1	0.1 %
2.10	-	1	0.1 %
2.11	-	1	0.1 %
2.13	-	2	0.1 %
2.15	-	1	0.1 %
2.18	-	1	0.1 %
2.22	-	1	0.1 %
2.23	-	1	0.1 %
2.24	-	1	0.1 %
2.27	-	1	0.1 %
2.30	-	1	0.1 %
2.31	-	1	0.1 %
2.32	-	1	0.1 %
2.33	-	1	0.1 %
2.35	-	1	0.1 %
2.38	-	1	0.1 %
2.40	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.42	-	2	0.1 %
2.43	-	2	0.1 %
2.44	-	2	0.1 %
2.45	-	3	0.2 %
2.46	-	1	0.1 %
2.49	-	1	0.1 %
2.50	-	40	3.0 %
2.51	-	2	0.1 %
2.52	-	1	0.1 %
2.56	-	3	0.2 %
2.58	-	2	0.1 %
2.62	-	2	0.1 %
2.65	-	1	0.1 %
2.67	-	3	0.2 %
2.68	-	3	0.2 %
2.69	-	1	0.1 %
2.70	-	5	0.4 %
2.71	-	1	0.1 %
2.72	-	1	0.1 %
2.73	-	1	0.1 %
2.74	-	2	0.1 %
2.76	-	4	0.3 %
2.77	-	5	0.4 %
2.79	-	5	0.4 %
2.80	-	2	0.1 %
2.82	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	82	6.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,148 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1823-1829 (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

## S4PJJUDO: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	-	10	0.7 %
1.05	-	6	0.4 %
1.30	-	6	0.4 %
1.40	-	2	0.1 %
1.50	-	2	0.1 %
1.58	-	1	0.1 %
1.63	-	1	0.1 %
1.65	-	2	0.1 %
1.74	-	2	0.1 %
1.75	-	5	0.4 %
1.76	-	2	0.1 %
1.80	-	1	0.1 %
1.81	-	1	0.1 %
1.82	-	1	0.1 %
1.85	-	18	1.3 %
1.90	-	2	0.1 %
1.92	-	1	0.1 %
1.95	-	1	0.1 %
1.98	-	3	0.2 %
2.00	-	72	5.3 %
2.02	-	1	0.1 %

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
2.03	-	1	0.1 %
2.05	-	3	0.2 %
2.08	-	1	0.1 %
2.10	-	29	2.1 %
2.12	-	3	0.2 %
2.14	-	1	0.1 %
2.15	-	7	0.5 %
2.20	-	1	0.1 %
2.21	-	2	0.1 %
2.25	-	28	2.1 %
2.26	-	1	0.1 %
2.27	-	1	0.1 %
2.30	-	12	0.9 %
2.31	-	2	0.1 %
2.33	-	2	0.1 %
2.35	-	13	1.0 %
2.37	-	2	0.1 %
2.38	-	1	0.1 %
2.43	-	2	0.1 %
2.44	-	1	0.1 %
2.45	-	1	0.1 %
2.48	-	2	0.1 %
2.49	-	4	0.3 %
2.50	-	49	3.6 %
2.51	-	4	0.3 %
2.52	-	1	0.1 %
2.54	-	1	0.1 %
2.55	-	5	0.4 %
2.56	-	2	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1830-1836 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4LEGIT: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly disagree	20	1.5 %
1.09	-	6	0.4 %
1.11	-	1	0.1 %
1.14	-	1	0.1 %
1.17	-	1	0.1 %
1.18	-	13	1.0 %
1.27	-	35	2.6 %
1.30	-	1	0.1 %
1.33	-	2	0.1 %
1.36	-	19	1.4 %
1.40	-	3	0.2 %
1.43	-	1	0.1 %
1.45	-	18	1.3 %
1.50	-	3	0.2 %
1.55	-	25	1.8 %
1.57	-	2	0.1 %

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.60	-	4	0.3 %
1.63	-	1	0.1 %
1.64	-	37	2.7 %
1.67	-	6	0.4 %
1.70	-	6	0.4 %
1.73	-	35	2.6 %
1.78	-	2	0.1 %
1.80	-	3	0.2 %
1.82	-	45	3.3 %
1.83	-	6	0.4 %
1.86	-	1	0.1 %
1.88	-	1	0.1 %
1.89	-	2	0.1 %
1.90	-	3	0.2 %
1.91	-	36	2.7 %
2.00	Somewhat disagree	56	4.1 %
2.09	-	38	2.8 %
2.10	-	5	0.4 %
2.11	-	3	0.2 %
2.14	-	1	0.1 %
2.17	-	3	0.2 %
2.18	-	51	3.8 %
2.20	-	3	0.2 %
2.22	-	4	0.3 %
2.27	-	49	3.6 %
2.29	-	1	0.1 %
2.30	-	6	0.4 %
2.33	-	10	0.7 %
2.36	-	57	4.2 %
2.38	-	3	0.2 %
2.40	-	4	0.3 %
2.44	-	1	0.1 %
2.45	-	56	4.1 %
2.50	-	8	0.6 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1837-1843 (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

## S4CYNIC: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly disagree	131	9.7 %
1.20	-	51	3.8 %
1.40	-	93	6.9 %
1.60	-	113	8.3 %
1.75	-	1	0.1 %
1.80	-	104	7.7 %
2.00	Somewhat disagree	142	10.5 %
2.20	-	176	13.0 %
2.25	-	1	0.1 %
2.40	-	121	8.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.50	-	2	0.1 %
2.60	-	112	8.3 %
2.75	-	1	0.1 %
2.80	-	92	6.8 %
3.00	Somewhat agree	38	2.8 %
3.20	-	17	1.3 %
3.25	-	1	0.1 %
3.40	-	20	1.5 %
3.60	-	7	0.5 %
3.80	-	4	0.3 %
4.00	Strongly agree	3	0.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1844-1850 (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

## S4PROTIMEALLSETTINGS: S4 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	-	622	45.9 %
0.01	-	23	1.7 %
0.02	-	5	0.4 %
0.03	-	10	0.7 %
0.04	-	1	0.1 %
0.05	-	6	0.4 %
0.06	-	7	0.5 %
0.07	-	8	0.6 %
0.08	-	3	0.2 %
0.09	-	5	0.4 %
0.10	-	5	0.4 %
0.11	-	3	0.2 %

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
0.12	-	3	0.2 %
0.13	-	3	0.2 %
0.14	-	5	0.4 %
0.15	-	6	0.4 %
0.16	-	2	0.1 %
0.17	-	2	0.1 %
0.18	-	5	0.4 %
0.19	-	3	0.2 %
0.20	-	4	0.3 %
0.21	-	5	0.4 %
0.22	-	5	0.4 %
0.23	-	5	0.4 %
0.24	-	6	0.4 %
0.25	-	4	0.3 %
0.26	-	2	0.1 %
0.27	-	4	0.3 %
0.28	-	3	0.2 %
0.29	-	6	0.4 %
0.30	-	4	0.3 %
0.31	-	4	0.3 %
0.32	-	2	0.1 %
0.33	-	4	0.3 %
0.34	-	5	0.4 %
0.35	-	5	0.4 %
0.36	-	5	0.4 %
0.37	-	4	0.3 %
0.38	-	3	0.2 %
0.40	-	5	0.4 %
0.41	-	4	0.3 %
0.42	-	3	0.2 %
0.43	-	3	0.2 %
0.44	-	3	0.2 %
0.45	-	3	0.2 %
0.46	-	5	0.4 %
0.47	-	1	0.1 %
0.48	-	4	0.3 %
0.49	-	3	0.2 %
0.50	-	3	0.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,231 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1851-1857 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -202.00 , -201.00

## S4PROPTIMESTREETS: S4 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	-	168	12.4 %
0.01	-	59	4.4 %
0.02	-	21	1.6 %
0.03	-	5	0.4 %
0.04	-	4	0.3 %
0.05	-	4	0.3 %
0.06	-	3	0.2 %
0.07	-	1	0.1 %
0.08	-	8	0.6 %
0.09	-	3	0.2 %
0.10	-	5	0.4 %
0.11	-	2	0.1 %
0.12	-	4	0.3 %
0.13	-	2	0.1 %
0.14	-	4	0.3 %
0.15	-	4	0.3 %
0.16	-	2	0.1 %
0.17	-	2	0.1 %
0.18	-	2	0.1 %
0.19	-	3	0.2 %
0.20	-	2	0.1 %
0.21	-	2	0.1 %
0.22	-	5	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.23	-	1	0.1 %
0.24	-	1	0.1 %
0.25	-	1	0.1 %
0.26	-	3	0.2 %
0.27	-	2	0.1 %
0.28	-	2	0.1 %
0.29	-	3	0.2 %
0.30	-	4	0.3 %
0.33	-	4	0.3 %
0.34	-	5	0.4 %
0.35	-	3	0.2 %
0.36	-	2	0.1 %
0.37	-	4	0.3 %
0.38	-	5	0.4 %
0.39	-	3	0.2 %
0.40	-	3	0.2 %
0.41	-	5	0.4 %
0.42	-	1	0.1 %
0.43	-	4	0.3 %
0.44	-	3	0.2 %
0.45	-	2	0.1 %
0.46	-	2	0.1 %
0.47	-	4	0.3 %
0.48	-	3	0.2 %
0.49	-	2	0.1 %
0.50	-	3	0.2 %
0.51	-	3	0.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,231 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1858-1864 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -202.00 , -201.00

## S4PROPTIMESECURESETTINGS: S4 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	-	628	46.4 %
0.01	-	23	1.7 %
0.02	-	5	0.4 %
0.03	-	10	0.7 %
0.04	-	1	0.1 %
0.05	-	6	0.4 %
0.06	-	7	0.5 %
0.07	-	8	0.6 %
0.08	-	3	0.2 %
0.09	-	5	0.4 %
0.10	-	5	0.4 %
0.11	-	3	0.2 %
0.12	-	3	0.2 %
0.13	-	3	0.2 %
0.14	-	5	0.4 %
0.15	-	6	0.4 %
0.16	-	1	0.1 %
0.17	-	3	0.2 %
0.18	-	5	0.4 %
0.19	-	3	0.2 %
0.20	-	4	0.3 %
0.21	-	5	0.4 %
0.22	-	5	0.4 %
0.23	-	6	0.4 %
0.24	-	6	0.4 %
0.25	-	3	0.2 %
0.26	-	2	0.1 %
0.27	-	4	0.3 %
0.28	-	3	0.2 %
0.29	-	6	0.4 %
0.30	-	2	0.1 %
0.31	-	5	0.4 %
0.32	-	2	0.1 %
0.33	-	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.34	-	5	0.4 %
0.35	-	5	0.4 %
0.36	-	4	0.3 %
0.37	-	4	0.3 %
0.38	-	4	0.3 %
0.40	-	5	0.4 %
0.41	-	4	0.3 %
0.42	-	2	0.1 %
0.43	-	3	0.2 %
0.44	-	3	0.2 %
0.45	-	3	0.2 %
0.46	-	5	0.4 %
0.47	-	2	0.1 %
0.48	-	4	0.3 %
0.49	-	3	0.2 %
0.50	-	3	0.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,231 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1865-1871 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -202.00 , -201.00

---

## S4PROPTIMESTREETS\_SECURE: S4 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	-	165	12.2 %
0.01	-	58	4.3 %
0.02	-	21	1.6 %
0.03	-	5	0.4 %
0.04	-	4	0.3 %

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
0.05	-	4	0.3 %
0.06	-	3	0.2 %
0.07	-	1	0.1 %
0.08	-	8	0.6 %
0.09	-	3	0.2 %
0.10	-	5	0.4 %
0.11	-	2	0.1 %
0.12	-	4	0.3 %
0.13	-	2	0.1 %
0.14	-	4	0.3 %
0.15	-	4	0.3 %
0.16	-	2	0.1 %
0.17	-	2	0.1 %
0.18	-	2	0.1 %
0.19	-	3	0.2 %
0.20	-	2	0.1 %
0.21	-	2	0.1 %
0.22	-	5	0.4 %
0.23	-	1	0.1 %
0.24	-	1	0.1 %
0.25	-	1	0.1 %
0.26	-	3	0.2 %
0.27	-	2	0.1 %
0.28	-	2	0.1 %
0.29	-	2	0.1 %
0.30	-	4	0.3 %
0.33	-	4	0.3 %
0.34	-	5	0.4 %
0.35	-	3	0.2 %
0.36	-	2	0.1 %
0.37	-	4	0.3 %
0.38	-	5	0.4 %
0.39	-	3	0.2 %
0.40	-	3	0.2 %
0.41	-	5	0.4 %
0.42	-	1	0.1 %
0.43	-	3	0.2 %
0.44	-	3	0.2 %
0.45	-	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.46	-	2	0.1 %
0.47	-	3	0.2 %
0.48	-	3	0.2 %
0.49	-	2	0.1 %
0.50	-	3	0.2 %
0.51	-	3	0.2 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,231 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1872-1878 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -202.00 , -201.00

## S4PROBATION: S4 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	722	53.3 %
1	Yes	505	37.3 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	4	0.3 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,227 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1879-1884 (width: 6; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -9999 , -9998 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

## S4PSMI: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	Strongly Agree	0	0.0 %
1.20	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	2	0.1 %
1.53	-	1	0.1 %
1.67	-	1	0.1 %
1.73	-	1	0.1 %
1.77	-	1	0.1 %
1.87	-	1	0.1 %
1.90	-	2	0.1 %
1.97	-	2	0.1 %
2.00	Slightly Agree	2	0.1 %
2.03	-	1	0.1 %
2.07	-	4	0.3 %
2.10	-	8	0.6 %
2.13	-	6	0.4 %
2.17	-	2	0.1 %
2.20	-	5	0.4 %
2.23	-	5	0.4 %
2.27	-	6	0.4 %
2.30	-	2	0.1 %
2.33	-	5	0.4 %
2.37	-	7	0.5 %
2.40	-	7	0.5 %
2.41	-	1	0.1 %
2.43	-	11	0.8 %

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
2.47	-	12	0.9 %
2.50	-	15	1.1 %
2.53	-	21	1.6 %
2.57	-	14	1.0 %
2.60	-	19	1.4 %
2.63	-	19	1.4 %
2.67	-	23	1.7 %
2.69	-	1	0.1 %
2.70	-	23	1.7 %
2.73	-	24	1.8 %
2.77	-	34	2.5 %
2.80	-	24	1.8 %
2.83	-	35	2.6 %
2.87	-	44	3.2 %
2.90	-	42	3.1 %
2.93	-	49	3.6 %
2.97	-	55	4.1 %
3.00	Slightly Disagree	32	2.4 %
3.03	-	32	2.4 %
3.07	-	27	2.0 %
3.10	-	22	1.6 %
3.13	-	15	1.1 %
3.17	-	17	1.3 %
3.20	-	28	2.1 %
3.21	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,226 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1885-1891 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4PSMISR: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Agree	2	0.1 %
1.30	-	2	0.1 %
1.50	-	1	0.1 %
1.60	-	1	0.1 %
1.70	-	1	0.1 %
1.80	-	5	0.4 %
1.90	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	Slightly Agree	14	1.0 %
2.10	-	15	1.1 %
2.20	-	8	0.6 %
2.30	-	18	1.3 %
2.40	-	23	1.7 %
2.50	-	41	3.0 %
2.60	-	44	3.2 %
2.70	-	59	4.4 %
2.80	-	90	6.6 %
2.89	-	1	0.1 %
2.90	-	97	7.2 %
3.00	Slightly Disagree	104	7.7 %
3.10	-	70	5.2 %
3.11	-	1	0.1 %
3.20	-	61	4.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.30	-	54	4.0 %
3.40	-	64	4.7 %
3.44	-	1	0.1 %
3.50	-	63	4.7 %
3.60	-	55	4.1 %
3.67	-	1	0.1 %
3.70	-	81	6.0 %
3.80	-	59	4.4 %
3.89	-	1	0.1 %
3.90	-	57	4.2 %
4.00	Strongly Disagree	129	9.5 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	2	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,224 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1892-1898 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4PSMIID: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	Strongly Agree	2	0.1 %
1.30	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	1	0.1 %
1.60	-	2	0.1 %
1.80	-	1	0.1 %
1.90	-	8	0.6 %
2.00	Slightly Agree	6	0.4 %
2.10	-	9	0.7 %
2.20	-	10	0.7 %
2.30	-	9	0.7 %
2.33	-	1	0.1 %
2.40	-	22	1.6 %
2.50	-	27	2.0 %
2.60	-	41	3.0 %
2.70	-	52	3.8 %
2.80	-	77	5.7 %
2.89	-	1	0.1 %
2.90	-	92	6.8 %
3.00	Slightly Disagree	130	9.6 %
3.10	-	61	4.5 %
3.11	-	1	0.1 %
3.20	-	68	5.0 %
3.30	-	50	3.7 %
3.40	-	65	4.8 %
3.50	-	59	4.4 %
3.56	-	1	0.1 %
3.60	-	57	4.2 %
3.70	-	65	4.8 %
3.80	-	77	5.7 %
3.90	-	38	2.8 %
4.00	Strongly Disagree	192	14.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,226 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1899-1905 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4PSMIWK: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Agree	0	0.0 %
1.30	-	1	0.1 %
1.40	-	2	0.1 %
1.50	-	2	0.1 %
1.60	-	4	0.3 %
1.70	-	2	0.1 %
1.78	-	1	0.1 %
1.80	-	5	0.4 %
1.90	-	10	0.7 %
2.00	Slightly Agree	20	1.5 %
2.10	-	32	2.4 %
2.20	-	37	2.7 %
2.22	-	1	0.1 %
2.30	-	48	3.5 %
2.40	-	50	3.7 %
2.50	-	64	4.7 %
2.60	-	80	5.9 %

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
2.70	-	93	6.9 %
2.80	-	118	8.7 %
2.90	-	120	8.9 %
3.00	Slightly Disagree	62	4.6 %
3.10	-	74	5.5 %
3.11	-	1	0.1 %
3.20	-	44	3.2 %
3.30	-	39	2.9 %
3.40	-	65	4.8 %
3.44	-	1	0.1 %
3.50	-	63	4.7 %
3.60	-	45	3.3 %
3.67	-	1	0.1 %
3.70	-	104	7.7 %
3.80	-	10	0.7 %
3.90	-	15	1.1 %
4.00	Strongly Disagree	12	0.9 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,226 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1906-1912 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## **S4RELQLT: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	-	1	0.1 %
1.29	-	1	0.1 %
1.43	-	1	0.1 %
1.57	-	1	0.1 %
1.86	-	2	0.1 %
2.00	-	2	0.1 %
2.14	-	2	0.1 %
2.29	-	1	0.1 %
2.43	-	4	0.3 %
2.57	-	7	0.5 %
2.67	-	1	0.1 %
2.71	-	11	0.8 %
2.75	-	1	0.1 %
2.86	-	14	1.0 %
3.00	-	10	0.7 %
3.14	-	16	1.2 %
3.29	-	17	1.3 %
3.43	-	28	2.1 %
3.57	-	31	2.3 %
3.67	-	1	0.1 %
3.71	-	45	3.3 %
3.86	-	42	3.1 %
4.00	-	46	3.4 %
4.14	-	55	4.1 %
4.20	-	1	0.1 %
4.29	-	42	3.1 %
4.33	-	1	0.1 %
4.43	-	49	3.6 %
4.57	-	61	4.5 %
4.67	-	2	0.1 %
4.71	-	60	4.4 %
4.86	-	53	3.9 %
5.00	-	31	2.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-100.00	Did not skip into RQual measure	590	43.6 %
-8.00	Refuse	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 640 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1913-1919 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4RELDEV: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.0	Would not care at all	17	1.3 %
1.5	-	12	0.9 %
2.0	Would be bothered, but would not say anything to me about it	14	1.0 %
2.5	-	43	3.2 %
3.0	Would be bothered and would talk to me about it	124	9.2 %
3.5	-	80	5.9 %
4.0	Would get very upset with me	349	25.8 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-100.0	Did not skip into RQual measure	590	43.6 %
-9.0	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-8.0	Refuse	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 639 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1920-1926 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -300.0 , -202.0 , -201.0 , -100.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

## S4RELCON: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Doesn't know at all	22	1.6 %
1.20	-	8	0.6 %
1.40	-	14	1.0 %
1.60	-	16	1.2 %
1.80	-	19	1.4 %
2.00	Knows a little bit	38	2.8 %
2.20	-	32	2.4 %
2.40	-	45	3.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.60	-	36	2.7 %
2.80	-	43	3.2 %
3.00	Knows a lot	82	6.1 %
3.20	-	27	2.0 %
3.25	-	1	0.1 %
3.40	-	25	1.8 %
3.60	-	31	2.3 %
3.80	-	28	2.1 %
4.00	Knows everything	173	12.8 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into RQual measure	590	43.6 %
-8.00	Refuse	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 640 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1927-1933 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4DEL: S4 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 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	530	39.1 %
1	-	74	5.5 %
2	-	24	1.8 %
3	-	4	0.3 %
4	-	4	0.3 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
7	-	2	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Did not skip into RQual measure	590	43.6 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 639 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1934-1937 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -500 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

## S4SIGOTHER\_DEL: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	3	0.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-400	Questions not asked in this version	1225	90.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100	Did not skip into RQual measure	3	0.2 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 1938-1941 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4PEERPR: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	It's really true I'm influenced by my peers	0	0.0 %
1.40	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	4	0.3 %
1.60	-	4	0.3 %
1.70	-	3	0.2 %
1.80	-	2	0.1 %
1.90	-	11	0.8 %

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
2.00	It's sort of true I'm influenced by my peers	11	0.8 %
2.10	-	16	1.2 %
2.20	-	25	1.8 %
2.30	-	24	1.8 %
2.40	-	35	2.6 %
2.50	-	47	3.5 %
2.60	-	48	3.5 %
2.70	-	57	4.2 %
2.80	-	59	4.4 %
2.90	-	58	4.3 %
3.00	It's sort of true I prefer to be an individual	42	3.1 %
3.10	-	65	4.8 %
3.20	-	68	5.0 %
3.22	-	1	0.1 %
3.25	-	1	0.1 %
3.30	-	90	6.6 %
3.40	-	98	7.2 %
3.50	-	76	5.6 %
3.56	-	1	0.1 %
3.60	-	60	4.4 %
3.70	-	114	8.4 %
3.80	-	58	4.3 %
3.90	-	37	2.7 %
4.00	It's really true I prefer to be an individual	110	8.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,226 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1942-1948 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4ROUT: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	Never	30	2.2 %
1.25	-	9	0.7 %
1.33	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	20	1.5 %
1.75	-	28	2.1 %
2.00	A few times a year	41	3.0 %
2.25	-	50	3.7 %
2.50	-	58	4.3 %
2.75	-	81	6.0 %
3.00	Once or twice a month	99	7.3 %
3.25	-	90	6.6 %
3.50	-	113	8.3 %
3.75	-	91	6.7 %
4.00	At least once a week	78	5.8 %
4.25	-	65	4.8 %
4.50	-	55	4.1 %
4.75	-	37	2.7 %
5.00	Almost every day	15	1.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-666.00	Data deleted due to overlap - data in other tp	1	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	3	0.2 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into Routine Activities measure	266	19.6 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 961 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1949-1955 (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

---

## S4SRO\_DESTPROP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1102	81.4 %
1	Yes	128	9.5 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1956-1959 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

---

## S4SRO\_DESTPROP\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1102	81.4 %
1	-	44	3.2 %
2	-	26	1.9 %
3	-	9	0.7 %
4	-	9	0.7 %
5	-	15	1.1 %
6	-	2	0.1 %
7	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	4	0.3 %
12	-	2	0.1 %
13	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	5	0.4 %
17	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	5	0.4 %
60	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	2	0.1 %
235	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1960-1963 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -999, -998, -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101

---

## **S4SRO\_DESTPROP\_GROUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	56	4.1 %
1	Yes	72	5.3 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1102	81.4 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 128 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1964-1967 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

## **S4SRO\_SETFIRE: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1222	90.3 %
1	Yes	8	0.6 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1968-1971 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

## S4SRO\_SETFIRE\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1222	90.3 %
1	-	6	0.4 %
2	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1972-1975 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

## S4SRO\_SETFIRE\_GROUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1	0.1 %
1	Yes	7	0.5 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1222	90.3 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 8 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1976-1979 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

---

### **S4SRO\_ENTBLDSTEAL: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1195	88.3 %
1	Yes	35	2.6 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1980-1983 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

## S4SRO\_ENTBLDSTEAL\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1195	88.3 %
1	-	15	1.1 %
2	-	7	0.5 %
3	-	3	0.2 %
5	-	3	0.2 %
6	-	1	0.1 %
7	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	2	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1984-1987 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

## S4SRO\_ENTBLDSTEAL\_GROUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	11	0.8 %
1	Yes	24	1.8 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1195	88.3 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 35 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1988-1991 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

## S4SRO\_SHOPLIFT: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1166	86.1 %
1	Yes	64	4.7 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1992-1995 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -9, -8

## S4SRO\_SHOPLIFT\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1166	86.1 %
1	-	17	1.3 %
2	-	10	0.7 %
3	-	7	0.5 %
4	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	3	0.2 %
10	-	5	0.4 %
12	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	2	0.1 %
20	-	8	0.6 %
30	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	2	0.1 %
52	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	1	0.1 %
75	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	3	0.2 %
160	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 1996-1999 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

## S4SRO\_SHOPLIFT\_GROUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	29	2.1 %
1	Yes	35	2.6 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1166	86.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 2000-2003 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

## S4SRO\_BSTOLEN: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1080	79.8 %
1	Yes	148	10.9 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,228 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2004-2007 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

---

## S4SRO\_BSTOLEN\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1080	79.8 %
1	-	43	3.2 %
2	-	28	2.1 %
3	-	12	0.9 %
4	-	11	0.8 %
5	-	9	0.7 %
6	-	3	0.2 %
7	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	13	1.0 %
12	-	2	0.1 %
15	-	3	0.2 %
16	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	4	0.3 %
23	-	1	0.1 %
24	-	2	0.1 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	3	0.2 %
60	-	2	0.1 %
70	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
150	-	1	0.1 %
200	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-999	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	2	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,227 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2008-2011 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

---

## S4SRO\_BSTOLEN\_GROUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	77	5.7 %
1	Yes	71	5.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1082	79.9 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 148 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2012-2015 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

---

## S4SRO\_ILLCREDIT: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1209	89.3 %
1	Yes	21	1.6 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2016-2019 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

---

## S4SRO\_ILLCREDIT\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1209	89.3 %
1	-	2	0.1 %
2	-	5	0.4 %
3	-	4	0.3 %
4	-	2	0.1 %
5	-	3	0.2 %
10	-	2	0.1 %
20	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	1	0.1 %
150	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2020-2023 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

---

## **S4SRO\_ILLCREDIT\_GROUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	10	0.7 %
1	Yes	11	0.8 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1209	89.3 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 2024-2027 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

## S4SRO\_STOLECAR: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1206	89.1 %
1	Yes	24	1.8 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2028-2031 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

---

## S4SRO\_STOLECAR\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1206	89.1 %
1	-	10	0.7 %
2	-	5	0.4 %
3	-	1	0.1 %
4	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
7	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	2	0.1 %
20	-	2	0.1 %
100	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2032-2035 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -999, -998, -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101

---

## S4SRO\_STOLECAR\_GROUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	5	0.4 %
1	Yes	19	1.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1206	89.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 24 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2036-2039 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

---

## S4SRO\_SOLDMAR: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1085	80.1 %
1	Yes	145	10.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2040-2043 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

## S4SRO\_SOLDMAR\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1085	80.1 %
1	-	11	0.8 %
2	-	8	0.6 %
3	-	8	0.6 %
4	-	3	0.2 %
5	-	6	0.4 %
6	-	3	0.2 %
7	-	2	0.1 %
8	-	3	0.2 %
9	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	8	0.6 %
12	-	2	0.1 %
15	-	4	0.3 %
16	-	1	0.1 %
18	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
20	-	2	0.1 %
21	-	2	0.1 %
24	-	1	0.1 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
26	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	2	0.1 %
36	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	2	0.1 %
45	-	1	0.1 %
48	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	11	0.8 %
56	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	4	0.3 %
90	-	2	0.1 %
100	-	3	0.2 %
105	-	1	0.1 %
118	-	1	0.1 %
120	-	5	0.4 %
150	-	3	0.2 %
168	-	1	0.1 %
180	-	3	0.2 %
200	-	2	0.1 %
210	-	1	0.1 %
240	-	3	0.2 %
300	-	1	0.1 %
320	-	1	0.1 %
500	-	1	0.1 %
600	-	1	0.1 %
900	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	14	1.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-999	Dont Know	10	0.7 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,220 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2044-2047 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric  
*(Range of) Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

---

## S4SRO\_SOLDMAR\_GROUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	81	6.0 %
1	Yes	64	4.7 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1085	80.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 145 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2048-2051 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

---

## S4SRO\_SOLDOTHDR: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1112	82.1 %
1	Yes	118	8.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2052-2055 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

## **S4SRO\_SOLDOTHDR\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1112	82.1 %
1	-	4	0.3 %
2	-	4	0.3 %
4	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	5	0.4 %
6	-	1	0.1 %
7	-	3	0.2 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	11	0.8 %
13	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
14	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	2	0.1 %
16	-	1	0.1 %
18	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	3	0.2 %
30	-	5	0.4 %
31	-	1	0.1 %
36	-	1	0.1 %
37	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
44	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	2	0.1 %
48	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	4	0.3 %
75	-	3	0.2 %
90	-	3	0.2 %
96	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	7	0.5 %
118	-	1	0.1 %
120	-	1	0.1 %
134	-	1	0.1 %
150	-	2	0.1 %
180	-	2	0.1 %
200	-	2	0.1 %
210	-	1	0.1 %
240	-	2	0.1 %
300	-	2	0.1 %
400	-	1	0.1 %
500	-	2	0.1 %
600	-	1	0.1 %
900	-	2	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	16	1.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-999	Dont Know	12	0.9 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,218 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2056-2059 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -999, -998, -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101)

---

## S4SRO\_SOLDOTHDR\_GROUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	62	4.6 %
1	Yes	56	4.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1112	82.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 118 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2060-2063 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101, -9, -8)

---

## S4SRO\_CARJACK: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1220	90.1 %
1	Yes	10	0.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2064-2067 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

## S4SRO\_CARJACK\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1220	90.1 %
1	-	4	0.3 %
2	-	1	0.1 %
3	-	2	0.1 %
5	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
10	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2068-2071 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

## **S4SRO\_CARJACK\_GROUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	4	0.3 %
1	Yes	6	0.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1220	90.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 2072-2075 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

---

## S4SRO\_CARJACK\_GUN: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1	0.1 %
1	Yes	9	0.7 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1220	90.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 2076-2079 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

---

## S4SRO\_DROVEDRUNK: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1069	79.0 %
1	Yes	161	11.9 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2080-2083 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

## **S4SRO\_DROVEDRUNK\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1069	79.0 %
1	-	29	2.1 %
2	-	28	2.1 %
3	-	15	1.1 %
4	-	8	0.6 %
5	-	7	0.5 %
6	-	5	0.4 %
7	-	3	0.2 %
8	-	2	0.1 %
10	-	9	0.7 %
12	-	3	0.2 %
14	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
16	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	6	0.4 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	3	0.2 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	8	0.6 %
52	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	2	0.1 %
70	-	2	0.1 %
75	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	4	0.3 %
114	-	1	0.1 %
120	-	3	0.2 %
136	-	1	0.1 %
150	-	2	0.1 %
180	-	2	0.1 %
510	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	3	0.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-999	Dont Know	5	0.4 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,225 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2084-2087 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

---

## **S4SRO\_DROVEDRUNK\_GROUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	37	2.7 %
1	Yes	124	9.2 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1069	79.0 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 161 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2088-2091 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

## S4SRO\_PAIDSEX: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1223	90.3 %
1	Yes	7	0.5 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2092-2095 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -9, -8

---

## S4SRO\_PAIDSEX\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1223	90.3 %
1	-	1	0.1 %
2	-	1	0.1 %
3	-	2	0.1 %
4	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	2	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	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2096-2099 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -999, -998, -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101

---

## S4SRO\_FORCEDSEX: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

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

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

*Location:* 2100-2104 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

---

#### **S4SRO\_FORCEDSEX\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

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

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

*Location:* 2105-2109 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

---

#### **S4SRO\_FORCEDSEX\_GROUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

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

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

*Location:* 2110-2114 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

## **S4SRO\_FORCEDSEX\_GUN: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

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

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

*Location:* 2115-2119 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

---

## S4SRO\_KILLED: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

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

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

*Location:* 2120-2124 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

---

## S4SRO\_KILLED\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

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

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

*Location:* 2125-2129 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

---

## **S4SRO\_KILLED\_GROUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

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

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

*Location:* 2130-2134 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

---

## **S4SRO\_KILLED\_GUN: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

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

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

*Location:* 2135-2139 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

## S4SRO\_SHOT: S4 SRO: Shot someone (where bullet hit) - 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1224	90.4 %
1	Yes	5	0.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-8	Refusal	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2140-2143 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -9, -8

## S4SRO\_SHOT\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1224	90.4 %
1	-	3	0.2 %
3	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2144-2147 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

---

## S4SRO\_SHOT\_GROUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1	0.1 %
1	Yes	4	0.3 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1225	90.5 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 2148-2151 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

## S4SRO\_SHOTAT: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1204	88.9 %
1	Yes	25	1.8 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-8	Refusal	1	0.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2152-2155 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

---

## S4SRO\_SHOTAT\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1204	88.9 %
1	-	13	1.0 %
2	-	4	0.3 %
3	-	4	0.3 %
4	-	2	0.1 %
12	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2156-2159 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -999, -998, -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101

---

## S4SRO\_SHOTAT\_GROUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	7	0.5 %
1	Yes	18	1.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1205	89.0 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 25 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2160-2163 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

## S4SRO\_ROBWEAPON: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1194	88.2 %
1	Yes	36	2.7 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2164-2167 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

## **S4SRO\_ROBWEAPON\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1194	88.2 %
1	-	15	1.1 %
2	-	8	0.6 %
3	-	4	0.3 %
4	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
6	-	1	0.1 %
7	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	2	0.1 %
30	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
70	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2168-2171 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

## S4SRO\_ROBWEAPON\_GROUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	13	1.0 %
1	Yes	23	1.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1194	88.2 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 36 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2172-2175 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

## S4SRO\_ROBWEAPON\_GUN: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	11	0.8 %
1	Yes	25	1.8 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1194	88.2 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 36 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2176-2179 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

#### S4SRO\_ROBNOWEAPON: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1157	85.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Yes	73	5.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2180-2183 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

## S4SRO\_ROBNOWEAPON\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1157	85.5 %
1	-	24	1.8 %
2	-	21	1.6 %
3	-	8	0.6 %
4	-	6	0.4 %
5	-	4	0.3 %
9	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	3	0.2 %
12	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	1	0.1 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
50	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2184-2187 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

## **S4SRO\_ROBNOWEAPON\_GROUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	36	2.7 %
1	Yes	37	2.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1157	85.5 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 73 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2188-2191 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

## S4SRO\_BEATENUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1141	84.3 %
1	Yes	89	6.6 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 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

## S4SRO\_BEATENUP\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1141	84.3 %
1	-	48	3.5 %
2	-	18	1.3 %
3	-	9	0.7 %
4	-	2	0.1 %
5	-	5	0.4 %
6	-	2	0.1 %
7	-	2	0.1 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 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

---

## S4SRO\_BEATENUP\_GROUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	35	2.6 %
1	Yes	54	4.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1141	84.3 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 89 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

## S4SRO\_INFIGHT: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	868	64.1 %
1	Yes	362	26.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 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

## S4SRO\_INFIGHT\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	868	64.1 %
1	-	154	11.4 %
2	-	71	5.2 %
3	-	39	2.9 %
4	-	25	1.8 %
5	-	23	1.7 %
6	-	9	0.7 %
7	-	6	0.4 %
8	-	9	0.7 %
9	-	2	0.1 %
10	-	8	0.6 %
11	-	1	0.1 %
12	-	2	0.1 %
13	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	1	0.1 %
18	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	4	0.3 %
25	-	2	0.1 %
30	-	1	0.1 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-999	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 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

---

## S4SRO\_INFIGHT\_GROUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	164	12.1 %
1	Yes	198	14.6 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	868	64.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 362 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

---

## S4SRO\_FIGHTGANG: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1180	87.1 %
1	Yes	50	3.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 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

---

## S4SRO\_FIGHTGANG\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1180	87.1 %
1	-	22	1.6 %
2	-	10	0.7 %
3	-	4	0.3 %
4	-	2	0.1 %
5	-	6	0.4 %
6	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
7	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	3	0.2 %
20	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 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

## S4SRO\_FIGHTGANG\_GROUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	7	0.5 %
1	Yes	43	3.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1180	87.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 50 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

---

## S4SRO\_FIGHTGANG\_GUN: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	42	3.1 %
1	Yes	8	0.6 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1180	87.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 50 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2228-2231 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

---

## S4SRO\_CARRGUN: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1099	81.2 %
1	Yes	131	9.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2232-2235 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

## **S4SRO\_CARRGUN\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1099	81.2 %
1	-	11	0.8 %
2	-	14	1.0 %
3	-	8	0.6 %
4	-	5	0.4 %
5	-	9	0.7 %
7	-	4	0.3 %
10	-	5	0.4 %
12	-	2	0.1 %
14	-	1	0.1 %
18	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
20	-	6	0.4 %
30	-	7	0.5 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
39	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	2	0.1 %
44	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	5	0.4 %
52	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	6	0.4 %
80	-	2	0.1 %
85	-	1	0.1 %
90	-	4	0.3 %
100	-	2	0.1 %
105	-	1	0.1 %
118	-	1	0.1 %
120	-	5	0.4 %
140	-	1	0.1 %
150	-	2	0.1 %
180	-	5	0.4 %
210	-	1	0.1 %
240	-	2	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	4	0.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-999	Dont Know	9	0.7 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,221 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2236-2239 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

## S4SRO\_ENTCARSTEAL: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1192	88.0 %
1	Yes	38	2.8 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 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

## S4SRO\_ENTCARSTEAL\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1192	88.0 %
1	-	10	0.7 %
2	-	9	0.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	-	2	0.1 %
4	-	2	0.1 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	2	0.1 %
15	-	2	0.1 %
20	-	3	0.2 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	2	0.1 %
70	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	2	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 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

## S4SRO\_ENTCARSTEAL\_GROUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	16	1.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Yes	22	1.6 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1192	88.0 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 38 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

## S4SRO\_JOYRIDING: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1169	86.3 %
1	Yes	61	4.5 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 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

## S4SRO\_JOYRIDING\_NUM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1169	86.3 %
1	-	32	2.4 %
2	-	12	0.9 %
3	-	6	0.4 %
4	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	3	0.2 %
10	-	2	0.1 %
15	-	1	0.1 %
17	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	1	0.1 %
24	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 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

---

## **S4SRO\_JOYRIDING\_GROUP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	9	0.7 %
1	Yes	52	3.8 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1169	86.3 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 61 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

---

## S4SROPRV: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
0.00	-	679	50.1 %
0.05	-	232	17.1 %
0.09	-	100	7.4 %
0.10	-	1	0.1 %
0.14	-	55	4.1 %
0.18	-	59	4.4 %
0.23	-	23	1.7 %
0.27	-	21	1.6 %
0.32	-	18	1.3 %
0.36	-	15	1.1 %
0.41	-	8	0.6 %
0.45	-	3	0.2 %
0.50	-	5	0.4 %
0.55	-	2	0.1 %
0.59	-	2	0.1 %
0.64	-	1	0.1 %
0.68	-	2	0.1 %
0.73	-	2	0.1 %
0.82	-	1	0.1 %
0.86	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2264-2270 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -500.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00

## **S4SRSEND: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	732	54.1 %
0.05	-	244	18.0 %
0.06	-	1	0.1 %
0.11	-	84	6.2 %
0.16	-	76	5.6 %
0.21	-	27	2.0 %
0.26	-	22	1.6 %
0.32	-	16	1.2 %
0.37	-	9	0.7 %
0.42	-	7	0.5 %
0.53	-	4	0.3 %
0.58	-	2	0.1 %
0.63	-	1	0.1 %
0.68	-	3	0.2 %
0.79	-	1	0.1 %
0.84	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2271-2277 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -500.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00

## S4SROFRQ: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	682	50.4 %
1	-	110	8.1 %
2	-	73	5.4 %
3	-	34	2.5 %
4	-	27	2.0 %
5	-	31	2.3 %
6	-	9	0.7 %
7	-	7	0.5 %
8	-	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
9	-	13	1.0 %
10	-	16	1.2 %
11	-	8	0.6 %
12	-	8	0.6 %
13	-	7	0.5 %
14	-	5	0.4 %
15	-	5	0.4 %
16	-	1	0.1 %
17	-	1	0.1 %
18	-	4	0.3 %
19	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	2	0.1 %
21	-	4	0.3 %
22	-	4	0.3 %
23	-	2	0.1 %
24	-	5	0.4 %
25	-	5	0.4 %
26	-	3	0.2 %
27	-	1	0.1 %
29	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	2	0.1 %
31	-	2	0.1 %
32	-	1	0.1 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
36	-	2	0.1 %
40	-	2	0.1 %
41	-	1	0.1 %
43	-	1	0.1 %
44	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	3	0.2 %
46	-	1	0.1 %
47	-	1	0.1 %
48	-	1	0.1 %
49	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	2	0.1 %
51	-	1	0.1 %
52	-	2	0.1 %
56	-	1	0.1 %
58	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
60	-	1	0.1 %
61	-	1	0.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2278-2281 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -500 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

## S4SROFRQND: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	735	54.3 %
1	-	128	9.5 %
2	-	74	5.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	-	34	2.5 %
4	-	25	1.8 %
5	-	26	1.9 %
6	-	16	1.2 %
7	-	12	0.9 %
8	-	7	0.5 %
9	-	9	0.7 %
10	-	16	1.2 %
11	-	7	0.5 %
12	-	8	0.6 %
13	-	4	0.3 %
14	-	3	0.2 %
15	-	6	0.4 %
16	-	3	0.2 %
17	-	1	0.1 %
18	-	6	0.4 %
20	-	5	0.4 %
21	-	3	0.2 %
22	-	2	0.1 %
24	-	3	0.2 %
25	-	3	0.2 %
26	-	3	0.2 %
28	-	2	0.1 %
29	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	3	0.2 %
31	-	1	0.1 %
32	-	1	0.1 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
38	-	2	0.1 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
41	-	1	0.1 %
42	-	1	0.1 %
43	-	1	0.1 %
44	-	3	0.2 %
45	-	2	0.1 %
47	-	3	0.2 %
50	-	2	0.1 %
51	-	1	0.1 %
55	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
56	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	1	0.1 %
63	-	3	0.2 %
67	-	1	0.1 %
68	-	1	0.1 %
69	-	1	0.1 %
76	-	1	0.1 %
77	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2282-2285 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -500 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

## S4SROAGG: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	803	59.3 %
0.09	-	248	18.3 %
0.18	-	97	7.2 %
0.27	-	40	3.0 %
0.36	-	18	1.3 %
0.45	-	11	0.8 %
0.55	-	7	0.5 %
0.63	-	1	0.1 %
0.64	-	2	0.1 %
0.73	-	1	0.1 %
0.82	-	2	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	Partial Interview -data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2286-2292 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -500.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00

## S4AGGFRQ: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	804	59.4 %
1	-	134	9.9 %
2	-	73	5.4 %
3	-	45	3.3 %
4	-	30	2.2 %
5	-	29	2.1 %
6	-	13	1.0 %
7	-	11	0.8 %
8	-	11	0.8 %
9	-	3	0.2 %
10	-	16	1.2 %
11	-	6	0.4 %
12	-	4	0.3 %
13	-	3	0.2 %
15	-	4	0.3 %
16	-	1	0.1 %
17	-	2	0.1 %
18	-	4	0.3 %
19	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	3	0.2 %
21	-	4	0.3 %
22	-	3	0.2 %
23	-	1	0.1 %
24	-	2	0.1 %
25	-	4	0.3 %
26	-	1	0.1 %
27	-	2	0.1 %
30	-	1	0.1 %
32	-	2	0.1 %
34	-	1	0.1 %
37	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
48	-	1	0.1 %
62	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
74	-	1	0.1 %
85	-	1	0.1 %
88	-	1	0.1 %
114	-	1	0.1 %
115	-	1	0.1 %
133	-	1	0.1 %
237	-	1	0.1 %
246	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2293-2296 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -500 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

## S4SROINC: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	932	68.8 %
0.10	-	132	9.7 %
0.11	-	2	0.1 %
0.20	-	79	5.8 %
0.30	-	33	2.4 %
0.40	-	20	1.5 %
0.50	-	12	0.9 %
0.60	-	10	0.7 %
0.70	-	4	0.3 %
0.80	-	2	0.1 %
0.90	-	4	0.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2297-2303 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -500.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00

## S4SROIND: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
0.00	-	1017	75.1 %
0.13	-	118	8.7 %
0.25	-	47	3.5 %
0.38	-	23	1.7 %
0.50	-	11	0.8 %
0.63	-	5	0.4 %
0.75	-	5	0.4 %
0.88	-	4	0.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2304-2310 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -500.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00

---

## S4INCFRQ: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	939	69.4 %
1	-	47	3.5 %
2	-	36	2.7 %
3	-	7	0.5 %
4	-	12	0.9 %
5	-	11	0.8 %
6	-	9	0.7 %
7	-	3	0.2 %
8	-	3	0.2 %
9	-	5	0.4 %
10	-	11	0.8 %
11	-	1	0.1 %
12	-	3	0.2 %
13	-	1	0.1 %
14	-	2	0.1 %
15	-	2	0.1 %
16	-	2	0.1 %
17	-	2	0.1 %
18	-	3	0.2 %
20	-	5	0.4 %
21	-	1	0.1 %
22	-	1	0.1 %
24	-	1	0.1 %
25	-	3	0.2 %
28	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	3	0.2 %
31	-	4	0.3 %
32	-	1	0.1 %
33	-	2	0.1 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
37	-	3	0.2 %
40	-	2	0.1 %
44	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
45	-	1	0.1 %
46	-	2	0.1 %
47	-	1	0.1 %
49	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	3	0.2 %
56	-	2	0.1 %
58	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	4	0.3 %
64	-	2	0.1 %
69	-	1	0.1 %
71	-	1	0.1 %
75	-	1	0.1 %
78	-	1	0.1 %
86	-	1	0.1 %
90	-	1	0.1 %
91	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	2	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2311-2314 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -500 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

---

## S4ICFQND: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1018	75.2 %
1	-	60	4.4 %
2	-	33	2.4 %
3	-	10	0.7 %
4	-	15	1.1 %
5	-	14	1.0 %
6	-	8	0.6 %
7	-	4	0.3 %
8	-	3	0.2 %
9	-	2	0.1 %
10	-	8	0.6 %
11	-	2	0.1 %
14	-	3	0.2 %
15	-	2	0.1 %
16	-	2	0.1 %
17	-	1	0.1 %
18	-	3	0.2 %
19	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	1	0.1 %
21	-	1	0.1 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
26	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	2	0.1 %
31	-	1	0.1 %
33	-	2	0.1 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
36	-	2	0.1 %
37	-	2	0.1 %
40	-	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
44	-	2	0.1 %
48	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	3	0.2 %
61	-	1	0.1 %
70	-	1	0.1 %
77	-	1	0.1 %
81	-	1	0.1 %
83	-	1	0.1 %
85	-	1	0.1 %
109	-	1	0.1 %
112	-	2	0.1 %
115	-	2	0.1 %
129	-	1	0.1 %
151	-	1	0.1 %
156	-	1	0.1 %
160	-	1	0.1 %
177	-	1	0.1 %
182	-	1	0.1 %
670	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,230 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2315-2318 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -500 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

## S4SCCLINT: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	None	12	0.9 %
1.13	-	4	0.3 %
1.14	-	2	0.1 %
1.17	-	1	0.1 %
1.20	-	1	0.1 %
1.25	-	8	0.6 %
1.29	-	3	0.2 %
1.33	-	2	0.1 %
1.38	-	11	0.8 %
1.40	-	2	0.1 %
1.43	-	4	0.3 %
1.50	-	11	0.8 %
1.57	-	12	0.9 %
1.60	-	2	0.1 %
1.63	-	18	1.3 %
1.67	-	4	0.3 %
1.71	-	16	1.2 %
1.75	-	29	2.1 %
1.80	-	3	0.2 %
1.83	-	3	0.2 %
1.86	-	27	2.0 %
1.88	-	29	2.1 %
2.00	A Few	86	6.4 %
2.13	-	41	3.0 %
2.14	-	28	2.1 %
2.17	-	6	0.4 %
2.25	-	40	3.0 %
2.29	-	30	2.2 %
2.33	-	3	0.2 %
2.38	-	34	2.5 %
2.43	-	33	2.4 %

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
2.50	-	54	4.0 %
2.57	-	35	2.6 %
2.60	-	1	0.1 %
2.63	-	34	2.5 %
2.67	-	8	0.6 %
2.71	-	25	1.8 %
2.75	-	43	3.2 %
2.80	-	1	0.1 %
2.83	-	5	0.4 %
2.86	-	33	2.4 %
2.88	-	33	2.4 %
3.00	Many	59	4.4 %
3.13	-	16	1.2 %
3.14	-	18	1.3 %
3.17	-	3	0.2 %
3.20	-	2	0.1 %
3.25	-	12	0.9 %
3.29	-	12	0.9 %
3.33	-	5	0.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-666.00	Data deleted due to overlap - data in other tp	1	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into SocCap measure	266	19.6 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 963 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2319-2325 (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

## S4SOCAP2: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	None	38	2.8 %
1.20	-	18	1.3 %
1.25	-	24	1.8 %
1.33	-	3	0.2 %
1.40	-	37	2.7 %
1.50	-	49	3.6 %
1.60	-	62	4.6 %
1.67	-	14	1.0 %
1.75	-	59	4.4 %
1.80	-	68	5.0 %
2.00	A Few	174	12.9 %
2.20	-	69	5.1 %
2.25	-	56	4.1 %
2.33	-	12	0.9 %
2.40	-	50	3.7 %
2.50	-	51	3.8 %
2.60	-	31	2.3 %
2.67	-	6	0.4 %
2.75	-	25	1.8 %
2.80	-	19	1.4 %
3.00	Many	46	3.4 %
3.20	-	9	0.7 %
3.25	-	6	0.4 %
3.33	-	4	0.3 %
3.40	-	7	0.5 %
3.50	-	4	0.3 %
3.60	-	4	0.3 %
3.67	-	1	0.1 %
3.75	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.80	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Most	13	1.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-666.00	Data deleted due to overlap - data in other tp	1	0.1 %
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into SocCap measure	266	19.6 %
-97.00	NA	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 961 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2326-2332 (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

## S4SOCAP3: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Disagree	16	1.2 %
1.20	-	3	0.2 %
1.40	-	3	0.2 %
1.80	-	3	0.2 %
2.00	Disagree	27	2.0 %

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
2.20	-	13	1.0 %
2.40	-	24	1.8 %
2.60	-	21	1.6 %
2.80	-	38	2.8 %
3.00	Neither Agree nor Disagree	71	5.2 %
3.20	-	69	5.1 %
3.25	-	1	0.1 %
3.40	-	61	4.5 %
3.50	-	2	0.1 %
3.60	-	111	8.2 %
3.80	-	110	8.1 %
4.00	Agree	270	19.9 %
4.20	-	23	1.7 %
4.40	-	19	1.4 %
4.60	-	21	1.6 %
4.80	-	12	0.9 %
5.00	Strongly Agree	42	3.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-666.00	Data deleted due to overlap - data in other tp	1	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-100.00	Did not skip into SocCap measure	266	19.6 %
-9.00	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-8.00	Refusal	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 960 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2333-2339 (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

---

## S4SUBUSE1: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	650	48.0 %
2	1-2 times	146	10.8 %
3	3-5 times	112	8.3 %
4	1X per month	50	3.7 %
5	2-3X per month	90	6.6 %
6	1X per week	58	4.3 %
7	2-3X per week	73	5.4 %
8	4-5X per week	26	1.9 %
9	Every day	24	1.8 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2340-2343 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

## S4SUBUSE2: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	650	48.0 %
1	-	66	4.9 %
2	-	108	8.0 %
3	-	85	6.3 %
4	-	68	5.0 %
5	-	48	3.5 %
6	-	57	4.2 %
7	-	23	1.7 %
8	-	15	1.1 %
9	-	4	0.3 %
10	-	30	2.2 %
11	-	1	0.1 %
12	-	37	2.7 %
13	-	1	0.1 %
14	-	3	0.2 %
15	-	7	0.5 %
16	-	1	0.1 %
18	-	3	0.2 %
19	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	6	0.4 %
24	-	3	0.2 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	5	0.4 %
36	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	1	0.1 %
66	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-99	Dont know	3	0.2 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,226 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2344-2347 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -101 , -99 , -98

## S4SUBUSE3: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	864	63.8 %
2	1-2 times	99	7.3 %
3	3-5 times	60	4.4 %
4	1X per month	38	2.8 %
5	2-3X per month	49	3.6 %
6	1X per week	40	3.0 %
7	2-3X per week	45	3.3 %
8	4-5X per week	18	1.3 %
9	Every day	14	1.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-99	Dont know	2	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,227 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2348-2351 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

---

## S4SUBUSE4: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	824	60.9 %
2	1-2 times	158	11.7 %
3	3-5 times	85	6.3 %
4	1X per month	35	2.6 %
5	2-3X per month	37	2.7 %
6	1X per week	35	2.6 %
7	2-3X per week	30	2.2 %
8	4-5X per week	18	1.3 %
9	Every day	7	0.5 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2352-2355 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

---

## S4SUBUSE6: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	807	59.6 %
2	1-2 times	70	5.2 %
3	3-5 times	36	2.7 %
4	1X per month	22	1.6 %
5	2-3X per month	38	2.8 %
6	1X per week	27	2.0 %
7	2-3X per week	49	3.6 %
8	4-5X per week	54	4.0 %
9	Every day	125	9.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-99	Dont know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,228 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2356-2359 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

## S4SUBUSE8: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1173	86.6 %
2	1-2 times	25	1.8 %
3	3-5 times	6	0.4 %
4	1X per month	6	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	2-3X per month	7	0.5 %
6	1X per week	2	0.1 %
7	2-3X per week	4	0.3 %
8	4-5X per week	3	0.2 %
9	Every day	3	0.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2360-2363 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

## S4SUBUSE10: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1155	85.3 %
2	1-2 times	10	0.7 %
3	3-5 times	8	0.6 %
4	1X per month	6	0.4 %
5	2-3X per month	12	0.9 %
6	1X per week	5	0.4 %
7	2-3X per week	11	0.8 %
8	4-5X per week	5	0.4 %
9	Every day	17	1.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2364-2367 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

## S4SUBUSE12: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1179	87.1 %
2	1-2 times	20	1.5 %
3	3-5 times	10	0.7 %
4	1X per month	7	0.5 %
5	2-3X per month	7	0.5 %
6	1X per week	3	0.2 %
7	2-3X per week	2	0.1 %
8	4-5X per week	1	0.1 %
9	Every day	0	0.0 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2368-2371 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

---

## S4SUBUSE14: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1207	89.1 %
2	1-2 times	7	0.5 %
3	3-5 times	1	0.1 %
4	1X per month	2	0.1 %
5	2-3X per month	7	0.5 %
6	1X per week	0	0.0 %
7	2-3X per week	2	0.1 %
8	4-5X per week	2	0.1 %
9	Every day	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2372-2375 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

---

## S4SUBUSE16: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1211	89.4 %
2	1-2 times	5	0.4 %
3	3-5 times	3	0.2 %
4	1X per month	0	0.0 %
5	2-3X per month	5	0.4 %
6	1X per week	4	0.3 %
7	2-3X per week	1	0.1 %
8	4-5X per week	0	0.0 %
9	Every day	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2376-2379 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

---

## S4SUBUSE18: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1179	87.1 %
2	1-2 times	22	1.6 %
3	3-5 times	9	0.7 %
4	1X per month	2	0.1 %
5	2-3X per month	7	0.5 %
6	1X per week	4	0.3 %
7	2-3X per week	3	0.2 %
8	4-5X per week	1	0.1 %
9	Every day	2	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2380-2383 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

## S4SUBUSE20: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1210	89.4 %
2	1-2 times	7	0.5 %
3	3-5 times	3	0.2 %
4	1X per month	0	0.0 %
5	2-3X per month	7	0.5 %
6	1X per week	0	0.0 %
7	2-3X per week	0	0.0 %
8	4-5X per week	1	0.1 %
9	Every day	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2384-2387 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

## S4SUBUSE22: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1217	89.9 %
2	1-2 times	5	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	3-5 times	0	0.0 %
4	1X per month	0	0.0 %
5	2-3X per month	7	0.5 %
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 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2388-2391 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

## S4SUBUSE24: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1229	90.8 %
1	Yes	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2392-2395 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -202, -201, -110, -109, -108, -107, -106, -104, -103, -9, -8

---

## S4SUBUSE26: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1229	90.8 %
2	1-2 times	0	0.0 %
3	3-5 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 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2396-2399 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800, -202, -201, -110, -109, -108, -107, -106, -104, -103, -99, -98

---

## S4SUBUSE28: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	0	0.0 %
2	1-2 times	2	0.1 %
3	3-5 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	1	0.1 %
8	4-5X per week	0	0.0 %
9	Every day	0	0.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-800	Question not asked for this subject	1226	90.5 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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

*Location:* 2400-2403 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

---

## S4SUBUSE30: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	603	44.5 %
2	1-2 times	27	2.0 %
3	3-5 times	22	1.6 %
4	1X per month	9	0.7 %
5	2-3X per month	23	1.7 %
6	1X per week	19	1.4 %
7	2-3X per week	42	3.1 %
8	4-5X per week	35	2.6 %
9	Every day	448	33.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-99	Dont know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,228 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2404-2407 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

---

## S4SUBUSE31: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	0 cigarettes	617	45.6 %
2	1-4 cigarettes	229	16.9 %
3	5-9 cigarettes	163	12.0 %
4	10-15 cigarettes	107	7.9 %
5	16-20 cigarettes	84	6.2 %
6	More than a pack a day cigarettes	29	2.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2408-2411 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -105 , -9 , -8

## S4QFBRMO: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	650	48.0 %
1	-	38	2.8 %
2	-	53	3.9 %
3	-	29	2.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	-	46	3.4 %
5	-	7	0.5 %
6	-	28	2.1 %
7	-	4	0.3 %
8	-	32	2.4 %
9	-	10	0.7 %
10	-	22	1.6 %
12	-	37	2.7 %
14	-	8	0.6 %
15	-	19	1.4 %
16	-	19	1.4 %
18	-	16	1.2 %
20	-	21	1.6 %
21	-	6	0.4 %
24	-	35	2.6 %
25	-	5	0.4 %
28	-	7	0.5 %
30	-	15	1.1 %
32	-	4	0.3 %
35	-	5	0.4 %
36	-	17	1.3 %
40	-	11	0.8 %
42	-	9	0.7 %
44	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	2	0.1 %
48	-	11	0.8 %
49	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	4	0.3 %
54	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	9	0.7 %
64	-	2	0.1 %
70	-	3	0.2 %
72	-	6	0.4 %
75	-	3	0.2 %
78	-	1	0.1 %
80	-	2	0.1 %
84	-	3	0.2 %
90	-	2	0.1 %
96	-	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
98	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	1	0.1 %
105	-	1	0.1 %
120	-	5	0.4 %
128	-	1	0.1 %
140	-	1	0.1 %
144	-	2	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-300	Too few answers for computation	3	0.2 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,226 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2412-2415 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S46MOUSE: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	781	57.7 %
1	-	307	22.7 %
2	-	74	5.5 %
3	-	35	2.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	-	17	1.3 %
5	-	8	0.6 %
6	-	3	0.2 %
9	-	4	0.3 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2416-2419 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4QFSMK6: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.0	-	617	45.6 %
2.5	-	19	1.4 %
5.0	-	16	1.2 %
7.0	-	2	0.1 %
7.5	-	5	0.4 %
10.0	-	16	1.2 %
12.5	-	11	0.8 %
14.0	-	2	0.1 %
15.0	-	28	2.1 %
17.5	-	13	1.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
20.0	-	121	8.9 %
21.0	-	1	0.1 %
25.0	-	1	0.1 %
28.0	-	3	0.2 %
35.0	-	2	0.1 %
36.0	-	1	0.1 %
37.5	-	3	0.2 %
42.0	-	10	0.7 %
49.0	-	9	0.7 %
50.0	-	1	0.1 %
56.0	-	134	9.9 %
62.5	-	3	0.2 %
72.0	-	1	0.1 %
75.0	-	1	0.1 %
80.0	-	1	0.1 %
87.5	-	3	0.2 %
100.0	-	95	7.0 %
108.0	-	2	0.1 %
126.0	-	9	0.7 %
140.0	-	1	0.1 %
144.0	-	71	5.2 %
160.0	-	27	2.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.0	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2420-2426 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -300.0 , -202.0 , -201.0 , -100.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

## S4A6SC2: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	995	73.5 %
1	-	73	5.4 %
2	-	55	4.1 %
3	-	29	2.1 %
4	-	23	1.7 %
5	-	12	0.9 %
6	-	18	1.3 %
7	-	8	0.6 %
8	-	5	0.4 %
9	-	3	0.2 %
10	-	4	0.3 %
11	-	3	0.2 %
17	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2427-2430 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4D6SC2: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1001	73.9 %
1	-	62	4.6 %
2	-	44	3.2 %
3	-	33	2.4 %
4	-	32	2.4 %
5	-	12	0.9 %
6	-	9	0.7 %
7	-	10	0.7 %
8	-	5	0.4 %
9	-	5	0.4 %
10	-	6	0.4 %
11	-	5	0.4 %
13	-	3	0.2 %
14	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2431-2434 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4A6DP2: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1096	80.9 %
1	-	52	3.8 %
2	-	37	2.7 %
3	-	21	1.6 %
4	-	6	0.4 %
5	-	5	0.4 %
6	-	5	0.4 %
7	-	2	0.1 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
9	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	3	0.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2435-2438 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4D6DP2: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1050	77.5 %
1	-	51	3.8 %
2	-	36	2.7 %
3	-	24	1.8 %
4	-	14	1.0 %
5	-	14	1.0 %
6	-	19	1.4 %
7	-	5	0.4 %
8	-	6	0.4 %
9	-	6	0.4 %
10	-	4	0.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2439-2442 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4TOTSC6: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	908	67.1 %
1	-	81	6.0 %
2	-	59	4.4 %
3	-	47	3.5 %
4	-	41	3.0 %
5	-	22	1.6 %
6	-	20	1.5 %
7	-	15	1.1 %
8	-	6	0.4 %
9	-	4	0.3 %
10	-	7	0.5 %
11	-	7	0.5 %
12	-	5	0.4 %
13	-	4	0.3 %
14	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	1	0.1 %
17	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2443-2446 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4TOTDS6: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1002	74.0 %
1	-	63	4.7 %
2	-	52	3.8 %
3	-	33	2.4 %
4	-	17	1.3 %
5	-	16	1.2 %
6	-	19	1.4 %
7	-	5	0.4 %
8	-	8	0.6 %
9	-	6	0.4 %
10	-	8	0.6 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2447-2450 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

---

## S4ALTRTM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1193	88.1 %
1	Yes	36	2.7 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2451-2454 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4DGTRTM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1184	87.4 %
1	Yes	45	3.3 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2455-2458 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4TRTM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1170	86.4 %
1	Yes	59	4.4 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2459-2462 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

---

### S4TCO1: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	1172	86.6 %
2	Almost never	20	1.5 %
3	Sometimes	18	1.3 %
4	Often	9	0.7 %
5	Very often	6	0.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,225 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2463-2466 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4TCO2: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	1162	85.8 %
2	Almost never	26	1.9 %
3	Sometimes	20	1.5 %
4	Often	14	1.0 %
5	Very often	4	0.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,226 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2467-2470 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4TCO3: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	1047	77.3 %
2	Almost never	48	3.5 %
3	Sometimes	88	6.5 %
4	Often	25	1.8 %
5	Very often	18	1.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,226 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2471-2474 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4TCOCNT: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1021	75.4 %
1	-	147	10.9 %
2	-	25	1.8 %
3	-	33	2.4 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,226 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2475-2478 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values:* -700 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

## S4IMPULS: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	False	7	0.5 %
1.13	-	9	0.7 %
1.25	-	11	0.8 %
1.38	-	12	0.9 %
1.50	-	32	2.4 %
1.63	-	23	1.7 %
1.75	-	19	1.4 %
1.88	-	31	2.3 %
2.00	Somewhat False	41	3.0 %
2.13	-	45	3.3 %
2.25	-	54	4.0 %
2.38	-	49	3.6 %
2.50	-	84	6.2 %
2.63	-	44	3.2 %
2.75	-	62	4.6 %
2.88	-	63	4.7 %
3.00	Not sure	67	4.9 %
3.13	-	47	3.5 %
3.25	-	45	3.3 %
3.38	-	50	3.7 %
3.50	-	61	4.5 %
3.63	-	44	3.2 %
3.75	-	46	3.4 %
3.88	-	34	2.5 %
4.00	Somewhat True	55	4.1 %
4.13	-	22	1.6 %
4.25	-	32	2.4 %
4.38	-	16	1.2 %
4.50	-	44	3.2 %
4.63	-	15	1.1 %
4.75	-	7	0.5 %
4.88	-	18	1.3 %
5.00	True	40	3.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2479-2485 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4SUPAGG: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	False	25	1.8 %
1.14	-	19	1.4 %
1.29	-	16	1.2 %
1.43	-	15	1.1 %
1.57	-	45	3.3 %
1.71	-	38	2.8 %
1.86	-	47	3.5 %
2.00	Somewhat False	45	3.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.14	-	73	5.4 %
2.29	-	79	5.8 %
2.33	-	1	0.1 %
2.43	-	68	5.0 %
2.57	-	61	4.5 %
2.71	-	76	5.6 %
2.86	-	62	4.6 %
3.00	Not sure	63	4.7 %
3.14	-	57	4.2 %
3.29	-	68	5.0 %
3.43	-	54	4.0 %
3.57	-	42	3.1 %
3.71	-	32	2.4 %
3.86	-	57	4.2 %
4.00	Somewhat True	34	2.5 %
4.14	-	28	2.1 %
4.29	-	15	1.1 %
4.43	-	47	3.5 %
4.57	-	13	1.0 %
4.71	-	13	1.0 %
4.86	-	8	0.6 %
5.00	True	28	2.1 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2486-2492 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4CONSID: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.00	False	2	0.1 %
1.14	-	2	0.1 %
1.29	-	3	0.2 %
1.43	-	1	0.1 %
1.57	-	10	0.7 %
1.71	-	3	0.2 %
1.86	-	6	0.4 %
2.00	Somewhat False	16	1.2 %
2.14	-	26	1.9 %
2.29	-	16	1.2 %
2.43	-	20	1.5 %
2.57	-	18	1.3 %
2.67	-	1	0.1 %
2.71	-	51	3.8 %
2.86	-	44	3.2 %
3.00	Not sure	63	4.7 %
3.14	-	76	5.6 %
3.29	-	77	5.7 %
3.43	-	66	4.9 %
3.57	-	82	6.1 %
3.71	-	89	6.6 %
3.86	-	102	7.5 %
4.00	Somewhat True	93	6.9 %
4.14	-	73	5.4 %
4.29	-	52	3.8 %
4.43	-	70	5.2 %
4.57	-	35	2.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4.71	-	37	2.7 %
4.86	-	34	2.5 %
5.00	True	61	4.5 %
	<b>Missing Data</b>		
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2493-2499 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## S4TEMPER: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	False	1	0.1 %
1.07	-	1	0.1 %
1.13	-	2	0.1 %
1.20	-	2	0.1 %

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
1.27	-	9	0.7 %
1.33	-	6	0.4 %
1.40	-	6	0.4 %
1.47	-	11	0.8 %
1.53	-	14	1.0 %
1.60	-	13	1.0 %
1.67	-	11	0.8 %
1.73	-	15	1.1 %
1.80	-	23	1.7 %
1.87	-	17	1.3 %
1.93	-	16	1.2 %
2.00	Somewhat False	18	1.3 %
2.07	-	35	2.6 %
2.13	-	29	2.1 %
2.20	-	29	2.1 %
2.27	-	25	1.8 %
2.33	-	35	2.6 %
2.40	-	31	2.3 %
2.47	-	32	2.4 %
2.53	-	25	1.8 %
2.60	-	33	2.4 %
2.67	-	43	3.2 %
2.69	-	1	0.1 %
2.73	-	27	2.0 %
2.80	-	30	2.2 %
2.87	-	47	3.5 %
2.93	-	44	3.2 %
3.00	Not sure	40	3.0 %
3.07	-	31	2.3 %
3.13	-	33	2.4 %
3.20	-	43	3.2 %
3.27	-	24	1.8 %
3.33	-	35	2.6 %
3.40	-	29	2.1 %
3.47	-	34	2.5 %
3.53	-	24	1.8 %
3.60	-	27	2.0 %
3.67	-	30	2.2 %
3.73	-	22	1.6 %

<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Unweighted Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
3.80	-	22	1.6 %
3.87	-	17	1.3 %
3.93	-	22	1.6 %
4.00	Somewhat True	17	1.3 %
4.07	-	11	0.8 %
4.13	-	11	0.8 %
4.20	-	21	1.6 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,229 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2500-2506 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

## **S4CHARM: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	213	15.7 %
6	-	58	4.3 %
7	-	84	6.2 %
8	-	95	7.0 %
9	-	83	6.1 %
10	-	177	13.1 %
11	-	126	9.3 %
12	-	84	6.2 %
13	-	66	4.9 %
14	-	80	5.9 %
15	-	63	4.7 %
16	-	29	2.1 %
17	-	32	2.4 %
18	-	15	1.1 %
19	-	5	0.4 %
20	-	14	1.0 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,225 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2507-2510 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

## S4GRAND: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	69	5.1 %
6	-	34	2.5 %
7	-	85	6.3 %
8	-	104	7.7 %
9	-	104	7.7 %
10	-	164	12.1 %
11	-	183	13.5 %
12	-	144	10.6 %
13	-	123	9.1 %
14	-	76	5.6 %
15	-	52	3.8 %
16	-	30	2.2 %
17	-	27	2.0 %
18	-	12	0.9 %
19	-	7	0.5 %
20	-	10	0.7 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,225 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2511-2514 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

## S4LYING: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	323	23.9 %
6	-	93	6.9 %
7	-	110	8.1 %
8	-	106	7.8 %
9	-	114	8.4 %
10	-	164	12.1 %
11	-	115	8.5 %
12	-	62	4.6 %
13	-	49	3.6 %
14	-	31	2.3 %
15	-	16	1.2 %
16	-	12	0.9 %
17	-	12	0.9 %
18	-	6	0.4 %
19	-	5	0.4 %
20	-	7	0.5 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,225 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2515-2518 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

## S4MANIP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	277	20.5 %
6	-	57	4.2 %
7	-	77	5.7 %
8	-	95	7.0 %
9	-	87	6.4 %
10	-	203	15.0 %
11	-	103	7.6 %
12	-	65	4.8 %
13	-	78	5.8 %
14	-	63	4.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
15	-	46	3.4 %
16	-	21	1.6 %
17	-	20	1.5 %
18	-	11	0.8 %
19	-	7	0.5 %
20	-	15	1.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,225 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2519-2522 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

## S4REMOR: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	181	13.4 %
6	-	63	4.7 %
7	-	96	7.1 %
8	-	89	6.6 %
9	-	116	8.6 %
10	-	184	13.6 %
11	-	153	11.3 %
12	-	127	9.4 %
13	-	89	6.6 %
14	-	57	4.2 %
15	-	30	2.2 %
16	-	15	1.1 %
17	-	16	1.2 %
18	-	3	0.2 %
19	-	2	0.1 %
20	-	4	0.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,225 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2523-2526 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

## S4UNEMO: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	44	3.2 %
6	-	23	1.7 %
7	-	85	6.3 %
8	-	112	8.3 %
9	-	87	6.4 %
10	-	148	10.9 %
11	-	186	13.7 %
12	-	155	11.4 %
13	-	141	10.4 %
14	-	116	8.6 %
15	-	52	3.8 %
16	-	30	2.2 %
17	-	23	1.7 %
18	-	6	0.4 %
19	-	9	0.7 %
20	-	8	0.6 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,225 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2527-2530 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

## S4CALLOS: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	21	1.6 %
6	-	24	1.8 %
7	-	36	2.7 %
8	-	70	5.2 %
9	-	85	6.3 %
10	-	123	9.1 %
11	-	170	12.6 %
12	-	204	15.1 %
13	-	170	12.6 %
14	-	185	13.7 %
15	-	59	4.4 %
16	-	43	3.2 %
17	-	26	1.9 %
18	-	1	0.1 %
19	-	5	0.4 %
20	-	3	0.2 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,225 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2531-2534 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

---

## S4THRILL: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	35	2.6 %
6	-	12	0.9 %
7	-	20	1.5 %
8	-	41	3.0 %
9	-	52	3.8 %
10	-	70	5.2 %
11	-	139	10.3 %
12	-	130	9.6 %
13	-	168	12.4 %
14	-	158	11.7 %
15	-	138	10.2 %
16	-	100	7.4 %
17	-	73	5.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
18	-	32	2.4 %
19	-	26	1.9 %
20	-	31	2.3 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>			<b>1,354</b> <b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,225 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2535-2538 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

## S4YPIIMP: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	79	5.8 %
6	-	35	2.6 %
7	-	71	5.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
8	-	80	5.9 %
9	-	67	4.9 %
10	-	137	10.1 %
11	-	130	9.6 %
12	-	130	9.6 %
13	-	138	10.2 %
14	-	144	10.6 %
15	-	89	6.6 %
16	-	53	3.9 %
17	-	40	3.0 %
18	-	10	0.7 %
19	-	10	0.7 %
20	-	12	0.9 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,225 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2539-2542 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

## S4IRRESP: S4 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"), 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	142	10.5 %
6	-	54	4.0 %
7	-	93	6.9 %
8	-	140	10.3 %
9	-	111	8.2 %
10	-	152	11.2 %
11	-	135	10.0 %
12	-	113	8.3 %
13	-	84	6.2 %
14	-	77	5.7 %
15	-	47	3.5 %
16	-	33	2.4 %
17	-	24	1.8 %
18	-	7	0.5 %
19	-	5	0.4 %
20	-	8	0.6 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,225 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2543-2546 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

## S4GRANMA: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
20	-	40	3.0 %
21	-	10	0.7 %
22	-	36	2.7 %
23	-	42	3.1 %
24	-	27	2.0 %
25	-	23	1.7 %
26	-	35	2.6 %
27	-	25	1.8 %
28	-	41	3.0 %
29	-	31	2.3 %
30	-	35	2.6 %
31	-	27	2.0 %
32	-	36	2.7 %
33	-	23	1.7 %
34	-	24	1.8 %
35	-	18	1.3 %
36	-	30	2.2 %
37	-	33	2.4 %
38	-	31	2.3 %
39	-	35	2.6 %
40	-	53	3.9 %
41	-	62	4.6 %
42	-	48	3.5 %
43	-	48	3.5 %
44	-	41	3.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
45	-	38	2.8 %
46	-	31	2.3 %
47	-	30	2.2 %
48	-	30	2.2 %
49	-	33	2.4 %
50	-	23	1.7 %
51	-	35	2.6 %
52	-	10	0.7 %
53	-	20	1.5 %
54	-	17	1.3 %
55	-	11	0.8 %
56	-	17	1.3 %
57	-	10	0.7 %
58	-	7	0.5 %
59	-	12	0.9 %
60	-	9	0.7 %
61	-	7	0.5 %
62	-	2	0.1 %
63	-	2	0.1 %
64	-	3	0.2 %
65	-	4	0.3 %
66	-	1	0.1 %
67	-	1	0.1 %
68	-	3	0.2 %
69	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,225 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2547-2550 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

## S4CALUNE: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
15	-	2	0.1 %
16	-	1	0.1 %
17	-	2	0.1 %
18	-	9	0.7 %
19	-	7	0.5 %
20	-	14	1.0 %
21	-	29	2.1 %
22	-	20	1.5 %
23	-	30	2.2 %
24	-	55	4.1 %
25	-	30	2.2 %
26	-	46	3.4 %
27	-	59	4.4 %
28	-	46	3.4 %
29	-	54	4.0 %
30	-	60	4.4 %
31	-	54	4.0 %
32	-	71	5.2 %
33	-	84	6.2 %
34	-	90	6.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
35	-	77	5.7 %
36	-	79	5.8 %
37	-	48	3.5 %
38	-	53	3.9 %
39	-	36	2.7 %
40	-	41	3.0 %
41	-	23	1.7 %
42	-	21	1.6 %
43	-	18	1.3 %
44	-	16	1.2 %
45	-	13	1.0 %
46	-	11	0.8 %
48	-	8	0.6 %
49	-	4	0.3 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
51	-	5	0.4 %
52	-	3	0.2 %
54	-	2	0.1 %
55	-	1	0.1 %
58	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	1	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based upon 1,225 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2551-2554 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

## S4IMPIRR: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
15	-	14	1.0 %
16	-	2	0.1 %
17	-	9	0.7 %
18	-	18	1.3 %
19	-	11	0.8 %
20	-	10	0.7 %
21	-	30	2.2 %
22	-	18	1.3 %
23	-	22	1.6 %
24	-	27	2.0 %
25	-	22	1.6 %
26	-	36	2.7 %
27	-	28	2.1 %
28	-	30	2.2 %
29	-	48	3.5 %
30	-	43	3.2 %
31	-	52	3.8 %
32	-	46	3.4 %
33	-	58	4.3 %
34	-	59	4.4 %
35	-	61	4.5 %
36	-	64	4.7 %
37	-	61	4.5 %
38	-	61	4.5 %
39	-	48	3.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
40	-	57	4.2 %
41	-	54	4.0 %
42	-	44	3.2 %
43	-	36	2.7 %
44	-	31	2.3 %
45	-	29	2.1 %
46	-	7	0.5 %
47	-	20	1.5 %
48	-	14	1.0 %
49	-	13	1.0 %
50	-	10	0.7 %
51	-	9	0.7 %
52	-	5	0.4 %
53	-	1	0.1 %
54	-	7	0.5 %
55	-	3	0.2 %
56	-	1	0.1 %
57	-	2	0.1 %
58	-	1	0.1 %
59	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	2	0.1 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,225 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**Location:** 2555-2558 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

**Variable Type:** numeric

**(Range of) Missing Values:** -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

## S4YPI: S4 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](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
55	-	1	0.1 %
57	-	1	0.1 %
58	-	3	0.2 %
59	-	7	0.5 %
60	-	1	0.1 %
61	-	5	0.4 %
62	-	7	0.5 %
63	-	6	0.4 %
64	-	5	0.4 %
65	-	8	0.6 %
66	-	4	0.3 %
67	-	8	0.6 %
68	-	14	1.0 %
69	-	10	0.7 %
70	-	9	0.7 %
71	-	9	0.7 %
72	-	13	1.0 %
73	-	9	0.7 %
74	-	17	1.3 %
75	-	16	1.2 %
76	-	8	0.6 %
77	-	4	0.3 %
78	-	11	0.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
79	-	13	1.0 %
80	-	10	0.7 %
81	-	22	1.6 %
82	-	7	0.5 %
83	-	15	1.1 %
84	-	6	0.4 %
85	-	15	1.1 %
86	-	19	1.4 %
87	-	14	1.0 %
88	-	17	1.3 %
89	-	16	1.2 %
90	-	16	1.2 %
91	-	11	0.8 %
92	-	10	0.7 %
93	-	16	1.2 %
94	-	12	0.9 %
95	-	16	1.2 %
96	-	9	0.7 %
97	-	14	1.0 %
98	-	7	0.5 %
99	-	14	1.0 %
100	-	16	1.2 %
101	-	19	1.4 %
102	-	14	1.0 %
103	-	13	1.0 %
104	-	23	1.7 %
105	-	22	1.6 %
<b>Missing Data</b>			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	123	9.1 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,354</b>	<b>100%</b>

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 1,225 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

*Location:* 2559-2562 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values:* -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8