

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 Baseline 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. Some questions were open ended asking the respondent to specify an answer where the respondent answered with "Other". These variables were recoded from string to numeric, and then masked.
2. 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)".
3. Questions from multiple sections asked the respondent to provide a specific number of days that an event took place or last occurred. These were collapsed into categories.
4. Due to small frequencies ethnicity groups other than White, African American, and Hispanic were combined together and merged with the group "Other".
5. 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.
6. Many questions asked for the respondent to state how old they were when an event occurred. These variables were bottom coded at "9 and Younger".
7. There was a series of questions asking for the specific gender, age, and whether or not they lived at the same residence as the respondent for up to ten siblings. Valid data for these variables was masked. However, they were used to compute new variables that provide an overall count for both the number of brothers and sisters, as well as for how many lived with the respondent, and how many were younger, older, and the same age.
8. All questions in the section for "Offense History" were masked. The original responses were self-reported. However, two variables were included from official records which provide more accurate information and match what has been used in prior published research.
9. The section on "Self-Reported Offending" asked a series of six questions about 22 specific crimes / 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.
10. In the "Services and Medications" section questions were asked about medications the respondent may have taken during the past six months and the period of time prior to the past six months. The variables asking about the specific brand names of the medications were masked. However, there are variables that list the broader drug category the medications belong to.



## 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.

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

### **Baseline**

#### **Variable Groups**

GROUP 1: CASE IDENTIFICATION  
GROUP 2: INTERVIEW INFORMATION  
GROUP 3: GEOGRAPHIC  
GROUP 4: DEMOGRAPHICS  
GROUP 5: ACCULTURATION RATING SCALE FOR MEXICAN AMERICANS - II (ARSMA-II)  
GROUP 6: BRIEF SYMPTOM INVENTORY (BSI)  
GROUP 7: CARING ADULT  
GROUP 8: CHARACTERISTICS OF FAMILY  
GROUP 9: CHARACTERISTICS OF FRIENDS  
GROUP 10: CHARACTERISTICS OF ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS  
GROUP 11: CHILDREN'S EMOTIONAL INTENSITY CHILD REPORT (WALDEN)  
GROUP 12: COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT  
GROUP 13: COMPOSITE INTERNATIONAL DIAGNOSTIC INTERVIEW (CIDI)  
GROUP 14: EARLY ONSET OF BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS  
GROUP 15: EASI  
GROUP 16: EDUCATION (BL): SCHOOL BONDING, ATTENDANCE, ACTIVITIES, AND ORIENTATION  
GROUP 17: EMPLOYMENT  
GROUP 18: EXPOSURE TO VIOLENCE (ETV)  
GROUP 19: FRIENDSHIP QUALITY  
GROUP 20: FUTURE ORIENTATION INVENTORY (FOI)  
GROUP 21: GANG INVOLVEMENT  
GROUP 22: GUN ACCESSIBILITY  
GROUP 23: HEAD INJURY  
GROUP 24: IMPORTANCE OF SPIRITUALITY  
GROUP 25: INDICES OF PERSONAL AND SOCIAL COSTS AND REWARDS  
GROUP 26: INFORMATION RELATED TO PREGNANCY AND CHILDREN  
GROUP 27: MORAL THINKING  
GROUP 28: MOTIVATION TO SUCCEED  
GROUP 29: MULTIGROUP MEASURE OF ETHNIC IDENTITY (PHINNEY)  
GROUP 30: NEIGHBORHOOD CONDITIONS  
GROUP 31: OFFENSE HISTORY  
GROUP 32: PARENTAL MONITORING  
GROUP 33: PARENTAL ORIENTATION  
GROUP 34: PARENTAL WARMTH AND HOSTILITY  
GROUP 35: PEER DELINQUENCY  
GROUP 36: PERCEPTIONS OF CHANCES FOR SUCCESS  
GROUP 37: PROCEDURAL JUSTICE  
GROUP 38: PSYCHOPATHY CHECKLIST YOUTH VERSION (PCL-YV)  
GROUP 39: PSYCHOSOCIAL MATURITY INVENTORY (PSMI)  
GROUP 40: QUALITY OF ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS  
GROUP 41: RESISTANCE TO PEER INFLUENCE  
GROUP 42: REVISED CHILDREN'S MANIFEST ANXIETY SCALE (RCMAS)  
GROUP 43: ROUTINE ACTIVITIES  
GROUP 44: SELF-REPORTED OFFENDING (SRO)  
GROUP 45: SERVICES AND MEDICATIONS  
GROUP 46: SOCIAL CAPITAL  
GROUP 47: SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS (SES)  
GROUP 48: STROOP COLOR-WORD TEST

GROUP 49: SUBSTANCE ABUSE  
GROUP 50: THREAT CONTROL OVERRIDE (TCO)  
GROUP 51: TRAIL MAKING TEST  
GROUP 52: WECHSLER ABBREVIATED SCALE OF INTELLIGENCE (WASI)  
GROUP 53: WEINBERGER ADJUSTMENT INVENTORY (WAI)

## Variables

### LINEID: Line Identification Number

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

#### Question:

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.

### CASEID: S0 IntInfo: Subject ID

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

#### Question:

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.

### S0INTYR: S0 IntInfo: Year of Interview

*Location:* 10-13 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

#### Question:

What year did the interview take place in?

Value	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2000	50	3.7 %	3.7%
2001	704	52.0 %	52.0%
2002	596	44.0 %	44.0%
2003	4	0.3 %	0.3%

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

### S0QVERSI: S0 IntInfo: Version number associated with programming changes to the interview

*Location:* 14-18 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* character

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
01.01	21	1.6 %	1.6%
01.02	50	3.7 %	3.7%
01.03	41	3.0 %	3.0%
01.04	167	12.3 %	12.3%
01.05	253	18.7 %	18.7%
01.06	98	7.2 %	7.2%
01.07	268	19.8 %	19.8%
01.08	193	14.3 %	14.3%
01.09	167	12.3 %	12.3%
01.10	46	3.4 %	3.4%
01.11	35	2.6 %	2.6%
01.12	15	1.1 %	1.1%

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

**S0INTLOC: S0 IntInfo: Enter interview location**

*Location:* 19-20 (width: 2; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Where did this interview take place?

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	Subject's home	579	42.8 %	42.8%
2	Detention center, jail, or other locked facility	698	51.6 %	51.6%
3	Somewhere else	77	5.7 %	5.7%

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

**S0INTLOC\_FACCODE: S0 IntInfo: Interview location - facility code**

*Location:* 21-25 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -97

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	698	51.6 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-97 (M)	NA: Interview conducted in community	656	48.4 %	-

Based upon 698 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0INTLOC\_FACTYPE: S0 IntInfo: Interview location - facility type**

*Location:* 26-28 (width: 3; decimal: 0)

- Study 29961 -

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -97

**Question:**

What type of facility did the interview take place in?

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
8	Residential treatment center (centralized staff, institutional setting)	154	11.4 %	22.1%
14	Secure	218	16.1 %	31.2%
15	Jail / Prison	182	13.4 %	26.1%
16	Detention	137	10.1 %	19.6%
20	Other	7	0.5 %	1.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-97 (M)	NA: Interview conducted in community	656	48.4 %	-

Based upon 698 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SITE: S0 DEM: Study Site Location**

Location: 29-29 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

**Question:**

The geographic site where the subject is located.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Philadelphia	700	51.7 %	51.7%
2	Phoenix	654	48.3 %	48.3%

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

**S0AGE: S0 DEM: Subject Age at Baseline - Truncated**

Location: 30-31 (width: 2; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

**Question:**

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	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
14	162	12.0 %	12.0%
15	255	18.8 %	18.8%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
16	412	30.4 %	30.4%
17	413	30.5 %	30.5%
18	111	8.2 %	8.2%
19	1	0.1 %	0.1%

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

**S0CTAGE: S0 DEM: Subject Age at Baseline - Continuous**

*Location:* 32-36 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

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

MEASURE: Demographics

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,354	100.0 %	100.0%

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

**S0ETHCTY: S0 DEM: Subjects Ethnicity**

*Location:* 37-41 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Ethnicity; subject's self-reported ethnicity based on items dem21 and dem24.

MEASURE: Demographics

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,354	100.0 %	100.0%

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

**S0ETHN\_R: S0 DEM: Subjects Ethnicity - Recoded**

*Location:* 42-42 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

- Study 29961 -

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

MEASURE: Demographics

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

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

**S0SGEND: S0 DEM: Subject gender**

*Location:* 43-43 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Subject's gender.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Male	1,170	86.4 %	86.4%
2	Female	184	13.6 %	13.6%

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

**S0DEM19: S0 Ethnicity: In what country were you born**

*Location:* 44-45 (width: 2; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Country of subject's birth.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	United States	1,271	93.9 %	93.9%
96	Other (specify)	83	6.1 %	6.1%

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

- Study 29961 -

**S0DEM20: S0 Ethnicity: In what country were you born (specify)**

*Location:* 46-50 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -101

**Question:**

Country of subject's birth (specify).

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	83	6.1 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-101 (M)	Skipped: Born in the United States	1,271	93.9 %	-

Based upon 83 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL117: S0 FamStr: Total number people living in subj household**

*Location:* 51-51 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Total number of people living at subject's home address.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
1	-	98	7.2 %	7.2%
2	-	248	18.3 %	18.3%
3	-	280	20.7 %	20.7%
4	-	279	20.6 %	20.6%
5	-	177	13.1 %	13.1%
6	-	106	7.8 %	7.8%
7	-	67	4.9 %	4.9%
8	-	37	2.7 %	2.7%
9	9 or More	45	3.3 %	3.3%

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

**S0BIODAD: S0 FamStr: Biological father in house**

*Location:* 52-52 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

- Study 29961 -

Variable Type: numeric

**Question:**

Biological father lives in house with subject.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	Absent	1,039	76.7 %	76.7%
1	Present	315	23.3 %	23.3%

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

**S0BIOMOM: S0 FamStr: Biological mother in house**

Location: 53-53 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

**Question:**

Biological mother lives in house with subject.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	Absent	358	26.4 %	26.4%
1	Present	996	73.6 %	73.6%

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

**S0BIOSIS: S0 FamStr: Biological sister in house**

Location: 54-54 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

**Question:**

Biological sister lives in house with subject.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	Absent	656	48.4 %	48.4%
1	Present	698	51.6 %	51.6%

- Study 29961 -

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

**S0BIOBRO: S0 FamStr: Biological brother in house**

*Location:* 55-55 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Biological brother lives in house with subject.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	Absent	685	50.6 %	50.6%
1	Present	669	49.4 %	49.4%

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

**S0GRANDMOM: S0 FamStr: Biological grandmother in house**

*Location:* 56-56 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Biological grandmother lives in house with subject.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	Absent	1,170	86.4 %	86.4%
1	Present	184	13.6 %	13.6%

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

**S0GRANDDAD: S0 FamStr: Biological grandfather in house**

*Location:* 57-57 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Biological grandfather lives in house with subject.

MEASURE: Demographics

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	Absent	1,288	95.1 %	95.1%
1	Present	66	4.9 %	4.9%

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

**S0OTHdad: S0 FamStr: non-biological father (step, adopted, foster) in house**

*Location:* 58-58 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Step, adopted, or foster dad lives in house with subject.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	Absent	1,094	80.8 %	80.8%
1	Present	260	19.2 %	19.2%

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

**S0OTHmom: S0 FamStr: non-biological mother (step, adopted, foster) in house**

*Location:* 59-59 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Step, adopted, or foster mom lives in house with subject.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	Absent	1,287	95.1 %	95.1%
1	Present	67	4.9 %	4.9%

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

**S0OTHSib: S0 FamStr: non-biological siblings (step, adopted, foster) in house**

*Location:* 60-60 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

- Study 29961 -

Step, adopted, or foster sibling(s) lives in house with subject.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	Absent	1,285	94.9 %	94.9%
1	Present	69	5.1 %	5.1%

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

**S0SIGOTH: S0 FamStr: significant other (spouse, girlfriend, boyfriend) in house**

*Location:* 61-61 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

The significant other of the subject (spouse, girlfriend/boyfriend) lives in house with subject.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	Absent	1,286	95.0 %	95.0%
1	Present	68	5.0 %	5.0%

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

**S0CHILD: S0 FamStr: own son or daughter in house**

*Location:* 62-62 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

A child of the subject lives in house with subject.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	Absent	1,327	98.0 %	98.0%
1	Present	27	2.0 %	2.0%

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

**S0FRIEND: S0 FamStr: friend or roommate in house**

*Location:* 63-63 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

A friend or roommate lives in house with subject.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	Absent	1,321	97.6 %	97.6%
1	Present	33	2.4 %	2.4%

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

**S0RELATIVE: S0 FamStr: some other relative in house**

*Location:* 64-64 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Some other relative (aunt, uncle, niece, nephew, cousin) lives in house with subject.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	Absent	981	72.5 %	72.5%
1	Present	373	27.5 %	27.5%

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

**S0OTHERS: S0 FamStr: any other person in house**

*Location:* 65-65 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Some other person lives in house with subject.

MEASURE: Demographics

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	Absent	1,216	89.8 %	89.8%
1	Present	138	10.2 %	10.2%

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

#### **S0FAMSTR: S0 FamStr: Family Structure**

*Location:* 66-67 (width: 2; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

##### **Question:**

Family structure; indicates the combination of parental figures living with the subject.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Two bio parents	199	14.7 %	14.7%
2	Single bio mom, never married	288	21.3 %	21.3%
3	Single bio mom, divorced or separated	218	16.1 %	16.1%
4	Single bio mom, widowed	22	1.6 %	1.6%
5	Bio mom and stepdad	238	17.6 %	17.6%
6	Single bio dad	74	5.5 %	5.5%
7	Other adult relative	164	12.1 %	12.1%
8	Bio dad and stepmom	42	3.1 %	3.1%
9	Two adoptive parents	10	0.7 %	0.7%
10	No adult in the home	64	4.7 %	4.7%
11	Other	4	0.3 %	0.3%
12	Single bio mom, married, bio dad not present	23	1.7 %	1.7%
13	Single bio mom, marital status unknown	8	0.6 %	0.6%

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

#### **S0NBPHOM: S0 FamStr: Number of biological parents living at home**

*Location:* 68-68 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

##### **Question:**

Biological parents in the household; count of biological Parents living with the subject.

MEASURE: Demographics

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	243	17.9 %	17.9%
1	912	67.4 %	67.4%
2	199	14.7 %	14.7%

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

**S0ADULTS: S0 FamStr: Number of Adults in home**

*Location:* 69-69 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Number of adults in the household.

MEASURE: Demographics

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	64	4.7 %	4.7%
1	-	575	42.5 %	42.5%
2	-	611	45.1 %	45.1%
3	-	85	6.3 %	6.3%
4	4 or More	19	1.4 %	1.4%

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

**S0REL149: S0 RunAway: Ever run away from where you were living**

*Location:* 70-73 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Ever run away from where you were living.

MEASURE: Demographics

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	897	66.2 %	66.2%
1	Yes	457	33.8 %	33.8%

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

**S0REL150: S0 RunAway: Number of times ran away**

- Study 29961 -

*Location:* 74-77 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Number of times ran away.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	1 time	153	11.3 %	33.5%
2	2-3 times	165	12.2 %	36.1%
3	4 or more times	139	10.3 %	30.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-101 (M)	Skipped: Never ran away	897	66.2 %	-

Based upon 457 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL151: S0 RunAway: Age first time ran away**

*Location:* 78-81 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Age first time ran away.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 or Younger	28	2.1 %	6.1%
10	-	15	1.1 %	3.3%
11	-	24	1.8 %	5.3%
12	-	64	4.7 %	14.0%
13	-	84	6.2 %	18.4%
14	-	98	7.2 %	21.4%
15	-	81	6.0 %	17.7%
16	-	50	3.7 %	10.9%
17	-	13	1.0 %	2.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-101 (M)	Skipped: Never ran away	897	66.2 %	-

Based upon 457 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0MEXAM: S0 ARSMA: Consider yourself to be Mexican American

Location: 82-82 (width: 1; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

#### Question:

Do you consider yourself to be 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	%	Valid %
0	No	1,020	75.3 %	75.3%
1	Yes	334	24.7 %	24.7%

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

### S0MOS: S0 ARSMA: Mexican Orientation Subscale

Location: 83-89 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -300.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

#### Question:

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

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.25	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
1.33	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
1.42	-	2	0.1 %	0.6%
1.50	-	6	0.4 %	1.8%
1.58	-	3	0.2 %	0.9%
1.67	-	7	0.5 %	2.1%
1.75	-	10	0.7 %	3.0%
1.83	-	7	0.5 %	2.1%
1.92	-	14	1.0 %	4.2%
2.00	Very little or not very often	18	1.3 %	5.4%
2.08	-	16	1.2 %	4.8%
2.17	-	7	0.5 %	2.1%
2.25	-	8	0.6 %	2.4%
2.33	-	10	0.7 %	3.0%
2.42	-	11	0.8 %	3.3%
2.50	-	5	0.4 %	1.5%
2.58	-	4	0.3 %	1.2%
2.67	-	19	1.4 %	5.7%
2.75	-	9	0.7 %	2.7%
2.83	-	7	0.5 %	2.1%
2.92	-	9	0.7 %	2.7%
3.00	Moderately	13	1.0 %	3.9%
3.08	-	7	0.5 %	2.1%
3.17	-	4	0.3 %	1.2%
3.25	-	8	0.6 %	2.4%
3.33	-	9	0.7 %	2.7%
3.42	-	9	0.7 %	2.7%
3.50	-	6	0.4 %	1.8%
3.58	-	12	0.9 %	3.6%
3.67	-	6	0.4 %	1.8%
3.75	-	4	0.3 %	1.2%
3.83	-	7	0.5 %	2.1%
3.92	-	7	0.5 %	2.1%
4.00	More or very often	5	0.4 %	1.5%
4.08	-	5	0.4 %	1.5%
4.17	-	6	0.4 %	1.8%
4.25	-	9	0.7 %	2.7%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
4.33	-	3	0.2 %	0.9%
4.42	-	4	0.3 %	1.2%
4.50	-	2	0.1 %	0.6%
4.58	-	5	0.4 %	1.5%
4.67	-	7	0.5 %	2.1%
4.75	-	3	0.2 %	0.9%
4.83	-	4	0.3 %	1.2%
4.92	-	2	0.1 %	0.6%
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	13	1.0 %	3.9%
-100.00 (M)	Skipped: Did not skip into section	1,020	75.3 %	-

Based upon 334 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0AOS: S0 ARSMA: Anglo Orientation Subscale**

*Location:* 90-96 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

#### **Question:**

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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
2.09	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
2.27	-	2	0.1 %	0.6%
2.36	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
2.45	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2.55	-	2	0.1 %	0.6%
2.82	-	2	0.1 %	0.6%
2.91	-	2	0.1 %	0.6%
3.00	Moderately	5	0.4 %	1.5%
3.09	-	4	0.3 %	1.2%
3.18	-	3	0.2 %	0.9%
3.27	-	8	0.6 %	2.4%
3.36	-	8	0.6 %	2.4%
3.45	-	12	0.9 %	3.6%
3.55	-	18	1.3 %	5.4%
3.64	-	15	1.1 %	4.5%
3.73	-	17	1.3 %	5.1%
3.82	-	17	1.3 %	5.1%
3.91	-	12	0.9 %	3.6%
4.00	More or very often	17	1.3 %	5.1%
4.09	-	26	1.9 %	7.8%
4.18	-	20	1.5 %	6.0%
4.27	-	19	1.4 %	5.7%
4.36	-	31	2.3 %	9.3%
4.40	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
4.45	-	23	1.7 %	6.9%
4.55	-	11	0.8 %	3.3%
4.64	-	21	1.6 %	6.3%
4.73	-	7	0.5 %	2.1%
4.82	-	12	0.9 %	3.6%
4.91	-	3	0.2 %	0.9%
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	13	1.0 %	3.9%
-100.00 (M)	Skipped: Did not skip into section	1,020	75.3 %	-

Based upon 334 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MEXAFF: S0 ARSMA: Mexican Affiliation Subscale**

*Location:* 97-103 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Mexican Orientation - Affiliation; Mean of 3 items.

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

- Study 29961 -

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	%	Valid %
1.33	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
1.67	-	3	0.2 %	0.9%
2.00	Very little or not very often	2	0.1 %	0.6%
2.33	-	4	0.3 %	1.2%
2.67	-	9	0.7 %	2.7%
3.00	Moderately	20	1.5 %	6.0%
3.33	-	19	1.4 %	5.7%
3.67	-	30	2.2 %	9.0%
4.00	More or very often	35	2.6 %	10.5%
4.33	-	38	2.8 %	11.4%
4.67	-	57	4.2 %	17.1%
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	116	8.6 %	34.7%
-100.00 (M)	Skipped: Did not skip into section	1,020	75.3 %	-

Based upon 334 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### S0SPALNG: S0 ARSMA: Spanish Language Subscale

*Location:* 104-110 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

#### Question:

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

- Study 29961 -

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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	Not at all	23	1.7 %	6.9%
1.11	-	17	1.3 %	5.1%
1.22	-	16	1.2 %	4.8%
1.33	-	13	1.0 %	3.9%
1.44	-	11	0.8 %	3.3%
1.56	-	12	0.9 %	3.6%
1.67	-	13	1.0 %	3.9%
1.78	-	5	0.4 %	1.5%
1.89	-	10	0.7 %	3.0%
2.00	Very little or not very often	13	1.0 %	3.9%
2.11	-	12	0.9 %	3.6%
2.22	-	11	0.8 %	3.3%
2.33	-	10	0.7 %	3.0%
2.44	-	9	0.7 %	2.7%
2.56	-	10	0.7 %	3.0%
2.67	-	8	0.6 %	2.4%
2.78	-	5	0.4 %	1.5%
2.89	-	12	0.9 %	3.6%
3.00	Moderately	8	0.6 %	2.4%
3.11	-	8	0.6 %	2.4%
3.22	-	10	0.7 %	3.0%
3.33	-	8	0.6 %	2.4%
3.44	-	4	0.3 %	1.2%
3.56	-	7	0.5 %	2.1%
3.67	-	8	0.6 %	2.4%
3.78	-	6	0.4 %	1.8%
3.89	-	8	0.6 %	2.4%
4.00	More or very often	10	0.7 %	3.0%
4.11	-	2	0.1 %	0.6%
4.22	-	5	0.4 %	1.5%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
4.33	-	4	0.3 %	1.2%
4.44	-	5	0.4 %	1.5%
4.56	-	7	0.5 %	2.1%
4.67	-	4	0.3 %	1.2%
4.78	-	4	0.3 %	1.2%
4.89	-	2	0.1 %	0.6%
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	14	1.0 %	4.2%
-100.00 (M)	Skipped: Did not skip into section	1,020	75.3 %	-

Based upon 334 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0ANGAFF: S0 ARSMA: Anglo Affiliation Subscale**

*Location:* 111-117 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

#### **Question:**

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)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	Not at all	17	1.3 %	5.1%
1.33	-	13	1.0 %	3.9%
1.67	-	24	1.8 %	7.2%
2.00	Very little or not very often	39	2.9 %	11.7%
2.33	-	29	2.1 %	8.7%
2.67	-	36	2.7 %	10.8%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
3.00	Moderately	63	4.7 %	18.9%
3.33	-	25	1.8 %	7.5%
3.67	-	26	1.9 %	7.8%
4.00	More or very often	21	1.6 %	6.3%
4.33	-	14	1.0 %	4.2%
4.67	-	6	0.4 %	1.8%
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	21	1.6 %	6.3%
-100.00 (M)	Skipped: Did not skip into section	1,020	75.3 %	-

Based upon 334 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0ENGLNG: S0 ARSMA: English Language Subscale

*Location:* 118-124 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

#### Question:

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	%	Valid %
2.00	Very little or not very often	1	0.1 %	0.3%
2.25	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
2.38	-	2	0.1 %	0.6%
2.75	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
2.88	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
3.00	Moderately	4	0.3 %	1.2%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
3.13	-	2	0.1 %	0.6%
3.25	-	3	0.2 %	0.9%
3.38	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
3.50	-	6	0.4 %	1.8%
3.63	-	3	0.2 %	0.9%
3.75	-	10	0.7 %	3.0%
3.88	-	15	1.1 %	4.5%
4.00	More or very often	21	1.6 %	6.3%
4.13	-	21	1.6 %	6.3%
4.25	-	17	1.3 %	5.1%
4.38	-	17	1.3 %	5.1%
4.50	-	24	1.8 %	7.2%
4.63	-	20	1.5 %	6.0%
4.75	-	36	2.7 %	10.8%
4.88	-	29	2.1 %	8.7%
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	99	7.3 %	29.6%
-100.00 (M)	Skipped: Did not skip into section	1,020	75.3 %	-

Based upon 334 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### S0BSISOM: S0 BSI: Somatization

*Location:* 125-131 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200.00 , -100.00 , -99.00 , -98.00 , -97.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

#### Question:

S0 BSI: Somatization, The mean of the 7 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 (IS, 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 (PHB, 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

- Study 29961 -

- (1) A little bit
- (2) Moderately
- (3) Quite a bit
- (4) Extremely

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0.00	Not at all	532	39.3 %	42.2%
0.14	-	213	15.7 %	16.9%
0.29	-	109	8.1 %	8.6%
0.43	-	94	6.9 %	7.4%
0.57	-	75	5.5 %	5.9%
0.71	-	57	4.2 %	4.5%
0.86	-	38	2.8 %	3.0%
1.00	A little bit	20	1.5 %	1.6%
1.14	-	19	1.4 %	1.5%
1.29	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
1.43	-	19	1.4 %	1.5%
1.57	-	12	0.9 %	1.0%
1.71	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
1.86	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
2.00	Moderately	11	0.8 %	0.9%
2.14	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
2.29	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.43	-	7	0.5 %	0.6%
2.57	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
2.71	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
2.86	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
3.00	Quite a bit	3	0.2 %	0.2%
3.14	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
3.43	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
3.57	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
3.71	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-97.00 (M)	Invalid Test	88	6.5 %	-

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SOM\_T: S0 BSI: Somatization Clinically Significant**

*Location:* 132-135 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

- Study 29961 -

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -97 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

S0 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 (IS, 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 (PHB, 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 information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	not clinically significant	1,194	88.2 %	94.6%
1	clinical range	68	5.0 %	5.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-97 (M)	Invalid Test	88	6.5 %	-

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0BSIOC: S0 BSI: Obsessive-Compulsive**

Location: 136-142 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200.00 , -100.00 , -99.00 , -98.00 , -97.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

**Question:**

S0 BSI: Obsessive-Compulsive, The mean of the 6 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

- Study 29961 -

double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (IS, 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 (PHB, 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 information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0.00	Not at all	291	21.5 %	23.1%
0.17	-	149	11.0 %	11.8%
0.33	-	138	10.2 %	10.9%
0.50	-	115	8.5 %	9.1%
0.67	-	100	7.4 %	7.9%
0.83	-	85	6.3 %	6.7%
1.00	A little bit	67	4.9 %	5.3%
1.17	-	56	4.1 %	4.4%
1.33	-	50	3.7 %	4.0%
1.50	-	34	2.5 %	2.7%
1.67	-	39	2.9 %	3.1%
1.83	-	35	2.6 %	2.8%
2.00	Moderately	23	1.7 %	1.8%
2.17	-	15	1.1 %	1.2%
2.33	-	12	0.9 %	1.0%
2.50	-	16	1.2 %	1.3%
2.67	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
2.80	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.83	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
3.00	Quite a bit	5	0.4 %	0.4%
3.17	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
3.33	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
3.50	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
3.67	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.83	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
4.00	Extremely	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-97.00 (M)	Invalid Test	88	6.5 %	-

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0OC\_T: S0 BSI: Obsessive-Compulsive Clinically Significant

*Location:* 143-146 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -97 , -9 , -8

#### Question:

S0 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 (IS, 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 (PHB, 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 information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	not clinically significant	1,159	85.6 %	91.8%
1	clinical range	103	7.6 %	8.2%

#### Missing Data

-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-97 (M)	Invalid Test	88	6.5 %	-

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0BSIIS: S0 BSI: Interpersonal Sensitivity

*Location:* 147-153 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200.00 , -100.00 , -99.00 , -98.00 , -97.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

- Study 29961 -

**Question:**

S0 BSI: Interpersonal Sensitivity, The mean of the 4 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 (IS, 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 (PHB, 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 information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0.00	Not at all	583	43.1 %	46.2%
0.25	-	222	16.4 %	17.6%
0.50	-	121	8.9 %	9.6%
0.75	-	108	8.0 %	8.6%
1.00	A little bit	70	5.2 %	5.5%
1.25	-	46	3.4 %	3.6%
1.50	-	35	2.6 %	2.8%
1.75	-	20	1.5 %	1.6%
2.00	Moderately	21	1.6 %	1.7%
2.25	-	11	0.8 %	0.9%
2.50	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
2.75	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
3.00	Quite a bit	10	0.7 %	0.8%
3.25	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
3.50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
4.00	Extremely	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-97.00 (M)	Invalid Test	88	6.5 %	-

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0IS\_T: S0 BSI: Interpersonal Sensitivity Clinically Significant

*Location:* 154-157 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -97 , -9 , -8

#### Question:

S0 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 (IS, 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 (PHB, 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 information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	not clinically significant	1,226	90.5 %	97.1%
1	clinical range	36	2.7 %	2.9%

#### Missing Data

-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-97 (M)	Invalid Test	88	6.5 %	-

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0BSIDEP: S0 BSI: Depression

*Location:* 158-164 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200.00 , -100.00 , -99.00 , -98.00 , -97.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

- Study 29961 -

**Question:**

S0 BSI: Depression, The mean of the 6individual 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 (IS, 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 (PHB, 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 information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0.00	Not at all	374	27.6 %	29.6%
0.17	-	207	15.3 %	16.4%
0.33	-	135	10.0 %	10.7%
0.50	-	99	7.3 %	7.8%
0.67	-	86	6.4 %	6.8%
0.83	-	59	4.4 %	4.7%
1.00	A little bit	56	4.1 %	4.4%
1.17	-	38	2.8 %	3.0%
1.33	-	39	2.9 %	3.1%
1.40	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.50	-	32	2.4 %	2.5%
1.67	-	22	1.6 %	1.7%
1.83	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
2.00	Moderately	22	1.6 %	1.7%
2.17	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
2.33	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
2.50	-	12	0.9 %	1.0%
2.67	-	7	0.5 %	0.6%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2.83	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
3.00	Quite a bit	7	0.5 %	0.6%
3.17	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
3.33	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
3.50	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
3.67	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
4.00	Extremely	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-97.00 (M)	Invalid Test	88	6.5 %	-

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0DEP\_T: S0 BSI: Depression Clinically Significant

*Location:* 165-168 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -97 , -9 , -8

#### Question:

S0 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 (IS, 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 (PHB, 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 information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	not clinically significant	1,165	86.0 %	92.3%
1	clinical range	97	7.2 %	7.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-97 (M)	Invalid Test	88	6.5 %	-

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0BSIANX: S0 BSI: Anxiety

*Location:* 169-175 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200.00 , -100.00 , -99.00 , -98.00 , -97.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

#### Question:

S0 BSI: Anxiety, The mean of the 6 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 (IS, 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 (PHB, 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 information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0.00	Not at all	460	34.0 %	36.5%
0.17	-	209	15.4 %	16.6%
0.33	-	131	9.7 %	10.4%
0.50	-	101	7.5 %	8.0%
0.67	-	79	5.8 %	6.3%
0.80	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.83	-	63	4.7 %	5.0%
1.00	A little bit	50	3.7 %	4.0%
1.17	-	37	2.7 %	2.9%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.33	-	32	2.4 %	2.5%
1.50	-	21	1.6 %	1.7%
1.67	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
1.83	-	12	0.9 %	1.0%
2.00	Moderately	11	0.8 %	0.9%
2.17	-	7	0.5 %	0.6%
2.33	-	7	0.5 %	0.6%
2.50	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
2.67	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
2.83	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
3.00	Quite a bit	4	0.3 %	0.3%
3.17	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
3.33	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
3.50	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
3.83	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-97.00 (M)	Invalid Test	88	6.5 %	-

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0ANX\_T: S0 BSI: Anxiety Clinically Significant

*Location:* 176-179 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -97 , -9 , -8

#### Question:

S0 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 (IS, 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 (PHB, 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.

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	not clinically significant	1,197	88.4 %	94.8%
1	clinical range	65	4.8 %	5.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-97 (M)	Invalid Test	88	6.5 %	-

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0BSIHOS: S0 BSI: Hostility

*Location:* 180-186 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200.0 , -100.0 , -99.0 , -98.0 , -97.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

#### Question:

S0 BSI: Hostility, The mean of the 5 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 (IS, 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 (PHB, 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 information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0.0	Not at all	299	22.1 %	23.7%
0.2	-	168	12.4 %	13.3%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0.4	-	134	9.9 %	10.6%
0.6	-	138	10.2 %	10.9%
0.8	-	124	9.2 %	9.8%
1.0	A little bit	87	6.4 %	6.9%
1.2	-	74	5.5 %	5.9%
1.4	-	36	2.7 %	2.9%
1.6	-	40	3.0 %	3.2%
1.8	-	34	2.5 %	2.7%
2.0	Moderately	29	2.1 %	2.3%
2.2	-	21	1.6 %	1.7%
2.4	-	22	1.6 %	1.7%
2.6	-	18	1.3 %	1.4%
2.8	-	14	1.0 %	1.1%
3.0	Quite a bit	11	0.8 %	0.9%
3.2	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
3.4	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
3.6	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
4.0	Extremely	3	0.2 %	0.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200.0 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-97.0 (M)	Invalid Test	88	6.5 %	-

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0HOS\_T: S0 BSI: Hostility Clinically Significant

*Location:* 187-190 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -97 , -9 , -8

#### Question:

S0 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 (IS, 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 (PHB, e.g., "Feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a

- Study 29961 -

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 information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	not clinically significant	1,172	86.6 %	92.9%
1	clinical range	90	6.6 %	7.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-97 (M)	Invalid Test	88	6.5 %	-

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### **S0BSIPHB: S0 BSI: Phobic Anxiety**

*Location:* 191-197 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200.0 , -100.0 , -99.0 , -98.0 , -97.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

#### **Question:**

S0 BSI: Phobic Anxiety, The mean of the 5 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 (IS, 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 (PHB, 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 information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0.0	Not at all	810	59.8 %	64.2%
0.2	-	171	12.6 %	13.5%
0.4	-	71	5.2 %	5.6%
0.5	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.6	-	60	4.4 %	4.8%
0.8	-	45	3.3 %	3.6%
1.0	A little bit	31	2.3 %	2.5%
1.2	-	26	1.9 %	2.1%
1.4	-	11	0.8 %	0.9%
1.6	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
1.8	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
2.0	Moderately	3	0.2 %	0.2%
2.2	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
2.4	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
2.6	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
2.8	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.2	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.4	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
4.0	Extremely	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200.0 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-97.0 (M)	Invalid Test	88	6.5 %	-

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0PHB\_T: S0 BSI: Phobic Anxiety Clinically Significant**

*Location:* 198-201 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200 , -97 , -9 , -8

#### **Question:**

S0 BSI: Phobic Anxiety Clinically Significant, The mean of the clinic ally 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 (IS, 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

## - Study 29961 -

things"), phobic anxiety (PHB, 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 information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	not clinically significant	1,223	90.3 %	96.9%
1	clinical range	39	2.9 %	3.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-97 (M)	Invalid Test	88	6.5 %	-

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0BSIPAR: S0 BSI: Paranoid Ideation

*Location:* 202-208 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200.0 , -100.0 , -99.0 , -98.0 , -97.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

#### Question:

S0 BSI: Paranoid Ideation, The mean of the 5 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 (IS, 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 (PHB, 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 information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0.0	Not at all	190	14.0 %	15.1%
0.2	-	143	10.6 %	11.3%
0.4	-	131	9.7 %	10.4%
0.6	-	141	10.4 %	11.2%
0.8	-	150	11.1 %	11.9%
1.0	A little bit	106	7.8 %	8.4%
1.2	-	77	5.7 %	6.1%
1.4	-	76	5.6 %	6.0%
1.5	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.6	-	50	3.7 %	4.0%
1.8	-	46	3.4 %	3.6%
2.0	Moderately	35	2.6 %	2.8%
2.2	-	27	2.0 %	2.1%
2.4	-	26	1.9 %	2.1%
2.6	-	21	1.6 %	1.7%
2.8	-	14	1.0 %	1.1%
3.0	Quite a bit	7	0.5 %	0.6%
3.2	-	11	0.8 %	0.9%
3.4	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
3.6	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
3.8	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
4.0	Extremely	1	0.1 %	0.1%

*Missing Data*

-200.0 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-97.0 (M)	Invalid Test	88	6.5 %	-

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PAR\_T: S0 BSI: Paranoid Ideation Clinically Significant**

*Location:* 209-212 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -97 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

S0 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.,

- Study 29961 -

"Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (IS, 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 (PHB, 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 information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	not clinically significant	1,167	86.2 %	92.5%
1	clinical range	95	7.0 %	7.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-97 (M)	Invalid Test	88	6.5 %	-

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0BSIPSY: S0 BSI: Psychoticism

*Location:* 213-219 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200.00 , -100.00 , -99.00 , -98.00 , -97.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

#### Question:

S0 BSI: Psychoticism, The mean of the 5 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 (IS, 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 (PHB, 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

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0.00	Not at all	432	31.9 %	34.2%
0.20	-	218	16.1 %	17.3%
0.40	-	125	9.2 %	9.9%
0.60	-	129	9.5 %	10.2%
0.80	-	99	7.3 %	7.8%
1.00	A little bit	52	3.8 %	4.1%
1.20	-	54	4.0 %	4.3%
1.25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.40	-	41	3.0 %	3.2%
1.60	-	21	1.6 %	1.7%
1.80	-	29	2.1 %	2.3%
2.00	Moderately	21	1.6 %	1.7%
2.20	-	10	0.7 %	0.8%
2.40	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
2.50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.60	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
2.80	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
3.00	Quite a bit	4	0.3 %	0.3%
3.20	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
3.60	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
4.00	Extremely	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-97.00 (M)	Invalid Test	88	6.5 %	-

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PSY\_T: S0 BSI: Psychoticism Clinically Significant**

*Location:* 220-223 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -97 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

S0 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

## - Study 29961 -

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 (IS, 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 (PHB, 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 information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	not clinically significant	1,172	86.6 %	92.9%
1	clinical range	90	6.6 %	7.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-97 (M)	Invalid Test	88	6.5 %	-

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0BSIGSI: S0 BSI: Global Severity Index

*Location:* 224-230 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -97 , -9 , -8

#### Question:

S0 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 (IS, 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 (PHB, 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

- Study 29961 -

- (3) Quite a bit  
(4) Extremely

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label
0	Not at all
1	A little bit
2	Moderately
3	Quite a bit
4	Extremely

*Missing Data*

-200 (M)	Data missing
-97 (M)	Invalid test
-9 (M)	Dont Know
-8 (M)	Refuse

\* Frequencies not displayed for this variable.

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0GSI\_T: S0 BSI: GSI Clinically Significant**

*Location:* 231-234 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -97 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

S0 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 (IS, 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 (PHB, 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 information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	not clinically significant	1,204	88.9 %	95.4%
1	clinical range	58	4.3 %	4.6%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-97 (M)	Invalid Test	88	6.5 %	-

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0BSIPST: S0 BSI: Positive Symptom Total

*Location:* 235-238 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200 , -97 , -9 , -8

#### Question:

S0 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 (IS, 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 (PHB, 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 information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	-	51	3.8 %	4.0%
2	-	63	4.7 %	5.0%
3	-	71	5.2 %	5.6%
4	-	49	3.6 %	3.9%
5	-	46	3.4 %	3.6%
6	-	49	3.6 %	3.9%
7	-	50	3.7 %	4.0%
8	-	47	3.5 %	3.7%
9	-	46	3.4 %	3.6%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
10	-	44	3.2 %	3.5%
11	-	55	4.1 %	4.4%
12	-	43	3.2 %	3.4%
13	-	28	2.1 %	2.2%
14	-	40	3.0 %	3.2%
15	-	37	2.7 %	2.9%
16	-	34	2.5 %	2.7%
17	-	30	2.2 %	2.4%
18	-	28	2.1 %	2.2%
19	-	30	2.2 %	2.4%
20	-	38	2.8 %	3.0%
21	-	24	1.8 %	1.9%
22	-	34	2.5 %	2.7%
23	-	26	1.9 %	2.1%
24	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
25	-	22	1.6 %	1.7%
26	-	26	1.9 %	2.1%
27	-	25	1.8 %	2.0%
28	-	14	1.0 %	1.1%
29	-	20	1.5 %	1.6%
30	-	16	1.2 %	1.3%
31	-	20	1.5 %	1.6%
32	-	12	0.9 %	1.0%
33	-	15	1.1 %	1.2%
34	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
35	-	10	0.7 %	0.8%
36	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
37	-	11	0.8 %	0.9%
38	-	10	0.7 %	0.8%
39	-	7	0.5 %	0.6%
40	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
41	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
42	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
43	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
44	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
45	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
46	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
47	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
48	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
49	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
50	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
51	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
53	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-97 (M)	Invalid Test	88	6.5 %	-

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0BSIPSD: S0 BSI: Positive Symptom Distress Index

*Location:* 239-245 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -97 , -9 , -8

#### Question:

S0 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 (IS, 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 (PHB, 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 information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>
0	Not at all
1	A little bit
2	Moderately
3	Quite a bit
4	Extremely

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>
<i>Missing Data</i>	
-200 (M)	Data missing
-97 (M)	Invalid Test
-9 (M)	Dont Know
-8 (M)	Refuse

\* Frequencies not displayed for this variable.

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0BSIDX1: S0 BSI: Subscale Diagnosis Significant

*Location:* 246-249 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -97

#### Question:

S0 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 (IS, 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 (PHB, 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 information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	989	73.0 %	78.4%
1	-	114	8.4 %	9.0%
2	-	66	4.9 %	5.2%
3	-	26	1.9 %	2.1%
4	-	25	1.8 %	2.0%
5	-	16	1.2 %	1.3%
6	-	10	0.7 %	0.8%
7	-	11	0.8 %	0.9%
8	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
9	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-97 (M)	Invalid test	88	6.5 %	-

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0BSIDX: S0 BSI: Clinically Significant

*Location:* 250-253 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -97 , -9 , -8

#### Question:

S0 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 (IS, 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 (PHB, 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 information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	not clinically significant	1,103	81.5 %	87.4%
1	clinical range	159	11.7 %	12.6%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-97 (M)	Invalid test	88	6.5 %	-

Based upon 1,262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0CADPRE: S0 CarAdlt: Domains of Social Support

*Location:* 254-257 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

#### Question:

- Study 29961 -

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

MEASURE: Caring Adult

The Contact with Caring Adults inventory (Nakkula, et al., 1990; Phillips and Springer, 1992; Institute of Behavioral Science, 1990) was modified for this study to determine the presence of supportive adults present in the adolescent's life. This support is assessed across 8 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 three adults the youth is most likely to turn to within each domain. The first of these dimensions, Domains of Social Support, examines 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 8 domains. Diversity is further computed by choosing 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. Higher scores indicate a greater number of relationships with adults who spend time with the adolescent and provide support.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
1	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
2	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
3	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
4	-	47	3.5 %	3.5%
5	-	79	5.8 %	5.8%
6	-	196	14.5 %	14.5%
7	-	455	33.6 %	33.6%
8	-	491	36.3 %	36.3%

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

**S0CADETH: S0 CarAdlt: Domains with either Family or Non-Family support**

*Location:* 258-261 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -100 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Domains of social support; Domains with either Family or Non-Family support.

- Study 29961 -

**MEASURE: Caring Adult**

The Contact with Caring Adults inventory (Nakkula, et al., 1990; Phillips and Springer, 1992; Institute of Behavioral Science, 1990) was modified for this study to determine the presence of supportive adults present in the adolescent's life. This support is assessed across 8 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 three adults the youth is most likely to turn to within each domain. The first of these dimensions, Domains of Social Support, examines 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 8 domains. Diversity is further computed by choosing 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. Higher scores indicate a greater number of relationships with adults who spend time with the adolescent and provide support.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
1	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
2	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
3	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
4	-	47	3.5 %	3.5%
5	-	79	5.8 %	5.8%
6	-	196	14.5 %	14.5%
7	-	455	33.6 %	33.6%
8	-	491	36.3 %	36.3%

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

**S0CADFM: S0 CarAdlt: Domains of Social Support - Family**

*Location:* 262-265 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -100 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

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

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Caring Adult

The Contact with Caring Adults inventory (Nakkula, et al., 1990; Phillips and Springer, 1992; Institute of Behavioral Science, 1990) was modified for this study to determine the presence of supportive adults present in the adolescent's life. This support is assessed across 8 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 three adults the youth is most likely to turn to within each domain. The first of these dimensions, Domains of Social Support, examines 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 8 domains. Diversity is further computed by choosing 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. Higher scores indicate a greater number of relationships with adults who spend time with the adolescent and provide support.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	58	4.3 %	4.3%
1	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
2	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
3	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
4	-	86	6.4 %	6.4%
5	-	102	7.5 %	7.5%
6	-	220	16.2 %	16.2%
7	-	415	30.6 %	30.6%
8	-	359	26.5 %	26.5%

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

**S0CADNFM: S0 CarAdlt: Domains of Social Support - Non-Family**

*Location:* 266-269 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -300 , -100 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

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

MEASURE: Caring Adult

- Study 29961 -

The Contact with Caring Adults inventory (Nakkula, et al., 1990; Phillips and Springer, 1992; Institute of Behavioral Science, 1990) was modified for this study to determine the presence of supportive adults present in the adolescent's life. This support is assessed across 8 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 three adults the youth is most likely to turn to within each domain. The first of these dimensions, Domains of Social Support, examines 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 8 domains. Diversity is further computed by choosing 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. Higher scores indicate a greater number of relationships with adults who spend time with the adolescent and provide support.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	731	54.0 %	54.0%
1	-	193	14.3 %	14.3%
2	-	110	8.1 %	8.1%
3	-	67	4.9 %	4.9%
4	-	48	3.5 %	3.5%
5	-	60	4.4 %	4.4%
6	-	59	4.4 %	4.4%
7	-	46	3.4 %	3.4%
8	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%

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

**S0CADRNG: S0 CarAdlt: Total Number of Adults Mentioned**

*Location:* 270-273 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -100 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Total number of adults mentioned; Sum of individuals across all domains.

**MEASURE:** Caring Adult

The Contact with Caring Adults inventory (Nakkula, et al., 1990; Phillips and Springer,

- Study 29961 -

1992; Institute of Behavioral Science, 1990) was modified for this study to determine the presence of supportive adults present in the adolescent's life. This support is assessed across 8 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 three adults the youth is most likely to turn to within each domain. The first of these dimensions, Domains of Social Support, examines 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 8 domains. Diversity is further computed by choosing 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. Higher scores indicate a greater number of relationships with adults who spend time with the adolescent and provide support.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label
<i>Missing Data</i>	
-300 (M)	Too few answers for computation
-100 (M)	Skipped: Did not skip into section
-99 (M)	Dont Know
-98 (M)	Refuse

\* Frequencies not displayed for this variable.

Based upon 1,319 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0CADMDV: S0 CarAdlt: Maximum Diversity within Domains**

*Location:* 274-277 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -300 , -100 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

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

**MEASURE:** Caring Adult

The Contact with Caring Adults inventory (Nakkula, et al., 1990; Phillips and Springer, 1992; Institute of Behavioral Science, 1990) was modified for this study to determine the presence of supportive adults present in the adolescent's life. This support is assessed across 8 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

- Study 29961 -

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 three adults the youth is most likely to turn to within each domain. The first of these dimensions, Domains of Social Support, examines 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 8 domains. Diversity is further computed by choosing 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. Higher scores indicate a greater number of relationships with adults who spend time with the adolescent and provide support.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	-	121	8.9 %	9.2%
2	-	253	18.7 %	19.2%
3	-	210	15.5 %	15.9%
4	-	142	10.5 %	10.8%
5	-	166	12.3 %	12.6%
6	-	62	4.6 %	4.7%
7	-	30	2.2 %	2.3%
8	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
9	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
10	-	118	8.7 %	8.9%
11	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
12	-	18	1.3 %	1.4%
13	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
14	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
15	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
17	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
18	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
20	-	55	4.1 %	4.2%
21	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
22	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
23	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
25	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
27	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
30	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
35	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
40	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
50	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
60	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
65	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
80	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
90	-	10	0.7 %	0.8%
-100 (M)	Skipped: Did not skip into section	35	2.6 %	-

Based upon 1,319 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0CADDIV: S0 CarAdlt: Diversity of Social Support**

*Location:* 278-281 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Diversity of social support - number of different types of people mentioned; Count by relationship code.

**MEASURE:** Caring Adult

The Contact with Caring Adults inventory (Nakkula, et al., 1990; Phillips and Springer, 1992; Institute of Behavioral Science, 1990) was modified for this study to determine the presence of supportive adults present in the adolescent's life. This support is assessed across 8 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 three adults the youth is most likely to turn to within each domain. The first of these dimensions, Domains of Social Support, examines 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 8 domains. Diversity is further computed by choosing 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. Higher scores indicate a greater number of relationships with adults who spend time with the adolescent and provide support.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	35	2.6 %	2.6%
1	65	4.8 %	4.8%
2	145	10.7 %	10.7%
3	346	25.6 %	25.6%
4	285	21.0 %	21.0%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
5	226	16.7 %	16.7%
6	121	8.9 %	8.9%
7	65	4.8 %	4.8%
8	36	2.7 %	2.7%
9	14	1.0 %	1.0%
10	6	0.4 %	0.4%
11	6	0.4 %	0.4%
12	1	0.1 %	0.1%
14	3	0.2 %	0.2%

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

**S0DEPSUP: S0 CarAdlt: Depth of Social Support - Number of unique adults mentioned 3 or more times**

*Location:* 282-285 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -100 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Depth of social support; Count of unique adults mentioned in 2 or more domains.

**MEASURE:** Caring Adult

The Contact with Caring Adults inventory (Nakkula, et al., 1990; Phillips and Springer, 1992; Institute of Behavioral Science, 1990) was modified for this study to determine the presence of supportive adults present in the adolescent's life. This support is assessed across 8 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 three adults the youth is most likely to turn to within each domain. The first of these dimensions, Domains of Social Support, examines 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 8 domains. Diversity is further computed by choosing 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. Higher scores indicate a greater number of relationships with adults who spend time with the adolescent and provide support.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	98	7.2 %	7.2%
1	-	365	27.0 %	27.0%
2	-	423	31.2 %	31.2%
3	-	387	28.6 %	28.6%
4	-	73	5.4 %	5.4%
5	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
6	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

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

**S0CADNFD: S0 CarAdlt: Diversity of Non-Family Social Support**

*Location:* 286-289 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Diversity of Non-Family Support; Count of unique non-family adults mentioned across all domains.

MEASURE: Caring Adult

The Contact with Caring Adults inventory (Nakkula, et al., 1990; Phillips and Springer, 1992; Institute of Behavioral Science, 1990) was modified for this study to determine the presence of supportive adults present in the adolescent's life. This support is assessed across 8 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 three adults the youth is most likely to turn to within each domain. The first of these dimensions, Domains of Social Support, examines 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 8 domains. Diversity is further computed by choosing 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. Higher scores indicate a greater number of relationships with adults who spend time with the adolescent and provide support.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	736	54.4 %	54.4%
1	325	24.0 %	24.0%
2	157	11.6 %	11.6%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
3	77	5.7 %	5.7%
4	32	2.4 %	2.4%
5	10	0.7 %	0.7%
6	7	0.5 %	0.5%
7	3	0.2 %	0.2%
8	3	0.2 %	0.2%
9	1	0.1 %	0.1%
10	3	0.2 %	0.2%

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

**S0DEPNFS: S0 CarAdlt: Depth of Non-Family Social Support - Number of Adults mentioned more than 2 times**

*Location:* 290-293 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -100 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Depth of Non-Family Support; Count of non-family adults mentioned more than 2 times.

MEASURE: Caring Adult

The Contact with Caring Adults inventory (Nakkula, et al., 1990; Phillips and Springer, 1992; Institute of Behavioral Science, 1990) was modified for this study to determine the presence of supportive adults present in the adolescent's life. This support is assessed across 8 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 three adults the youth is most likely to turn to within each domain. The first of these dimensions, Domains of Social Support, examines 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 8 domains. Diversity is further computed by choosing 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. Higher scores indicate a greater number of relationships with adults who spend time with the adolescent and provide support.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	1,057	78.1 %	78.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	-	222	16.4 %	16.4%
2	-	59	4.4 %	4.4%
3	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
4	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%

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

**S0REL160: S0 CharFamily: Is your biological mother living**

*Location:* 294-297 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Biological mother living.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	40	3.0 %	3.0%
1	Yes	1,302	96.2 %	97.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	12	0.9 %	-

Based upon 1,342 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL161: S0 CharFamily: How old were you when she died**

*Location:* 298-301 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Subject's age when biological mother died.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 or Younger	19	1.4 %	47.5%
10	-	4	0.3 %	10.0%
11	-	2	0.1 %	5.0%
12	-	5	0.4 %	12.5%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
13	-	2	0.1 %	5.0%
14	-	1	0.1 %	2.5%
15	-	3	0.2 %	7.5%
16	-	1	0.1 %	2.5%
17	-	3	0.2 %	7.5%

**Missing Data**

-102 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK if parent is deceased or living	12	0.9 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Parent is not deceased	1,302	96.2 %	-

Based upon 40 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL162: S0 CharFamily: Is your biological father living**

*Location:* 302-305 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Biological father living.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	132	9.7 %	10.5%
1	Yes	1,124	83.0 %	89.5%

**Missing Data**

-9 (M)	Dont Know	98	7.2 %	-
--------	-----------	----	-------	---

Based upon 1,256 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL163: S0 CharFamily: How old were you when he died**

*Location:* 306-309 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Subject's age when biological father died.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 or Younger	75	5.5 %	59.5%
10	-	7	0.5 %	5.6%
11	-	4	0.3 %	3.2%
12	-	7	0.5 %	5.6%
13	-	10	0.7 %	7.9%
14	-	7	0.5 %	5.6%
15	-	7	0.5 %	5.6%
16	-	9	0.7 %	7.1%

*Missing Data*

-102 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK if parent is deceased or living	98	7.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Parent is not deceased	1,124	83.0 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	5	0.4 %	-
-98 (M)	Refused	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 126 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL164: S0 CharFamily: Bioparents marital status**

*Location:* 310-313 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -99 , -98

**Question:**

Biological parents marital status

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Never married to each other	621	45.9 %	46.8%
2	Separated from each other	135	10.0 %	10.2%
3	Divorced from each other	294	21.7 %	22.1%
4	Married to each other	203	15.0 %	15.3%
5	Widowed from each other	48	3.5 %	3.6%
6	Mother remarried	16	1.2 %	1.2%
7	Father remarried	5	0.4 %	0.4%
8	Both remarried	4	0.3 %	0.3%
9	Both deceased	2	0.1 %	0.2%

*Missing Data*

-99 (M)	Dont Know	26	1.9 %	-
---------	-----------	----	-------	---

Based upon 1,328 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

- Study 29961 -

**S0REL165: S0 CharFamily: Was your biomom born in the US**

*Location:* 314-317 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Biological mother was born in the US.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	193	14.3 %	14.4%
1	Yes	1,151	85.0 %	85.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	10	0.7 %	-

Based upon 1,344 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL166: S0 CharFamily: Was your biodad born in the US**

*Location:* 318-321 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Biological father was born in the US.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	251	18.5 %	19.6%
1	Yes	1,030	76.1 %	80.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	73	5.4 %	-

Based upon 1,281 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL167: S0 CharFamily: Language mom/female guardian speaks most**

*Location:* 322-325 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -99 , -98 , -97

**Question:**

- Study 29961 -

Language mom/female guardian speaks most.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	English	1,098	81.1 %	84.3%
2	Spanish	197	14.5 %	15.1%
96	Other (specify)	8	0.6 %	0.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-99 (M)	Don't Know	1	0.1 %	-
-97 (M)	Not Applicable: Single Parent House	50	3.7 %	-

Based upon 1,303 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL168: S0 CharFamily: Language mom/female guardian speaks most (specify)**

*Location:* 326-330 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -101

**Question:**

Language mom/female guardian speaks most (specify)

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	8	0.6 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-101 (M)	Skipped: Other Not Marked	1,346	99.4 %	-

Based upon 8 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL169: S0 CharFamily: Language dad/male guardian speaks most**

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -99 , -98 , -97

**Question:**

Language dad/male guardian speaks most.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	English	731	54.0 %	80.2%
2	Spanish	174	12.9 %	19.1%
96	Other (specify)	6	0.4 %	0.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-99 (M)	Don't Know	1	0.1 %	-
-97 (M)	Not Applicable: Single Parent House	442	32.6 %	-

Based upon 911 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL170: S0 CharFamily: Language dad/male guardian speaks most (specify)**

*Location:* 335-339 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -101

**Question:**

Language dad/male guardian speaks most (specify)

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	6	0.4 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-101 (M)	Skipped: Other Not Marked	1,348	99.6 %	-

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

**S0CURJOB\_MOM: S0 CharFamily: Job type - mother current job**

*Location:* 340-343 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -103 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -97

**Question:**

Job type - mother current job

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Higher executives of large concerns, proprietors, and major professionals	10	0.7 %	1.3%
2	Business managers, proprietors of medium-sized businesses, and lesser professionals	103	7.6 %	13.7%
3	Administrative personnel, owners of small businesses, and minor professionals	65	4.8 %	8.6%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
4	Clerical and sales workers, technicians, and owners of little businesses	303	22.4 %	40.2%
5	Skilled manual employees	32	2.4 %	4.2%
6	Machine operators and semiskilled employees	106	7.8 %	14.1%
7	Unskilled employees	135	10.0 %	17.9%
-102 (M)	NA: No current, but has a past job	359	26.5 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Parent has never worked	57	4.2 %	-
-99 (M)	Type unknown	109	8.1 %	-
-97 (M)	Skipped: Single parent household without mom	75	5.5 %	-

Based upon 754 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0LASTJOB\_MOM: S0 CharFamily: Job type - mother last job**

*Location:* 344-347 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -104 , -103 , -101 , -99 , -97

**Question:**

Job type - mother last job

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Higher executives of large concerns, proprietors, and major professionals	2	0.1 %	0.8%
2	Business managers, proprietors of medium-sized businesses, and lesser professionals	29	2.1 %	11.1%
3	Administrative personnel, owners of small businesses, and minor professionals	10	0.7 %	3.8%
4	Clerical and sales workers, technicians, and owners of little businesses	96	7.1 %	36.6%
5	Skilled manual employees	9	0.7 %	3.4%
6	Machine operators and semiskilled employees	40	3.0 %	15.3%
7	Unskilled employees	76	5.6 %	29.0%

**Missing Data**

-104 (M)	NA: Parent has a current job	863	63.7 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Parent has never worked	57	4.2 %	-
-99 (M)	Type unknown	97	7.2 %	-
-97 (M)	Skipped: Single parent household without mom	75	5.5 %	-

Based upon 262 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0CURJOB\_DAD: S0 CharFamily: Job type - father current job**

*Location:* 348-351 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -103 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -97

- Study 29961 -

**Question:**

Job type - father current job

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Higher executives of large concerns, proprietors, and major professionals	18	1.3 %	3.2%
2	Business managers, proprietors of medium-sized businesses, and lesser professionals	15	1.1 %	2.7%
3	Administrative personnel, owners of small businesses, and minor professionals	52	3.8 %	9.2%
4	Clerical and sales workers, technicians, and owners of little businesses	96	7.1 %	17.0%
5	Skilled manual employees	116	8.6 %	20.5%
6	Machine operators and semiskilled employees	134	9.9 %	23.7%
7	Unskilled employees	134	9.9 %	23.7%

*Missing Data*

-103 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK parent employment status	17	1.3 %	-
-102 (M)	NA: No current, but has a past job	156	11.5 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Parent has never worked	9	0.7 %	-
-99 (M)	Type unknown	88	6.5 %	-
-97 (M)	Skipped: Single parent household without dad	519	38.3 %	-

Based upon 565 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0LASTJOB\_DAD: S0 CharFamily: Job type - father past job**

*Location:* 352-355 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -104 , -103 , -101 , -99 , -97

**Question:**

Job type - father last job

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Higher executives of large concerns, proprietors, and major professionals	1	0.1 %	0.8%
2	Business managers, proprietors of medium-sized businesses, and lesser professionals	1	0.1 %	0.8%
3	Administrative personnel, owners of small businesses, and minor professionals	7	0.5 %	5.8%
4	Clerical and sales workers, technicians, and owners of little businesses	24	1.8 %	20.0%
5	Skilled manual employees	22	1.6 %	18.3%
6	Machine operators and semiskilled employees	20	1.5 %	16.7%
7	Unskilled employees	45	3.3 %	37.5%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-104 (M)	NA: Parent has a current job	653	48.2 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK parent employment status	17	1.3 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Parent has never worked	9	0.7 %	-
-99 (M)	Type unknown	36	2.7 %	-
-97 (M)	Skipped: Single parent household without dad	519	38.3 %	-

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

**S0REL300: S0 CharFamily: Did your parents get along**

*Location:* 356-359 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -99 , -98 , -97

**Question:**

Did your parents get along?

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	240	17.7 %	26.9%
1	Yes	653	48.2 %	73.1%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-99 (M)	Dont Know	9	0.7 %	-
-97 (M)	NA (single parent home)	452	33.4 %	-

Based upon 893 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL301: S0 CharFamily: Did your parents have arguments**

*Location:* 360-363 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -99 , -98 , -97

**Question:**

Did your parents have arguments?

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	209	15.4 %	23.3%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Yes	688	50.8 %	76.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-99 (M)	Dont Know	13	1.0 %	-
-97 (M)	NA (single parent home)	444	32.8 %	-

Based upon 897 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL302: S0 CharFamily: Did your parents have physical fights**

*Location:* 364-367 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -99 , -98 , -97

**Question:**

Did your parents have physical fights?

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	654	48.3 %	72.7%
1	Yes	245	18.1 %	27.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-99 (M)	Dont Know	17	1.3 %	-
-97 (M)	NA (single parent home)	438	32.3 %	-

Based upon 899 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL310: S0 CharFamily: How often do you see siblings**

*Location:* 368-371 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -103 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Frequency the subject sees siblings.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Daily	952	70.3 %	72.0%
2	3-6 times per week	84	6.2 %	6.4%
3	2 times per week	49	3.6 %	3.7%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
4	1 time per week	37	2.7 %	2.8%
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	38	2.8 %	2.9%
6	1 time per month	27	2.0 %	2.0%
7	Less than monthly	135	10.0 %	10.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,322 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL179: S0 Siblings: Do you have brothers or sisters**

*Location:* 372-375 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Has brothers or sisters.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	31	2.3 %	2.3%
1	Yes	1,323	97.7 %	97.7%

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

**S0REL180: S0 Siblings: Total number of brothers and sisters**

*Location:* 376-379 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Total number of brothers and sisters.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
1	-	137	10.1 %	10.1%
2	-	202	14.9 %	14.9%
3	-	256	18.9 %	18.9%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
4	-	212	15.7 %	15.7%
5	-	178	13.1 %	13.1%
6	-	113	8.3 %	8.3%
7	-	71	5.2 %	5.2%
8	-	60	4.4 %	4.4%
9	-	29	2.1 %	2.1%
10	10 or More	65	4.8 %	4.8%

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

**S0BORS: S0 Siblings: Sib 1 - brother or sister**

*Location:* 380-384 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -103 , -9

**Question:**

Gender of sibling 01 - brother or sister.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,322	97.6 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Don't Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,322 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0AGEBS: S0 Siblings: Sib 1 - age**

*Location:* 385-389 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -104 , -103

**Question:**

Age of sibling 01.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,314	97.0 %	100.0%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	7	0.5 %	-
-997 (M)	Sibling is deceased	2	0.1 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-

Based upon 1,314 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0RESBS: S0 Siblings: Sib 1 - does this sibling live at subj home address**

*Location:* 390-394 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -103 , -9

**Question:**

Sibling 01 lives at subj home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,322	97.6 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Don't Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,322 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0BORS2: S0 Siblings: Sib 2 - brother or sister**

*Location:* 395-399 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -104 , -103 , -9

**Question:**

Gender of sibling 02 - brother or sister.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,184	87.4 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	137	10.1 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-9 (M)	Don't Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,184 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0AGEBS2: S0 Siblings: Sib 2 - age**

*Location:* 400-404 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -104 , -103

**Question:**

Age of sibling 02.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,158	85.5 %	100.0%

*Missing Data*

-999 (M)	Dont Know	21	1.6 %	-
-998 (M)	Refused	1	0.1 %	-
-997 (M)	Sibling is deceased	6	0.4 %	-
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	137	10.1 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-

Based upon 1,158 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0RESBS2: S0 Siblings: Sib 2 - does this sibling live at subj home address**

*Location:* 405-409 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -104 , -103 , -9

**Question:**

Sibling 02 lives at subj home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,185	87.5 %	100.0%

*Missing Data*

-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	137	10.1 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-9 (M)	Don't Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,185 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0BORS3: S0 Siblings: Sib 3 - brother or sister**

*Location:* 410-414 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -104 , -103 , -9

**Question:**

Gender of sibling 03 - brother or sister.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	981	72.5 %	100.0%

*Missing Data*

-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	339	25.0 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Don't Know	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 981 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0AGEBS3: S0 Siblings: Sib 3 - age**

*Location:* 415-419 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -104 , -103

**Question:**

Age of sibling 03.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	944	69.7 %	100.0%

*Missing Data*

-999 (M)	Dont Know	35	2.6 %	-
-997 (M)	Sibling is deceased	5	0.4 %	-
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	339	25.0 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Based upon 944 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0RESBS3: S0 Siblings: Sib 3 - does this sibling live at subj home address**

*Location:* 420-424 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -104 , -103 , -9

**Question:**

Sibling 03 lives at subj home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	982	72.5 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	339	25.0 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Don't Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 982 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0BORS4: S0 Siblings: Sib 4 - brother or sister**

*Location:* 425-429 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -104 , -103 , -9

**Question:**

Gender of sibling 04 - brother or sister.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	723	53.4 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	595	43.9 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Don't Know	5	0.4 %	-

Based upon 723 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0AGEBS4: S0 Siblings: Sib 4 - age**

*Location:* 430-434 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

- Study 29961 -

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -999 , -998 , -997 , -104 , -103

**Question:**

Age of sibling 04.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	689	50.9 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	37	2.7 %	-
-997 (M)	Sibling is deceased	2	0.1 %	-
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	595	43.9 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-

Based upon 689 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0RESBS4: S0 Siblings: Sib 4 - does this sibling live at subj home address**

Location: 435-439 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -104 , -103 , -9

**Question:**

Sibling 04 lives at subj home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	726	53.6 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	595	43.9 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Don't Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 726 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0BORS5: S0 Siblings: Sib 5 - brother or sister**

Location: 440-444 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -104 , -103 , -9

**Question:**

- Study 29961 -

Gender of sibling 05 - brother or sister.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	509	37.6 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	807	59.6 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Don't Know	7	0.5 %	-

Based upon 509 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0AGEBS5: S0 Siblings: Sib 5 - age**

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -104 , -103

**Question:**

Age of sibling 05.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	470	34.7 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	43	3.2 %	-
-997 (M)	Sibling is deceased	3	0.2 %	-
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	807	59.6 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-

Based upon 470 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0RESBS5: S0 Siblings: Sib 5 - does this sibling live at subj home address**

*Location:* 450-454 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -104 , -103 , -9

**Question:**

Sibling 05 lives at subj home address.

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	514	38.0 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	807	59.6 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Don't Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 514 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0BORS6: S0 Siblings: Sib 6 - brother or sister**

*Location:* 455-459 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -104 , -103 , -9

**Question:**

Gender of sibling 06 - brother or sister.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	330	24.4 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	985	72.7 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Don't Know	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 330 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0AGEBS6: S0 Siblings: Sib 6 - age**

*Location:* 460-464 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -104 , -103

**Question:**

Age of sibling 06.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	298	22.0 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	39	2.9 %	-
-997 (M)	Sibling is deceased	1	0.1 %	-
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	985	72.7 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-

Based upon 298 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0RESBS6: S0 Siblings: Sib 6 - does this sibling live at subj home address**

*Location:* 465-469 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -104 , -103 , -9

**Question:**

Sibling 06 lives at subj home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	337	24.9 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	985	72.7 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Don't Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 337 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0BORS7: S0 Siblings: Sib 7 - brother or sister**

*Location:* 470-474 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -104 , -103 , -9

**Question:**

Gender of sibling 07 - brother or sister.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	214	15.8 %	100.0%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	1,098	81.1 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Don't Know	11	0.8 %	-

Based upon 214 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0AGEBS7: S0 Siblings: Sib 7 - age

*Location:* 475-479 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -104 , -103

#### Question:

Age of sibling 07.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	184	13.6 %	100.0%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	40	3.0 %	-
-997 (M)	Sibling is deceased	1	0.1 %	-
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	1,098	81.1 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-

Based upon 184 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0RESBS7: S0 Siblings: Sib 7 - does this sibling live at subj home address

*Location:* 480-484 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -104 , -103 , -9

#### Question:

Sibling 07 lives at subj home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	224	16.5 %	100.0%
<b>Missing Data</b>				

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	1,098	81.1 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Don't Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 224 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0BORS8: S0 Siblings: Sib 8 - brother or sister**

*Location:* 485-489 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -104 , -103 , -9

#### **Question:**

Gender of sibling 08 - brother or sister.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	143	10.6 %	100.0%

#### **Missing Data**

-104 (M) Skipped: No additional siblings

1,169 86.3 %

-103 (M) Skipped: No siblings

31 2.3 %

-9 (M) Don't Know

11 0.8 %

Based upon 143 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0AGEBS8: S0 Siblings: Sib 8 - age**

*Location:* 490-494 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -104 , -103

#### **Question:**

Age of sibling 08.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	124	9.2 %	100.0%

#### **Missing Data**

-999 (M) Dont Know

30 2.2 %

-104 (M) Skipped: No additional siblings

1,169 86.3 %

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-

Based upon 124 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0RESBS8: S0 Siblings: Sib 8 - does this sibling live at subj home address**

*Location:* 495-499 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -104 , -103 , -9

**Question:**

Sibling 08 lives at subj home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	152	11.2 %	100.0%

*Missing Data*

-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	1,169	86.3 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Don't Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 152 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0BORS9: S0 Siblings: Sib 9 - brother or sister**

*Location:* 500-504 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -104 , -103 , -9

**Question:**

Gender of sibling 09 - brother or sister.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	83	6.1 %	100.0%

*Missing Data*

-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	1,229	90.8 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Don't Know	11	0.8 %	-

Based upon 83 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

- Study 29961 -

### S0AGEBS9: S0 Siblings: Sib 9 - age

*Location:* 505-509 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -104 , -103

#### Question:

Age of sibling 09.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	66	4.9 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	28	2.1 %	-
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	1,229	90.8 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-

Based upon 66 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0RESBS9: S0 Siblings: Sib 9 - does this sibling live at subj home address

*Location:* 510-514 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -104 , -103 , -9

#### Question:

Sibling 09 lives at subj home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	92	6.8 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	1,229	90.8 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Don't Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 92 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0BORS10: S0 Siblings: Sib 10 - brother or sister

*Location:* 515-519 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -104 , -103 , -9

**Question:**

Gender of sibling 10 - brother or sister.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	55	4.1 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	1,258	92.9 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Don't Know	10	0.7 %	-

Based upon 55 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0AGEB10: S0 Siblings: Sib 10 - age**

*Location:* 520-524 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -104 , -103

**Question:**

Age of sibling 10.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	40	3.0 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	25	1.8 %	-
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	1,258	92.9 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-

Based upon 40 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0RESB10: S0 Siblings: Sib 10 - does this sibling live at subj home address**

*Location:* 525-529 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -104 , -103 , -9

**Question:**

Sibling 10 lives at subj home address.

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	63	4.7 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional siblings	1,258	92.9 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No siblings	31	2.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Don't Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 63 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0BRONUM: S0 Siblings: Number of Brothers**

*Location:* 530-531 (width: 2; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

How many brothers do you have?

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

<i>Value</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	200	14.8 %	14.8%
1	335	24.7 %	24.7%
2	351	25.9 %	25.9%
3	221	16.3 %	16.3%
4	133	9.8 %	9.8%
5	65	4.8 %	4.8%
6	26	1.9 %	1.9%
7	16	1.2 %	1.2%
8	6	0.4 %	0.4%
9	1	0.1 %	0.1%

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

**S0SISNUM: S0 Siblings: Number of Sisters**

*Location:* 532-533 (width: 2; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

How many sisters do you have?

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

<i>Value</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	211	15.6 %	15.6%
1	380	28.1 %	28.1%
2	349	25.8 %	25.8%
3	212	15.7 %	15.7%
4	119	8.8 %	8.8%
5	48	3.5 %	3.5%
6	21	1.6 %	1.6%
7	9	0.7 %	0.7%
8	3	0.2 %	0.2%
9	1	0.1 %	0.1%
10	1	0.1 %	0.1%

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

**S0UNKNUM: S0 Siblings: Number of siblings (gender unknown) the subject has**

*Location:* 534-535 (*width:* 2; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

How many siblings do you have where you do not know the gender?

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

<i>Value</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	1,340	99.0 %	99.0%
1	2	0.1 %	0.1%
3	1	0.1 %	0.1%
4	4	0.3 %	0.3%
6	4	0.3 %	0.3%
7	1	0.1 %	0.1%
8	1	0.1 %	0.1%
9	1	0.1 %	0.1%

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

**S0RESBSNUM: S0 Siblings: Number of Siblings that live at subject's home address**

*Location:* 536-537 (*width:* 2; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

- Study 29961 -

**Question:**

How many of your siblings live at your address?

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

<i>Value</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	345	25.5 %	25.5%
1	359	26.5 %	26.5%
2	311	23.0 %	23.0%
3	171	12.6 %	12.6%
4	93	6.9 %	6.9%
5	41	3.0 %	3.0%
6	15	1.1 %	1.1%
7	9	0.7 %	0.7%
8	4	0.3 %	0.3%
9	3	0.2 %	0.2%
10	3	0.2 %	0.2%

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

**S0SIBSAMEYNG: S0 Siblings: Number of siblings that are the same age or younger than the subject**

*Location:* 538-539 (*width:* 2; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

How many of your siblings are the same age or younger as you?

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

<i>Value</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	293	21.6 %	21.6%
1	312	23.0 %	23.0%
2	273	20.2 %	20.2%
3	198	14.6 %	14.6%
4	121	8.9 %	8.9%
5	72	5.3 %	5.3%
6	41	3.0 %	3.0%
7	23	1.7 %	1.7%
8	15	1.1 %	1.1%
9	5	0.4 %	0.4%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
10	1	0.1 %	0.1%

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

**S0SIBOLDER: S0 Siblings: Number of siblings that are older than the subject**

*Location:* 540-541 (*width:* 2; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

How many of your siblings are older than you?

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

<i>Value</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	366	27.0 %	27.0%
1	369	27.3 %	27.3%
2	243	17.9 %	17.9%
3	177	13.1 %	13.1%
4	79	5.8 %	5.8%
5	50	3.7 %	3.7%
6	45	3.3 %	3.3%
7	15	1.1 %	1.1%
8	8	0.6 %	0.6%
9	2	0.1 %	0.1%

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

**S0SIBUNK: S0 Siblings: Number of siblings of unknown age**

*Location:* 542-543 (*width:* 2; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

How many of your siblings do you not know if they are older or younger than you?

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

<i>Value</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	1,215	89.7 %	89.7%
1	60	4.4 %	4.4%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
2	36	2.7 %	2.7%
3	15	1.1 %	1.1%
4	11	0.8 %	0.8%
5	4	0.3 %	0.3%
6	9	0.7 %	0.7%
7	2	0.1 %	0.1%
8	1	0.1 %	0.1%
9	1	0.1 %	0.1%

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

**S0REL197: S0 FamCrim: Anyone in your family ever been arrested**

*Location:* 544-547 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Anyone in your family ever been arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	292	21.6 %	21.6%
1	Yes	1,058	78.1 %	78.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL198: S0 FamCrim: Anyone in family been in jail or prison**

*Location:* 548-551 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Anyone in family been in jail or prison.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	159	11.7 %	15.1%
1	Yes	892	65.9 %	84.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family arrested/jailed	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members arrested/jailed	292	21.6 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	7	0.5 %	-

Based upon 1,051 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL199: S0 FamCrim: How many family members arrested OR jailed**

*Location:* 552-555 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -106 , -105 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

How many family members arrested OR jailed?

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	-	404	29.8 %	38.3%
2	-	271	20.0 %	25.7%
3	-	154	11.4 %	14.6%
4	-	83	6.1 %	7.9%
5	-	49	3.6 %	4.6%
6	6 or More	94	6.9 %	8.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family arrested/jailed	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members arrested/jailed	292	21.6 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,055 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0RELFM: S0 FamCrim: Rel 1 - Relationship of relative arrested/jailed**

*Location:* 556-559 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105

**Question:**

Relationship of the relative 1 that arrested/jailed

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	539	39.8 %	51.1%
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	345	25.5 %	32.7%
3	Significant Other (spouse, boyfriend/girlfriend)	1	0.1 %	0.1%
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	149	11.0 %	14.1%
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	17	1.3 %	1.6%
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	4	0.3 %	0.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-108 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-

Based upon 1,055 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DISPFM: S0 FamCrim: Rel 1 - Was relative jailed or only arrested**

*Location:* 560-563 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether relative 1 was jailed or only arrested

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Arrested only	227	16.8 %	21.6%
2	Arrested and Jailed	825	60.9 %	78.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,052 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PRESFM: S0 FamCrim: Rel 1 - Is relative arrested/jailed currently in jail**

*Location:* 564-567 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

- Study 29961 -

Whether the relative 1 that is arrested/jailed is currently in jail

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	793	58.6 %	76.8%
1	Yes	239	17.7 %	23.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	23	1.7 %	-

Based upon 1,032 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0HOMEFM: S0 FamCrim: Rel 1 - Does relative arrested/jailed live at your home address**

*Location:* 568-571 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether relative 1 that was in a mental hospital lives at subject's home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	613	45.3 %	58.1%
1	Yes	442	32.6 %	41.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-

Based upon 1,055 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0AGEFM: S0 FamCrim: Rel 1 - Age of relative arrested/jailed**

*Location:* 572-575 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -108 , -107 , -106 , -105

**Question:**

- Study 29961 -

Age of relative 1 that arrested/jailed

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	14 and Younger	11	0.8 %	1.1%
2	15 - 17	74	5.5 %	7.5%
3	18 - 25	247	18.2 %	25.0%
4	26 - 35	208	15.4 %	21.1%
5	36 - 45	343	25.3 %	34.8%
6	46 - 55	82	6.1 %	8.3%
7	56 or Older	22	1.6 %	2.2%

*Missing Data*

-999 (M)	Dont Know	49	3.6 %	-
-997 (M)	Relative is deceased	19	1.4 %	-
-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-

Based upon 987 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0BIRFM: S0 FamCrim: Rel 1 - Is relative arrested/jailed a birth relative**

*Location:* 576-579 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Is relative 1 that was arrested/jailed is a birth relative?

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	43	3.2 %	4.1%
1	Yes	1,012	74.7 %	95.9%

*Missing Data*

-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-

Based upon 1,055 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0ALCHFM: S0 FamCrim: Rel 1 - Does relative arrested/jailed have problems with drugs/alcohol**

- Study 29961 -

*Location:* 580-583 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Does the relative 1 that was arrested/jailed have problems with drugs/alcohol?

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	701	51.8 %	68.7%
1	Yes	320	23.6 %	31.3%

*Missing Data*

-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	34	2.5 %	-

Based upon 1,021 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0RELFM2: S0 FamCrim: Rel 2 - Relationship of relative arrested/jailed**

*Location:* 584-587 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105

**Question:**

Relationship of the relative 2 that arrested/jailed

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	177	13.1 %	27.2%
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	278	20.5 %	42.7%
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	164	12.1 %	25.2%
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	27	2.0 %	4.1%
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	5	0.4 %	0.8%

*Missing Data*

-108 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	404	29.8 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Based upon 651 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DISPF2: S0 FamCrim: Rel 2 - Was relative jailed or only arrested**

*Location:* 588-591 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether relative 2 was jailed or only arrested

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Arrested only	150	11.1 %	23.0%
2	Arrested and Jailed	501	37.0 %	77.0%

*Missing Data*

-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	404	29.8 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-

Based upon 651 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PRESF2: S0 FamCrim: Rel 2 - Is relative arrested/jailed currently in jail**

*Location:* 592-595 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the relative 2 that is arrested/jailed is currently in jail

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	499	36.9 %	77.4%
1	Yes	146	10.8 %	22.6%

*Missing Data*

-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	404	29.8 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-9 (M)	Dont Know	6	0.4 %	-

Based upon 645 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0HOMEF2: S0 FamCrim: Rel 2 - Does relative arrested/jailed live at your home address**

*Location:* 596-599 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether relative 2 that was arrested/jailed lives at subject's home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	410	30.3 %	63.2%
1	Yes	239	17.7 %	36.8%

**Missing Data**

-108 (M) Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed

3 0.2 % -

-107 (M) Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed

404 29.8 % -

-106 (M) Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested

4 0.3 % -

-105 (M) Skipped: No family members ever arrested

292 21.6 % -

-9 (M) Dont Know

2 0.1 % -

Based upon 649 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0AGEFM2: S0 FamCrim: Rel 2 - Age of relative arrested/jailed**

*Location:* 600-603 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -108 , -107 , -106 , -105

**Question:**

Age of relative 2 that arrested/jailed

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	14 and Younger	17	1.3 %	2.8%
2	15 - 17	60	4.4 %	9.9%
3	18 - 25	208	15.4 %	34.3%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
4	26 - 35	159	11.7 %	26.2%
5	36 - 45	125	9.2 %	20.6%
6	46 - 55	25	1.8 %	4.1%
7	56 or Older	13	1.0 %	2.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	34	2.5 %	-
-997 (M)	Relative is deceased	10	0.7 %	-
-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	404	29.8 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-

Based upon 607 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0BIRFM2: S0 FamCrim: Rel 2 - Is relative arrested/jailed a birth relative**

*Location:* 604-607 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Is relative 2 that was arrested/jailed a birth relative?

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	58	4.3 %	8.9%
1	Yes	593	43.8 %	91.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	404	29.8 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-

Based upon 651 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0ALCHF2: S0 FamCrim: Rel 2 - Does relative arrested/jailed have problems with drugs/alcohol**

*Location:* 608-611 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Does the relative 2 that was arrested/jailed have problems with drugs/alcohol?

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	438	32.3 %	68.7%
1	Yes	200	14.8 %	31.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	404	29.8 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	13	1.0 %	-

Based upon 638 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### S0RELFM3: S0 FamCrim: Rel 3 - Relationship of relative arrested/jailed

*Location:* 612-615 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105

#### Question:

Relationship of relative 3 arrested/jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	41	3.0 %	10.8%
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	142	10.5 %	37.4%
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	168	12.4 %	44.2%
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	24	1.8 %	6.3%
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	5	0.4 %	1.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-108 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	675	49.9 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-

Based upon 380 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### S0DISPF3: S0 FamCrim: Rel 3 - Was relative jailed or only arrested

- Study 29961 -

*Location:* 616-619 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Was relative 3 jailed or only arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Arrested only	85	6.3 %	22.4%
2	Arrested and Jailed	294	21.7 %	77.6%

*Missing Data*

-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	675	49.9 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 379 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PRESF3: S0 FamCrim: Rel 3 - Is relative arrested/jailed currently in jail**

*Location:* 620-623 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Is relative 3 currently in jail.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	282	20.8 %	74.4%
1	Yes	97	7.2 %	25.6%

*Missing Data*

-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	675	49.9 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 379 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

- Study 29961 -

**S0HOMEF3: S0 FamCrim: Rel 3 - Does relative arrested/jailed live at your home address**

*Location:* 624-627 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether relative 3 that was arrested/jailed lives at subjects home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	273	20.2 %	72.0%
1	Yes	106	7.8 %	28.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	675	49.9 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 379 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0AGEFM3: S0 FamCrim: Rel 3 - Age of relative arrested/jailed**

*Location:* 628-631 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -108 , -107 , -106 , -105

**Question:**

Age of relative 3 that was arrested/jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	14 and Younger	18	1.3 %	5.1%
2	15 - 17	35	2.6 %	9.8%
3	18 - 25	124	9.2 %	34.8%
4	26 - 35	91	6.7 %	25.6%
5	36 - 45	67	4.9 %	18.8%
6	46 - 55	11	0.8 %	3.1%
7	56 or Older	10	0.7 %	2.8%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	19	1.4 %	-
-997 (M)	Relative is deceased	5	0.4 %	-
-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	675	49.9 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-

Based upon 356 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0BIRFM3: S0 FamCrim: Rel 3 - Is relative arrested/jailed a birth relative**

*Location:* 632-635 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Is relative 3 that was arrested/jailed a birth relative?

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	31	2.3 %	8.2%
1	Yes	349	25.8 %	91.8%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	675	49.9 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-

Based upon 380 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0ALCHF3: S0 FamCrim: Rel 3 - Does relative arrested/jailed have problems with drugs/alcohol**

*Location:* 636-639 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Does relative 3 have problems with drugs or alcohol.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	238	17.6 %	64.0%
1	Yes	134	9.9 %	36.0%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	675	49.9 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 372 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0RELFM4: S0 FamCrim: Rel 4 - Relationship of relative arrested/jailed**

*Location:* 640-643 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105

**Question:**

Relationship of the relative 4 that was arrested/jailed

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	16	1.2 %	7.1%
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	66	4.9 %	29.2%
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	110	8.1 %	48.7%
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	30	2.2 %	13.3%
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	4	0.3 %	1.8%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-108 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	829	61.2 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-

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

**S0DISPF4: S0 FamCrim: Rel 4 - Was relative jailed or only arrested**

*Location:* 644-647 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Was relative 4 jailed or only arrested

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Arrested only	48	3.5 %	21.2%
2	Arrested and Jailed	178	13.1 %	78.8%

*Missing Data*

-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	829	61.2 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-

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

**S0PRESF4: S0 FamCrim: Rel 4 - Is relative arrested/jailed currently in jail**

*Location:* 648-651 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Is relative 4 currently in jail.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	167	12.3 %	73.9%
1	Yes	59	4.4 %	26.1%

*Missing Data*

-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	829	61.2 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-

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

**S0HOMEOF4: S0 FamCrim: Rel 4 - Does relative arrested/jailed live at your home address**

*Location:* 652-655 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

- Study 29961 -

Whether relative 4 that was arrested/jailed lives at subject's home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	185	13.7 %	81.9%
1	Yes	41	3.0 %	18.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	829	61.2 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-

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

**S0AGEFM4: S0 FamCrim: Rel 4 - Age of relative arrested/jailed**

*Location:* 656-659 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -108 , -107 , -106 , -105

**Question:**

Age of relative 4 that was arrested/jailed

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	14 and Younger	12	0.9 %	5.7%
2	15 - 17	24	1.8 %	11.4%
3	18 - 25	74	5.5 %	35.2%
4	26 - 35	51	3.8 %	24.3%
5	36 - 45	36	2.7 %	17.1%
6	46 - 55	5	0.4 %	2.4%
7	56 or Older	8	0.6 %	3.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	13	1.0 %	-
-998 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-
-997 (M)	Relative is deceased	2	0.1 %	-
-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	829	61.2 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-

Based upon 210 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0BIRFM4: S0 FamCrim: Rel 4 - Is relative arrested/jailed a birth relative**

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Is relative 4 that was arrested/jailed a birth relative.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	19	1.4 %	8.4%
1	Yes	207	15.3 %	91.6%

**Missing Data**

-108 (M) Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed

3 0.2 %

-107 (M) Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed

829 61.2 %

-106 (M) Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested

4 0.3 %

-105 (M) Skipped: No family members ever arrested

292 21.6 %

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

**S0ALCHF4: S0 FamCrim: Rel 4 - Does relative arrested/jailed have problems with drugs/alcohol**

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Does relative 4 that was arrested/jailed have problems with drugs or alcohol.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	136	10.0 %	61.5%
1	Yes	85	6.3 %	38.5%

**Missing Data**

-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
----------	--	---	-------	---

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	829	61.2 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	5	0.4 %	-

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

**S0RELFM5: S0 FamCrim: Rel 5 - Relationship of relative arrested/jailed**

*Location:* 668-671 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105

**Question:**

Relationship of the relative 5 that was arrested/jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	13	1.0 %	9.1%
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	27	2.0 %	18.9%
3	Significant Other (spouse, boyfriend/girlfriend)	1	0.1 %	0.7%
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	80	5.9 %	55.9%
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	21	1.6 %	14.7%
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	1	0.1 %	0.7%

**Missing Data**

-108 (M) Skipped: Subject DK how many family members arrested/jailed

3

0.2 %

-

-107 (M) Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed

912

67.4 %

-

-106 (M) Skipped: Subject DK if any family members ever arrested

4

0.3 %

-

-105 (M) Skipped: No family members ever arrested

292

21.6 %

-

Based upon 143 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DISPF5: S0 FamCrim: Rel 5 - Was relative jailed or only arrested**

*Location:* 672-675 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Was relative 5 jailed or only arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Arrested only	25	1.8 %	17.5%
2	Arrested and Jailed	118	8.7 %	82.5%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	912	67.4 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-

Based upon 143 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PRESF5: S0 FamCrim: Rel 5 - Is relative arrested/jailed currently in jail**

*Location:* 676-679 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Is relative 5 currently in jail.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	99	7.3 %	70.2%
1	Yes	42	3.1 %	29.8%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	912	67.4 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 141 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0HOMEF5: S0 FamCrim: Rel 5 - Does relative arrested/jailed live at your home address**

*Location:* 680-683 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether relative 5 that was arrested/jailed lives at subject's home address.

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	126	9.3 %	88.1%
1	Yes	17	1.3 %	11.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	912	67.4 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-

Based upon 143 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0AGEFM5: S0 FamCrim: Rel 5 - Age of relative arrested/jailed**

*Location:* 684-687 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -108 , -107 , -106 , -105

**Question:**

Age of relative 5 that was arrested/jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	14 and Younger	5	0.4 %	3.7%
2	15 - 17	12	0.9 %	8.8%
3	18 - 25	48	3.5 %	35.3%
4	26 - 35	33	2.4 %	24.3%
5	36 - 45	27	2.0 %	19.9%
6	46 - 55	7	0.5 %	5.1%
7	56 or Older	4	0.3 %	2.9%

*Missing Data*

-999 (M)	Dont Know	6	0.4 %	-
-997 (M)	Relative is deceased	1	0.1 %	-
-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	912	67.4 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-

Based upon 136 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0BIRFM5: S0 FamCrim: Rel 5 - Is relative arrested/jailed a birth relative**

- Study 29961 -

*Location:* 688-691 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Is relative 5 that was arrested/jailed a birth relative?

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	13	1.0 %	9.1%
1	Yes	130	9.6 %	90.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	912	67.4 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-

Based upon 143 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0ALCHF5: S0 FamCrim: Rel 5 - Does relative arrested/jailed have problems with drugs/alcohol**

*Location:* 692-695 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -108 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Does relative 5 have problems with drugs or alcohol.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	87	6.4 %	61.3%
1	Yes	55	4.1 %	38.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-108 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members arrested/jailed	3	0.2 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: No additional family members arrested/jailed	912	67.4 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family members ever arrested	4	0.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever arrested	292	21.6 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 142 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0CRIMEATH: S0 FamCrim: Any family members arrested/jailed and living at subj home address**

- Study 29961 -

*Location:* 696-699 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -102 , -101 , -100

**Question:**

Marker when any family members that have been arrested and/or jailed also live at the subject's home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No - family member(s) involved arrested/jailed but none live at subj home address	451	33.3 %	42.7%
1	Yes - at least one family member arrested/jailed also lives at subj home address	604	44.6 %	57.3%

*Missing Data*

-102 (M)	Cannot compute: Family arrested/jailed but subj DK number of family members	3	0.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family ever arrested/jailed	4	0.3 %	-
-100 (M)	No family members ever arrested/jailed	292	21.6 %	-

Based upon 1,055 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0FCATH: S0 FamCrim: Number family members arrested/jailed and living at subj home address**

*Location:* 700-703 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -102 , -101 , -100

**Question:**

Count of the number of family members that have been arrested and/or jailed that also live at the subject's home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	451	33.3 %	42.7%
1	-	421	31.1 %	39.9%
2	-	132	9.7 %	12.5%
3	-	44	3.2 %	4.2%
4	-	7	0.5 %	0.7%

*Missing Data*

-102 (M)	Cannot compute: Family arrested/jailed but subj DK number of family members	3	0.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family ever arrested/jailed	4	0.3 %	-
-100 (M)	No family members ever arrested/jailed	292	21.6 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Based upon 1,055 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0CRIMEATH\_REL1: S0 FamCrim: Relationship of fam member 1 if living at subj home address**

*Location:* 704-707 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -105 , -104 , -103 , -102 , -101 , -100

**Question:**

Relationship of family member 1 if living at subj home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	234	17.3 %	52.9%
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	167	12.3 %	37.8%
3	Significant Other (spouse, boyfriend/girlfriend)	1	0.1 %	0.2%
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	34	2.5 %	7.7%
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	4	0.3 %	0.9%
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	2	0.1 %	0.5%
-103 (M)	Not computed: This relative does not live at subject's hom address	613	45.3 %	-
-102 (M)	Cannot compute: Family arrested/jailed but subject DK number of family members	3	0.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family ever arrested/jailed	4	0.3 %	-
-100 (M)	No family members ever arrested/jailed	292	21.6 %	-

Based upon 442 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0CRIMEATH\_REL2: S0 FamCrim: Relationship of fam member 2 if living at subj home address**

*Location:* 708-711 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -105 , -104 , -103 , -102 , -101 , -100

**Question:**

Relationship of family member 2 if living at subj home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	87	6.4 %	36.4%
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	112	8.3 %	46.9%
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	29	2.1 %	12.1%
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	9	0.7 %	3.8%
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	2	0.1 %	0.8%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-105 (M)	Cannot compute: Family member has been arrested/jailed but subject DK if living at home address	2	0.1 %	-
-104 (M)	No additional family members arrested/jailed	404	29.8 %	-
-103 (M)	Not computed: This relative does not live at subject's home address	410	30.3 %	-
-102 (M)	Cannot compute: Family arrested/jailed but subject DK number of family members	3	0.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family ever arrested/jailed	4	0.3 %	-
-100 (M)	No family members ever arrested/jailed	292	21.6 %	-

Based upon 239 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0CRIMEATH\_REL3: S0 FamCrim: Relationship of fam member 3 if living at subj home address**

*Location:* 712-715 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -105 , -104 , -103 , -102 , -101 , -100

**Question:**

Relationship of family member 3 if living at subj home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	17	1.3 %	16.0%
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	57	4.2 %	53.8%
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	25	1.8 %	23.6%
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	4	0.3 %	3.8%
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	3	0.2 %	2.8%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-105 (M)	Cannot compute: Family member has been arrested/jailed but subject DK if living at home address	1	0.1 %	-
-104 (M)	No additional family members arrested/jailed	675	49.9 %	-
-103 (M)	Not computed: This relative does not live at subject's home address	273	20.2 %	-
-102 (M)	Cannot compute: Family arrested/jailed but subject DK number of family members	3	0.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family ever arrested/jailed	4	0.3 %	-
-100 (M)	No family members ever arrested/jailed	292	21.6 %	-

Based upon 106 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0CRIMEATH\_REL4: S0 FamCrim: Relationship of fam member 4 if living at subj home address**

*Location:* 716-719 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -105 , -104 , -103 , -102 , -101 , -100

**Question:**

Relationship of family member 4 if living at subj home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	7	0.5 %	17.1%
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	19	1.4 %	46.3%
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	10	0.7 %	24.4%
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	4	0.3 %	9.8%
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	1	0.1 %	2.4%
-104 (M)	No additional family members arrested/jailed	829	61.2 %	-
-103 (M)	Not computed: This relative does not live at subject's hom address	185	13.7 %	-
-102 (M)	Cannot compute: Family arrested/jailed but subject DK number of family members	3	0.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family ever arrested/jailed	4	0.3 %	-
-100 (M)	No family members ever arrested/jailed	292	21.6 %	-

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

**S0CRIMEATH\_REL5: S0 FamCrim: Relationship of fam member 5 if living at subj home address**

*Location: 720-723 (width: 4; decimal: 0)*

*Variable Type: numeric*

*(Range of) Missing Values (M): -105 , -104 , -103 , -102 , -101 , -100*

**Question:**

Relationship of family member 5 if living at subj home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	3	0.2 %	17.6%
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	5	0.4 %	29.4%
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	7	0.5 %	41.2%
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	1	0.1 %	5.9%
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	1	0.1 %	5.9%
-104 (M)	No additional family members arrested/jailed	912	67.4 %	-
-103 (M)	Not computed: This relative does not live at subject's hom address	126	9.3 %	-
-102 (M)	Cannot compute: Family arrested/jailed but subject DK number of family members	3	0.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family ever arrested/jailed	4	0.3 %	-
-100 (M)	No family members ever arrested/jailed	292	21.6 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Based upon 17 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PCRIMEATH: S0 FamCrim: Proportion family members arrested/jailed and living at subj home address**

*Location:* 724-730 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -106.00 , -102.00 , -101.00 , -100.00

**Question:**

Proportion of family members that have been arrested and/or jailed and also live at the subject's home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0.00	-	451	33.3 %	42.7%
0.20	-	47	3.5 %	4.5%
0.25	-	23	1.7 %	2.2%
0.33	-	46	3.4 %	4.4%
0.40	-	21	1.6 %	2.0%
0.50	-	134	9.9 %	12.7%
0.60	-	17	1.3 %	1.6%
0.67	-	42	3.1 %	4.0%
0.75	-	9	0.7 %	0.9%
0.80	-	3	0.2 %	0.3%
1.00	-	262	19.4 %	24.8%
-102.00 (M)	Cannot compute: Family arrested/jailed but subj DK number of family members	3	0.2 %	-
-101.00 (M)	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family ever arrested/jailed	4	0.3 %	-
-100.00 (M)	No family members ever arrested/jailed	292	21.6 %	-

Based upon 1,055 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0ARRMOM: S0 CharFamily: Biological mother arrested or jailed**

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

A marker when biological mother has been arrested and/or jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	Bio mother not arrested or jailed	1,112	82.1 %	82.1%
1	Bio mother was arrested or jailed	242	17.9 %	17.9%

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

**S0ARRDAD: S0 CharFamily: Biological father arrested or jailed**

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

A marker when biological father has been arrested and/or jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	Bio father not arrested or jailed	879	64.9 %	64.9%
1	Bio father was arrested or jailed	475	35.1 %	35.1%

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

**S0ARRBTH: S0 CharFamily: Both bio mom and dad arrested or jailed**

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

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

A marker when both biological father and mother have been arrested and/or jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	Neither bio parent arrested or jailed	764	56.4 %	56.4%
1	Both bio father and mother were arrested or jailed	127	9.4 %	9.4%
2	Bio mother or bio father arrested, but not both	463	34.2 %	34.2%

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

**S0MOM\_DRUG: S0 CharFamily: Scale mom drug problem**

*Location:* 743-746 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -300 , -200 , -100

**Question:**

A marker indicating if biological mom had a past or current drug problem.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	924	68.2 %	71.7%
1	Yes - drug problem in past	311	23.0 %	24.1%
2	Yes - drug problem currently	53	3.9 %	4.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-300 (M)	Too few values for computation	63	4.7 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,288 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DAD\_DRUG: S0 CharFamily: Scale dad drug problem**

*Location:* 747-750 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -100

**Question:**

A marker indicating if biological dad had a past or current drug problem.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	574	42.4 %	54.1%
1	Yes - drug problem in past	384	28.4 %	36.2%
2	Yes - drug problem currently	103	7.6 %	9.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-300 (M)	Too few values for computation	290	21.4 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,061 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MOMPASTALC: S0 CharFamily: moms past alcohol status**

*Location:* 751-754 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -100 , -9

**Question:**

- Study 29961 -

A marker indicating if biological mom had a past alcohol problem.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	Had no past alcohol problems	1,100	81.2 %	86.4%
1	Had past alcohol problems	173	12.8 %	13.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-300 (M)	Too few values for computation	54	4.0 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	24	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,273 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MOMCURRENTALC: S0 CharFamily: moms current alcohol status**

*Location:* 755-758 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -100 , -9

**Question:**

A marker indicating if biological mom has a current alcohol problem.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	has no current alcohol problems	1,244	91.9 %	97.0%
1	has current alcohol problems	38	2.8 %	3.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-300 (M)	Too few values for computation	41	3.0 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	28	2.1 %	-

Based upon 1,282 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MOMALCSTAT: S0 CharFamily: alcohol status mom**

*Location:* 759-762 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -100 , -9

**Question:**

A marker for presence or absence of both past and current alcohol

- Study 29961 -

problems for biological mom.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	had no past and has no current alcohol problems	1,092	80.6 %	86.3%
1	had past alcohol problems	135	10.0 %	10.7%
2	has current alcohol problems	38	2.8 %	3.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-300 (M)	Too few values for computation	63	4.7 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	23	1.7 %	-

Based upon 1,265 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MOM\_SUBSTANCE: S0 CharFamily: Mother drug or alcoholism problems**

*Location:* 763-766 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -100

**Question:**

A marker for combining past and current drug and alcohol problems for biological mom.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	had no past and has no current drug or alcoholism problems	844	62.3 %	66.2%
1	had past drug or alcoholism problems	351	25.9 %	27.5%
2	has current drug or alcoholism problems	80	5.9 %	6.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-300 (M)	Too few values for computation	76	5.6 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,275 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL231: S0 FamMH: Any family members ever been in mental hospital**

*Location:* 767-770 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

- Study 29961 -

Whether any family members have been in a mental hospital.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	1,156	85.4 %	86.1%
1	Yes	187	13.8 %	13.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	11	0.8 %	-

Based upon 1,343 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0NUM\_MH: S0 CharFamily: Number of family members ever in MH - recoded**

*Location:* 771-774 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9

**Question:**

Number of family members that have been in a mental hospital.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	1,156	85.4 %	86.1%
1	-	151	11.2 %	11.2%
2	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
3	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
4	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
5	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	11	0.8 %	-

Based upon 1,343 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0RELFMH: S0 FamMH: Rel 1 - Relationship of relative in mental hospital**

*Location:* 775-778 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -112 , -110 , -109

**Question:**

Relationship of relative 1 in mental hospital.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	58	4.3 %	31.0%
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	49	3.6 %	26.2%
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	32	2.4 %	17.1%
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	48	3.5 %	25.7%
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK if any family member ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-

Based upon 187 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0PRESF6: S0 FamMH: Rel 1 - Is relative currently in a mental hospital**

*Location:* 779-782 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -112 , -111 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Is relative 1 currently in a mental hospital?

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	169	12.5 %	92.9%
1	Yes	13	1.0 %	7.1%
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	5	0.4 %	-

Based upon 182 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0HOMEF6: S0 FamMH: Rel 1 - Does relative in MH live at your home address**

*Location:* 783-786 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -112 , -111 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether relative 1 that was in a mental hospital lives at subject's home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	118	8.7 %	63.1%
1	Yes	69	5.1 %	36.9%
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-

Based upon 187 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0AGEFMH: S0 FamMH: Rel 1 - Age of relative in MH**

*Location:* 787-790 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -112 , -111 , -110 , -109

**Question:**

Age of relative 1 that was in a mental hospital.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	14 and Younger	5	0.4 %	3.0%
2	15 - 17	17	1.3 %	10.2%
3	18 - 25	40	3.0 %	24.0%
4	26 - 35	23	1.7 %	13.8%
5	36 - 45	53	3.9 %	31.7%
6	46 - 55	19	1.4 %	11.4%
7	56 or Older	10	0.7 %	6.0%

*Missing Data*

-999 (M)	Dont Know	12	0.9 %	-
-998 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-
-997 (M)	Relative is deceased	7	0.5 %	-
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-

Based upon 167 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0BIRFMH: S0 FamMH: Rel 1 - Is relative in MH a birth relative**

*Location:* 791-794 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -112 , -111 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Is relative 1 that was in a mental hospital a birth relative?

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	7	0.5 %	3.7%
1	Yes	180	13.3 %	96.3%
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-

Based upon 187 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0RELFM6: S0 FamMH: Rel 2 - Relationship of relative in mental hospital**

*Location:* 795-798 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -112 , -110 , -109

**Question:**

Relationship of relative 2 in mental hospital.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	3	0.2 %	8.3%
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	12	0.9 %	33.3%
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	8	0.6 %	22.2%
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	11	0.8 %	30.6%
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	2	0.1 %	5.6%

**Missing Data**

-112 (M) Skipped: Subject DK how many family members ever in MH

151 11.2 %

-110 (M) Skipped: Subject DK if any family member ever in MH

11 0.8 %

-109 (M) Skipped: No family members ever in MH

1,156 85.4 %

Based upon 36 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PRESF7: S0 FamMH: Rel 2 - Is relative currently in a mental hospital**

*Location:* 799-802 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -112 , -111 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Is relative 2 currently in a mental hospital.

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	34	2.5 %	97.1%
1	Yes	1	0.1 %	2.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-112 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members ever in MH	151	11.2 %	-
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

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

**S0HOMEF7: S0 FamMH: Rel 2 - Does relative in MH live at your home address**

*Location:* 803-806 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -112 , -111 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether relative 2 that was in a mental hospital lives at subject's home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	32	2.4 %	88.9%
1	Yes	4	0.3 %	11.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-112 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members ever in MH	151	11.2 %	-
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-

Based upon 36 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0AGEFM6: S0 FamMH: Rel 2 - Age of relative in MH**

*Location:* 807-810 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -112 , -111 , -110 , -109

**Question:**

Age of relative 2 that was in a mental hospital.

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	14 and Younger	1	0.1 %	3.1%
2	15 - 17	2	0.1 %	6.2%
3	18 - 25	15	1.1 %	46.9%
4	26 - 35	5	0.4 %	15.6%
5	36 - 45	6	0.4 %	18.8%
7	56 or Older	3	0.2 %	9.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-
-997 (M)	Relative is deceased	3	0.2 %	-
-112 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members ever in MH	151	11.2 %	-
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-

Based upon 32 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0BIRFM6: S0 FamMH: Rel 2 - Is relative in MH a birth relative**

*Location:* 811-814 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -112 , -111 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Is relative 2 that was in a mental hospital a birth relative?

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	2	0.1 %	5.6%
1	Yes	34	2.5 %	94.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-112 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members ever in MH	151	11.2 %	-
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-

Based upon 36 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0RELFM7: S0 FamMH: Rel 3 - Relationship of relative in mental hospital**

*Location:* 815-818 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -112 , -110 , -109

- Study 29961 -

**Question:**

Relationship of relative 3 in mental hospital.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	1	0.1 %	10.0%
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	4	0.3 %	40.0%
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	2	0.1 %	20.0%
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	3	0.2 %	30.0%

*Missing Data*

-112 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK how many family members ever in MH	177	13.1 %	-
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK if any family member ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-

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

**S0PRESF8: S0 FamMH: Rel 3 - Is relative currently in a mental hospital**

*Location:* 819-822 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -112 , -111 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Is relative 3 currently in a mental hospital.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	9	0.7 %	90.0%
1	Yes	1	0.1 %	10.0%

*Missing Data*

-112 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members ever in MH	177	13.1 %	-
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-

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

**S0HOMEF8: S0 FamMH: Rel 3 - Does relative in MH live at your home address**

*Location:* 823-826 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -112 , -111 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

- Study 29961 -

**Question:**

Whether relative 3 that was in a mental hospital lives at subject's home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	9	0.7 %	90.0%
1	Yes	1	0.1 %	10.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-112 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members ever in MH	177	13.1 %	-
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-

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

**S0AGEFM7: S0 FamMH: Rel 3 - Age of relative in MH**

*Location:* 827-830 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -112 , -111 , -110 , -109

**Question:**

Age of relative 3 that was in a mental hospital.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
3	18 - 25	4	0.3 %	40.0%
4	26 - 35	4	0.3 %	40.0%
5	36 - 45	2	0.1 %	20.0%
-112 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members ever in MH	177	13.1 %	-
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-

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

**S0BIRFM7: S0 FamMH: Rel 3 - Is relative in MH a birth relative**

*Location:* 831-834 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -112 , -111 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

- Study 29961 -

Is relative 3 that was in a mental hospital a birth relative.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Yes	10	0.7 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-112 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members ever in MH	177	13.1 %	-
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-

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

**S0RELFM8: S0 FamMH: Rel 4 - Relationship of relative in mental hospital**

*Location:* 835-838 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -112 , -110 , -109

**Question:**

Relationship of relative 4 in mental hospital.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	1	0.1 %	33.3%
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	1	0.1 %	33.3%
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	1	0.1 %	33.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-112 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK how many family members ever in MH	184	13.6 %	-
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK if any family member ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-

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

**S0PRESF9: S0 FamMH: Rel 4 - Is relative currently in a mental hospital**

*Location:* 839-842 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -112 , -111 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Is relative 4 currently in a mental hospital.

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	3	0.2 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-112 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members ever in MH	184	13.6 %	-
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-

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

**S0HOMEF9: S0 FamMH: Rel 4 - Does relative in MH live at your home address**

*Location:* 843-846 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -112 , -111 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether relative 4 that was in a mental hospital lives at subject's home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	3	0.2 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-112 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members ever in MH	184	13.6 %	-
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-

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

**S0AGEFM8: S0 FamMH: Rel 4 - Age of relative in MH**

*Location:* 847-850 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -112 , -111 , -110 , -109

**Question:**

Age of relative 4 that was in a mental hospital.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
3	18 - 25	1	0.1 %	50.0%
5	36 - 45	1	0.1 %	50.0%
-997 (M)	Relative is deceased	1	0.1 %	-
-112 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members ever in MH	184	13.6 %	-
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-

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

**S0BIRFM8: S0 FamMH: Rel 4 - Is relative in MH a birth relative**

*Location:* 851-854 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -112 , -111 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Is relative 4 that was in a mental hospital a birth relative?

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Yes	3	0.2 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-112 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members ever in MH	184	13.6 %	-
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-

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

**S0RELFM9: S0 FamMH: Rel 5 - Relationship of relative in mental hospital**

*Location:* 855-858 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -112 , -110 , -109

**Question:**

Relationship of relative 5 in mental hospital.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	1	0.1 %	100.0%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-112 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK how many family members ever in MH	186	13.7 %	-
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK if any family member ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-

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

**S0PRES10: S0 FamMH: Rel 5 - Is relative currently in a mental hospital**

*Location:* 859-862 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -112 , -111 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Is relative 5 currently in a mental hospital.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1	0.1 %	100.0%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-112 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members ever in MH	186	13.7 %	-
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-

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

**S0HOME10: S0 FamMH: Rel 5 - Does relative in MH live at your home address**

*Location:* 863-866 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -112 , -111 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether relative 5 that was in a mental hospital lives at subject's home address.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1	0.1 %	100.0%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-112 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members ever in MH	186	13.7 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-

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

**S0AGEFM9: S0 FamMH: Rel 5 - Age of relative in MH**

*Location:* 867-870 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -112 , -111 , -110 , -109

**Question:**

Age of relative 5 that was in a mental hospital.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
5	36 - 45	1	0.1 %	100.0%
-112 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members ever in MH	186	13.7 %	-
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-

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

**S0BIRFM9: S0 FamMH: Rel 5 - Is relative in MH a birth relative**

*Location:* 871-874 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -112 , -111 , -110 , -109 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Is relative 5 that was in a mental hospital a birth relative.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Yes	1	0.1 %	100.0%

**Missing Data**

-112 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK how many family members ever in MH	186	13.7 %	-
-110 (M)	Skipped: Subj DK if any family ever in MH	11	0.8 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: No family members ever in MH	1,156	85.4 %	-

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

- Study 29961 -

**S0DAD\_MH: S0 CharFamily: Biological father has been in mental hospital**

*Location:* 875-878 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9

**Question:**

A marker when biological father has been in a mental hospital.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,324	97.8 %	98.6%
1	Yes	19	1.4 %	1.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	11	0.8 %	-

Based upon 1,343 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MOM\_MH: S0 CharFamily: Biological mother has been in mental hospital**

*Location:* 879-882 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9

**Question:**

A marker when biological mother has been in a mental hospital.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,303	96.2 %	97.0%
1	Yes	40	3.0 %	3.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	11	0.8 %	-

Based upon 1,343 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MHBIOPAR: S0 CharFamily: Bio parent ever been in mental hospital**

*Location:* 883-886 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

A marker when either biological mother or father has been in a mental hospital.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	Neither parent	1,285	94.9 %	95.7%
1	Mom or dad	57	4.2 %	4.2%
2	Both parents	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-9 (M)	Dont Know MH status of either parent	11	0.8 %	-

Based upon 1,343 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### S0REL253: S0 CharFriends: Number of close friends

Location: 887-890 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -99 , -98

**Question:**

Number of close friends the subject reports having.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	49	3.6 %	3.6%
1	-	231	17.1 %	17.1%
2	-	294	21.7 %	21.7%
3	-	248	18.3 %	18.3%
4	-	141	10.4 %	10.4%
5	-	109	8.1 %	8.1%
6	-	49	3.6 %	3.6%
7	-	38	2.8 %	2.8%
8	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
9	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
10	-	56	4.1 %	4.1%
11	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
12	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
13	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
15	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
16	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
17	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
19	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
22	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
30	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
35	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
40	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
50	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
52	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
60	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
95	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
-98 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0AGEFR: S0 CharFriends: Friend 1 - age**

*Location:* 891-894 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -102 , -101

**Question:**

Age of Friend 1.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
6	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
11	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
12	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
13	-	24	1.8 %	1.9%
14	-	97	7.2 %	7.5%
15	-	191	14.1 %	14.7%
16	-	291	21.5 %	22.4%
17	-	237	17.5 %	18.3%
18	-	187	13.8 %	14.4%
19	-	81	6.0 %	6.2%
20	-	48	3.5 %	3.7%
21	-	32	2.4 %	2.5%
22	-	18	1.3 %	1.4%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
23	-	14	1.0 %	1.1%
24	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
25	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
26	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
27	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
28	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
29	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
30	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
31	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
32	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
33	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
34	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
35	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
36	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
37	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
38	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
39	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
40	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
41	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
43	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
47	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
48	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
51	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
55	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
58	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
59	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
60	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
68	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
70	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
74	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

**Missing Data**

-999 (M)	Dont Know	4	0.3 %	-
-997 (M)	Friend is deceased	3	0.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero friends	50	3.7 %	-

Based upon 1,297 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0ARRFR: S0 CharFriends: Friend 1 - ever arrested**

*Location:* 895-898 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Marker if Friend 1 was ever arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	692	51.1 %	53.5%
1	Yes	601	44.4 %	46.5%
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero friends	50	3.7 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	10	0.7 %	-
-8 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,293 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0JAIFR: S0 CharFriends: Friend 1 - ever in jail**

*Location:* 899-902 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -103 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Marker if friend 1 was ever in jail.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	231	17.1 %	38.6%
1	Yes	368	27.2 %	61.4%

  

Missing Data				
-103 (M)	Skipped: Friend was never arrested	703	51.9 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero friends	50	3.7 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 599 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0GENFR: S0 CharFriends: Friend 1 - gender**

*Location:* 903-906 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Gender of friend 1.

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Male	966	71.3 %	74.1%
2	Female	338	25.0 %	25.9%
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero friends	50	3.7 %	-

Based upon 1,304 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MHOSFR: S0 CharFriends: Friend 1 - ever in a mental hosp**

*Location:* 907-910 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Marker if friend 1 was ever in a mental hospital.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,277	94.3 %	98.5%
1	Yes	20	1.5 %	1.5%
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero friends	50	3.7 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	7	0.5 %	-

Based upon 1,297 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0CONTFR: S0 CharFriends: Friend 1 - frequency of contact**

*Location:* 911-914 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Frequency of contact with friend 1.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Daily	947	69.9 %	72.6%
2	3 - 6 times per week	156	11.5 %	12.0%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
3	2 times per week	55	4.1 %	4.2%
4	One time per week	50	3.7 %	3.8%
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	22	1.6 %	1.7%
6	1 time per month	24	1.8 %	1.8%
7	Less than monthly	50	3.7 %	3.8%
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero friends	50	3.7 %	-

Based upon 1,304 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0AGEFR2: S0 CharFriends: Friend 2 - age**

*Location:* 915-918 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -102 , -101

**Question:**

Age of Friend 2.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
5	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
6	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
7	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
9	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
12	-	9	0.7 %	0.8%
13	-	25	1.8 %	2.3%
14	-	61	4.5 %	5.7%
15	-	159	11.7 %	14.8%
16	-	234	17.3 %	21.8%
17	-	200	14.8 %	18.7%
18	-	129	9.5 %	12.0%
19	-	78	5.8 %	7.3%
20	-	40	3.0 %	3.7%
21	-	26	1.9 %	2.4%
22	-	15	1.1 %	1.4%
23	-	13	1.0 %	1.2%
24	-	10	0.7 %	0.9%
25	-	11	0.8 %	1.0%
26	-	7	0.5 %	0.7%
27	-	8	0.6 %	0.7%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
28	-	3	0.2 %	0.3%
29	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
30	-	6	0.4 %	0.6%
31	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
32	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
33	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
34	-	5	0.4 %	0.5%
38	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
39	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
40	-	5	0.4 %	0.5%
41	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
42	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
45	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
46	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
47	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
49	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
62	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
63	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
68	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: No additional friends	231	17.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero friends	50	3.7 %	-

Based upon 1,071 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0ARRFR2: S0 CharFriends: Friend 2 - ever arrested**

*Location:* 919-922 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Marker if Friend 2 was ever arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	577	42.6 %	54.2%
1	Yes	488	36.0 %	45.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-102 (M)	Skipped: No additional friends	231	17.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero friends	50	3.7 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	7	0.5 %	-
-8 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,065 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0JAIFR2: S0 CharFriends: Friend 2 - ever in jail**

*Location:* 923-926 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -103 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Marker if friend 2 was ever in jail.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	179	13.2 %	36.8%
1	Yes	307	22.7 %	63.2%

**Missing Data**

-103 (M) Skipped: Friend was never arrested

-102 (M) Skipped: No additional friends

-101 (M) Skipped: Subject has zero friends

-9 (M) Dont Know

Based upon 486 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0GENFR2: S0 CharFriends: Friend 2 - gender**

*Location:* 927-930 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Gender of friend 2.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Male	831	61.4 %	77.4%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2	Female	242	17.9 %	22.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-102 (M)	Skipped: No additional friends	231	17.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero friends	50	3.7 %	-

Based upon 1,073 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MHOSF2: S0 CharFriends: Friend 2 - ever in a mental hosp**

*Location:* 931-934 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Marker if friend 2 was ever in a mental hospital.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,051	77.6 %	98.4%
1	Yes	17	1.3 %	1.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-102 (M)	Skipped: No additional friends	231	17.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero friends	50	3.7 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	5	0.4 %	-

Based upon 1,068 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0CONTF2: S0 CharFriends: Friend 2 - frequency of contact**

*Location:* 935-938 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Frequency of contact with friend 2.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Daily	696	51.4 %	64.9%
2	3 - 6 times per week	171	12.6 %	15.9%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
3	2 times per week	60	4.4 %	5.6%
4	One time per week	60	4.4 %	5.6%
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	24	1.8 %	2.2%
6	1 time per month	28	2.1 %	2.6%
7	Less than monthly	34	2.5 %	3.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-102 (M)	Skipped: No additional friends	231	17.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero friends	50	3.7 %	-

Based upon 1,073 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0AGEFR3: S0 CharFriends: Friend 3 - age**

*Location:* 939-942 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -102 , -101

**Question:**

Age of Friend 3.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
6	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
9	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
12	-	9	0.7 %	1.2%
13	-	9	0.7 %	1.2%
14	-	71	5.2 %	9.1%
15	-	96	7.1 %	12.4%
16	-	153	11.3 %	19.7%
17	-	126	9.3 %	16.2%
18	-	101	7.5 %	13.0%
19	-	57	4.2 %	7.3%
20	-	41	3.0 %	5.3%
21	-	22	1.6 %	2.8%
22	-	16	1.2 %	2.1%
23	-	10	0.7 %	1.3%
24	-	9	0.7 %	1.2%
25	-	6	0.4 %	0.8%
26	-	8	0.6 %	1.0%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
27	-	3	0.2 %	0.4%
28	-	5	0.4 %	0.6%
31	-	4	0.3 %	0.5%
32	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
33	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
35	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
36	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
37	-	5	0.4 %	0.6%
38	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
39	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
40	-	3	0.2 %	0.4%
41	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
42	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
43	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
49	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
54	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
59	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
63	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
72	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

**Missing Data**

-999 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: No additional friends	525	38.8 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero friends	50	3.7 %	-

Based upon 777 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0ARRFR3: S0 CharFriends: Friend 3 - ever arrested**

*Location:* 943-946 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Marker if Friend 3 was ever arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	416	30.7 %	53.9%
1	Yes	356	26.3 %	46.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-102 (M)	Skipped: No additional friends	525	38.8 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero friends	50	3.7 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	6	0.4 %	-
-8 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 772 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0JAIFR3: S0 CharFriends: Friend 3 - ever in jail**

*Location:* 947-950 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -103 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Marker if friend 3 was ever in jail.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	127	9.4 %	35.8%
1	Yes	228	16.8 %	64.2%

**Missing Data**

-103 (M) Skipped: Friend was never arrested

423 31.2 % -

-102 (M) Skipped: No additional friends

525 38.8 % -

-101 (M) Skipped: Subject has zero friends

50 3.7 % -

-9 (M) Dont Know

1 0.1 % -

Based upon 355 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0GENFR3: S0 CharFriends: Friend 3 - gender**

*Location:* 951-954 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Gender of friend 3.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Male	573	42.3 %	73.6%
2	Female	206	15.2 %	26.4%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-102 (M)	Skipped: No additional friends	525	38.8 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero friends	50	3.7 %	-

Based upon 779 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MHOSF3: S0 CharFriends: Friend 3 - ever in a mental hosp**

*Location:* 955-958 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Marker if friend 3 was ever in a mental hospital.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	757	55.9 %	97.9%
1	Yes	16	1.2 %	2.1%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-102 (M)	Skipped: No additional friends	525	38.8 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero friends	50	3.7 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	6	0.4 %	-

Based upon 773 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0CONTF3: S0 CharFriends: Friend 3 - frequency of contact**

*Location:* 959-962 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Frequency of contact with friend 3.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Daily	479	35.4 %	61.5%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2	3 - 6 times per week	118	8.7 %	15.1%
3	2 times per week	65	4.8 %	8.3%
4	One time per week	37	2.7 %	4.7%
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	16	1.2 %	2.1%
6	1 time per month	26	1.9 %	3.3%
7	Less than monthly	38	2.8 %	4.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-102 (M)	Skipped: No additional friends	525	38.8 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero friends	50	3.7 %	-

Based upon 779 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0AGEFR4: S0 CharFriends: Friend 4 - age**

*Location:* 963-966 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -102 , -101

**Question:**

Age of Friend 4.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
8	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
9	-	2	0.1 %	0.4%
11	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
12	-	3	0.2 %	0.6%
13	-	6	0.4 %	1.1%
14	-	43	3.2 %	8.1%
15	-	84	6.2 %	15.8%
16	-	105	7.8 %	19.8%
17	-	83	6.1 %	15.6%
18	-	62	4.6 %	11.7%
19	-	37	2.7 %	7.0%
20	-	27	2.0 %	5.1%
21	-	16	1.2 %	3.0%
22	-	10	0.7 %	1.9%
23	-	7	0.5 %	1.3%
24	-	9	0.7 %	1.7%
25	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
26	-	5	0.4 %	0.9%
27	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
28	-	3	0.2 %	0.6%
29	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
30	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
31	-	3	0.2 %	0.6%
32	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
33	-	2	0.1 %	0.4%
34	-	2	0.1 %	0.4%
35	-	2	0.1 %	0.4%
36	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
38	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
39	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
40	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
41	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
42	-	2	0.1 %	0.4%
52	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
53	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
56	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
57	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
58	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
59	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
-102 (M)	Skipped: No additional friends	773	57.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero friends	50	3.7 %	-

Based upon 531 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0ARRFR4: S0 CharFriends: Friend 4 - ever arrested**

*Location:* 967-970 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Marker if Friend 4 was ever arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	293	21.6 %	55.4%
1	Yes	236	17.4 %	44.6%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-102 (M)	Skipped: No additional friends	773	57.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero friends	50	3.7 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 529 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0JAIFR4: S0 CharFriends: Friend 4 - ever in jail**

*Location:* 971-974 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -103 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Marker if friend 4 was ever in jail.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	82	6.1 %	34.9%
1	Yes	153	11.3 %	65.1%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-103 (M)	Skipped: Friend was never arrested	295	21.8 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: No additional friends	773	57.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero friends	50	3.7 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 235 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0GENFR4: S0 CharFriends: Friend 4 - gender**

*Location:* 975-978 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Gender of friend 4.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Male	385	28.4 %	72.5%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2	Female	146	10.8 %	27.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-102 (M)	Skipped: No additional friends	773	57.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero friends	50	3.7 %	-

Based upon 531 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MHOSF4: S0 CharFriends: Friend 4 - ever in a mental hosp**

*Location:* 979-982 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Marker if friend 4 was ever in a mental hospital.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	517	38.2 %	97.5%
1	Yes	13	1.0 %	2.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-102 (M)	Skipped: No additional friends	773	57.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero friends	50	3.7 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 530 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0CONTF4: S0 CharFriends: Friend 4 - frequency of contact**

*Location:* 983-986 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Frequency of contact with friend 4.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Daily	315	23.3 %	59.3%
2	3 - 6 times per week	87	6.4 %	16.4%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
3	2 times per week	43	3.2 %	8.1%
4	One time per week	38	2.8 %	7.2%
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	15	1.1 %	2.8%
6	1 time per month	12	0.9 %	2.3%
7	Less than monthly	21	1.6 %	4.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-102 (M)	Skipped: No additional friends	773	57.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero friends	50	3.7 %	-

Based upon 531 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0FRARR: S0 CharFriends: Count of 4 closest friends arrested**

*Location:* 987-990 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Count of 4 closest friends arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	389	28.7 %	29.8%
1	-	431	31.8 %	33.1%
2	-	266	19.6 %	20.4%
3	-	154	11.4 %	11.8%
4	-	64	4.7 %	4.9%
-100 (M)	Skipped: Subject had zero friends	50	3.7 %	-

Based upon 1,304 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0ARRDEN: S0 CharFriends: Denominator for number of friends mentioned-arrest**

*Location:* 991-994 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Count of the number of friends for which we have a report of arrest. We count of the number of friends where the subject gives either a yes, no or don't know response.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1	-	231	17.1 %	17.7%
2	-	294	21.7 %	22.5%
3	-	247	18.2 %	18.9%
4	-	531	39.2 %	40.7%
-100 (M)	Skipped: Subject had zero friends	50	3.7 %	-

Based upon 1,304 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PFRARR: S0 CharFriends: Proportion of 4 closest friends ever arrested**

*Location:* 995-1001 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

The proportion of the 4 closest friends who have been arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0.00	-	388	28.7 %	29.8%
0.25	-	131	9.7 %	10.1%
0.33	-	86	6.4 %	6.6%
0.50	-	239	17.7 %	18.3%
0.67	-	58	4.3 %	4.5%
0.75	-	114	8.4 %	8.7%
1.00	-	287	21.2 %	22.0%

**Missing Data**

-300.00 (M)	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %	-
-100.00 (M)	Skipped: Subject had zero friends	50	3.7 %	-

Based upon 1,303 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0FRJAIL: S0 CharFriends: Count of 4 closest friends jailed**

*Location:* 1002-1005 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

- Study 29961 -

Count of 4 closest friends jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	544	40.2 %	44.8%
1	-	407	30.1 %	33.6%
2	-	165	12.2 %	13.6%
3	-	69	5.1 %	5.7%
4	-	28	2.1 %	2.3%
-100 (M)	Skipped: Subject did not skip into question	141	10.4 %	-

Based upon 1,213 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0JAIDEN: S0 CharFriends: Denominator for number of friends mentioned-jail**

*Location:* 1006-1009 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Count of the number of friends for which we have a report for being jailed. We count of the number of friends where the subject gives either a yes, no or don't know response.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	298	22.0 %	24.6%
1	-	431	31.8 %	35.5%
2	-	266	19.6 %	21.9%
3	-	154	11.4 %	12.7%
4	-	64	4.7 %	5.3%
-100 (M)	Skipped: Subject did not skip into question	141	10.4 %	-

Based upon 1,213 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PFRJAI: S0 CharFriends: Proportion of 4 closest friends ever jailed**

*Location:* 1010-1016 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

- Study 29961 -

The proportion of the 4 closest friends who have been in jail.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0.00	-	246	18.2 %	26.9%
0.25	-	10	0.7 %	1.1%
0.33	-	32	2.4 %	3.5%
0.50	-	112	8.3 %	12.2%
0.67	-	49	3.6 %	5.4%
0.75	-	14	1.0 %	1.5%
1.00	-	452	33.4 %	49.4%

*Missing Data*

-300.00 (M)	Too few answers for computation	298	22.0 %	-
-100.00 (M)	Skipped: Subject did not skip into question	141	10.4 %	-

Based upon 915 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0FRMHOS: S0 CharFriends: Count of 4 closest friends in mental hosp**

*Location:* 1017-1020 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Count of 4 closest friends in mental hospital.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	1,241	91.7 %	95.2%
1	-	61	4.5 %	4.7%
2	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-100 (M)	Skipped: Subject had zero friends	50	3.7 %	-

Based upon 1,304 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MHODEN: S0 CharFriends: Denominator for number of friends mentioned-mental hospital**

*Location:* 1021-1024 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

- Study 29961 -

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

**Question:**

Count of the number of friends for which we have a report for being in a mental hospital. We count of the number of friends where the subject gives either a yes, no or don't know response.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	-	231	17.1 %	17.7%
2	-	294	21.7 %	22.5%
3	-	248	18.3 %	19.0%
4	-	531	39.2 %	40.7%
-100 (M)	Skipped: Subject had zero friends	50	3.7 %	-

Based upon 1,304 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PFRMHO: S0 CharFriends: Proportion of 4 closest friends ever in mental hospital**

Location: 1025-1031 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -300.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

**Question:**

The proportion of the 4 closest friends who have been in a mental hospital.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0.00	-	1,241	91.7 %	95.2%
0.25	-	34	2.5 %	2.6%
0.33	-	14	1.0 %	1.1%
0.50	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
0.67	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.00	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
-100.00 (M)	Skipped: Subject had zero friends	50	3.7 %	-

Based upon 1,304 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL94: S0 CharRelationship: How many people have you had sex with**

Location: 1032-1035 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

- Study 29961 -

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -999 , -998

**Question:**

Number of different sex partners. (By sex I mean intercourse).

MEASURE: Characteristics of Romantic Relationships

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	136	10.0 %	10.1%
1	-	109	8.1 %	8.1%
2	-	139	10.3 %	10.4%
3	-	140	10.3 %	10.4%
4	-	118	8.7 %	8.8%
5	-	118	8.7 %	8.8%
6	-	72	5.3 %	5.4%
7	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
8	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
9	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
10	-	89	6.6 %	6.6%
11	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
12	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
13	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
14	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
15	-	58	4.3 %	4.3%
16	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
17	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
18	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
19	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	66	4.9 %	4.9%
22	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
23	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
25	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
26	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
27	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
28	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
30	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
31	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
34	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
35	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
38	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
40	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
45	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
50	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
55	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
60	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
65	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
70	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
75	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
80	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
85	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
89	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
90	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
100	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
150	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
152	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
200	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
300	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	6	0.4 %	-
-998 (M)	Refuse	6	0.4 %	-

Based upon 1,342 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL95: S0 CharRelationship: Age at first sexual relationship**

*Location:* 1036-1039 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -103 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Age at first sexual relationship

MEASURE: Characteristics of Romantic Relationships

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 and Younger	49	3.6 %	4.1%
10	-	41	3.0 %	3.4%
11	-	101	7.5 %	8.4%
12	-	201	14.8 %	16.7%
13	-	329	24.3 %	27.3%
14	-	247	18.2 %	20.5%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
15	-	156	11.5 %	13.0%
16	-	68	5.0 %	5.7%
17	-	11	0.8 %	0.9%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-103 (M)	Skipped: Subject RF to answer number of sexual partners	6	0.4 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK number of sexual partners	6	0.4 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has had sex with 0 people	136	10.0 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL96: S0 CharRelationship: First sex with someone known or casual**

*Location:* 1040-1043 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -103 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

First sex with someone known or casual

MEASURE: Characteristics of Romantic Relationships

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Someone I had been seeing for a while	788	58.2 %	65.3%
2	Casual acquaintance or one-night stand	418	30.9 %	34.7%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-103 (M)	Skipped: Subject RF to answer number of sexual partners	6	0.4 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK number of sexual partners	6	0.4 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has had sex with 0 people	136	10.0 %	-

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

**S0REL97: S0 CharRelationship: How many one night stands have you had**

*Location:* 1044-1047 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -103 , -102 , -101

**Question:**

Number of one night stands have you had

MEASURE: Characteristics of Romantic Relationships

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	426	31.5 %	35.6%
1	-	162	12.0 %	13.5%
2	-	147	10.9 %	12.3%
3	-	103	7.6 %	8.6%
4	-	70	5.2 %	5.8%
5	-	66	4.9 %	5.5%
6	-	20	1.5 %	1.7%
7	-	21	1.6 %	1.8%
8	-	13	1.0 %	1.1%
9	-	7	0.5 %	0.6%
10	-	47	3.5 %	3.9%
11	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
12	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
13	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
14	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
15	-	23	1.7 %	1.9%
16	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
18	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	22	1.6 %	1.8%
24	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
25	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
26	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
29	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
30	-	11	0.8 %	0.9%
35	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
38	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
40	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
45	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
50	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
60	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
75	-	3	0.2 %	0.3%
80	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
100	-	3	0.2 %	0.3%
130	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
160	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
200	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

**Missing Data**

-999 (M)	Dont Know	9	0.7 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Subject RF to answer number of sexual partners	6	0.4 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK number of sexual partners	6	0.4 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has had sex with 0 people	136	10.0 %	-

Based upon 1,197 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL98: S0 CharRelationship: Ever in more than one sexual relationship at time**

*Location:* 1048-1051 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -103 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Ever in more than one sexual relationship at time

MEASURE: Characteristics of Romantic Relationships

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	664	49.0 %	55.1%
1	Yes	542	40.0 %	44.9%

*Missing Data*

-103 (M) Skipped: Subject RF to answer number of sexual partners

6 0.4 %

-102 (M) Skipped: Subject DK number of sexual partners

6 0.4 %

-101 (M) Skipped: Subject has had sex with 0 people

136 10.0 %

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

**S0REL99: S0 CharRelationship: Ever been unfaithful to your partner**

*Location:* 1052-1055 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -103 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Ever been unfaithful to your partner

MEASURE: Characteristics of Romantic Relationships

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	440	32.5 %	36.5%
1	Yes	766	56.6 %	63.5%

*Missing Data*

-103 (M) Skipped: Subject RF to answer number of sexual partners

6 0.4 %

-102 (M) Skipped: Subject DK number of sexual partners

6 0.4 %

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has had sex with 0 people	136	10.0 %	-

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

**S0REL100: S0 CharRelationship: How many partners unfaithful to**

*Location:* 1056-1059 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -104 , -103 , -102 , -101

**Question:**

How many partners unfaithful to

MEASURE: Characteristics of Romantic Relationships

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	-	182	13.4 %	24.0%
2	-	158	11.7 %	20.9%
3	-	78	5.8 %	10.3%
4	-	57	4.2 %	7.5%
5	-	52	3.8 %	6.9%
6	-	21	1.6 %	2.8%
7	-	16	1.2 %	2.1%
8	-	14	1.0 %	1.8%
9	-	7	0.5 %	0.9%
10	-	44	3.2 %	5.8%
11	-	8	0.6 %	1.1%
12	-	6	0.4 %	0.8%
13	-	5	0.4 %	0.7%
14	-	4	0.3 %	0.5%
15	-	25	1.8 %	3.3%
16	-	5	0.4 %	0.7%
17	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
18	-	3	0.2 %	0.4%
20	-	24	1.8 %	3.2%
22	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
24	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
25	-	5	0.4 %	0.7%
29	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
30	-	10	0.7 %	1.3%
31	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
35	-	5	0.4 %	0.7%
36	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
40	-	5	0.4 %	0.7%
45	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
46	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
50	-	4	0.3 %	0.5%
60	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
80	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
100	-	5	0.4 %	0.7%
152	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

**Missing Data**

-999 (M)	Dont Know	9	0.7 %	-
-104 (M)	Skipped: Subject was never unfaithful	440	32.5 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Subject RF to answer number of sexual partners	6	0.4 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK number of sexual partners	6	0.4 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has had sex with 0 people	136	10.0 %	-

Based upon 757 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL101: S0 CharRelationship: Age first time you were unfaithful**

*Location:* 1060-1063 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -104 , -103 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Age first time you were unfaithful

MEASURE: Characteristics of Romantic Relationships

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 and Younger	18	1.3 %	2.4%
10	-	16	1.2 %	2.1%
11	-	38	2.8 %	5.0%
12	-	74	5.5 %	9.8%
13	-	166	12.3 %	21.9%
14	-	202	14.9 %	26.7%
15	-	142	10.5 %	18.8%
16	-	79	5.8 %	10.4%
17	-	21	1.6 %	2.8%
18	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-104 (M)	Skipped: Subject was never unfaithful	440	32.5 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Subject RF to answer number of sexual partners	6	0.4 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK number of sexual partners	6	0.4 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has had sex with 0 people	136	10.0 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	9	0.7 %	-

Based upon 757 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL102: S0 CharRelationship: Currently married**

*Location:* 1064-1068 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Currently married

MEASURE: Characteristics of Romantic Relationships

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,354	100.0 %	100.0%

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

**S0REL103: S0 CharRelationship: Currently have a bf/gf/husband/wife**

*Location:* 1069-1072 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Currently have a boyfriend/girlfriend

MEASURE: Characteristics of Romantic Relationships

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	525	38.8 %	38.8%
1	Yes	829	61.2 %	61.2%

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

**S0REL104: S0 CharRelationship: How long have you been with bf/bf/husband/wife**

*Location:* 1073-1076 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

- Study 29961 -

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -106 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

How long have you been with bf/bf/husband/wife

MEASURE: Characteristics of Romantic Relationships

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	4 weeks or less	74	5.5 %	8.9%
2	1-2 months	105	7.8 %	12.7%
3	3-6 months	193	14.3 %	23.3%
4	7months - 1year	146	10.8 %	17.6%
5	1-2 years	168	12.4 %	20.3%
6	2 or more years	143	10.6 %	17.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subject is not married and doesnt have a bfgf	525	38.8 %	-

Based upon 829 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL105: S0 CharRelationship: Age of bf/gf/husband/wife**

Location: 1077-1080 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -999 , -998 , -400 , -106

**Question:**

Age of bf/gf/husband/wife

MEASURE: Characteristics of Romantic Relationships

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
14	14 or Younger	71	5.2 %	10.8%
15	-	130	9.6 %	19.8%
16	-	172	12.7 %	26.2%
17	-	119	8.8 %	18.1%
18	-	72	5.3 %	11.0%
19	-	41	3.0 %	6.2%
20	-	17	1.3 %	2.6%
21	-	8	0.6 %	1.2%
22	-	6	0.4 %	0.9%
23	-	3	0.2 %	0.5%
24	-	9	0.7 %	1.4%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
25	25 or Older	9	0.7 %	1.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	3	0.2 %	-
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	274	20.2 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subject is not married and doesnt have a bf/gf	420	31.0 %	-

Based upon 657 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL106: S0 CharRelationship: Live with bf/gf/husband/wife**

*Location:* 1081-1084 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -106 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Live with bf/gf/husband/wife living with you prior to the arrest that brought you here

MEASURE: Characteristics of Romantic Relationships

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	744	54.9 %	89.7%
1	Yes	85	6.3 %	10.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subject is not married and doesnt have a bf/gf	525	38.8 %	-

Based upon 829 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL107: S0 CharRelationship: How many boyfriends/girlfriends have you had**

*Location:* 1085-1088 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998

**Question:**

Number of boyfriends/girlfriends ever

MEASURE: Characteristics of Romantic Relationships

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
1	-	67	4.9 %	5.0%
2	-	81	6.0 %	6.0%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
3	-	124	9.2 %	9.2%
4	-	102	7.5 %	7.6%
5	-	132	9.7 %	9.8%
6	-	74	5.5 %	5.5%
7	-	67	4.9 %	5.0%
8	-	45	3.3 %	3.3%
9	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
10	-	134	9.9 %	9.9%
11	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
12	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
13	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
14	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
15	-	101	7.5 %	7.5%
16	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
17	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
18	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
19	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	96	7.1 %	7.1%
21	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
22	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
23	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
25	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
26	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
27	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
28	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
29	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
30	-	54	4.0 %	4.0%
32	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
35	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
36	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
38	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
40	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
42	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
45	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
46	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
48	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
50	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
54	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
55	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
56	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
60	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
70	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
73	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
85	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
100	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
200	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
300	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL108: S0 CharRelationship: Longest period of time you stayed in one relationship**

*Location:* 1089-1092 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -107 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Longest period of time you stayed in one relationship

MEASURE: Characteristics of Romantic Relationships

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	4 weeks or less	26	1.9 %	2.0%
2	1-2 months	104	7.7 %	7.8%
3	3-6 months	261	19.3 %	19.6%
4	7months - 1year	268	19.8 %	20.1%
5	1-2 years	322	23.8 %	24.2%
6	2 or more years	350	25.8 %	26.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-800 (M)	Data missing due to data cleaning	13	1.0 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: Subject has had zero bfgr	10	0.7 %	-

Based upon 1,331 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL109: S0 CharRelationship: Ever been deeply in love**

*Location:* 1093-1096 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -107 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Ever been deeply in love

MEASURE: Characteristics of Romantic Relationships

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	716	52.9 %	54.0%
1	Yes	610	45.1 %	46.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-800 (M)	Data missing due to data cleaning	13	1.0 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: Subject has had zero bfgf	10	0.7 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	5	0.4 %	-

Based upon 1,326 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0WALDEN: S0 Walden: Self-Regulation Scale

*Location:* 1097-1103 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00

#### Question:

Walden self-regulation scale; Mean of the 9 items.

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 adolescents 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	Not at all like me	7	0.5 %	0.5%
1.11	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
1.22	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
1.33	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.44	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
1.50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.56	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
1.57	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.63	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.67	-	25	1.8 %	1.8%
1.78	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
1.89	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
2.00	A little like me	54	4.0 %	4.0%
2.11	-	52	3.8 %	3.8%
2.13	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.22	-	64	4.7 %	4.7%
2.33	-	81	6.0 %	6.0%
2.44	-	83	6.1 %	6.1%
2.56	-	80	5.9 %	5.9%
2.67	-	107	7.9 %	7.9%
2.78	-	67	4.9 %	4.9%
2.89	-	83	6.1 %	6.1%
3.00	Kind of like me	95	7.0 %	7.0%
3.11	-	58	4.3 %	4.3%
3.22	-	72	5.3 %	5.3%
3.33	-	70	5.2 %	5.2%
3.38	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.44	-	52	3.8 %	3.8%
3.56	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
3.67	-	50	3.7 %	3.7%
3.78	-	25	1.8 %	1.8%
3.88	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.89	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
4.00	Really like me	48	3.5 %	3.5%

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

**S0COMIN: S0 ComIn: Involvement in Community Activities - Ever**

*Location:* 1104-1107 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Involvement in community activities; count of endorsed activities, independent of recency.

- Study 29961 -

**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 adolescent's involvement in four different community organizations (e.g., sports teams, scouts, church related groups, and volunteer work). Each of these scales can range from 0 through 4, with higher scores on these scales indicating more community involvement.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	765	56.5 %	56.7%
1	-	381	28.1 %	28.2%
2	-	141	10.4 %	10.4%
3	-	53	3.9 %	3.9%
4	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0COM6MO: S0 ComIn: Involvement in Community Activities - past 6 months**

*Location:* 1108-1111 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Involvement in community activities; count of endorsed activities in which the youth has been involved during the past six months.

**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 adolescent's involvement in four different community organizations (e.g., sports teams, scouts, church related groups, and volunteer work). Each of these scales can range from 0 through 4, with higher scores on these scales indicating more community involvement.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	1,079	79.7 %	79.9%
1	-	206	15.2 %	15.3%
2	-	52	3.8 %	3.9%
3	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
4	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0CIDI\_QVERSION: S0 CIDI: Version number associated with programming changes to the interview**

*Location:* 1112-1115 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* character

**Question:**

CIDI version number associated with programming changes to the interview.

**MEASURE:** Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.01	21	1.6 %	1.6%
1.02	50	3.7 %	3.7%
1.03	41	3.0 %	3.0%
1.04	167	12.3 %	12.3%
1.05	253	18.7 %	18.7%
1.06	97	7.2 %	7.2%
1.07	267	19.7 %	19.7%
1.08	189	14.0 %	14.0%
1.09	166	12.3 %	12.3%
1.10	49	3.6 %	3.6%
1.11	29	2.1 %	2.1%
Inc	25	1.8 %	1.8%

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

**S0MDD: S0 CIDI: Major depressive disorder - ever**

*Location:* 1116-1119 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -100 , -99

**Question:**

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Major Depressive Disorder over the lifetime.

MEASURE: Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,231	90.9 %	92.6%
1	Yes	98	7.2 %	7.4%
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,329 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MDD12: S0 CIDI: Major depressive disorder - past year**

*Location:* 1120-1123 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -100 , -99

**Question:**

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Major Depressive Disorder over the past year.

MEASURE: Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,259	93.0 %	94.7%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Yes	70	5.2 %	5.3%
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,329 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MDD30: S0 CIDI: Major depressive disorder - past 30 days**

*Location:* 1124-1127 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -100 , -99

**Question:**

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Major Depressive Disorder over the past 30 days.

MEASURE: Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,309	96.7 %	98.5%
1	Yes	20	1.5 %	1.5%
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,329 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DYS: S0 CIDI: Dysthymia - ever**

*Location:* 1128-1131 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -100 , -99

**Question:**

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Dysthymia over the lifetime.

MEASURE: Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders.

- Study 29961 -

By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,321	97.6 %	99.4%
1	Yes	8	0.6 %	0.6%
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,329 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DYS12: S0 CIDI: Dysthymia - past year**

*Location:* 1132-1135 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -100 , -99

**Question:**

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Dysthymia over the past year.

**MEASURE:** Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,323	97.7 %	99.5%
1	Yes	6	0.4 %	0.5%
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,329 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DYS30: S0 CIDI: Dysthymia - past 30 days**

*Location:* 1136-1139 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -100 , -99

- Study 29961 -

**Question:**

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Dysthymia over the past 30 days.

MEASURE: Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,328	98.1 %	99.9%
1	Yes	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,329 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MANIA: S0 CIDI: Manic episode - ever**

*Location:* 1140-1143 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -100 , -99

**Question:**

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Mania over the lifetime.

MEASURE: Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,277	94.3 %	96.1%
1	Yes	52	3.8 %	3.9%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,329 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0MANIA12: S0 CIDI: Manic episode - past year

*Location:* 1144-1147 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -100 , -99

#### Question:

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Mania over the past year.

MEASURE: Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,294	95.6 %	97.4%
1	Yes	35	2.6 %	2.6%
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,329 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0MANIA30: S0 CIDI: Manic episode - past 30 days

*Location:* 1148-1151 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -100 , -99

#### Question:

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Mania over the past 30 days.

MEASURE: Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10.

- Study 29961 -

The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,321	97.6 %	99.4%
1	Yes	8	0.6 %	0.6%
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,329 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PTSD: S0 CIDI: Posttraumatic disorder - ever**

*Location:* 1152-1155 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -100 , -99

**Question:**

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Posttraumatic Stress Disorder over the lifetime.

**MEASURE:** Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders.

By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,242	91.7 %	93.5%
1	Yes	87	6.4 %	6.5%
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,329 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PTSD12: S0 CIDI: Posttraumatic disorder - past year**

*Location:* 1156-1159 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -100 , -99

**Question:**

- Study 29961 -

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Posttraumatic Stress Disorder over the past year.

MEASURE: Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,277	94.3 %	96.1%
1	Yes	52	3.8 %	3.9%
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,329 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PTSD30: S0 CIDI: Posttraumatic disorder - past 30 days**

*Location:* 1160-1163 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -100 , -99

**Question:**

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Posttraumatic Stress Disorder over the past 30 days.

MEASURE: Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,296	95.7 %	97.5%
1	Yes	33	2.4 %	2.5%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,329 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0ALCHABU: S0 CIDI: Alcohol abuse - ever**

*Location:* 1164-1167 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -100 , -99

#### **Question:**

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Alcohol Abuse over the lifetime.

**MEASURE:** Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,154	85.2 %	88.6%
1	Yes	148	10.9 %	11.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-100 (M)	Items Missing - Unknown Reasons	27	2.0 %	-
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,302 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0ALCABU12: S0 CIDI: Alcohol abuse - past year**

*Location:* 1168-1171 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -100 , -99

#### **Question:**

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Alcohol Abuse over the past year.

**MEASURE:** Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders.

- Study 29961 -

By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	1,196	88.3 %	91.9%
1	Yes	106	7.8 %	8.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-100 (M)	Items Missing - Unknown Reasons	27	2.0 %	-
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,302 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0ALCABU30: S0 CIDI: Alcohol abuse - past 30 days**

*Location:* 1172-1175 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -100 , -99

**Question:**

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Alcohol Abuse over the past 30 days.

**MEASURE:** Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	1,292	95.4 %	99.2%
1	Yes	10	0.7 %	0.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-100 (M)	Items Missing - Unknown Reasons	27	2.0 %	-
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,302 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0ALCHDEP: S0 CIDI: Alcohol dependency - ever

Location: 1176-1179 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -100 , -99

#### Question:

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Alcohol Dependence over the lifetime.

MEASURE: Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,170	86.4 %	89.9%
1	Yes	132	9.7 %	10.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-100 (M)	Items Missing - Unknown Reasons	27	2.0 %	-
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,302 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0ALCDEP12: S0 CIDI: Alcohol dependency - past year

Location: 1180-1183 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -100 , -99

#### Question:

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Alcohol Dependence over the past year.

MEASURE: Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	1,205	89.0 %	92.5%
1	Yes	97	7.2 %	7.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-100 (M)	Items Missing - Unknown Reasons	27	2.0 %	-
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,302 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0ALCDEP30: S0 CIDI: Alcohol dependency - past 30 days**

*Location:* 1184-1187 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -100 , -99

**Question:**

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Alcohol Dependence over the past 30 days.

MEASURE: Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	1,295	95.6 %	99.5%
1	Yes	7	0.5 %	0.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-100 (M)	Items Missing - Unknown Reasons	27	2.0 %	-
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,302 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DRUGABU: S0 CIDI: Drug abuse - ever**

*Location:* 1188-1191 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -100 , -99

**Question:**

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Drug Abuse over the lifetime.

MEASURE: Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	959	70.8 %	73.7%
1	Yes	343	25.3 %	26.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-100 (M)	Items Missing - Unknown Reasons	27	2.0 %	-
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,302 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DRUABU12: S0 CIDI: Drug abuse - past year**

*Location:* 1192-1195 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -100 , -99

**Question:**

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Drug Abuse over the past year.

MEASURE: Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,052	77.7 %	80.8%
1	Yes	250	18.5 %	19.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-100 (M)	Items Missing - Unknown Reasons	27	2.0 %	-
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,302 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DRUABU30: S0 CIDI: Drug abuse - past 30 days**

*Location:* 1196-1199 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -100 , -99

**Question:**

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Drug Abuse over the past 30 days.

**MEASURE:** Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,269	93.7 %	97.5%
1	Yes	33	2.4 %	2.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-100 (M)	Items Missing - Unknown Reasons	27	2.0 %	-
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,302 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DRUGDEP: S0 CIDI: Drug dependency - ever**

*Location:* 1200-1203 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -100 , -99

**Question:**

- Study 29961 -

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Drug Dependence over the lifetime.

MEASURE: Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,098	81.1 %	84.3%
1	Yes	204	15.1 %	15.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-100 (M)	Items Missing - Unknown Reasons	27	2.0 %	-
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,302 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DRUDEP12: S0 CIDI: Drug dependency - past year**

*Location:* 1204-1207 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -100 , -99

**Question:**

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Drug Dependence over the past year.

MEASURE: Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,137	84.0 %	87.3%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Yes	165	12.2 %	12.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-100 (M)	Items Missing - Unknown Reasons	27	2.0 %	-
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,302 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DRUDEP30: S0 CIDI: Drug dependency - past 30 days**

*Location:* 1208-1211 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -100 , -99

**Question:**

Marker for cases meeting diagnostic criteria for Drug Dependence over the past 30 days.

**MEASURE:** Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,280	94.5 %	98.3%
1	Yes	22	1.6 %	1.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-100 (M)	Items Missing - Unknown Reasons	27	2.0 %	-
-99 (M)	No CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,302 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MDSYMCNT: S0 CIDI: MD count of symptoms**

*Location:* 1212-1215 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -99

**Question:**

Count of Major Depression symptoms that were EVER present.

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	1,171	86.5 %	88.1%
1	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
4	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
5	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
6	-	26	1.9 %	2.0%
7	-	44	3.2 %	3.3%
8	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
9	-	34	2.5 %	2.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-99 (M)	no CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,329 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0PTSDSYMCNT: S0 CIDI: PTSD count of symptoms

*Location:* 1216-1219 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -99

**Question:**

Count of PTSD symptoms that were EVER present.

MEASURE: Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI)

The Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI; World Health Organization, 1990) is a comprehensive, fully structured interview used to assess mental disorders. By means of computerized algorithms, the CIDI provides both lifetime ("Ever") and current ("Past year" and "Past 30 days") diagnosis as defined by the DSM-IV and ICD-10. The entire CIDI was not administered. The following eight modules were selected for the purpose of this study: Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, Manic Episode, Posttraumatic Stress Disorder, Alcohol Abuse, Alcohol Dependence, Drug Abuse, and Drug Dependence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	1,076	79.5 %	81.0%
1	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
2	-	47	3.5 %	3.5%
3	-	10	0.7 %	0.8%
4	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
5	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
6	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
7	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
8	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
9	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
10	-	14	1.0 %	1.1%
11	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
12	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
13	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
14	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
15	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
16	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
17	-	18	1.3 %	1.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-99 (M)	no CIDI	25	1.8 %	-

Based upon 1,329 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM43: S0 EarlyOnset: Before age 11, get in trouble for cheating**

*Location:* 1220-1223 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Before age 11, did you get into trouble for cheating?

MEASURE: Early Onset of Behavior Problems

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,163	85.9 %	86.1%
1	Yes	187	13.8 %	13.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM44: S0 EarlyOnset: Before age 11, get in trouble for disturbing class**

*Location:* 1224-1227 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Before age 11, did you get into trouble for disturbing the class?

MEASURE: Early Onset of Behavior Problems

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	534	39.4 %	39.5%
1	Yes	819	60.5 %	60.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM45: S0 EarlyOnset: Before age 11, get in trouble for being drunk/stoned**

*Location:* 1228-1231 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Before age 11, did you get into trouble for being drunk/stoned?

MEASURE: Early Onset of Behavior Problems

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,298	95.9 %	95.9%
1	Yes	56	4.1 %	4.1%

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

**S0DEM46: S0 EarlyOnset: Before age 11, get in trouble for stealing**

*Location:* 1232-1235 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Before age 11, did you get into trouble for stealing?

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Early Onset of Behavior Problems

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,122	82.9 %	82.9%
1	Yes	231	17.1 %	17.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM47: S0 EarlyOnset: Before age 11, get in trouble for fighting**

*Location:* 1236-1239 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Before age 11, did you get into trouble for fighting?

MEASURE: Early Onset of Behavior Problems

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	587	43.4 %	43.4%
1	Yes	765	56.5 %	56.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,352 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0NEARPRO: S0 EarlyOnset: Count of early onset problems**

*Location:* 1240-1243 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

A count of the number of early onset problems that were endorsed.

MEASURE: Early Onset of Behavior Problems

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	328	24.2 %	24.2%
1	-	352	26.0 %	26.0%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2	-	411	30.4 %	30.4%
3	-	178	13.1 %	13.1%
4	-	75	5.5 %	5.5%
5	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%

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

### S0EASI: S0 EASI: Internal Emotionality

*Location:* 1244-1250 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

#### Question:

Overall Emotionality - EASI; Mean of 9 items included. One item is reverse coded.

MEASURE: EASI

The EASI is a measure of temperament that was modified for this study to assess the adolescents internal emotionality (Buss and Plomin, 1984). This measure is only used at the baseline interview; it is not repeated at follow-up interviews. Examples of items are "I am almost always calm - nothing ever bothers me" and "I tend to be nervous in new situations". The scale contains 14 items to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree". Higher scores indicate greater emotionality.

- (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	%	Valid %
1.11	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.33	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
1.44	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.56	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
1.67	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
1.78	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
1.89	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
2.00	Disagree	60	4.4 %	4.4%
2.11	-	45	3.3 %	3.3%
2.22	-	148	10.9 %	10.9%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2.33	-	69	5.1 %	5.1%
2.44	-	156	11.5 %	11.5%
2.56	-	89	6.6 %	6.6%
2.67	-	140	10.3 %	10.3%
2.78	-	62	4.6 %	4.6%
2.89	-	138	10.2 %	10.2%
3.00	Neither Agree or Disagree	49	3.6 %	3.6%
3.11	-	91	6.7 %	6.7%
3.22	-	45	3.3 %	3.3%
3.33	-	63	4.7 %	4.7%
3.44	-	34	2.5 %	2.5%
3.56	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
3.67	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
3.78	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
3.89	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
4.00	Agree	9	0.7 %	0.7%
4.11	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
4.22	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
4.44	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
4.67	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
4.89	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%

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

**S0DEM26: S0 Education: Enrolled in school (currently/before coming to detention)**

*Location:* 1251-1254 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Enrolled in school either currently (if not locked up) or enrolled before coming to this facility.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	382	28.2 %	28.2%
1	Yes	972	71.8 %	71.8%

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

**S0DEM26B: S0 Education: Have you dropped out of school**

- Study 29961 -

Location: 1255-1258 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -110 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has dropped out of school.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	163	12.0 %	42.8%
1	Yes	218	16.1 %	57.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-110 (M)	Skipped: Is enrolled in school	972	71.8 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 381 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM27: S0 Education: Have you obtained a GED**

Location: 1259-1262 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -110 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has obtained a GED.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	319	23.6 %	83.5%
1	Yes	27	2.0 %	7.1%
2	Currently enrolled in GED program but not completed	36	2.7 %	9.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-110 (M)	Skipped: Is enrolled in school	972	71.8 %	-

Based upon 382 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM28: S0 Education: Highest grade completed before GED**

Location: 1263-1266 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -9 , -8

**Question:**

- Study 29961 -

The subject's highest grade completed before GED.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	6th grade or less	26	1.9 %	1.9%
2	7th grade	88	6.5 %	6.5%
3	8th grade	402	29.7 %	29.7%
4	9th grade	342	25.3 %	25.3%
5	10th grade	323	23.9 %	23.9%
6	11th grade	149	11.0 %	11.0%
7	High school graduate	24	1.8 %	1.8%

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

**S0DEM29: S0 Education: What were grades like in school**

*Location:* 1267-1270 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subject's grades in school.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Mostly A's	50	3.7 %	3.7%
2	About half A's and half B's	169	12.5 %	12.6%
3	Mostly B's	77	5.7 %	5.7%
4	About half B's and half C's	325	24.0 %	24.2%
5	Mostly C's	185	13.7 %	13.8%
6	About half C's and half D's	301	22.2 %	22.4%
7	Mostly D's	99	7.3 %	7.4%
8	Mostly below D's	139	10.3 %	10.3%

**Missing Data**

-99 (M)	Dont Know	9	0.7 %	-
---------	-----------	---	-------	---

Based upon 1,345 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM30: S0 Education: Ever been suspended from school**

*Location:* 1271-1274 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

- Study 29961 -

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject ever been suspended from school.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	122	9.0 %	9.0%
1	Yes	1,232	91.0 %	91.0%

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

**S0DEM31: S0 Education: How many times suspended**

Location: 1275-1278 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -999 , -998 , -111

**Question:**

Count the number of times the subject has been suspended.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	-	142	10.5 %	11.6%
2	-	152	11.2 %	12.4%
3	-	113	8.3 %	9.3%
4	-	78	5.8 %	6.4%
5	-	101	7.5 %	8.3%
6	-	54	4.0 %	4.4%
7	-	44	3.2 %	3.6%
8	-	19	1.4 %	1.6%
9	-	11	0.8 %	0.9%
10	-	116	8.6 %	9.5%
11	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
12	-	29	2.1 %	2.4%
13	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
14	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
15	-	60	4.4 %	4.9%
16	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
17	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
18	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
19	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	74	5.5 %	6.1%
21	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
22	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
23	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
24	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
25	-	30	2.2 %	2.5%
26	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
27	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
28	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
29	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
30	-	41	3.0 %	3.4%
31	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
32	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
33	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
35	-	7	0.5 %	0.6%
37	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
40	-	17	1.3 %	1.4%
45	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
50	-	35	2.6 %	2.9%
53	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
55	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
60	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
64	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
65	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
70	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
80	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
90	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
100	-	13	1.0 %	1.1%
110	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
150	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
200	-	7	0.5 %	0.6%
250	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
265	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
300	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
500	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
900	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	11	0.8 %	-
-111 (M)	Skipped: Never suspended	122	9.0 %	-

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

**S0DEM32: S0 Education: Age first time suspended**

*Location:* 1279-1282 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -111 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subject's age at first time suspended.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 or Younger	268	19.8 %	22.0%
10	-	141	10.4 %	11.6%
11	-	139	10.3 %	11.4%
12	-	204	15.1 %	16.8%
13	-	200	14.8 %	16.4%
14	-	136	10.0 %	11.2%
15	-	77	5.7 %	6.3%
16	-	46	3.4 %	3.8%
17	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-111 (M)	Skipped: Never suspended	122	9.0 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	15	1.1 %	-

Based upon 1,217 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM33: S0 Education: Ever been expelled from school**

*Location:* 1283-1286 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject expelled from school. An ever question.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	815	60.2 %	60.2%
1	Yes	539	39.8 %	39.8%

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

**S0DEM34: S0 Education: How many times expelled**

*Location:* 1287-1290 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -112

**Question:**

Count the number of times the subject has been expelled from school.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	-	366	27.0 %	67.9%
2	-	108	8.0 %	20.0%
3	-	35	2.6 %	6.5%
4	-	11	0.8 %	2.0%
5	-	9	0.7 %	1.7%
6	-	3	0.2 %	0.6%
7	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
8	-	2	0.1 %	0.4%
12	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
15	-	2	0.1 %	0.4%
20	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
-112 (M)	Skipped: Never expelled	815	60.2 %	-

Based upon 539 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM34B: S0 Education: Age first time expelled**

*Location:* 1291-1294 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -112 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subject's age at first expulsion.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
9	9 or Younger	26	1.9 %	4.8%
10	-	30	2.2 %	5.6%
11	-	36	2.7 %	6.7%
12	-	66	4.9 %	12.3%
13	-	103	7.6 %	19.1%
14	-	118	8.7 %	21.9%
15	-	90	6.6 %	16.7%
16	-	60	4.4 %	11.2%
17	-	9	0.7 %	1.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-112 (M)	Skipped: Never expelled	815	60.2 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 538 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM35: S0 Education: Over last year average number days missed per month**

*Location:* 1295-1298 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -99 , -98

**Question:**

Over the past year, the average number days of missed per month.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	185	13.7 %	13.9%
1	-	116	8.6 %	8.7%
2	-	160	11.8 %	12.0%
3	-	115	8.5 %	8.6%
4	-	66	4.9 %	5.0%
5	-	156	11.5 %	11.7%
6	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
7	-	45	3.3 %	3.4%
8	-	45	3.3 %	3.4%
9	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
10	-	134	9.9 %	10.1%
11	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
12	-	22	1.6 %	1.7%
13	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
14	-	10	0.7 %	0.8%
15	-	56	4.1 %	4.2%
16	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
17	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
18	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
19	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	156	11.5 %	11.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-99 (M)	Dont Know	22	1.6 %	-

Based upon 1,332 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM36: S0 Education: Ever have years when you missed more than what you missed in last year**

*Location:* 1299-1302 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has had school years where missed more school days per month than missed in last year. An ever question.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	803	59.3 %	59.3%
1	Yes	550	40.6 %	40.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM37: S0 Education: Age when you missed the most**

*Location:* 1303-1306 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -113 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The age when the subject missed the most school.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 or Younger	26	1.9 %	4.7%
10	-	21	1.6 %	3.8%
11	-	12	0.9 %	2.2%
12	-	49	3.6 %	8.9%
13	-	101	7.5 %	18.4%
14	-	143	10.6 %	26.0%
15	-	118	8.7 %	21.5%
16	-	61	4.5 %	11.1%
17	-	19	1.4 %	3.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-113 (M)	Skipped: Did not miss a lot of school in the past	804	59.4 %	-

Based upon 550 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM38: S0 Education: Average number of days missed per month when missed the most**

*Location:* 1307-1310 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -113 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Average number of days missed per month when missed the most school.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
1	-	6	0.4 %	1.1%
2	-	11	0.8 %	2.0%
3	-	19	1.4 %	3.5%
4	-	23	1.7 %	4.3%
5	-	42	3.1 %	7.8%
6	-	12	0.9 %	2.2%
7	-	27	2.0 %	5.0%
8	-	9	0.7 %	1.7%
9	-	15	1.1 %	2.8%
10	-	90	6.6 %	16.7%
11	-	3	0.2 %	0.6%
12	-	17	1.3 %	3.2%
13	-	4	0.3 %	0.7%
14	-	11	0.8 %	2.0%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
15	-	59	4.4 %	10.9%
16	-	9	0.7 %	1.7%
17	-	2	0.1 %	0.4%
18	-	5	0.4 %	0.9%
19	-	3	0.2 %	0.6%
20	-	171	12.6 %	31.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-113 (M)	Skipped: Did not miss a lot of school in the past	804	59.4 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	11	0.8 %	-

Based upon 539 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MISSSUSPEXP: S0 Education: Missed school in the past - suspended/expelled**

*Location:* 1311-1314 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -113 , -9

**Question:**

Missed school in the past due to being suspended/expelled.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	495	36.6 %	90.0%
1	Yes	55	4.1 %	10.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-113 (M)	Skipped: Did not miss a lot of school in the past	803	59.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 550 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MISSPHYSILL: S0 Education: Missed school in the past - physical illness**

*Location:* 1315-1318 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -113 , -9

**Question:**

Missed school in the past due to physical illness.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	469	34.6 %	85.3%
1	Yes	81	6.0 %	14.7%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-113 (M)	Skipped: Did not miss a lot of school in the past	803	59.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 550 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MISSMENTAL: S0 Education: Missed school in the past - mental health/emotion problems**

*Location:* 1319-1322 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -113 , -9

**Question:**

Missed school in the past due to mental health/emotion problems.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	537	39.7 %	97.6%
1	Yes	13	1.0 %	2.4%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-113 (M)	Skipped: Did not miss a lot of school in the past	803	59.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 550 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MISSAFRAID: S0 Education: Missed school in the past - afraid to go**

*Location:* 1323-1326 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -113 , -9

**Question:**

Missed school in the past due to afraid to go.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	545	40.3 %	99.1%
1	Yes	5	0.4 %	0.9%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-113 (M)	Skipped: Did not miss a lot of school in the past	803	59.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 550 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MISSTRUANT: S0 Education: Missed school in the past - refused to go/truancy**

*Location:* 1327-1330 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -113 , -9

**Question:**

Missed school in past due to refuse to go/truancy.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	161	11.9 %	29.3%
1	Yes	389	28.7 %	70.7%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-113 (M)	Skipped: Did not miss a lot of school in the past	803	59.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 550 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MISSOTHER: S0 Education: Missed school in the past - other reason**

*Location:* 1331-1334 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -113 , -9

**Question:**

Missed school in the past due to other reason.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	479	35.4 %	87.1%
1	Yes	71	5.2 %	12.9%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-113 (M)	Skipped: Did not miss a lot of school in the past	803	59.3 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 550 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0DEM41: S0 Education: Ever skip school or classes**

*Location:* 1335-1338 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

##### **Question:**

Subject skipped school/classes. An ever question.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Yes skipped school and classes	838	61.9 %	61.9%
2	Yes skipped classes	233	17.2 %	17.2%
3	Yes skipped school	118	8.7 %	8.7%
5	No, skipped neither	165	12.2 %	12.2%

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

#### **S0DEM42: S0 Education: Have you ever failed a class**

*Location:* 1339-1342 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

##### **Question:**

The subject has failed a class. An ever question.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	254	18.8 %	18.8%
1	Yes	1,098	81.1 %	81.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,352 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0DEM48: S0 Education: Ever cheat on exam or plagiarized info**

- Study 29961 -

*Location:* 1343-1346 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has cheated on exam or plagiarized information. An ever question.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	727	53.7 %	53.7%
1	Yes	627	46.3 %	46.3%

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

**S0SCH2: S0 Education: Gone to school any days in past year**

*Location:* 1347-1350 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -800 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Gone to school any days in the past year.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	71	5.2 %	10.4%
1	Yes	610	45.1 %	89.6%
-101 (M)	Skipped: In detention or locked facility	673	49.7 %	-

Based upon 681 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SCH2A: S0 Education: Reason not enrolled in school during the past year**

*Location:* 1351-1354 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Reason not enrolled in school during the past year.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2	expelled	6	0.4 %	8.5%
4	mental health/emotional problem	1	0.1 %	1.4%
6	refusing to go/truancy	12	0.9 %	16.9%
8	dropped out of high school	19	1.4 %	26.8%
9	graduated from high school (diploma or GED)	4	0.3 %	5.6%
11	administrative reasons (e.g. released from fac, awaiting new	1	0.1 %	1.4%
12	forced to work	4	0.3 %	5.6%
13	pregnancy/birth	3	0.2 %	4.2%
15	family responsibilities	1	0.1 %	1.4%
16	incarcerated (and NOT attending school in facility)	10	0.7 %	14.1%
21	Financial problems	1	0.1 %	1.4%
96	Other	9	0.7 %	12.7%

*Missing Data*

-102 (M)	Skipped: Has gone to school in the past year	610	45.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: In detention or locked facility	673	49.7 %	-

Based upon 71 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SCH3: S0 Education: How long ago last attended school (in years)**

*Location:* 1355-1358 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Length of time since the subject last attended school.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	-	37	2.7 %	52.9%
2	-	22	1.6 %	31.4%
3	-	8	0.6 %	11.4%
4	-	2	0.1 %	2.9%
15	-	1	0.1 %	1.4%

*Missing Data*

-800 (M)	Missing due to data cleaning	9	0.7 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Has gone to school in the past year	602	44.5 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: In detention or locked facility	673	49.7 %	-

Based upon 70 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0SCH29: S0 Education: Ever get into fights at school

*Location:* 1359-1362 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

#### Question:

The subject fights at school. An ever question.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	318	23.5 %	23.5%
1	Yes	1,036	76.5 %	76.5%

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

### S0SCH30: S0 Education: How often did you fight at school

*Location:* 1363-1366 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -104 , -9 , -8

#### Question:

Frequency of fighting at school.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Daily	47	3.5 %	4.5%
2	3-6 times per week	46	3.4 %	4.4%
3	2 times per week	65	4.8 %	6.3%
4	1 times per week	66	4.9 %	6.4%
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	81	6.0 %	7.8%
6	1 time per month	138	10.2 %	13.3%
7	Less than monthly	592	43.7 %	57.2%

#### Missing Data

-104 (M)	Skipped: Never in a fight at school	318	23.5 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,035 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0SCH31: S0 Education: How old were you when they started

*Location:* 1367-1370 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

- Study 29961 -

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -104 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Age when started fighting in school.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
4	-	7	0.5 %	0.7%
5	-	39	2.9 %	3.8%
6	-	55	4.1 %	5.4%
7	-	71	5.2 %	6.9%
8	-	80	5.9 %	7.8%
9	-	83	6.1 %	8.1%
10	-	118	8.7 %	11.5%
11	-	123	9.1 %	12.0%
12	-	137	10.1 %	13.4%
13	-	135	10.0 %	13.2%
14	-	91	6.7 %	8.9%
15	-	53	3.9 %	5.2%
16	-	28	2.1 %	2.7%
17	-	4	0.3 %	0.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-104 (M)	Skipped: Never in a fight at school	318	23.5 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	12	0.9 %	-

Based upon 1,024 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SCH32: S0 Education: How many of these fights did you start**

*Location:* 1371-1374 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -104 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Count of fights the subject started.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	None	301	22.2 %	29.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2	Some	364	26.9 %	35.2%
3	About half	208	15.4 %	20.1%
4	Most	108	8.0 %	10.4%
5	All	54	4.0 %	5.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-104 (M)	Skipped: Never in a fight at school	318	23.5 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,035 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SCH34: S0 Education: You ever bully anyone**

*Location:* 1375-1378 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has bullied someone. An ever question.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,046	77.3 %	77.3%
1	Yes	308	22.7 %	22.7%

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

**S0SCH35: S0 Education: How often did you bully**

*Location:* 1379-1382 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -105 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Frequency the subject has bullied others.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Once a week	45	3.3 %	14.6%
2	Twice a week	38	2.8 %	12.3%
3	Three times a week	24	1.8 %	7.8%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
4	Four times a week	7	0.5 %	2.3%
5	Five times a week	6	0.4 %	1.9%
6	Six times a week	2	0.1 %	0.6%
7	Everyday	62	4.6 %	20.1%
8	1-3 times a month	30	2.2 %	9.7%
9	Less than once per month	94	6.9 %	30.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-105 (M)	Skipped: Never bullied anyone	1,046	77.3 %	-

Based upon 308 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SCH36: S0 Education: At what age did it start**

*Location:* 1383-1386 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -105 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Age the subject started to bully people.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
4	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
5	-	7	0.5 %	2.3%
6	-	8	0.6 %	2.6%
7	-	12	0.9 %	3.9%
8	-	17	1.3 %	5.6%
9	-	13	1.0 %	4.3%
10	-	36	2.7 %	11.8%
11	-	29	2.1 %	9.5%
12	-	48	3.5 %	15.7%
13	-	48	3.5 %	15.7%
14	-	48	3.5 %	15.7%
15	-	23	1.7 %	7.5%
16	-	11	0.8 %	3.6%
17	-	4	0.3 %	1.3%

*Missing Data*

-105 (M)	Skipped: Never bullied anyone	1,046	77.3 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-
-98 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Based upon 305 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SCH37: S0 Education: Were you ever picked on by a bully**

*Location:* 1387-1390 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Subject been picked on by a bully. An ever question.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	902	66.6 %	66.6%
1	Yes	452	33.4 %	33.4%

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

**S0SCH38: S0 Education: How often were you bullied**

*Location:* 1391-1394 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -113 , -106 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Frequency the subject has been bullied.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Once a week	47	3.5 %	10.4%
2	Twice a week	42	3.1 %	9.3%
3	Three times a week	27	2.0 %	6.0%
4	Four times a week	12	0.9 %	2.7%
5	Five times a week	10	0.7 %	2.2%
6	Six times a week	2	0.1 %	0.4%
7	Everyday	103	7.6 %	22.8%
8	1-3 times a month	42	3.1 %	9.3%
9	Less than once per month	166	12.3 %	36.8%
-106 (M)	Skipped: Never picked on by bully	902	66.6 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 451 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

- Study 29961 -

**S0SCH39: S0 Education: At what age did start being bullied**

*Location:* 1395-1398 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -106 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Subjects age when bulling started.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
4	-	2	0.1 %	0.4%
5	-	13	1.0 %	2.9%
6	-	33	2.4 %	7.3%
7	-	35	2.6 %	7.8%
8	-	38	2.8 %	8.4%
9	-	32	2.4 %	7.1%
10	-	66	4.9 %	14.7%
11	-	57	4.2 %	12.7%
12	-	67	4.9 %	14.9%
13	-	57	4.2 %	12.7%
14	-	33	2.4 %	7.3%
15	-	13	1.0 %	2.9%
16	-	4	0.3 %	0.9%

**Missing Data**

-106 (M)	Skipped: Never picked on by bully	902	66.6 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 450 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0NDAY6: S0 Education: How long have you been at this facility - converted to days**

*Location:* 1399-1405 (width: 7; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999999 , -999998 , -200 , -107

**Question:**

The number of days the subject has been at this facility.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	0 - 7	49	3.6 %	7.4%
2	8 - 14	69	5.1 %	10.4%
3	15 - 30	223	16.5 %	33.5%
4	31 - 60	178	13.1 %	26.8%
5	61 - 180	100	7.4 %	15.0%
6	181 - 365	39	2.9 %	5.9%
7	366 - 730	6	0.4 %	0.9%
8	731 or More	1	0.1 %	0.2%

*Missing Data*

-999999 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	6	0.4 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: Not In detention or locked facility	681	50.3 %	-

Based upon 665 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SCH\_COMMCODE: S0 Education: Community school ID**

*Location:* 1406-1413 (width: 8; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -101

**Question:**

Community school ID. See also s0sch6.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,326	97.9 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-101 (M)	Unknown: Data missing	28	2.1 %	-

Based upon 1,326 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SCH\_COMMTYPE: S0 Education: Community school type**

*Location:* 1414-1421 (width: 8; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -101 , -99

**Question:**

Community school type. See also s0sch6.

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	Regular public	886	65.4 %	67.0%
2	Parochial / private	5	0.4 %	0.4%
3	Private approved	20	1.5 %	1.5%
5	Alternative public	69	5.1 %	5.2%
6	Trade / vocation	61	4.5 %	4.6%
7	College / Junior college	11	0.8 %	0.8%
8	Charter school	239	17.7 %	18.1%
9	Home-schooling	2	0.1 %	0.2%
10	GED program	28	2.1 %	2.1%
96	Other	2	0.1 %	0.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-101 (M)	Unknown: Data missing	28	2.1 %	-
-99 (M)	Unknown type	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,323 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SCH6: S0 Education: Last time you went to that school (sch5)**

*Location:* 1422-1425 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The last time the subject attended school mentioned in coded variable s0sch\_commcode and s0schcommtype.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	Within the past 30 days	498	36.8 %	39.7%
2	2-5 Months ago	404	29.8 %	32.2%
3	6-11 Months ago	164	12.1 %	13.1%
4	More than 1 year ago	187	13.8 %	14.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-800 (M)	Missing due to data cleaning	9	0.7 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Has gone to school in the past year	70	5.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: In detention or locked facility	21	1.6 %	-
-8 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,253 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

- Study 29961 -

**S0SCHT: S0 Education: How long have you gone to that school (sch5)**

*Location:* 1426-1429 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -400 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Length of time attended that school.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Less than a month	104	7.7 %	9.8%
2	1-5 Months	330	24.4 %	31.2%
3	6-11 Months	175	12.9 %	16.6%
4	A year or longer	448	33.1 %	42.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-800 (M)	Missing due to data cleaning	20	1.5 %	-
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	275	20.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,057 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SCH7: S0 Education: Hours a week spent doing homework (sch5)**

*Location:* 1430-1433 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -103 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Number of hours the subject spend doing homework outside of school hours.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	None	571	42.2 %	46.8%
2	Less than one hour	202	14.9 %	16.6%
3	1-5 Hours	372	27.5 %	30.5%
4	6-10 Hours	52	3.8 %	4.3%
5	More than 10 hours	22	1.6 %	1.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-800 (M)	Missing due to data cleaning	29	2.1 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Attended school for < 1mth	104	7.7 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-
-8 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,219 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SCH\_18: S0 Education: CommSch - Days spent student government**

*Location:* 1434-1437 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -400 , -103 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Days per week spent on Student Government.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	1,183	87.4 %	96.9%
1	-	12	0.9 %	1.0%
2	-	8	0.6 %	0.7%
3	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
4	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
5	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
7	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

**Missing Data**

-800 (M)	Missing due to data cleaning	21	1.6 %	-
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	8	0.6 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Attended school for < 1mth	104	7.7 %	-

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

**S0SCH\_19: S0 Education: CommSch - Days spent athletic teams**

*Location:* 1438-1441 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -400 , -103 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Days per week spent on Athletic Teams.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	893	66.0 %	73.1%
1	-	17	1.3 %	1.4%
2	-	38	2.8 %	3.1%
3	-	59	4.4 %	4.8%
4	-	36	2.7 %	2.9%
5	-	132	9.7 %	10.8%
6	-	18	1.3 %	1.5%
7	-	28	2.1 %	2.3%

*Missing Data*

-800 (M)	Missing due to data cleaning	21	1.6 %	-
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	8	0.6 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Attended school for < 1mth	104	7.7 %	-

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

**S0SCH\_20: S0 Education: CommSch - Days spent cheerleading sport**

*Location:* 1442-1445 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -400 , -103 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Days per week spent on Cheerleading or other sport-related team (such as drill team or pep squad).

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	1,177	86.9 %	96.4%
1	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
2	-	12	0.9 %	1.0%
3	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
4	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
5	-	18	1.3 %	1.5%
7	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

*Missing Data*

-800 (M)	Missing due to data cleaning	21	1.6 %	-
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	8	0.6 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Attended school for < 1mth	104	7.7 %	-

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

**S0SCH\_21: S0 Education: CommSch - Days spent music band**

- Study 29961 -

*Location:* 1446-1449 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -400 , -103 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Days per week spent on Music/band.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	1,159	85.6 %	94.9%
1	-	12	0.9 %	1.0%
2	-	7	0.5 %	0.6%
3	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
4	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
5	-	24	1.8 %	2.0%
6	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
7	-	7	0.5 %	0.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-800 (M)	Missing due to data cleaning	21	1.6 %	-
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	8	0.6 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Attended school for < 1mth	104	7.7 %	-

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

**S0SCH\_22: S0 Education: CommSch - Days spent school clubs**

*Location:* 1450-1453 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -400 , -103 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Days per week spent on School clubs (hobby, service, recreational).

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	1,141	84.3 %	93.4%
1	-	19	1.4 %	1.6%
2	-	14	1.0 %	1.1%
3	-	12	0.9 %	1.0%
4	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
5	-	24	1.8 %	2.0%
7	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-800 (M)	Missing due to data cleaning	21	1.6 %	-
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	8	0.6 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Attended school for < 1mth	104	7.7 %	-

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

**S0SCH\_23: S0 Education: CommSch - Days spent National Honor Society**

*Location:* 1454-1457 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -800 , -400 , -103 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Days per week spent on National Honor Society.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	1,210	89.4 %	99.1%
1	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
3	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
5	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-800 (M)	Missing due to data cleaning	21	1.6 %	-
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	8	0.6 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Attended school for < 1mth	104	7.7 %	-

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

**S0SCH\_24: S0 Education: CommSch - Days spent newspaper/yearbook**

*Location:* 1458-1461 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -800 , -400 , -103 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Days per week spent on Newspaper/yearbook.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	1,177	86.9 %	96.4%
1	-	11	0.8 %	0.9%
2	-	13	1.0 %	1.1%
3	-	7	0.5 %	0.6%
4	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
5	-	8	0.6 %	0.7%
7	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

**Missing Data**

-800 (M)	Missing due to data cleaning	21	1.6 %	-
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	8	0.6 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Attended school for < 1mth	104	7.7 %	-

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

**S0SCH\_25: S0 Education: CommSch - Days spent attending events play**

*Location:* 1462-1465 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -400 , -103 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Days per week spent on attending athletic events, plays or school dances.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	832	61.4 %	68.5%
1	-	222	16.4 %	18.3%
2	-	85	6.3 %	7.0%
3	-	47	3.5 %	3.9%
4	-	13	1.0 %	1.1%
5	-	10	0.7 %	0.8%
6	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
7	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%

**Missing Data**

-800 (M)	Missing due to data cleaning	21	1.6 %	-
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	8	0.6 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Attended school for < 1mth	104	7.7 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	6	0.4 %	-

Based upon 1,215 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

- Study 29961 -

**S0SCH26: S0 Education: CommSch - How important to participate in school activities**

*Location:* 1466-1469 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -103 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Important to participate in school activities.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Not at all important	451	33.3 %	37.5%
2	Not too important	225	16.6 %	18.7%
3	Somewhat important	199	14.7 %	16.6%
4	Pretty important	146	10.8 %	12.1%
5	Very important	181	13.4 %	15.1%

**Missing Data**

-800 (M)	Missing due to data cleaning	29	2.1 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Attended school for < 1mth	104	7.7 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	19	1.4 %	-

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

**S0TOTEXA: S0 Education: Total number of extracurricular activities - community school**

*Location:* 1470-1473 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Total Number Extra-curricular School Activities; count of endorsed activities.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	655	48.4 %	53.6%
1	-	290	21.4 %	23.8%
2	-	176	13.0 %	14.4%
3	-	72	5.3 %	5.9%
4	-	17	1.3 %	1.4%
5	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
6	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
7	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
8	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-800 (M)	Missing due to data cleaning	21	1.6 %	-
-400 (M)	Question not asked in this version	8	0.6 %	-
-100 (M)	Did not skip into section	104	7.7 %	-

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

### **S0SCHTCH: S0 Education: Bonding to teachers - Community School**

*Location:* 1474-1480 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -800.00 , -300.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

#### **Question:**

Bonding to Teacher - nonfacility school; mean of 3 items.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance 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 mean is taken for the items associated with each subscale. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in a facility for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the facility school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	Strongly Disagree	19	1.4 %	1.6%
1.33	-	10	0.7 %	0.8%
1.67	-	25	1.8 %	2.0%
2.00	Disagree	70	5.2 %	5.7%
2.33	-	63	4.7 %	5.2%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2.67	-	159	11.7 %	13.0%
3.00	Neither Agree or Disagree	98	7.2 %	8.0%
3.33	-	224	16.5 %	18.3%
3.67	-	124	9.2 %	10.2%
4.00	Agree	286	21.1 %	23.4%
4.33	-	74	5.5 %	6.1%
4.67	-	42	3.1 %	3.4%
5.00	Strongly Agree	27	2.0 %	2.2%
-300.00 (M)	Too few values for computation	29	2.1 %	-
-100.00 (M)	Did not skip into section	104	7.7 %	-

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

#### **S0SCHATC: S0 Education: School Orientation - Community School**

*Location:* 1481-1487 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -800.00 , -300.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

#### **Question:**

School orientation - nonfacility school; mean of 7 items.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance 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 mean is taken for the items associated with each subscale. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in a facility for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the facility school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	Strongly Disagree	3	0.2 %	0.2%
1.29	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
1.43	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
1.57	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
1.71	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
1.86	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
2.00	Disagree	28	2.1 %	2.3%
2.14	-	12	0.9 %	1.0%
2.29	-	33	2.4 %	2.7%
2.43	-	20	1.5 %	1.6%
2.57	-	31	2.3 %	2.5%
2.71	-	36	2.7 %	2.9%
2.83	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.86	-	61	4.5 %	5.0%
3.00	Neither Agree or Disagree	43	3.2 %	3.5%
3.14	-	56	4.1 %	4.6%
3.29	-	55	4.1 %	4.5%
3.43	-	86	6.4 %	7.0%
3.57	-	83	6.1 %	6.8%
3.67	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
3.71	-	122	9.0 %	10.0%
3.86	-	88	6.5 %	7.2%
4.00	Agree	194	14.3 %	15.9%
4.14	-	56	4.1 %	4.6%
4.29	-	46	3.4 %	3.8%
4.43	-	36	2.7 %	2.9%
4.57	-	34	2.5 %	2.8%
4.71	-	28	2.1 %	2.3%
4.86	-	26	1.9 %	2.1%
5.00	Strongly Agree	17	1.3 %	1.4%
-300.00 (M)	Too few values for computation	29	2.1 %	-
-100.00 (M)	Did not skip into section	104	7.7 %	-

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

**S0DEM35R: S0 Education: Number of days attended - Community School**

*Location:* 1488-1491 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -100 , -99 , -98

- Study 29961 -

**Question:**

Attendance - Number of days.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	156	11.5 %	11.7%
9	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
18	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
27	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
36	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
45	-	56	4.1 %	4.2%
54	-	10	0.7 %	0.8%
63	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
72	-	22	1.6 %	1.7%
81	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
90	-	134	9.9 %	10.1%
99	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
108	-	45	3.3 %	3.4%
117	-	45	3.3 %	3.4%
126	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
135	-	156	11.5 %	11.7%
144	-	66	4.9 %	5.0%
153	-	115	8.5 %	8.6%
162	-	160	11.8 %	12.0%
171	-	116	8.6 %	8.7%
180	-	185	13.7 %	13.9%
-99 (M)	Dont Know	22	1.6 %	-

Based upon 1,332 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SCH\_HSSATISFACTION: S0 Education: Satisfaction with School - Community School**

*Location: 1492-1498 (width: 7; decimal: 2)*

*Variable Type: numeric*

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

**Question:**

Satisfaction - community school; Mean of 2 items.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

The school attachment items included are taken from the work of Cernkovich and

- Study 29961 -

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 mean is taken for the items associated with each subscale. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in a facility for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the facility school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.0	Strongly Disagree	28	2.1 %	2.3%
1.5	-	32	2.4 %	2.6%
2.0	Disagree	132	9.7 %	10.8%
2.5	-	97	7.2 %	7.9%
3.0	Neither Agree nor Disagree	242	17.9 %	19.8%
3.5	-	169	12.5 %	13.8%
4.0	Agree	396	29.2 %	32.4%
4.5	-	78	5.8 %	6.4%
5.0	Strongly Agree	47	3.5 %	3.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-800.0 (M)	Missing due to data cleaning	29	2.1 %	-
-100.0 (M)	Did not skip into Community School Section	104	7.7 %	-

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

**S0SCH\_HSENGAGEMENT: S0 School: High School Engagement - Community School**

*Location:* 1499-1505 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Engagement - community school; Mean of 4 items, two of which are reverse-coded.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance 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

- Study 29961 -

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 mean is taken for the items associated with each subscale. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in a facility for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the facility school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	Strongly Disagree	6	0.4 %	0.5%
1.25	-	8	0.6 %	0.7%
1.50	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
1.75	-	13	1.0 %	1.1%
2.00	Disagree	62	4.6 %	5.1%
2.25	-	27	2.0 %	2.2%
2.50	-	75	5.5 %	6.1%
2.75	-	40	3.0 %	3.3%
3.00	Neither Agree nor Disagree	123	9.1 %	10.1%
3.25	-	93	6.9 %	7.6%
3.33	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.50	-	155	11.4 %	12.7%
3.75	-	112	8.3 %	9.2%
4.00	Agree	291	21.5 %	23.8%
4.25	-	64	4.7 %	5.2%
4.50	-	58	4.3 %	4.8%
4.75	-	48	3.5 %	3.9%
5.00	Strongly Agree	40	3.0 %	3.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-800.00 (M)	Missing due to data cleaning	29	2.1 %	-
-100.00 (M)	Did not skip into Community School Section	104	7.7 %	-

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

**S0SCH\_DETCODE: S0 Education: DetSch - Facility code associated with detention school**

- Study 29961 -

*Location:* 1506-1510 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -102 , -101

**Question:**

Facility code associated with detention school.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	135	10.0 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-102 (M)	Skipped: Not currently in detention	656	48.4 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: In detention <3 months	563	41.6 %	-

Based upon 135 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DETSC7: S0 Education: DetSch - Hours a week spend doing homework**

*Location:* 1511-1514 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -108 , -107 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Count of hours a week subject spends doing homework.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance Activities and Orientation.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	None	101	7.5 %	81.5%
2	Less than one hour	5	0.4 %	4.0%
3	1-5 Hours	14	1.0 %	11.3%
4	6-10 Hours	3	0.2 %	2.4%
5	More than 10 hours	1	0.1 %	0.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	6	0.4 %	-
-108 (M)	Skipped: In detention less than 3mths	532	39.3 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: Not In detention or locked facility	681	50.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	9	0.7 %	-
-8 (M)	Refuse	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 124 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DETTCH: S0 Education: Bonding to teachers - institutional school**

- Study 29961 -

Location: 1515-1521 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -300.00 , -200.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

**Question:**

Bonding to Teacher - facility school; mean of 3 items.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance 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 mean is taken for the items associated with each subscale. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in a facility for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the facility school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.33	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
1.67	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
2.00	Disagree	5	0.4 %	4.0%
2.33	-	3	0.2 %	2.4%
2.50	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
2.67	-	10	0.7 %	8.0%
3.00	Neither Agree or Disagree	8	0.6 %	6.4%
3.33	-	36	2.7 %	28.8%
3.67	-	14	1.0 %	11.2%
4.00	Agree	33	2.4 %	26.4%
4.33	-	6	0.4 %	4.8%
4.67	-	6	0.4 %	4.8%
5.00	Strongly Agree	1	0.1 %	0.8%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	6	0.4 %	-
-100.00 (M)	Did not skip into section	1,213	89.6 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-9.00 (M)	Dont Know	8	0.6 %	-
-8.00 (M)	Refuse	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 125 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DETATC: S0 Education: School orientation - institutional school**

*Location:* 1522-1528 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

**Question:**

School orientation - facility school; mean of 7 items.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance 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 mean is taken for the items associated with each subscale. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in a facility for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the facility school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.43	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
2.00	Disagree	4	0.3 %	3.2%
2.29	-	5	0.4 %	4.0%
2.43	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
2.57	-	4	0.3 %	3.2%
2.71	-	3	0.2 %	2.4%
2.80	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
2.86	-	5	0.4 %	4.0%
3.00	Neither Agree or Disagree	3	0.2 %	2.4%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
3.14	-	8	0.6 %	6.4%
3.29	-	7	0.5 %	5.6%
3.43	-	2	0.1 %	1.6%
3.57	-	4	0.3 %	3.2%
3.71	-	13	1.0 %	10.4%
3.83	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
3.86	-	12	0.9 %	9.6%
4.00	Agree	29	2.1 %	23.2%
4.14	-	2	0.1 %	1.6%
4.17	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
4.29	-	5	0.4 %	4.0%
4.43	-	2	0.1 %	1.6%
4.57	-	4	0.3 %	3.2%
4.86	-	3	0.2 %	2.4%
5.00	Strongly Agree	5	0.4 %	4.0%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	6	0.4 %	-
-100.00 (M)	Did not skip into section	1,213	89.6 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Dont Know	8	0.6 %	-
-8.00 (M)	Refuse	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 125 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SCH\_DETSATISFACTION: S0 School: Satisfaction with School - Institutional School**

*Location:* 1529-1535 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800.0 , -200.0 , -100.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

**Question:**

Satisfaction - institution school; Mean of 2 items.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance 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 mean is taken for the items associated with each subscale. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in a facility for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the facility school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
2.0	Disagree	11	0.8 %	8.8%
2.5	-	8	0.6 %	6.4%
3.0	Neither Agree nor Disagree	18	1.3 %	14.4%
3.5	-	16	1.2 %	12.8%
4.0	Agree	62	4.6 %	49.6%
4.5	-	5	0.4 %	4.0%
5.0	Strongly Agree	5	0.4 %	4.0%
-200.0 (M)	Data missing	6	0.4 %	-
-100.0 (M)	Did not skip into Institution School Section	1,213	89.6 %	-
-9.0 (M)	Dont Know	8	0.6 %	-
-8.0 (M)	Refuse	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 125 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0SCH\_DETENGAGEMENT: S0 School: High School Engagement - Institutional School**

*Location:* 1536-1542 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800.00 , -200.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

#### **Question:**

Engagement - institution school; Mean of 4 items, two of which are reverse-coded.

MEASURE: Education (BL): School Bonding Attendance 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 mean is taken for the items associated with each subscale. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in a facility for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the facility school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree

- Study 29961 -

(3) Neither Agree nor Disagree

(4) Agree

(5) Strongly Agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.50	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
1.75	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
2.00	Disagree	7	0.5 %	5.6%
2.50	-	7	0.5 %	5.6%
2.75	-	10	0.7 %	8.0%
3.00	Neither Agree nor Disagree	11	0.8 %	8.8%
3.25	-	9	0.7 %	7.2%
3.50	-	8	0.6 %	6.4%
3.67	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
3.75	-	11	0.8 %	8.8%
4.00	Agree	37	2.7 %	29.6%
4.25	-	7	0.5 %	5.6%
4.50	-	6	0.4 %	4.8%
4.75	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
5.00	Strongly Agree	8	0.6 %	6.4%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	6	0.4 %	-
-100.00 (M)	Did not skip into Institution School Section	1,213	89.6 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Dont Know	8	0.6 %	-
-8.00 (M)	Refuse	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 125 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM49: S0 Income: Employed currently or before coming to facility**

*Location:* 1543-1546 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -800 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Currently employed.

MEASURE: Employment

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,000	73.9 %	73.9%
1	Yes	354	26.1 %	26.1%

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

**S0DEM50B: S0 Income: Job type (category)**

*Location:* 1547-1550 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -400 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Current job type.

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Retail/Cashier	45	3.3 %	13.4%
2	Counter help/Fast food/Restaurant worker	89	6.6 %	26.4%
3	Babysitting	3	0.2 %	0.9%
4	Skilled labor (e.g., carpentry	34	2.5 %	10.1%
5	Manual labor (e.g., grass cutting	91	6.7 %	27.0%
6	Office work/clerical	24	1.8 %	7.1%
96	Other	51	3.8 %	15.1%
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	70	5.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Not currently employed	947	69.9 %	-

Based upon 337 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM50C: S0 Income: Is this a training program like Job Corp**

*Location:* 1551-1555 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -400 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether current job is part of job training program

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	336	24.8 %	100.0%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	70	5.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Not currently employed - question skipped	947	69.9 %	-
-9 (M)	Don't Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 336 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM51: S0 Income: Hours worked per week**

*Location:* 1556-1559 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Hours worked per week at current job.

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	1-5	21	1.6 %	6.0%
2	6-10	31	2.3 %	8.8%
3	11-15	27	2.0 %	7.7%
4	16-20	43	3.2 %	12.2%
5	21-25	38	2.8 %	10.8%
6	26-30	32	2.4 %	9.1%
7	31-35	31	2.3 %	8.8%
8	36-40	70	5.2 %	19.9%
9	More than 40	59	4.4 %	16.8%
-101 (M)	Skipped: Not currently employed	1,000	73.9 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 352 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0NDAY: S0 Income: Length of time had job - converted to days**

*Location:* 1560-1566 (width: 7; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999999 , -999998 , -800 , -400 , -101

**Question:**

Length of time had job - converted to days.

MEASURE: Employment

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	0 - 7	31	2.3 %	9.0%
2	8 - 14	24	1.8 %	7.0%
3	15 - 30	49	3.6 %	14.2%
4	31 - 60	42	3.1 %	12.2%
5	61 - 180	113	8.3 %	32.8%
6	181 - 365	52	3.8 %	15.1%
7	366 - 730	18	1.3 %	5.2%
8	731 or More	16	1.2 %	4.6%
-800 (M)	Data corruption	3	0.2 %	-
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	18	1.3 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Not currently employed	988	73.0 %	-

Based upon 345 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM52: S0 Income: Money earned per hour**

*Location:* 1567-1570 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -800 , -101

**Question:**

Hourly wage at current job.

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	3	0.2 %	0.9%
1	-	4	0.3 %	1.2%
2	-	3	0.2 %	0.9%
3	-	3	0.2 %	0.9%
4	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
5	-	51	3.8 %	15.6%
6	-	92	6.8 %	28.1%
7	-	67	4.9 %	20.5%
8	-	38	2.8 %	11.6%
9	-	17	1.3 %	5.2%
10	-	29	2.1 %	8.9%
12	-	2	0.1 %	0.6%
13	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
15	-	5	0.4 %	1.5%
20	-	3	0.2 %	0.9%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
30	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
35	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
40	-	2	0.1 %	0.6%
50	-	2	0.1 %	0.6%
70	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
75	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	26	1.9 %	-
-998 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Not currently employed	1,000	73.9 %	-

Based upon 327 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM53: S0 Income: Ever work in the past**

*Location:* 1571-1574 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -102 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Ever work in the past.

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	455	33.6 %	45.5%
1	Yes	545	40.3 %	54.5%
-102 (M)	Skipped: Currently employed	354	26.1 %	-

Based upon 1,000 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0NDAY2: S0 Income: Longest time held one job - converted to days**

*Location:* 1575-1581 (width: 7; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999999 , -999998 , -800 , -103

**Question:**

Longest time held one job - converted to days.

MEASURE: Employment

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	0 - 7	35	2.6 %	3.9%
2	8 - 14	25	1.8 %	2.8%
3	15 - 30	96	7.1 %	10.7%
4	31 - 60	96	7.1 %	10.7%
5	61 - 180	390	28.8 %	43.5%
6	181 - 365	167	12.3 %	18.6%
7	366 - 730	60	4.4 %	6.7%
8	731 or More	28	2.1 %	3.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999999 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No current or past job	455	33.6 %	-

Based upon 897 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM56A: S0 Income: Job type - subjects longest held job**

*Location:* 1582-1585 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -103 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Job type for job held longest time.

**MEASURE:** Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Retail/Cashier	115	8.5 %	12.8%
2	Counter Help/Fast Food/Restaurant Worker	248	18.3 %	27.6%
3	Babysitting	60	4.4 %	6.7%
4	Skilled Labor (e.g. carpentry)	77	5.7 %	8.6%
5	Manual Labor (e.g. grass cutting)	311	23.0 %	34.7%
6	Office Work/Clerical	45	3.3 %	5.0%
96	Other	41	3.0 %	4.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-103 (M)	Skipped: No current or past job	455	33.6 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 897 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM57: S0 Income: How many different jobs have you had**

*Location:* 1586-1589 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

- Study 29961 -

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -800 , -103 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Number of different jobs ever held.

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	1 job	402	29.7 %	44.7%
2	2-3 jobs	340	25.1 %	37.8%
3	4-6 jobs	122	9.0 %	13.6%
4	7 or more jobs	35	2.6 %	3.9%
-103 (M)	Skipped: No current or past job	455	33.6 %	-

Based upon 899 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM59: S0 Income: Did you miss work or come in late a lot**

Location: 1590-1593 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -800 , -103 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether miss worked/come in late a lot.

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	811	59.9 %	90.3%
1	Yes	87	6.4 %	9.7%
-103 (M)	Skipped: No current or past job	455	33.6 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 898 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM60: S0 Income: Have you ever been fired**

Location: 1594-1597 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -800 , -103 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Ever been fired.

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	747	55.2 %	83.1%
1	Yes	152	11.2 %	16.9%
-103 (M)	Skipped: No current or past job	455	33.6 %	-

Based upon 899 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM61: S0 Income: Number times fired**

*Location:* 1598-1601 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -104 , -103 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

If fired, how many times.

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	1 time	131	9.7 %	86.2%
2	2 times	18	1.3 %	11.8%
3	3 times	2	0.1 %	1.3%
4	4 or more times	1	0.1 %	0.7%
-104 (M)	Skipped: Has worked but never fired	747	55.2 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No current or past job	455	33.6 %	-

Based upon 152 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM62: S0 Income: Age first time fired**

*Location:* 1602-1605 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -104 , -103 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

If fired, age when first fired.

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
11	-	1	0.1 %	0.7%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
12	-	4	0.3 %	2.6%
13	-	11	0.8 %	7.2%
14	-	16	1.2 %	10.5%
15	-	39	2.9 %	25.7%
16	-	68	5.0 %	44.7%
17	-	13	1.0 %	8.6%
-104 (M)	Skipped: Has worked but never fired	747	55.2 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: No current or past job	455	33.6 %	-

Based upon 152 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM63: S0 Income: Ever left job without another lined up**

*Location:* 1606-1609 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -103 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Ever left one job without another lined up.

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	586	43.3 %	65.5%
1	Yes	309	22.8 %	34.5%
-103 (M)	Skipped: No current or past job	455	33.6 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 895 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM64A: S0 Income: Currently: Make money another way including illegal**

*Location:* 1610-1613 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Currently make money in other ways, including illegally.

MEASURE: Employment

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,103	81.5 %	81.5%
1	Yes	251	18.5 %	18.5%

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

**S0DEM64B: S0 Income: Most serious way currently makes money in other ways including illegal**

*Location:* 1614-1617 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -105

**Question:**

Current way make money in other ways including illegal  
(most serious type of illegal work).

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Sold stolen property	4	0.3 %	1.6%
2	Sold drugs	122	9.0 %	48.6%
3	Stole merchandise	45	3.3 %	17.9%
4	Gambling	1	0.1 %	0.4%
6	Under-the-table (but not illegal)	79	5.8 %	31.5%
-105 (M)	Skipped: Doesn't currently make money in illegal ways	1,103	81.5 %	-

Based upon 251 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM64C: S0 Income: Currently: Hours worked per week for other activities**

*Location:* 1618-1621 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -105 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Hours per week doing illegal work.

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	1-5	77	5.7 %	31.7%
2	6-10	43	3.2 %	17.7%
3	11-15	25	1.8 %	10.3%
4	16-20	13	1.0 %	5.3%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
5	21-25	7	0.5 %	2.9%
6	26-30	13	1.0 %	5.3%
7	31-35	3	0.2 %	1.2%
8	36-40	11	0.8 %	4.5%
9	More than 40	51	3.8 %	21.0%
-105 (M)	Skipped: Doesn't currently make money in illegal ways	1,103	81.5 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 243 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM65: S0 Income: Currently: Money earned in a week from other activities**

*Location:* 1622-1628 (width: 7; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9999 , -9998 , -800 , -105

**Question:**

Money made per week from illegal work.

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
5	-	9	0.7 %	3.8%
7	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
8	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
10	-	8	0.6 %	3.3%
12	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
15	-	2	0.1 %	0.8%
20	-	14	1.0 %	5.8%
23	-	2	0.1 %	0.8%
25	-	2	0.1 %	0.8%
30	-	8	0.6 %	3.3%
35	-	2	0.1 %	0.8%
40	-	4	0.3 %	1.7%
45	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
50	-	11	0.8 %	4.6%
60	-	7	0.5 %	2.9%
75	-	2	0.1 %	0.8%
80	-	2	0.1 %	0.8%
90	-	3	0.2 %	1.2%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
100	-	19	1.4 %	7.9%
120	-	3	0.2 %	1.2%
125	-	2	0.1 %	0.8%
150	-	4	0.3 %	1.7%
160	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
200	-	14	1.0 %	5.8%
209	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
210	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
250	-	5	0.4 %	2.1%
300	-	6	0.4 %	2.5%
330	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
340	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
350	-	2	0.1 %	0.8%
400	-	3	0.2 %	1.2%
500	-	18	1.3 %	7.5%
550	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
600	-	5	0.4 %	2.1%
700	-	4	0.3 %	1.7%
800	-	2	0.1 %	0.8%
850	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
900	-	4	0.3 %	1.7%
1000	-	16	1.2 %	6.7%
1100	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
1200	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
1300	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
1400	-	2	0.1 %	0.8%
1500	-	6	0.4 %	2.5%
1600	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
2000	-	7	0.5 %	2.9%
2400	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
2500	-	2	0.1 %	0.8%
2800	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
3000	-	5	0.4 %	2.1%
3500	-	3	0.2 %	1.2%
3700	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
4000	-	2	0.1 %	0.8%
4100	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
4125	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
4500	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
5000	-	4	0.3 %	1.7%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
6000	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
7000	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
7500	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
8000	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9999 (M)	Dont Know	10	0.7 %	-
-9998 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: Doesn't currently make money in illegal ways	1,103	81.5 %	-

Based upon 240 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM64D: S0 Income: Ever: Make money another way including illegal**

*Location:* 1629-1632 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -400 , -108 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Ever made money in other ways, including illegally.

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	431	31.8 %	46.0%
1	Yes	505	37.3 %	54.0%
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	275	20.3 %	-
-108 (M)	Skipped: Currently makes money in illegal ways	142	10.5 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 936 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM64E: S0 Income: Most serious way EVER made money in other ways including illegal**

*Location:* 1633-1636 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -109 , -108

**Question:**

Way made money in other ways including illegal  
(most serious type of illegal work).

MEASURE: Employment

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Sold stolen property	12	0.9 %	2.4%
2	Sold drugs	350	25.8 %	69.3%
3	Stole merchandise	90	6.6 %	17.8%
4	Gambling	6	0.4 %	1.2%
6	Under-the-table (but not illegal)	47	3.5 %	9.3%
-109 (M)	Skipped: Never made money in illegal ways	598	44.2 %	-
-108 (M)	Skipped: Currently makes money in illegal ways	251	18.5 %	-

Based upon 505 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0NDAY3: S0 Income: Ever: Longest period of time made money other ways - converted to days**

*Location:* 1637-1643 (width: 7; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999999 , -999998 , -800 , -400 , -109 , -108

**Question:**

Longest period of time made money other ways converted to days.

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	0 - 7	28	2.1 %	5.6%
2	8 - 14	14	1.0 %	2.8%
3	15 - 30	42	3.1 %	8.4%
4	31 - 60	53	3.9 %	10.6%
5	61 - 180	95	7.0 %	18.9%
6	181 - 365	94	6.9 %	18.7%
7	366 - 730	71	5.2 %	14.1%
8	731 or More	105	7.8 %	20.9%

**Missing Data**

-999999 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-
-999998 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	279	20.6 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: Never made money in illegal ways	428	31.6 %	-
-108 (M)	Skipped: Currently makes money in illegal ways	142	10.5 %	-

Based upon 502 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM64G: S0 Income: Ever: Money earned per week from other activities**

*Location:* 1644-1650 (width: 7; decimal: 0)

- Study 29961 -

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9999 , -9998 , -800 , -400 , -109 , -108

**Question:**

Money made per week doing illegal activities in the past.

**MEASURE:** Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
6	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
10	-	2	0.1 %	0.4%
15	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
20	-	9	0.7 %	1.9%
25	-	7	0.5 %	1.5%
30	-	5	0.4 %	1.0%
35	-	4	0.3 %	0.8%
40	-	5	0.4 %	1.0%
50	-	8	0.6 %	1.7%
55	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
60	-	4	0.3 %	0.8%
70	-	4	0.3 %	0.8%
75	-	6	0.4 %	1.2%
80	-	8	0.6 %	1.7%
90	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
95	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
100	-	16	1.2 %	3.3%
120	-	3	0.2 %	0.6%
125	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
150	-	10	0.7 %	2.1%
160	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
170	-	2	0.1 %	0.4%
175	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
180	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
200	-	25	1.8 %	5.2%
250	-	13	1.0 %	2.7%
275	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
300	-	29	2.1 %	6.0%
333	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
350	-	10	0.7 %	2.1%
375	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
400	-	18	1.3 %	3.7%
450	-	4	0.3 %	0.8%
500	-	50	3.7 %	10.4%
530	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
550	-	2	0.1 %	0.4%
560	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
600	-	16	1.2 %	3.3%
650	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
700	-	12	0.9 %	2.5%
750	-	3	0.2 %	0.6%
800	-	13	1.0 %	2.7%
850	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
900	-	7	0.5 %	1.5%
1000	-	47	3.5 %	9.8%
1130	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
1200	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
1300	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
1400	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
1500	-	20	1.5 %	4.2%
1600	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
1750	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
1800	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
2000	-	27	2.0 %	5.6%
2100	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
2500	-	8	0.6 %	1.7%
2800	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
3000	-	17	1.3 %	3.5%
3200	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
3500	-	7	0.5 %	1.5%
4000	-	12	0.9 %	2.5%
4500	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
5000	-	7	0.5 %	1.5%
6000	-	2	0.1 %	0.4%
6500	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
7000	-	4	0.3 %	0.8%
8000	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
8500	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
9000	-	4	0.3 %	0.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9999 (M)	Dont Know		24	1.8 %

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	279	20.6 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: Never made money in illegal ways	428	31.6 %	-
-108 (M)	Skipped: Currently makes money in illegal ways	142	10.5 %	-

Based upon 481 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM69: S0 Income: Ever had to pay bills like rent/phone/electric**

*Location:* 1651-1654 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Ever had to pay bills.

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	910	67.2 %	67.2%
1	Yes	444	32.8 %	32.8%

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

**S0DEM70: S0 Income: Did you ever fail to pay bills**

*Location:* 1655-1658 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -106 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

If ever paid bills, whether ever failed to pay them.

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	352	26.0 %	79.3%
1	Yes	92	6.8 %	20.7%
-106 (M)	Skipped: Never had to pay bills	910	67.2 %	-

Based upon 444 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEM71: S0 Income: Have parents/friends helped you financially**

*Location:* 1659-1662 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

- Study 29961 -

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -800 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether parents/friends helped subject financially.

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	857	63.3 %	63.3%
1	Yes	497	36.7 %	36.7%

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

**S0DEM73: S0 Income: Ever owed people money and not paid back**

Location: 1663-1666 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -800 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Ever owed people money and not paid them back.

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	943	69.6 %	69.6%
1	Yes	411	30.4 %	30.4%

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

**S0DEM74: S0 Income: Number of times owed someone money and didnt pay back**

Location: 1667-1670 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -800 , -107 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

If ever owed people money and not paid them back,  
how many times.

MEASURE: Employment

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	1 time	65	4.8 %	15.9%
2	2-3 times	184	13.6 %	45.0%
3	4-6 times	91	6.7 %	22.2%
4	7-10 times	32	2.4 %	7.8%
5	11-15 times	11	0.8 %	2.7%
6	16-20 times	6	0.4 %	1.5%
7	21-25 times	3	0.2 %	0.7%
8	More than 25 times	17	1.3 %	4.2%
-107 (M)	Skipped: Never owed money and didnt pay back	943	69.6 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 409 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0EXPVIC: S0 ExpV: Victim Score (6)**

*Location:* 1671-1674 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200

**Question:**

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 ever been chased where you thought you might be seriously hurt?") and observed (i.e., Witnessed - 7 items, e.g., "Have you ever seen someone else being raped, an attempt made to rape someone or any other type of sexual attack?"). Higher scores indicate a greater exposure to violence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	442	32.6 %	32.7%
1	-	275	20.3 %	20.4%
2	-	258	19.1 %	19.1%
3	-	197	14.5 %	14.6%
4	-	151	11.2 %	11.2%
5	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
6	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0EXPWIT: S0 ExpV: Witnessed Score (7)**

*Location:* 1675-1678 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200

**Question:**

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 ever been chased where you thought you might be seriously hurt?") and observed (i.e., Witnessed - 7 items, e.g., "Have you ever seen someone else being raped, an attempt made to rape someone or any other type of sexual attack?"). Higher scores indicate a greater exposure to violence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	93	6.9 %	6.9%
1	-	131	9.7 %	9.7%
2	-	157	11.6 %	11.6%
3	-	176	13.0 %	13.0%
4	-	220	16.2 %	16.3%
5	-	250	18.5 %	18.5%
6	-	280	20.7 %	20.7%
7	-	44	3.2 %	3.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0EXPTOT: S0 ExpV: Total Score - witnessed plus victim (13)**

*Location:* 1679-1682 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200

**Question:**

Exposure to Violence - Total; sum of the victim and witness scales endorsed.

MEASURE: Exposure to Violence (ETV)

- Study 29961 -

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 ever been chased where you thought you might be seriously hurt?") and observed (i.e., Witnessed - 7 items, e.g., "Have you ever seen someone else being raped, an attempt made to rape someone or any other type of sexual attack?"). Higher scores indicate a greater exposure to violence.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	70	5.2 %	5.2%
1	-	100	7.4 %	7.4%
2	-	120	8.9 %	8.9%
3	-	120	8.9 %	8.9%
4	-	126	9.3 %	9.3%
5	-	137	10.1 %	10.1%
6	-	176	13.0 %	13.0%
7	-	144	10.6 %	10.7%
8	-	118	8.7 %	8.7%
9	-	123	9.1 %	9.1%
10	-	81	6.0 %	6.0%
11	-	29	2.1 %	2.1%
12	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
13	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0FRDQLT: S0 FQual: Friendship - Quality of Relationship**

*Location:* 1683-1689 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -100.00

**Question:**

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

- Study 29961 -

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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.30	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.60	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.70	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.90	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
2.10	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
2.20	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
2.30	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
2.40	-	23	1.7 %	1.8%
2.50	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
2.56	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.60	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
2.67	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
2.70	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
2.80	-	30	2.2 %	2.3%
2.89	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.90	-	46	3.4 %	3.5%
3.00	Quite a bit	67	4.9 %	5.1%
3.10	-	59	4.4 %	4.5%
3.11	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
3.20	-	70	5.2 %	5.4%
3.22	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
3.30	-	86	6.4 %	6.6%
3.33	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
3.40	-	111	8.2 %	8.5%
3.44	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
3.50	-	117	8.6 %	9.0%
3.56	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
3.60	-	126	9.3 %	9.7%
3.63	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
3.67	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
3.70	-	136	10.0 %	10.4%
3.75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.78	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
3.80	-	110	8.1 %	8.4%
3.90	-	87	6.4 %	6.7%
4.00	Very much	97	7.2 %	7.4%
-100.00 (M)	Did not skip into section	50	3.7 %	-

Based upon 1,304 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0FUTURE: S0 FOI: Future Orientation Inventory Scale**

*Location:* 1690-1696 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00

**Question:**

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: FOI**

The 15-item Future Outlook Inventory used in this study was developed by Cauffman and Woolard (1999; unpublished), using items from the Life Orientation Task (Scheier & Carver, 1985), the Zimbardo Time Perspective Scale (Zimbardo, 1980), and the Consideration of Future Consequences Scale (Strathman, Gleicher, Boninger, & 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	%	Valid %
1.00	Never True	9	0.7 %	0.7%
1.13	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
1.25	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
1.38	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
1.50	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
1.63	-	61	4.5 %	4.5%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.75	-	63	4.7 %	4.7%
1.88	-	77	5.7 %	5.7%
2.00	Rarely True	117	8.6 %	8.7%
2.13	-	140	10.3 %	10.4%
2.14	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.25	-	128	9.5 %	9.5%
2.29	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.38	-	123	9.1 %	9.1%
2.50	-	100	7.4 %	7.4%
2.63	-	81	6.0 %	6.0%
2.75	-	88	6.5 %	6.5%
2.88	-	78	5.8 %	5.8%
3.00	Often True	54	4.0 %	4.0%
3.13	-	41	3.0 %	3.0%
3.14	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.25	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
3.38	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
3.50	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
3.63	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
3.75	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
3.88	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
4.00	Always True	7	0.5 %	0.5%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0GANG1: S0 Gang: 6mo before JV - member of a gang**

*Location:* 1697-1700 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

In the past six months before you came into the juvenile system on this charge,  
were you a member of a street gang or posse?

MEASURE: Gang

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,122	82.9 %	83.1%
1	Yes	228	16.8 %	16.9%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-8 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0GANGCODE\_GANG6MO: S0 Gang: Gang code - gang subj was involved with in 6mo prior to detention**

*Location:* 1701-1705 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9992 , -9991 , -9982 , -9981 , -9972 , -9971 , -200 , -103 , -101

**Question:**

Gang identifier the subject was involved with in 6 months prior to detention.

MEASURE: Gang

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	213	15.7 %	100.0%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-9992 (M)	AZ: Subj doesnt know name of the gang	4	0.3 %	-
-9991 (M)	PA: Subj doesnt know name of the gang	1	0.1 %	-
-9982 (M)	AZ: Subj refused to provide name of gang	5	0.4 %	-
-9981 (M)	PA: Subj refused to provide name of gang	1	0.1 %	-
-9972 (M)	AZ: Gang does not have a name	1	0.1 %	-
-9971 (M)	PA: Gang does not have a name	3	0.2 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Not in gang 6mo before detention	1,123	82.9 %	-

Based upon 213 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0GANG5: S0 Gang: 6mo before JV - number of members in gang/posse**

*Location:* 1706-1710 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9999 , -9998 , -200 , -101

**Question:**

How many members are in the gang/posse?

MEASURE: Gang

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
5	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
7	-	3	0.2 %	1.5%
10	-	4	0.3 %	2.0%
11	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
12	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
13	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
14	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
15	-	4	0.3 %	2.0%
16	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
20	-	9	0.7 %	4.5%
25	-	4	0.3 %	2.0%
30	-	9	0.7 %	4.5%
35	-	3	0.2 %	1.5%
36	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
40	-	11	0.8 %	5.4%
45	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
50	-	20	1.5 %	9.9%
60	-	3	0.2 %	1.5%
62	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
65	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
70	-	3	0.2 %	1.5%
80	-	5	0.4 %	2.5%
90	-	2	0.1 %	1.0%
100	-	26	1.9 %	12.9%
150	-	8	0.6 %	4.0%
200	-	23	1.7 %	11.4%
250	-	2	0.1 %	1.0%
300	-	9	0.7 %	4.5%
350	-	2	0.1 %	1.0%
390	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
400	-	4	0.3 %	2.0%
500	-	12	0.9 %	5.9%
600	-	3	0.2 %	1.5%
732	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
800	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
1000	-	13	1.0 %	6.4%
2000	-	6	0.4 %	3.0%
9997	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9999 (M)	Dont Know	25	1.8 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-9998 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Not in gang 6mo before detention	1,123	82.9 %	-

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

**S0GANG6: S0 Gang: 6mo before JV - age oldest member of gang/posse**

*Location:* 1711-1714 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

What is the age of the oldest member of the gang/posse?

MEASURE: Gang

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
14	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
16	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
17	-	5	0.4 %	2.5%
18	-	7	0.5 %	3.4%
19	-	7	0.5 %	3.4%
20	-	5	0.4 %	2.5%
21	-	8	0.6 %	3.9%
22	-	9	0.7 %	4.4%
23	-	6	0.4 %	3.0%
24	-	4	0.3 %	2.0%
25	-	12	0.9 %	5.9%
26	-	3	0.2 %	1.5%
27	-	4	0.3 %	2.0%
28	-	4	0.3 %	2.0%
29	-	2	0.1 %	1.0%
30	-	20	1.5 %	9.9%
31	-	4	0.3 %	2.0%
32	-	5	0.4 %	2.5%
34	-	5	0.4 %	2.5%
35	-	11	0.8 %	5.4%
36	-	3	0.2 %	1.5%
37	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
38	-	3	0.2 %	1.5%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
40	-	12	0.9 %	5.9%
42	-	3	0.2 %	1.5%
43	-	3	0.2 %	1.5%
45	-	8	0.6 %	3.9%
46	-	3	0.2 %	1.5%
47	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
48	-	2	0.1 %	1.0%
49	-	3	0.2 %	1.5%
50	-	8	0.6 %	3.9%
51	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
52	-	2	0.1 %	1.0%
53	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
54	-	5	0.4 %	2.5%
56	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
57	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
58	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
60	-	2	0.1 %	1.0%
62	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
63	-	2	0.1 %	1.0%
65	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
67	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
70	-	4	0.3 %	2.0%
72	-	2	0.1 %	1.0%
73	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
76	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%
80	-	2	0.1 %	1.0%
90	-	1	0.1 %	0.5%

*Missing Data*

-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Not in gang 6mo before detention	1,123	82.9 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	24	1.8 %	-
-98 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 203 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0GANG7: S0 Gang: 6mo before JV - does gang/posse have any colors**

*Location:* 1715-1718 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

- Study 29961 -

Does your gang/posse have any colors?

MEASURE: Gang

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	65	4.8 %	28.6%
1	Yes	162	12.0 %	71.4%

*Missing Data*

-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Not in gang 6mo before detention	1,123	82.9 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

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

**S0GANG8: S0 Gang: 6mo before JV - does gang/posse have any rules**

*Location:* 1719-1722 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Does your gang/posse have any rules?

MEASURE: Gang

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	112	8.3 %	49.3%
1	Yes	115	8.5 %	50.7%

*Missing Data*

-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Not in gang 6mo before detention	1,123	82.9 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

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

**S0GANG9: S0 Gang: 6mo before JV - does gang/posse share money**

*Location:* 1723-1726 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Does your gang/posse share money?

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Gang

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	68	5.0 %	30.0%
1	Yes	159	11.7 %	70.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Not in gang 6mo before detention	1,123	82.9 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

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

**S0GANG10: S0 Gang: 6mo before JV - does gang/posse share drugs**

*Location:* 1727-1730 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Does your gang/posse share drugs?

MEASURE: Gang

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	45	3.3 %	19.9%
1	Yes	181	13.4 %	80.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Not in gang 6mo before detention	1,123	82.9 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

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

**S0GANG11: S0 Gang: 6mo before JV - does gang/posse have punishment if break rules**

*Location:* 1731-1734 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Does your gang/posse have punishments for breaking the rules?

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Gang

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	106	7.8 %	46.7%
1	Yes	121	8.9 %	53.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Not in gang 6mo before detention	1,123	82.9 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

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

**S0GANG12: S0 Gang: 6mo before JV - frequency of contact w/gang**

*Location:* 1735-1738 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

In the past six months, before you came into the system on this charge,  
how often did you have contact with the gang/posse?

MEASURE: Gang

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Daily	144	10.6 %	63.2%
2	3-6 times per week	21	1.6 %	9.2%
3	twice per week	11	0.8 %	4.8%
4	Once per week	10	0.7 %	4.4%
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	6	0.4 %	2.6%
6	Once per month	3	0.2 %	1.3%
7	Less than monthly	33	2.4 %	14.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Not in gang 6mo before detention	1,123	82.9 %	-

Based upon 228 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0GANG13: S0 Gang: 6mo before JV - position in the gang/posse**

*Location:* 1739-1742 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

- Study 29961 -

What is/was your position in the gang/posse?

MEASURE: Gang

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Leader	9	0.7 %	4.0%
2	Not leader, but one of the top people	52	3.8 %	22.9%
3	Member	158	11.7 %	69.6%
4	Something else (other)	8	0.6 %	3.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Not in gang 6mo before detention	1,123	82.9 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

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

**S0GANG15: S0 Gang: 6mo before JV - still a member of gang/posse**

*Location:* 1743-1746 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Are you still a member of the gang/posse?

MEASURE: Gang

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	52	3.8 %	22.9%
1	Yes	175	12.9 %	77.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Not in gang 6mo before detention	1,123	82.9 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

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

**S0GANG16: S0 Gang: 6mo before JV - how important is gang/posse to you**

*Location:* 1747-1750 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

- Study 29961 -

How important is the gang/posse to you?

MEASURE: Gang

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	Not at all	63	4.7 %	27.6%
1	A little bit	45	3.3 %	19.7%
2	Moderately	30	2.2 %	13.2%
3	Quite a bit	48	3.5 %	21.1%
4	Extremely	42	3.1 %	18.4%

*Missing Data*

-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Not in gang 6mo before detention	1,123	82.9 %	-

Based upon 228 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0GANG17: S0 Gang: 6mo before JV - how many friends are NOT in this gang/posse**

*Location:* 1751-1754 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

How many of your friends are NOT members of the gang/posse?

MEASURE: Gang

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	None (all are members)	33	2.4 %	14.6%
2	A few are not members	121	8.9 %	53.5%
3	Half are not members	34	2.5 %	15.0%
4	Most are not members	26	1.9 %	11.5%
5	All (none are members)	12	0.9 %	5.3%

*Missing Data*

-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Not in gang 6mo before detention	1,123	82.9 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

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

**S0GANG18: S0 Gang: Ever - member of a gang**

*Location:* 1755-1758 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

- Study 29961 -

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -102 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Were you ever a member of a gang/posse?

MEASURE: Gang

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,035	76.4 %	92.2%
1	Yes	87	6.4 %	7.8%

**Missing Data**

-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: In a gang 6mo before detention	228	16.8 %	-
-8 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,122 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0GANGCODE\_GANGEVER: S0 Gang: Gang code - last gang subj was involved with (if not in gang prior to coming to detention)**

*Location:* 1759-1763 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9992 , -9991 , -9982 , -9981 , -9972 , -9971 , -200 , -103 , -102

**Question:**

Gang identifier for the last gang the subject was involved with  
(if not in gang prior to coming to detention).

MEASURE: Gang

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	84	6.2 %	100.0%
-9971 (M)	PA: Gang does not have a name	3	0.2 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Never in a gang	1,036	76.5 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: In a gang 6mo before detention	228	16.8 %	-

Based upon 84 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0GANG20: S0 Gang: Ever - number of members in gang/posse**

*Location:* 1764-1768 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9999 , -9998 , -200 , -103

- Study 29961 -

**Question:**

How many members in the gang/posse?

MEASURE: Gang

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	-	1	0.1 %	1.2%
2	-	1	0.1 %	1.2%
3	-	1	0.1 %	1.2%
6	-	1	0.1 %	1.2%
7	-	1	0.1 %	1.2%
8	-	1	0.1 %	1.2%
10	-	5	0.4 %	6.2%
11	-	1	0.1 %	1.2%
13	-	1	0.1 %	1.2%
15	-	5	0.4 %	6.2%
20	-	5	0.4 %	6.2%
21	-	1	0.1 %	1.2%
23	-	1	0.1 %	1.2%
25	-	3	0.2 %	3.8%
30	-	7	0.5 %	8.8%
31	-	1	0.1 %	1.2%
35	-	1	0.1 %	1.2%
40	-	4	0.3 %	5.0%
42	-	1	0.1 %	1.2%
50	-	7	0.5 %	8.8%
52	-	1	0.1 %	1.2%
60	-	4	0.3 %	5.0%
70	-	2	0.1 %	2.5%
75	-	1	0.1 %	1.2%
76	-	1	0.1 %	1.2%
80	-	1	0.1 %	1.2%
87	-	1	0.1 %	1.2%
100	-	4	0.3 %	5.0%
150	-	1	0.1 %	1.2%
200	-	4	0.3 %	5.0%
215	-	1	0.1 %	1.2%
250	-	2	0.1 %	2.5%
300	-	2	0.1 %	2.5%
400	-	1	0.1 %	1.2%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
500	-	3	0.2 %	3.8%
2000	-	1	0.1 %	1.2%
4000	-	1	0.1 %	1.2%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-9999 (M)	Dont Know	7	0.5 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Never in a gang	1,264	93.4 %	-

Based upon 80 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0GANG21: S0 Gang: Ever - position in the gang/posse**

*Location:* 1769-1772 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -103 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

What was your position in the gang/posse?

MEASURE: Gang

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Leader	8	0.6 %	9.2%
2	Not leader, but one of the top people	25	1.8 %	28.7%
3	Member	53	3.9 %	60.9%
4	Something else (other)	1	0.1 %	1.1%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Never in a gang	1,264	93.4 %	-

Based upon 87 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0GANG23: S0 Gang: Subject age when joined this gang/posse**

*Location:* 1773-1776 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -103 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

How old were you when you joined the gang/posse?

MEASURE: Gang

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 or Younger	33	2.4 %	10.5%
10	-	21	1.6 %	6.7%
11	-	23	1.7 %	7.3%
12	-	52	3.8 %	16.6%
13	-	77	5.7 %	24.5%
14	-	59	4.4 %	18.8%
15	-	28	2.1 %	8.9%
16	-	19	1.4 %	6.1%
17	-	2	0.1 %	0.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Never in a gang	1,036	76.5 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 314 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0NDAY9: S0 Gang: How long in the gang/posse - converted to days**

*Location:* 1777-1783 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999999 , -999998 , -200 , -103

**Question:**

How long did you belong to the gang/posse?

MEASURE: Gang

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	0 - 7	2	0.1 %	0.6%
2	8 - 14	2	0.1 %	0.6%
3	15 - 30	1	0.1 %	0.3%
4	31 - 60	7	0.5 %	2.2%
5	61 - 180	14	1.0 %	4.5%
6	181 - 365	59	4.4 %	18.8%
7	366 - 730	70	5.2 %	22.3%
8	731 or More	159	11.7 %	50.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999999 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Never in a gang	1,036	76.5 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Based upon 314 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0GANG27: S0 Gang: Expect to be member when back on street**

*Location:* 1784-1787 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -103 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Do you expect to be a member when you are back on the street?

MEASURE: Gang

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	183	13.5 %	59.2%
1	Yes	126	9.3 %	40.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Never in a gang	1,036	76.5 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	6	0.4 %	-

Based upon 309 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0NGINV: S0 GANG: Involved in a gang - ever**

*Location:* 1788-1791 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -100 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Gang Involvement; Combines items S0GANG1 (member of gang now) and S0GANG18 (member of a gang in the past).

MEASURE: Gang

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,035	76.4 %	76.7%
1	Yes	315	23.3 %	23.3%
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-8 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SOCC17: S0 GunAccess: Person wants to buy a gun he she can**

*Location:* 1792-1795 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

- Study 29961 -

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

If a young person in this neighborhood wants to buy a gun, he/she can.

MEASURE: Gun Accessibility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Strongly Agree	272	20.1 %	20.3%
2	Agree	461	34.0 %	34.4%
3	Neither Agree nor Disagree	163	12.0 %	12.2%
4	Disagree	305	22.5 %	22.7%
5	Strongly Disagree	140	10.3 %	10.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	13	1.0 %	-

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

**S0SOCC18: S0 GunAccess: How much to buy a 9mm gun**

*Location:* 1796-1799 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998

**Question:**

How much would it cost to buy a 9mm gun?

MEASURE: Gun Accessibility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
4	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
5	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
10	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	7	0.5 %	0.9%
25	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
30	-	6	0.4 %	0.7%
35	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
40	-	8	0.6 %	1.0%
45	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
50	-	42	3.1 %	5.1%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
55	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
58	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
60	-	14	1.0 %	1.7%
69	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
70	-	12	0.9 %	1.5%
75	-	21	1.6 %	2.6%
80	-	23	1.7 %	2.8%
85	-	3	0.2 %	0.4%
89	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
90	-	10	0.7 %	1.2%
95	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
100	-	105	7.8 %	12.8%
110	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
113	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
120	-	16	1.2 %	2.0%
125	-	4	0.3 %	0.5%
140	-	4	0.3 %	0.5%
149	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
150	-	86	6.4 %	10.5%
170	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
175	-	8	0.6 %	1.0%
180	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
199	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
200	-	110	8.1 %	13.4%
225	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
250	-	55	4.1 %	6.7%
257	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
259	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
275	-	4	0.3 %	0.5%
300	-	85	6.3 %	10.4%
320	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
325	-	3	0.2 %	0.4%
350	-	34	2.5 %	4.1%
359	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
375	-	3	0.2 %	0.4%
400	-	40	3.0 %	4.9%
450	-	17	1.3 %	2.1%
500	-	34	2.5 %	4.1%
550	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
600	-	5	0.4 %	0.6%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
650	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
700	-	8	0.6 %	1.0%
750	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
800	-	7	0.5 %	0.9%
850	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
900	-	4	0.3 %	0.5%
995	-	7	0.5 %	0.9%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	533	39.4 %	-
-998 (M)	Refusal	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 820 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SOCC19: S0 GunAccess: How much to buy a 38**

*Location:* 1800-1803 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998

**Question:**

How much would it cost to buy a .38?

MEASURE: Gun Accessibility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	3	0.2 %	0.4%
2	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
10	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
20	-	9	0.7 %	1.2%
25	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
30	-	3	0.2 %	0.4%
35	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
40	-	10	0.7 %	1.3%
45	-	5	0.4 %	0.7%
50	-	54	4.0 %	7.2%
55	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
59	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
60	-	15	1.1 %	2.0%
65	-	4	0.3 %	0.5%
70	-	12	0.9 %	1.6%
75	-	19	1.4 %	2.5%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
80	-	28	2.1 %	3.7%
85	-	3	0.2 %	0.4%
89	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
90	-	12	0.9 %	1.6%
100	-	110	8.1 %	14.7%
110	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
113	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
115	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
120	-	12	0.9 %	1.6%
124	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
125	-	8	0.6 %	1.1%
129	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
130	-	3	0.2 %	0.4%
140	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
150	-	94	6.9 %	12.5%
170	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
175	-	13	1.0 %	1.7%
180	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
185	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
200	-	91	6.7 %	12.1%
210	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
215	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
220	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
225	-	3	0.2 %	0.4%
240	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
250	-	63	4.7 %	8.4%
260	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
270	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
275	-	5	0.4 %	0.7%
300	-	40	3.0 %	5.3%
325	-	4	0.3 %	0.5%
350	-	30	2.2 %	4.0%
359	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
360	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
368	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
375	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
400	-	13	1.0 %	1.7%
450	-	7	0.5 %	0.9%
500	-	21	1.6 %	2.8%
550	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
600	-	6	0.4 %	0.8%
650	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
700	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
750	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
800	-	4	0.3 %	0.5%
900	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
995	-	4	0.3 %	0.5%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	603	44.5 %	-
-998 (M)	Refusal	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 750 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0HEADIN: S0 HEADINJ: Head injury - ever**

*Location:* 1804-1807 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

A marker for the presence of a head injury which caused unconsciousness or needed medical attention.

**MEASURE:** Head Injury

Four descriptive items regarding head injury were developed for the study based on a consultation with two neuropsychologists (Lisa Marrow, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine and Charles Nelson, Univ of Minnesota). These items establish the presence of brain injury, the age at which the injury occurred, and the extent of the injury.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	943	69.6 %	69.6%
1	Yes	411	30.4 %	30.4%

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

**S0MALC: S0 HEADINJ: Minimum age at which subject lost consciousness**

*Location:* 1808-1811 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -98

**Question:**

- Study 29961 -

The earliest age at which loss of consciousness occurred.

MEASURE: Head Injury

Four descriptive items regarding head injury were developed for the study based on a consultation with two neuropsychologists (Lisa Marrow, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine and Charles Nelson, Univ of Minnesota). These items establish the presence of brain injury, the age at which the injury occurred, and the extent of the injury.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	2	0.1 %	0.5%
1	-	5	0.4 %	1.3%
2	-	7	0.5 %	1.8%
3	-	7	0.5 %	1.8%
4	-	5	0.4 %	1.3%
5	-	17	1.3 %	4.3%
6	-	21	1.6 %	5.3%
7	-	30	2.2 %	7.6%
8	-	22	1.6 %	5.6%
9	-	18	1.3 %	4.6%
10	-	31	2.3 %	7.9%
11	-	27	2.0 %	6.9%
12	-	29	2.1 %	7.4%
13	-	31	2.3 %	7.9%
14	-	50	3.7 %	12.7%
15	-	49	3.6 %	12.5%
16	-	28	2.1 %	7.1%
17	-	14	1.0 %	3.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-98 (M)	NA - did not loose consciousness	961	71.0 %	-

Based upon 393 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0RLG1: S0 Religion: Past year how often attend church**

*Location:* 1812-1815 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

During the past year, how often did you attend church, synagogue, or other religious activities?

- Study 29961 -

**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 as well as the participant's average yearly service attendance. 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	%	Valid %
1	Never	543	40.1 %	40.2%
2	Several times a year	292	21.6 %	21.6%
3	Once or twice per month	201	14.8 %	14.9%
4	Once a week	233	17.2 %	17.3%
5	Several times per week	81	6.0 %	6.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0RLG2: S0 Religion: How important has religion been in your life**

*Location:* 1816-1819 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

How important has religion been in your life?

**MEASURE: Importance of Spirituality**

The Importance of Spirituality measure, developed by Maton (1989), is a highly reliable assessment of spirituality (Maton, Teti, Corns, Vieira-Baker, Lavine, Gouze, and Keating, 1996). The scale contains three items that ask participants to indicate how much their actions are influenced by belief in a god. Participants respond on a 5- point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all true" to "Completely true", with higher scores indicating a greater degree of spirituality. These three items are summed into a single scale score. Two additional items are included to evaluate the importance of one's religion as well as the participant's average yearly service attendance. These are left as individual items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Not at all important	163	12.0 %	12.1%
2	Not too important	226	16.7 %	16.8%
3	Somewhat important	381	28.1 %	28.3%
4	Pretty important	256	18.9 %	19.0%
5	Very important	322	23.8 %	23.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-
-8 (M)	Refusal	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,348 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0RLG3: S0 Religion: I experience Gods love and caring on a regular basis**

*Location:* 1820-1823 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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 as well as the participant's average yearly service attendance. 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	%	Valid %
1	Not at all true	138	10.2 %	10.2%
2	Not very true	135	10.0 %	10.0%
3	Somewhat true	348	25.7 %	25.8%
4	Pretty true	345	25.5 %	25.6%
5	Completely true	383	28.3 %	28.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Don't Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,349 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### S0RLG4: S0 Religion: I experience a close personal relationship to God

Location: 1824-1827 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -9 , -8

##### Question:

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 as well as the participant's average yearly service attendance. 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	%	Valid %
1	Not at all true	175	12.9 %	13.0%
2	Not very true	178	13.1 %	13.2%
3	Somewhat true	322	23.8 %	23.9%
4	Pretty true	326	24.1 %	24.2%
5	Completely true	346	25.6 %	25.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Don't Know	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,347 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### S0RLG5: S0 Religion: Religion helps me to deal with my problems

Location: 1828-1831 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -9 , -8

##### Question:

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

- Study 29961 -

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 as well as the participant's average yearly service attendance. 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	%	Valid %
1	Not at all true	313	23.1 %	23.2%
2	Not very true	232	17.1 %	17.2%
3	Somewhat true	287	21.2 %	21.3%
4	Pretty true	248	18.3 %	18.4%
5	Completely true	269	19.9 %	19.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Don't Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,349 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0RELG: S0 Religion: Importance of Spirituality**

*Location:* 1832-1838 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

**Question:**

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 as well as the participant's average yearly service attendance. 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)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	Not at all true	121	8.9 %	9.0%
1.33	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
1.67	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
2.00	Not very true	92	6.8 %	6.8%
2.33	-	94	6.9 %	7.0%
2.67	-	94	6.9 %	7.0%
3.00	Somewhat true	133	9.8 %	9.9%
3.33	-	117	8.6 %	8.7%
3.67	-	148	10.9 %	11.0%
4.00	Pretty true	129	9.5 %	9.6%
4.33	-	90	6.6 %	6.7%
4.67	-	92	6.8 %	6.8%
5.00	Completely true	176	13.0 %	13.0%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-300.00 (M)	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %	-
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,349 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PUNOTH: S0 PainCost: Certainty of Punishment - Other**

*Location:* 1839-1845 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -99.00 , -98.00

**Question:**

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 compromised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {others and You (e.g., How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?)}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?)}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., If I take things, other people my age will respect me more.)}, and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g. How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?).

(0) No chance

(10) Absolutely certain to be caught

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0.00	No chance	13	1.0 %	1.0%
0.29	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
0.43	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.57	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.71	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
0.86	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
1.00	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
1.14	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
1.29	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
1.43	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
1.57	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
1.71	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
1.86	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
2.00	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
2.14	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
2.29	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
2.43	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
2.57	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
2.71	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
2.86	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
3.00	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
3.14	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
3.29	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
3.33	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.43	-	25	1.8 %	1.8%
3.57	-	34	2.5 %	2.5%
3.71	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
3.86	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
4.00	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
4.14	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
4.17	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
4.29	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
4.43	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
4.57	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
4.71	-	37	2.7 %	2.7%
4.86	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
5.00	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
5.14	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
5.29	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
5.43	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
5.57	-	29	2.1 %	2.1%
5.71	-	41	3.0 %	3.0%
5.86	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
6.00	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
6.14	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
6.29	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
6.43	-	29	2.1 %	2.1%
6.57	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
6.71	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
6.86	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
7.00	-	25	1.8 %	1.8%
7.14	-	37	2.7 %	2.7%
7.29	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
7.43	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
7.57	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
7.71	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
7.86	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
8.00	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
8.14	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
8.29	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
8.43	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
8.57	-	48	3.5 %	3.6%
8.71	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
8.86	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
9.00	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
9.14	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
9.29	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
9.43	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
9.57	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
9.71	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
9.86	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
10.00	Absolutely certain to be caught	18	1.3 %	1.3%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	1	0.1 %	-
-99.00 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,352 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PUNYOU: S0 PainCost: Certainty of Punishment - You**

- Study 29961 -

Location: 1846-1852 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -300.00 , -200.00 , -99.00 , -98.00

**Question:**

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	%	Valid %
0.00	No chance	62	4.6 %	4.6%
0.14	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
0.29	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
0.43	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
0.57	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
0.71	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
0.86	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
1.00	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
1.14	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
1.29	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
1.43	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
1.57	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
1.71	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
1.86	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
2.00	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
2.14	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
2.29	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
2.43	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
2.57	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
2.71	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
2.86	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
3.00	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
3.14	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
3.29	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
3.43	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
3.50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.57	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
3.71	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
3.86	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
4.00	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
4.14	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
4.29	-	33	2.4 %	2.4%
4.43	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
4.57	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
4.71	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
4.86	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
5.00	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
5.14	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
5.29	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
5.43	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
5.57	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
5.71	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
5.86	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
6.00	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
6.14	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
6.29	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
6.43	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
6.57	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
6.71	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
6.86	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
7.00	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
7.14	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
7.29	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
7.43	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
7.57	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
7.71	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
7.86	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
8.00	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
8.14	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
8.29	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
8.43	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
8.57	-	63	4.7 %	4.7%
8.71	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
8.86	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
9.00	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
9.14	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
9.29	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
9.43	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
9.57	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
9.71	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
9.86	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
10.00	Absolutely certain to be caught	74	5.5 %	5.5%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	1	0.1 %	-
-99.00 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,352 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0SOCCST: S0 PainCost: Social Costs of Punishment**

*Location:* 1853-1859 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -99.00 , -98.00

#### **Question:**

Social costs of punishment; Mean of 6 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is compromised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {others and You (e.g., How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?)}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?)}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., If I take things, other people my age will respect me more.)}, and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g.How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?).

- (1) Very unlikely
- (2) Somewhat unlikely
- (3) Neither likely nor unlikely
- (4) Somewhat likely
- (5) Very likely

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	Very unlikely	24	1.8 %	1.8%
1.17	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
1.20	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
1.33	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
1.40	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
1.50	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
1.60	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
1.67	-	66	4.9 %	4.9%
1.75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.80	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
1.83	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
2.00	Somewhat unlikely	75	5.5 %	5.5%
2.17	-	49	3.6 %	3.6%
2.20	-	45	3.3 %	3.3%
2.33	-	56	4.1 %	4.1%
2.40	-	46	3.4 %	3.4%
2.50	-	60	4.4 %	4.4%
2.60	-	60	4.4 %	4.4%
2.67	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
2.75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.80	-	45	3.3 %	3.3%
2.83	-	50	3.7 %	3.7%
3.00	Neither likely nor unlikely	114	8.4 %	8.4%
3.17	-	52	3.8 %	3.8%
3.20	-	44	3.2 %	3.3%
3.33	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
3.40	-	34	2.5 %	2.5%
3.50	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
3.60	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
3.67	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
3.80	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
3.83	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
4.00	Somewhat likely	30	2.2 %	2.2%
4.17	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
4.20	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
4.33	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
4.40	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
4.50	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
4.60	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
4.67	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
4.80	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
4.83	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
5.00	Very likely	14	1.0 %	1.0%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0VARCST: S0 PainCost: Punishment Costs - Variety**

*Location:* 1860-1863 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Punishment costs-variety; Count of 18 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is comprised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {others and You (e.g., How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?)}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?)}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., If I take things, other people my age will respect me more.)}, and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g. How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?).

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	113	8.3 %	8.4%
1	-	89	6.6 %	6.6%
2	-	73	5.4 %	5.4%
3	-	76	5.6 %	5.6%
4	-	64	4.7 %	4.8%
5	-	83	6.1 %	6.2%
6	-	83	6.1 %	6.2%
7	-	38	2.8 %	2.8%
8	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
9	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
10	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
11	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
12	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
13	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
14	-	47	3.5 %	3.5%
15	-	74	5.5 %	5.5%
16	-	98	7.2 %	7.3%
17	-	148	10.9 %	11.0%
18	-	203	15.0 %	15.1%
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MATCST: S0 PainCost: Punishment Costs (13) - Material Issues**

*Location:* 1864-1867 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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 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	%	Valid %
0	-	360	26.6 %	26.7%
1	-	140	10.3 %	10.4%
2	-	77	5.7 %	5.7%
3	-	44	3.2 %	3.3%
4	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
5	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
6	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
7	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
8	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	-	47	3.5 %	3.5%
10	-	72	5.3 %	5.3%
11	-	91	6.7 %	6.8%
12	-	142	10.5 %	10.5%
13	-	252	18.6 %	18.7%
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0FRECST: S0 PainCost: Punishment Costs (5) - Freedom Issues**

*Location:* 1868-1871 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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 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	%	Valid %
0	-	128	9.5 %	9.5%
1	-	103	7.6 %	7.7%
2	-	101	7.5 %	7.5%
3	-	126	9.3 %	9.4%
4	-	294	21.7 %	21.8%
5	-	594	43.9 %	44.1%
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0WGTCST: S0 PainCost: Punishment Costs - Weight**

*Location:* 1872-1878 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

- Study 29961 -

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -300 , -200 , -100 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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)).

Value	Label
1	Not at all
2	A little
3	Quite a bit
4	Very much

  

Missing Data	
-300 (M)	Too few answers for computation
-200 (M)	Data missing
-100 (M)	Did not skip into section
-9 (M)	Dont Know
-8 (M)	Refuse

\* Frequencies not displayed for this variable.

Based upon 1,233 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0STLRWD: S0 PainCost: Social Rewards of Crime - Stealing**

Location: 1879-1885 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -300.00 , -200.00 , -8.00

**Question:**

Social rewards of crime-stealing; Mean of 5 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is comprised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {others and You (e.g., How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?)}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?)}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., If I take things, other people my age will respect me more.)}, and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g. How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?).

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Somewhat disagree
- (3) Somewhat agree
- (4) Strongly agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	Strongly Disagree	150	11.1 %	11.1%
1.20	-	55	4.1 %	4.1%
1.40	-	68	5.0 %	5.0%
1.60	-	97	7.2 %	7.2%
1.75	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
1.80	-	115	8.5 %	8.5%
2.00	Disagree	384	28.4 %	28.4%
2.20	-	242	17.9 %	17.9%
2.40	-	116	8.6 %	8.6%
2.60	-	65	4.8 %	4.8%
2.80	-	34	2.5 %	2.5%
3.00	Agree	13	1.0 %	1.0%
3.20	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
3.40	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
3.60	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0FGTRWD: S0 PainCost: Social Rewards of Crime - Fighting**

*Location:* 1886-1892 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

**Question:**

Social rewards of crime-fighting; Mean of 5 items.

**MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards**

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is compromised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {others and You (e.g., How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?)}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?)}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., If I take things, other people my age will respect me more.)}, and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g. How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?).

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Somewhat disagree
- (3) Somewhat agree
- (4) Strongly agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	Strongly Disagree	77	5.7 %	5.7%
1.20	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
1.40	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
1.50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.60	-	49	3.6 %	3.6%
1.80	-	75	5.5 %	5.5%
2.00	Disagree	298	22.0 %	22.0%
2.20	-	198	14.6 %	14.6%
2.25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.40	-	210	15.5 %	15.5%
2.50	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
2.60	-	168	12.4 %	12.4%
2.80	-	102	7.5 %	7.5%
3.00	Agree	71	5.2 %	5.2%
3.20	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
3.40	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
3.60	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
3.75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.80	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
4.00	Strongly Agree	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0ROBRWD: S0 PainCost: Social Rewards of Crime - Robbery**

*Location:* 1893-1899 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

**Question:**

Social rewards of crime-robbery; Mean of 5 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is compromised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {others and You (e.g., How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?)}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?)}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., If I take things, other people my age will respect me more.)}, and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g. How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?).

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Somewhat disagree
- (3) Somewhat agree
- (4) Strongly agree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	Strongly Disagree	204	15.1 %	15.1%
1.20	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
1.40	-	57	4.2 %	4.2%
1.60	-	69	5.1 %	5.1%
1.80	-	103	7.6 %	7.6%
2.00	Disagree	479	35.4 %	35.4%
2.20	-	174	12.9 %	12.9%
2.25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.40	-	116	8.6 %	8.6%
2.60	-	68	5.0 %	5.0%
2.80	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
3.00	Agree	14	1.0 %	1.0%
3.20	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
3.40	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.60	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PERRWD: S0 PainCost: Personal Rewards of Crime**

*Location:* 1900-1906 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -99.00 , -98.00

**Question:**

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 compromised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {others and You (e.g., How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?)}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?)}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., If I take things, other people my age will respect me more.)}, and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g.How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?).

- (0) No 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	%	Valid %
0.00	No fun or kick at all	338	25.0 %	25.0%
0.14	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
0.29	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
0.43	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
0.57	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
0.71	-	54	4.0 %	4.0%
0.86	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
1.00	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
1.14	-	25	1.8 %	1.8%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.29	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
1.43	-	62	4.6 %	4.6%
1.57	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
1.71	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
1.86	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
2.00	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
2.14	-	34	2.5 %	2.5%
2.29	-	25	1.8 %	1.8%
2.43	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
2.57	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
2.71	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
2.86	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
3.00	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
3.14	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
3.29	-	25	1.8 %	1.8%
3.43	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
3.57	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
3.71	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
3.86	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
4.00	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
4.14	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
4.29	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
4.43	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
4.57	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
4.71	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
4.86	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
5.00	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
5.14	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
5.29	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
5.43	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
5.57	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
5.71	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
5.86	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
6.00	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
6.14	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
6.29	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
6.43	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
6.57	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
6.71	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
6.86	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
7.00	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
7.14	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
7.29	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
7.43	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
7.57	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
7.71	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
7.86	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
8.00	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
8.14	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
8.29	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
8.57	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
8.71	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
8.86	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
9.14	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
9.57	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
9.71	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
9.86	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
10.00	A great deal of fun or kick	4	0.3 %	0.3%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PCL013: S0 PCL: Ever do crazy dangerous things for fun**

*Location:* 1907-1910 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Subject has done crazy dangerous things for fun. An ever question.

**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?).

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	691	51.0 %	51.0%
1	Yes	663	49.0 %	49.0%

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

**S0PCL015: S0 PCL: Age started doing crazy things for fun**

*Location:* 1911-1914 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -102 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Subjects age when started doing crazy things for fun

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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
4	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
5	-	12	0.9 %	1.8%
6	-	7	0.5 %	1.1%
7	-	13	1.0 %	2.0%
8	-	17	1.3 %	2.6%
9	-	27	2.0 %	4.1%
10	-	44	3.2 %	6.6%
11	-	41	3.0 %	6.2%
12	-	95	7.0 %	14.3%
13	-	135	10.0 %	20.4%
14	-	122	9.0 %	18.4%
15	-	93	6.9 %	14.0%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
16	-	45	3.3 %	6.8%
17	-	10	0.7 %	1.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-102 (M)	Skipped: Doesn't do crazy things for fun	691	51.0 %	-

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

**S0PCL016: S0 PCL: Like to speed or take chances when you drive**

*Location:* 1915-1918 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subject likes to speed or take chances when you drive.

**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	%	Valid %
0	No	567	41.9 %	41.9%
1	Yes	494	36.5 %	36.5%
97	Subject does not drive	292	21.6 %	21.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-99 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PCL017: S0 PCL: Ever been stopped/chased by police for speeding/reckless driving**

*Location:* 1919-1922 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subject has been stopped/chased by police for speeding/reckless driving. An ever question.

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	%	Valid %
0	No	734	54.2 %	54.2%
1	Yes, for speeding	152	11.2 %	11.2%
2	Yes, for reckless driving	54	4.0 %	4.0%
3	Yes, for both	105	7.8 %	7.8%
4	Subject eluded police	52	3.8 %	3.8%
97	Subject does not drive	257	19.0 %	19.0%

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

#### **S0PCL018: S0 PCL: Number times stopped/chased for speeding/reckless driving**

*Location:* 1923-1926 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -103

#### **Question:**

Number times the subject has been stopped/chased for speeding/reckless driving.

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?).

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	-	166	12.3 %	46.1%
2	-	77	5.7 %	21.4%
3	-	42	3.1 %	11.7%
4	-	14	1.0 %	3.9%
5	-	18	1.3 %	5.0%
6	-	7	0.5 %	1.9%
7	-	4	0.3 %	1.1%
8	-	2	0.1 %	0.6%
9	-	3	0.2 %	0.8%
10	-	8	0.6 %	2.2%
11	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
12	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
13	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
15	-	3	0.2 %	0.8%
20	-	5	0.4 %	1.4%
25	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
30	-	3	0.2 %	0.8%
50	-	3	0.2 %	0.8%
75	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	3	0.2 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Never stopped for speeding/reckless driving	991	73.2 %	-

Based upon 360 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PCL019: S0 PCL: Tend to stay in one place or get bored and move on**

*Location:* 1927-1930 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject tends to stay in one place or gets bored and moves on.

**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

- Study 29961 -

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	%	Valid %
1	Like to stay in one place	267	19.7 %	19.7%
2	Get bored and want to move on	1,087	80.3 %	80.3%

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

**S0REL75: S0 Children: How many children have you had**

*Location:* 1931-1933 (width: 3; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -99 , -98

**Question:**

Subjects number of children.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	1,232	91.0 %	91.1%
1	-	110	8.1 %	8.1%
2	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-99 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0AGECH: S0 Children: Child01 - Age**

*Location:* 1934-1938 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -102 , -101

**Question:**

Age of child 01.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	114	8.4 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	6	0.4 %	-
-997 (M)	Child is deceased	1	0.1 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK if they have children	1	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero children	1,232	91.0 %	-

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

**S0CARECH: S0 Children: Child01 - Person child lives with**

*Location:* 1939-1942 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -111 , -103 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98 , -97

**Question:**

Child 01 lives with said person.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Self	13	1.0 %	10.9%
2	Other Biological Parent	40	3.0 %	33.6%
3	Biological Grandparent	7	0.5 %	5.9%
7	Boyfriend/Girlfriend	27	2.0 %	22.7%
8	Friend	19	1.4 %	16.0%
96	Other (not biologically related)	13	1.0 %	10.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-111 (M)	Skipped: Child is Deceased	1	0.1 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK if they have children	1	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero children	1,232	91.0 %	-
-97 (M)	Not Applicable	1	0.1 %	-

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

**S0OTHRCH: S0 Children: Child01 - Person child lives with (specify)**

*Location:* 1943-1947 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -102 , -101

**Question:**

Child 01 lives with said person (specify).

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	121	8.9 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-102 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK if they have children	1	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero children	1,232	91.0 %	-

Based upon 121 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0CONTCH: S0 Children: Child01 - Frequency of contact with child**

*Location:* 1948-1951 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -111 , -103 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Frequency of contact subject has with child 01.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Daily	55	4.1 %	45.8%
2	3-6 times per week	13	1.0 %	10.8%
3	2 times per week	7	0.5 %	5.8%
4	1 time per week	8	0.6 %	6.7%
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	7	0.5 %	5.8%
7	Less than monthly	30	2.2 %	25.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-111 (M)	Skipped: Child is deceased	1	0.1 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK if they have children	1	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero children	1,232	91.0 %	-

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

**S0AGECH2: S0 Children: Child02 - Age**

*Location:* 1952-1956 (*width:* 5; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -997 , -103 , -102 , -101

**Question:**

Age of child 02.

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	11	0.8 %	100.0%
-103 (M)	Skipped: No additional children	110	8.1 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK if they have children	1	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero children	1,232	91.0 %	-

Based upon 11 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0CAREC2: S0 Children: Child02 - Person child lives with**

*Location:* 1957-1960 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -111 , -103 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98 , -97

**Question:**

Child 02 lives with said person.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2	Other Biological Parent	2	0.1 %	18.2%
3	Biological Grandparent	2	0.1 %	18.2%
7	Boyfriend/Girlfriend	3	0.2 %	27.3%
8	Friend	2	0.1 %	18.2%
9	Foster Care	1	0.1 %	9.1%
96	Other (not biologically related)	1	0.1 %	9.1%
-103 (M)	Skipped: No Additional Children	110	8.1 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK if they have children	1	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero children	1,232	91.0 %	-

Based upon 11 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0OTHRC2: S0 Children: Child02 - Person child lives with (specify)**

*Location:* 1961-1965 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -103 , -102 , -101

**Question:**

Child 02 lives with said person (specify).

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	11	0.8 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-103 (M)	Skipped: No additional children	110	8.1 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK if they have children	1	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero children	1,232	91.0 %	-

Based upon 11 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0CONT2: S0 Children: Child02 - Frequency of contact with child**

*Location:* 1966-1969 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -111 , -103 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Frequency of contact subject has with child 02.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Daily	4	0.3 %	36.4%
2	3-6 times per week	1	0.1 %	9.1%
4	1 time per week	1	0.1 %	9.1%
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	1	0.1 %	9.1%
6	1 time per month	1	0.1 %	9.1%
7	Less than monthly	3	0.2 %	27.3%
-103 (M)	Skipped: No additional children	110	8.1 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK if they have children	1	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero children	1,232	91.0 %	-

Based upon 11 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL84: S0 Children: Are all children to one mother/father**

*Location:* 1970-1973 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -104 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Are all children to one mother/father.

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	8	0.6 %	72.7%
1	Yes	3	0.2 %	27.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-104 (M)	Skipped: Subject has only 1 child	110	8.1 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK if they have children	1	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero children	1,232	91.0 %	-

Based upon 11 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL85: S0 Children: Number different mothers/fathers to subjects children**

*Location:* 1974-1977 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -105 , -104 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Number different mothers/fathers to subjects children.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2	-	8	0.6 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-105 (M)	Skipped: Children are all to the same mom/dad	3	0.2 %	-
-104 (M)	Skipped: Subject has only 1 child	110	8.1 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK if they have children	1	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero children	1,232	91.0 %	-

Based upon 8 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0NDAY4: S0 Children: Length of time knew mother/father before became pregnant - converted to days**

*Location:* 1978-1981 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999999 , -999998 , -102 , -101

**Question:**

Length of time knew your childs mother/father before became pregnant - converted to days.

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	0 - 7	2	0.1 %	1.7%
3	15 - 30	5	0.4 %	4.1%
4	31 - 60	4	0.3 %	3.3%
5	61 - 180	10	0.7 %	8.3%
6	181 - 365	31	2.3 %	25.6%
7	366 - 730	25	1.8 %	20.7%
8	731 or More	44	3.2 %	36.4%
-102 (M)	Skipped: Subject DK if they have children	1	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has zero children	1,232	91.0 %	-

Based upon 121 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL91: S0 Children: Currently pregnant**

*Location:* 1982-1985 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -106 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Currently pregnant.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	173	12.8 %	94.0%
1	Yes	11	0.8 %	6.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subject is male	1,170	86.4 %	-

Based upon 184 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL91A: S0 Children: Been pregnant in the past 6 months**

*Location:* 1986-1989 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -107 , -106 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Been pregnant in the past 6 months.

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	152	11.2 %	87.9%
1	Yes	21	1.6 %	12.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-107 (M)	Skipped: Currently pregnant	11	0.8 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: Subject is male	1,170	86.4 %	-

Based upon 173 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL92: S0 Children: Any girlfriends currently pregnant with your child**

*Location:* 1990-1993 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -109 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Any girlfriends currently pregnant with your child.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,073	79.2 %	92.9%
1	Yes	82	6.1 %	7.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	1	0.1 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: Subject is female	184	13.6 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	14	1.0 %	-

Based upon 1,155 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0REL92A: S0 Children: Number of girlfriends currently pregnant**

*Location:* 1994-1997 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -200 , -110 , -109

**Question:**

Number of girlfriends currently pregnant.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	-	78	5.8 %	95.1%
2	-	4	0.3 %	4.9%
-200 (M)	Data missing	1	0.1 %	-
-110 (M)	Skipped: No girlfriends currently pregnant	1,087	80.3 %	-
-109 (M)	Skipped: Subject is female	184	13.6 %	-

Based upon 82 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0MORDIS: S0 MorThk: Moral Disengagement Overall**

*Location:* 1998-2004 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

#### **Question:**

Moral Disengagement - overall; mean of all items.

MEASURE: Moral Thinking

The Mechanisms of Moral Disengagement (Bandura, Barbarelli, Caprara, and 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, euphemistic language, advantageous comparison, displacement of responsibility, diffusion of responsibility, distorting consequences, attribution of blame, and dehumanization. Other investigators using this measure and the instruments' authors, however, advise that the subscales should not be used because of their inconsistency and unreliability.

- (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)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	Disagree	2	0.1 %	0.1%
1.03	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
1.06	-	49	3.6 %	3.6%
1.09	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
1.13	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
1.16	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
1.19	-	41	3.0 %	3.0%
1.22	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
1.25	-	47	3.5 %	3.5%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.28	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
1.31	-	48	3.5 %	3.6%
1.34	-	45	3.3 %	3.3%
1.38	-	54	4.0 %	4.0%
1.41	-	41	3.0 %	3.0%
1.44	-	39	2.9 %	2.9%
1.45	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.47	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
1.50	-	52	3.8 %	3.8%
1.53	-	38	2.8 %	2.8%
1.56	-	47	3.5 %	3.5%
1.59	-	29	2.1 %	2.1%
1.61	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.63	-	49	3.6 %	3.6%
1.66	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
1.69	-	54	4.0 %	4.0%
1.72	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
1.75	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
1.78	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
1.80	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.81	-	44	3.2 %	3.3%
1.84	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
1.87	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.88	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
1.91	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
1.94	-	33	2.4 %	2.4%
1.97	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
2.00	Neither Agree nor disagree	27	2.0 %	2.0%
2.03	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
2.06	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
2.09	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
2.13	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
2.16	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
2.19	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
2.22	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
2.25	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
2.28	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
2.31	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
2.34	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
2.38	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2.41	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
2.44	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
2.47	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
2.50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.53	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
2.56	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
2.59	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.63	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
2.66	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
2.69	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.72	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.00	Agree	3	0.2 %	0.2%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MORAL: S0 MorThk: Moral Disengagement Count**

*Location:* 2005-2008 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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, Barbarelli, Caprara, and 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, euphemistic language, advantageous comparison, displacement of responsibility, diffusion of responsibility, distorting consequences, attribution of blame, and dehumanization. Other investigators using this measure and the instruments' authors, however, advise that the subscales should not be used because of their inconsistency and unreliability.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
1	-	140	10.3 %	10.4%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2	-	125	9.2 %	9.3%
3	-	109	8.1 %	8.1%
4	-	123	9.1 %	9.1%
5	-	100	7.4 %	7.4%
6	-	94	6.9 %	7.0%
7	-	89	6.6 %	6.6%
8	-	73	5.4 %	5.4%
9	-	77	5.7 %	5.7%
10	-	72	5.3 %	5.3%
11	-	64	4.7 %	4.7%
12	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
13	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
14	-	41	3.0 %	3.0%
15	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
16	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
17	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
18	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
19	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
20	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
21	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
22	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
23	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
24	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
25	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
26	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
27	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
28	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
32	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SCH40: S0 Motivate: In my neighborhood easy for young person to get good job**

*Location:* 2009-2012 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

In my neighborhood, it's pretty easy for a young person to get a good-paying, honest job.

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

- Study 29961 -

The motivation to succeed items(Eccles et al, 1998) are the subject's assessment of the opportunities youth in his/her neighborhood have to succeed in school and/or the work force.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Strongly Disagree	90	6.6 %	6.7%
2	Disagree	452	33.4 %	33.5%
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	194	14.3 %	14.4%
4	Agree	557	41.1 %	41.3%
5	Strongly Agree	56	4.1 %	4.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	5	0.4 %	-

Based upon 1,349 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SCH41: S0 Motivate: Most of my friends will graduate from high school**

*Location:* 2013-2016 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Most of my friends will graduate from high school.

**MEASURE:** Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items(Eccles et al, 1998) are the subject's assessment of the opportunities youth in his/her neighborhood have to succeed in school and/or the work force.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Strongly Disagree	69	5.1 %	5.1%
2	Disagree	382	28.2 %	28.2%
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	182	13.4 %	13.5%
4	Agree	621	45.9 %	45.9%
5	Strongly Agree	99	7.3 %	7.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SCH42: S0 Motivate: In my neighborhood hard to make money without doing something illegal**

*Location:* 2017-2020 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

In my neighborhood, it's hard to make much money without doing something illegal.

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items(Eccles et al, 1998) are the subject's assessment of the opportunities youth in his/her neighborhood have to succeed in school and/or the work force.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	Strongly Disagree	116	8.6 %	8.6%
2	Disagree	530	39.1 %	39.3%
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	178	13.1 %	13.2%
4	Agree	440	32.5 %	32.6%
5	Strongly Agree	86	6.4 %	6.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SCH43: S0 Motivate: College too expensive for most people in my neighborhood**

*Location:* 2021-2024 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

College is too expensive for most of the people in my neighborhood.

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items(Eccles et al, 1998) are the subject's assessment of the opportunities youth in his/her neighborhood have to succeed in school and/or the work force.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Strongly Disagree	63	4.7 %	4.7%
2	Disagree	431	31.8 %	32.0%
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	209	15.4 %	15.5%
4	Agree	530	39.1 %	39.4%
5	Strongly Agree	113	8.3 %	8.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SCH44: S0 Motivate: Not much opportunity to succeed as kids from other neighborhoods**

*Location:* 2025-2028 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

I'll never have as much opportunity to succeed as kids from other neighborhoods.

**MEASURE:** Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items(Eccles et al, 1998) are the subject's assessment of the opportunities youth in his/her neighborhood have to succeed in school and/or the work force.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Strongly Disagree	185	13.7 %	13.7%
2	Disagree	726	53.6 %	53.7%
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	158	11.7 %	11.7%
4	Agree	242	17.9 %	17.9%
5	Strongly Agree	42	3.1 %	3.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SCH45: S0 Motivate: Chances of getting ahead/being successful not very good**

*Location:* 2029-2032 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

- Study 29961 -

My chances of getting ahead and being successful are not very good.

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items(Eccles et al, 1998) are the subject's assessment of the opportunities youth in his/her neighborhood have to succeed in school and/or the work force.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Strongly Disagree	231	17.1 %	17.1%
2	Disagree	773	57.1 %	57.1%
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	133	9.8 %	9.8%
4	Agree	194	14.3 %	14.3%
5	Strongly Agree	22	1.6 %	1.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SCH46: S0 Motivate: How far would you LIKE to go in school**

*Location:* 2033-2036 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

How far would you like to go in school?

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items(Eccles et al, 1998) are the subject's assessment of the opportunities youth in his/her neighborhood have to succeed in school and/or the work force.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Drop out before graduation	16	1.2 %	1.2%
2	Graduate from HS	385	28.4 %	28.5%
3	Go to business, tech school or jr college	184	13.6 %	13.6%
4	Graduate from college	633	46.8 %	46.9%
5	Go to graduate or professional school	133	9.8 %	9.8%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SCH47: S0 Motivate: How far do you THINK you will go in school**

*Location:* 2037-2040 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

How far do you think you will go in school?

**MEASURE:** Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items(Eccles et al, 1998) are the subject's assessment of the opportunities youth in his/her neighborhood have to succeed in school and/or the work force.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Drop out before graduation	73	5.4 %	5.4%
2	Graduate from HS	479	35.4 %	35.7%
3	Go to business, tech school or jr college	232	17.1 %	17.3%
4	Graduate from college	463	34.2 %	34.5%
5	Go to graduate or professional school	94	6.9 %	7.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	13	1.0 %	-

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

**S0MOTSUC: S0 Motivate: Motivation to Succeed**

*Location:* 2041-2047 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

An overall motivation to succeed score computed from the mean of six items after they are reverse coded. A higher score indicates more optimism regarding future success.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither agree nor disagree

- Study 29961 -

- (4) Agree  
 (5) Strongly agree

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items(Eccles et al, 1998) are the subject's assessment of the opportunities youth in his/her neighborhood have to succeed in school and/or the work force.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	Strongly Disagree	2	0.1 %	0.1%
1.17	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
1.33	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.50	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
1.60	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.67	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
1.83	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
2.00	Disagree	36	2.7 %	2.7%
2.17	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
2.33	-	65	4.8 %	4.8%
2.50	-	49	3.6 %	3.6%
2.67	-	98	7.2 %	7.2%
2.80	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.83	-	76	5.6 %	5.6%
3.00	Neither Agree nor Disagree	159	11.7 %	11.8%
3.17	-	98	7.2 %	7.2%
3.20	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
3.33	-	175	12.9 %	12.9%
3.40	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
3.50	-	94	6.9 %	6.9%
3.67	-	153	11.3 %	11.3%
3.80	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
3.83	-	74	5.5 %	5.5%
4.00	Agree	113	8.3 %	8.4%
4.17	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
4.33	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
4.50	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
4.67	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
4.83	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
5.00	Strongly Agree	7	0.5 %	0.5%
-9.00 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PHIN22: S0 Phinney: Subject biological father ethnicity**

*Location:* 2048-2051 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -99

**Question:**

Subject's biological father's ethnicity.

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 and 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.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2	Black or African American	535	39.5 %	40.1%
3	Hispanic or Latino (including Mex Am, Central Am, and others)	441	32.6 %	33.1%
4	White, Caucasian, Anglo, European American (not Hispanic)	278	20.5 %	20.9%
96	Other (Asian, Native American, Mixed)	79	5.8 %	5.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-99 (M)	Don't Know	17	1.3 %	-

Based upon 1,333 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PHIN23: S0 Phinney: Subject biological father ethnicity (specify)**

*Location:* 2052-2056 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -101

**Question:**

Subject's biological father's ethnicity (specify).

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 and Belonging (e.g., "I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to"),

- Study 29961 -

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.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	11	0.8 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-101 (M)	Skipped: Ethnicity not Other	1,343	99.2 %	-

Based upon 11 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**SOPHIN24: S0 Phinney: Subject biological mother ethnicity**

*Location:* 2057-2060 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -99

**Question:**

Subject's biological mother's ethnicity.

**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 and 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.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2	Black or African American	535	39.5 %	39.7%
3	Hispanic or Latino (including Mex Am, Central Am, and others)	399	29.5 %	29.6%
4	White, Caucasian, Anglo, European American (not Hispanic)	316	23.3 %	23.5%
96	Other (Asian, Native American, Mixed)	97	7.2 %	7.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-99 (M)	Don't Know	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,347 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**SOPHIN25: S0 Phinney: Subject biological mother ethnicity (specify)**

- Study 29961 -

Location: 2061-2065 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -101

**Question:**

Subject's biological mother's ethnicity (specify).

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 and 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.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	4	0.3 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-101 (M)	Skipped: Ethnicity not Other	1,350	99.7 %	-

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

**S0ETHAFF: S0 Phinney: Ethnic Identity - Affirmation and Belonging**

Location: 2066-2072 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -300.00 , -200.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

**Question:**

Affirmation & Belonging; 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 and 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

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	Strongly Disagree	5	0.4 %	0.4%
1.29	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.43	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
1.57	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
1.71	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
1.86	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
2.00	Disagree	30	2.2 %	2.2%
2.14	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
2.17	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
2.25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.29	-	33	2.4 %	2.4%
2.43	-	55	4.1 %	4.1%
2.57	-	84	6.2 %	6.2%
2.60	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
2.67	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
2.71	-	127	9.4 %	9.4%
2.80	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.83	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
2.86	-	169	12.5 %	12.5%
3.00	Agree	391	28.9 %	29.0%
3.14	-	89	6.6 %	6.6%
3.17	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
3.25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.29	-	48	3.5 %	3.6%
3.43	-	50	3.7 %	3.7%
3.57	-	46	3.4 %	3.4%
3.71	-	58	4.3 %	4.3%
3.83	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.86	-	50	3.7 %	3.7%
4.00	Strongly Agree	53	3.9 %	3.9%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0ETHACH: S0 Phinney: Ethnic Identity - Identity Achievement**

*Location:* 2073-2079 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

**Question:**

Identity Achievement; 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 and 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	%	Valid %
1.00	Strongly Disagree	18	1.3 %	1.3%
1.20	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
1.25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.40	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
1.50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.60	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
1.75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.80	-	41	3.0 %	3.0%
2.00	Disagree	210	15.5 %	15.6%
2.20	-	214	15.8 %	15.9%
2.25	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
2.40	-	179	13.2 %	13.3%
2.60	-	198	14.6 %	14.7%
2.80	-	148	10.9 %	11.0%
3.00	Agree	168	12.4 %	12.4%
3.20	-	46	3.4 %	3.4%
3.40	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
3.60	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
3.80	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
4.00	Strongly Agree	14	1.0 %	1.0%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0ETHID: S0 Phinney: Ethnic Identity - Overall**

*Location:* 2080-2086 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

**Question:**

Ethnic Identity-overall; 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 and 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	Strongly Disagree	4	0.3 %	0.3%
1.17	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.33	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.58	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
1.67	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
1.75	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
1.83	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
1.92	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
2.00	Disagree	27	2.0 %	2.0%
2.08	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
2.09	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
2.10	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.17	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
2.18	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.25	-	38	2.8 %	2.8%
2.30	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.33	-	69	5.1 %	5.1%
2.36	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2.42	-	70	5.2 %	5.2%
2.45	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
2.50	-	95	7.0 %	7.0%
2.55	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
2.58	-	97	7.2 %	7.2%
2.64	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
2.67	-	94	6.9 %	7.0%
2.73	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.75	-	108	8.0 %	8.0%
2.80	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.82	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.83	-	129	9.5 %	9.6%
2.92	-	109	8.1 %	8.1%
3.00	Agree	125	9.2 %	9.3%
3.08	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
3.17	-	38	2.8 %	2.8%
3.18	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.25	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
3.33	-	29	2.1 %	2.1%
3.42	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
3.50	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
3.58	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
3.67	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
3.75	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
3.83	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
3.92	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
4.00	Strongly Agree	13	1.0 %	1.0%

*Missing Data*

-300.00 (M)	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %	-
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,349 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0HOOD: S0 NeiCon: Neighborhood Conditions Total**

*Location:* 2087-2093 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

**Question:**

Total score; 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.

- (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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	Never	34	2.5 %	2.5%
1.05	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
1.10	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
1.14	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
1.19	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
1.24	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
1.29	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
1.33	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
1.35	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.38	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
1.43	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
1.45	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.48	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
1.52	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
1.57	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
1.62	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
1.67	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
1.71	-	25	1.8 %	1.8%
1.76	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
1.81	-	25	1.8 %	1.8%
1.86	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
1.90	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
1.95	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
2.00	Rarely	31	2.3 %	2.3%
2.05	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
2.10	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
2.14	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
2.15	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.19	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
2.24	-	25	1.8 %	1.8%
2.25	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
2.29	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
2.33	-	39	2.9 %	2.9%
2.37	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.38	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
2.40	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.43	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
2.48	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
2.52	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
2.57	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
2.62	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
2.67	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
2.71	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
2.76	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
2.80	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.81	-	37	2.7 %	2.7%
2.85	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.86	-	29	2.1 %	2.1%
2.90	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
2.95	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
3.00	Sometimes	21	1.6 %	1.6%
3.05	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
3.10	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
3.11	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.14	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
3.15	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.19	-	25	1.8 %	1.8%
3.24	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
3.29	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
3.33	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
3.38	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
3.43	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
3.48	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
3.52	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
3.57	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
3.62	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
3.67	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
3.71	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
3.76	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
3.81	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
3.86	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
3.90	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
3.95	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
4.00	Often	18	1.3 %	1.3%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	1	0.1 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,352 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### S0NEIPHY: S0 NeiCon: Physical Disorder

*Location:* 2094-2100 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

#### Question:

Physical disorder; 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.

- (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	%	Valid %
1.00	Never	42	3.1 %	3.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.08	-	25	1.8 %	1.8%
1.17	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
1.25	-	34	2.5 %	2.5%
1.27	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.33	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
1.36	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.42	-	45	3.3 %	3.3%
1.50	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
1.58	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
1.67	-	34	2.5 %	2.5%
1.73	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.75	-	37	2.7 %	2.7%
1.83	-	39	2.9 %	2.9%
1.91	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.92	-	48	3.5 %	3.6%
2.00	Rarely	58	4.3 %	4.3%
2.08	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
2.09	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.17	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
2.25	-	59	4.4 %	4.4%
2.33	-	57	4.2 %	4.2%
2.42	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
2.45	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.50	-	46	3.4 %	3.4%
2.55	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.58	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
2.64	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.67	-	46	3.4 %	3.4%
2.73	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.75	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
2.82	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.83	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
2.92	-	49	3.6 %	3.6%
3.00	Sometimes	48	3.5 %	3.6%
3.08	-	34	2.5 %	2.5%
3.09	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.17	-	41	3.0 %	3.0%
3.25	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
3.33	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
3.42	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
3.50	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
3.58	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
3.67	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
3.75	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
3.83	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
3.92	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
4.00	Often	21	1.6 %	1.6%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	1	0.1 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,352 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0NEISOC: S0 NeiCon: Social Disorder**

*Location:* 2101-2107 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

#### **Question:**

Social disorder; 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.

- (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	%	Valid %
1.00	Never	83	6.1 %	6.1%
1.11	-	39	2.9 %	2.9%
1.22	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
1.33	-	47	3.5 %	3.5%
1.44	-	58	4.3 %	4.3%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.56	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
1.67	-	58	4.3 %	4.3%
1.75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.78	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
1.89	-	66	4.9 %	4.9%
2.00	Rarely	56	4.1 %	4.1%
2.11	-	56	4.1 %	4.1%
2.22	-	54	4.0 %	4.0%
2.33	-	69	5.1 %	5.1%
2.44	-	58	4.3 %	4.3%
2.56	-	52	3.8 %	3.8%
2.67	-	74	5.5 %	5.5%
2.78	-	71	5.2 %	5.3%
2.89	-	55	4.1 %	4.1%
3.00	Sometimes	49	3.6 %	3.6%
3.11	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
3.22	-	52	3.8 %	3.8%
3.25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.33	-	38	2.8 %	2.8%
3.44	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
3.56	-	29	2.1 %	2.1%
3.67	-	25	1.8 %	1.8%
3.78	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
3.89	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
4.00	Often	33	2.4 %	2.4%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	1	0.1 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,352 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0OFFHX0: S0 OffHx: Number times arrested in lifetime**

*Location:* 2108-2112 (*width:* 5; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998

**Question:**

Number of times been arrested in lifetime.

**MEASURE:** Offense History

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,352	99.9 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,352 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0OFFHXA: S0 OffHx: Did you receive summons/letter to appear in court**

*Location:* 2113-2117 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -400 , -101

**Question:**

Receive a summons or letter telling you to appear in court.

MEASURE: Offense History

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	25	1.8 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-400 (M)	Question not asked in this version	279	20.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has been arrested before	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 25 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0OFFHX1: S0 OffHx: Age first time arrested**

*Location:* 2118-2122 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -400 , -103 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Age first time arrested.

MEASURE: Offense History

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,327	98.0 %	100.0%
-103 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been arrested	26	1.9 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,327 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0OFFHXB: S0 OffHx: Age first time received summons**

- Study 29961 -

*Location:* 2123-2127 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -400 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Age first time received a summons.

MEASURE:Offense History

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	23	1.7 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-400 (M)	Question not asked in this version	279	20.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has been arrested before	1,052	77.7 %	-

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

**S0OFFHX2: S0 OffHx: Before event that led to this study ever locked up detention center/jail**

*Location:* 2128-2132 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether locked up in a detention center/jail before the arrest/summons that led to study participation.

MEASURE: Offense History

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,353	99.9 %	100.0%
-8 (M)	Don't Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0OFFHX3: S0 OffHx: Before event that led to this study number times locked up**

*Location:* 2133-2137 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -400 , -104 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Number of times locked up in a detention center/jail before arrest/summons that led to study participation.

- Study 29961 -

MEASURE: Offense History

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	668	49.3 %	100.0%
-104 (M)	Skipped: Subject was not in jail prior to the study	686	50.7 %	-

Based upon 668 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0OFFHX4: S0 OffHx: Age first time locked up in dtn/jail**

*Location:* 2138-2142 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -400 , -104 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Age first time locked up in a detention center/jail.

MEASURE: Offense History

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	667	49.3 %	100.0%
-104 (M)	Skipped: Subject was not in jail prior to the study	686	50.7 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 667 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0OFFCU2: S0 OffHx: How many people did this with you**

*Location:* 2143-2147 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -99 , -98

**Question:**

How many people did this (the crime that brought subject to the institution) with you?

MEASURE: Offense History

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,345	99.3 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-99 (M)	Dont Know	7	0.5 %	-
-98 (M)	Refuse	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,345 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0OFFCU3: S0 OffHx: Have gun when committed offense that brought you here**

*Location:* 2148-2152 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Did subject have a gun when committed the offense that brought them to the institution?

MEASURE: Offense History

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,346	99.4 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Refused	6	0.4 %	-
-8 (M)	Don't Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0OFFCU4: S0 OffHx: Under influence of drugs/alcohol when committed this offense**

*Location:* 2153-2157 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Was subject under the influence of drugs/alcohol when committed the offense?

MEASURE: Offense History

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,345	99.3 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Refused	7	0.5 %	-
-8 (M)	Don't Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,345 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0OFFHX6: S0 OffHx: Currently in any court-ordered supervision programs**

*Location:* 2158-2162 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

- Study 29961 -

Is subject currently in any court-ordered supervision programs?

MEASURE: Offense History

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,354	100.0 %	100.0%

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

**PRI\_B4\_BL\_EVER: Official record: Petitions that fall before the baseline interview date-ever. All cases have at least one since the study initial referring counts)**

*Location:* 2163-2164 (width: 2; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Number of petitions prior to the Pathways study baseline interview. This information is based on court records in each jurisdiction (not self report).

MEASURE: Offense History

Value	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	351	25.9 %	25.9%
2	314	23.2 %	23.2%
3	226	16.7 %	16.7%
4	162	12.0 %	12.0%
5	113	8.3 %	8.3%
6	69	5.1 %	5.1%
7	54	4.0 %	4.0%
8	21	1.6 %	1.6%
9	23	1.7 %	1.7%
10	9	0.7 %	0.7%
11	5	0.4 %	0.4%
12	2	0.1 %	0.1%
13	2	0.1 %	0.1%
14	2	0.1 %	0.1%
15	1	0.1 %	0.1%

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

**AGE\_1\_PRI\_B4\_BL: Official record: Age at 1st prior (uses age at initial referring if no priors) before BL**

*Location:* 2165-2169 (width: 5; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Age of first petition to court prior to the Pathways study baseline interview. This information is based on court records in each jurisdiction (not self report).

MEASURE: Offense History

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

**S0PARMON: S0 PMonit: Relationship code of person primarily responsible for you**

*Location:* 2170-2173 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -400 , -99 , -98 , -97

**Question:**

Relationship of person who is primarily responsible for the subject.

MEASURE: Parental Monitoring

The Parental Monitoring inventory (Steinberg, Dornbusch, and 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 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. These are answered on a 4-point likert scale which ranges from "never" to "always".

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	887	65.5 %	86.3%
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	15	1.1 %	1.5%
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	15	1.1 %	1.5%
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	109	8.1 %	10.6%
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	2	0.1 %	0.2%

**Missing Data**

-400 (M)	Item not present before version 01.05	275	20.3 %	-
-99 (M)	Don't Know	10	0.7 %	-
-97 (M)	Not Applicable	41	3.0 %	-

Based upon 1,028 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PAKNOW: S0 PMonit: Parental Knowledge**

- Study 29961 -

Location: 2174-2180 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -500.00 , -300.00 , -100.00 , -99.00 , -98.00 , -97.00

**Question:**

Parental knowledge; Mean of 5 items.

MEASURE: Parental Monitoring

The Parental Monitoring inventory (Steinberg, Dornbusch, and 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 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. 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)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	Doesnt know at all	40	3.0 %	3.1%
1.20	-	29	2.1 %	2.3%
1.40	-	45	3.3 %	3.5%
1.60	-	46	3.4 %	3.6%
1.75	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
1.80	-	60	4.4 %	4.7%
2.00	Knows a little bit	91	6.7 %	7.1%
2.20	-	113	8.3 %	8.8%
2.25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.40	-	94	6.9 %	7.3%
2.50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.60	-	109	8.1 %	8.5%
2.75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.80	-	98	7.2 %	7.6%
3.00	Knows a lot	147	10.9 %	11.4%
3.20	-	80	5.9 %	6.2%
3.25	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
3.40	-	84	6.2 %	6.5%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
3.50	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
3.60	-	69	5.1 %	5.4%
3.80	-	34	2.5 %	2.6%
4.00	Knows everything	136	10.0 %	10.6%
-300.00 (M)	Too few answers for computation	16	1.2 %	-
-100.00 (M)	Did not skip into section	41	3.0 %	-
-99.00 (M)	Dont Know	13	1.0 %	-

Based upon 1,284 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### S0PARMNT: S0 PMonit: Parental Monitoring

*Location:* 2181-2187 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -500.00 , -300.00 , -100.00 , -99.00 , -98.00 , -97.00

#### Question:

Parental monitoring; Mean of 4 items which are only available if subject lives with supervising adult. 3 items are required valid.

MEASURE: Parental Monitoring

The Parental Monitoring inventory (Steinberg, Dornbusch, and 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 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. 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	%	Valid %
1.00	Never	31	2.3 %	2.6%
1.25	-	40	3.0 %	3.3%
1.50	-	56	4.1 %	4.7%
1.75	-	80	5.9 %	6.7%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2.00	Sometimes	82	6.1 %	6.9%
2.25	-	110	8.1 %	9.2%
2.50	-	106	7.8 %	8.9%
2.75	-	104	7.7 %	8.7%
3.00	Usually	110	8.1 %	9.2%
3.25	-	107	7.9 %	8.9%
3.50	-	103	7.6 %	8.6%
3.75	-	93	6.9 %	7.8%
4.00	Always	175	12.9 %	14.6%

*Missing Data*

-500.00 (M)	Data missing: Result of a programming error	6	0.4 %	-
-100.00 (M)	Did not skip into section	147	10.9 %	-
-97.00 (M)	NA (dont live with caregiver)	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,197 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PARENT: S0 POrient: Youths Parenting Orientation**

*Location:* 2188-2194 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

**Question:**

Youth Parenting Orientation; Mean of six items.

MEASURE: Parental 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.

(Please note that five of the six items are reverse coded resulting in the value labels in the data being reversed.)

- (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)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.50	-	1	0.1 %	0.9%
2.17	-	1	0.1 %	0.9%
2.50	-	3	0.2 %	2.6%
2.67	-	6	0.4 %	5.1%
2.83	-	19	1.4 %	16.2%
3.00	Agree	15	1.1 %	12.8%
3.17	-	13	1.0 %	11.1%
3.33	-	20	1.5 %	17.1%
3.50	-	11	0.8 %	9.4%
3.67	-	14	1.0 %	12.0%
3.80	-	1	0.1 %	0.9%
3.83	-	8	0.6 %	6.8%
4.00	Agree Strongly	5	0.4 %	4.3%

**Missing Data**

-300.00 (M)	Too few answers for computation	2	0.1 %	-
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	1	0.1 %	-
-100.00 (M)	Skipped: Subject reported having zero children	1,233	91.1 %	-
-8.00 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 117 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MAWARM: S0 PQual: Parent Warmth - Mother**

*Location:* 2195-2201 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -400.00 , -300.00 , -200.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

**Question:**

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.

- Study 29961 -

- (1) Never
- (2) Sometimes
- (3) Often
- (4) Always

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	Never	10	0.7 %	0.8%
1.11	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
1.33	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
1.44	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
1.56	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
1.67	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
1.78	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
1.89	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
2.00	Sometimes	30	2.2 %	2.3%
2.11	-	34	2.5 %	2.6%
2.22	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
2.33	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
2.44	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
2.50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.56	-	27	2.0 %	2.1%
2.67	-	47	3.5 %	3.6%
2.78	-	60	4.4 %	4.6%
2.89	-	64	4.7 %	4.9%
3.00	Often	59	4.4 %	4.5%
3.11	-	59	4.4 %	4.5%
3.13	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.22	-	70	5.2 %	5.4%
3.33	-	77	5.7 %	5.9%
3.44	-	58	4.3 %	4.4%
3.56	-	83	6.1 %	6.4%
3.63	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.67	-	89	6.6 %	6.8%
3.78	-	84	6.2 %	6.4%
3.89	-	95	7.0 %	7.3%
4.00	Always	210	15.5 %	16.1%
-300.00 (M)	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %	-
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-100.00 (M)	Did not skip into section	44	3.2 %	-

Based upon 1,306 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MAHOTL: S0 PQual: Parent Hostility - Mother**

*Location:* 2202-2208 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -400.00 , -300.00 , -200.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

**Question:**

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) Never
- (2) Sometimes
- (3) Often
- (4) Always

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	Never	41	3.0 %	3.1%
1.08	-	59	4.4 %	4.5%
1.17	-	102	7.5 %	7.8%
1.25	-	121	8.9 %	9.3%
1.33	-	135	10.0 %	10.3%
1.42	-	137	10.1 %	10.5%
1.50	-	112	8.3 %	8.6%
1.58	-	93	6.9 %	7.1%
1.67	-	82	6.1 %	6.3%
1.75	-	83	6.1 %	6.4%
1.83	-	75	5.5 %	5.7%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.92	-	45	3.3 %	3.4%
2.00	Sometimes	29	2.1 %	2.2%
2.08	-	30	2.2 %	2.3%
2.17	-	27	2.0 %	2.1%
2.25	-	19	1.4 %	1.5%
2.33	-	23	1.7 %	1.8%
2.42	-	18	1.3 %	1.4%
2.50	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
2.58	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
2.67	-	10	0.7 %	0.8%
2.75	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
2.83	-	10	0.7 %	0.8%
2.92	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
3.00	Often	2	0.1 %	0.2%
3.08	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
3.25	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
3.33	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.42	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
3.50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.58	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.67	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.92	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-300.00 (M)	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %	-
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-100.00 (M)	Did not skip into section	44	3.2 %	-

Based upon 1,306 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PAWARM: S0 PQual: Parent Warmth - Father**

*Location:* 2209-2215 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -400.00 , -300.00 , -200.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

**Question:**

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,

- Study 29961 -

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) Never
- (2) Sometimes
- (3) Often
- (4) Always

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	Never	29	2.1 %	3.5%
1.11	-	16	1.2 %	1.9%
1.22	-	13	1.0 %	1.5%
1.33	-	13	1.0 %	1.5%
1.44	-	11	0.8 %	1.3%
1.56	-	15	1.1 %	1.8%
1.67	-	16	1.2 %	1.9%
1.78	-	22	1.6 %	2.6%
1.86	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.89	-	29	2.1 %	3.5%
2.00	Sometimes	46	3.4 %	5.5%
2.11	-	39	2.9 %	4.6%
2.22	-	33	2.4 %	3.9%
2.33	-	33	2.4 %	3.9%
2.44	-	32	2.4 %	3.8%
2.56	-	30	2.2 %	3.6%
2.63	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.67	-	37	2.7 %	4.4%
2.78	-	25	1.8 %	3.0%
2.88	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.89	-	34	2.5 %	4.1%
3.00	Often	32	2.4 %	3.8%
3.11	-	33	2.4 %	3.9%
3.22	-	27	2.0 %	3.2%
3.33	-	29	2.1 %	3.5%
3.44	-	13	1.0 %	1.5%
3.56	-	29	2.1 %	3.5%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
3.67	-	29	2.1 %	3.5%
3.78	-	43	3.2 %	5.1%
3.89	-	38	2.8 %	4.5%
4.00	Always	90	6.6 %	10.7%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-100.00 (M)	Did not skip into section	495	36.6 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Dont Know	15	1.1 %	-
-8.00 (M)	Refuse	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 839 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0PAHOTL: S0 PQual: Parent Hostility - Father

*Location:* 2216-2222 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -400.00 , -300.00 , -200.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

#### Question:

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) Never
- (2) Sometimes
- (3) Often
- (4) Always

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	Never	114	8.4 %	13.6%
1.08	-	61	4.5 %	7.3%
1.17	-	86	6.4 %	10.3%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.25	-	78	5.8 %	9.3%
1.33	-	74	5.5 %	8.8%
1.42	-	49	3.6 %	5.8%
1.50	-	60	4.4 %	7.2%
1.55	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.58	-	48	3.5 %	5.7%
1.67	-	36	2.7 %	4.3%
1.75	-	26	1.9 %	3.1%
1.83	-	31	2.3 %	3.7%
1.92	-	26	1.9 %	3.1%
2.00	Sometimes	25	1.8 %	3.0%
2.08	-	20	1.5 %	2.4%
2.17	-	21	1.6 %	2.5%
2.25	-	11	0.8 %	1.3%
2.33	-	15	1.1 %	1.8%
2.42	-	14	1.0 %	1.7%
2.50	-	10	0.7 %	1.2%
2.58	-	5	0.4 %	0.6%
2.67	-	6	0.4 %	0.7%
2.75	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
2.83	-	8	0.6 %	1.0%
2.92	-	3	0.2 %	0.4%
3.08	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.17	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
3.33	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
3.42	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.67	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
4.00	Always	2	0.1 %	0.2%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-100.00 (M)	Did not skip into section	495	36.6 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Dont Know	15	1.1 %	-
-8.00 (M)	Refuse	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 839 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PRBEHV: S0 PDel: Antisocial Behavior**

*Location:* 2223-2229 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

**Question:**

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)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	None of them	93	6.9 %	7.1%
1.08	-	34	2.5 %	2.6%
1.17	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
1.20	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.25	-	44	3.2 %	3.3%
1.30	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.33	-	56	4.1 %	4.3%
1.36	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.42	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
1.45	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.50	-	38	2.8 %	2.9%
1.55	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.58	-	34	2.5 %	2.6%
1.60	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.67	-	30	2.2 %	2.3%
1.75	-	37	2.7 %	2.8%
1.82	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.83	-	38	2.8 %	2.9%
1.92	-	37	2.7 %	2.8%
2.00	Very few of them	34	2.5 %	2.6%
2.08	-	38	2.8 %	2.9%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
2.10	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.11	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.17	-	47	3.5 %	3.6%
2.25	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
2.30	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.33	-	43	3.2 %	3.3%
2.36	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
2.42	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
2.45	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.50	-	35	2.6 %	2.7%
2.58	-	35	2.6 %	2.7%
2.60	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.64	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.67	-	48	3.5 %	3.6%
2.70	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.73	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.75	-	30	2.2 %	2.3%
2.82	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
2.83	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
2.91	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.92	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
3.00	Some of them	32	2.4 %	2.4%
3.08	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
3.09	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.10	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.17	-	26	1.9 %	2.0%
3.18	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.25	-	34	2.5 %	2.6%
3.30	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.33	-	27	2.0 %	2.1%
3.36	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.42	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
3.50	-	31	2.3 %	2.4%
3.58	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
3.67	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
3.75	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
3.83	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
3.92	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
4.00	Most of them	12	0.9 %	0.9%
4.08	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
4.17	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
4.25	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
4.27	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
4.33	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
4.42	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
4.50	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
4.58	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
4.67	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
4.75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
4.83	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
4.91	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
4.92	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
5.00	All of them	4	0.3 %	0.3%

**Missing Data**

-300.00 (M)	Too few answers for computation	17	1.3 %	-
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Dont Know	18	1.3 %	-

Based upon 1,316 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**SOPRINFL: S0 PDel: Antisocial Influence**

*Location:* 2230-2236 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

**Question:**

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

- Study 29961 -

(5) All of them

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	None of them	368	27.2 %	27.5%
1.14	-	126	9.3 %	9.4%
1.29	-	111	8.2 %	8.3%
1.43	-	76	5.6 %	5.7%
1.57	-	85	6.3 %	6.3%
1.67	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.71	-	62	4.6 %	4.6%
1.86	-	61	4.5 %	4.6%
2.00	Very few of them	52	3.8 %	3.9%
2.14	-	56	4.1 %	4.2%
2.29	-	52	3.8 %	3.9%
2.43	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
2.57	-	49	3.6 %	3.7%
2.71	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
2.86	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
3.00	Some of them	24	1.8 %	1.8%
3.14	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
3.29	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
3.43	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
3.57	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
3.71	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
3.86	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
4.00	Most of them	10	0.7 %	0.7%
4.14	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
4.29	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
4.43	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
4.57	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
4.71	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
4.86	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
5.00	All of them	8	0.6 %	0.6%

*Missing Data*

-300.00 (M)	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %	-
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Dont Know	11	0.8 %	-

Based upon 1,339 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

- Study 29961 -

**S0OPP01A: S0 OppSuc: How important to have a good job or career**

*Location:* 2237-2240 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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".

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	Not at all important	18	1.3 %	1.3%
2	Not too important	16	1.2 %	1.2%
3	Somewhat important	89	6.6 %	6.6%
4	Pretty important	258	19.1 %	19.1%
5	Very important	968	71.5 %	71.8%

*Missing Data*

-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,349 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0OPP01B: S0 OppSuc: How likely to have a good job or career**

*Location:* 2241-2244 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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)

- Study 29961 -

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".

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Poor	73	5.4 %	5.4%
2	Fair	216	16.0 %	16.0%
3	Good	457	33.8 %	33.9%
4	Very Good	387	28.6 %	28.7%
5	Excellent	215	15.9 %	15.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,348 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0OPP02A: S0 OppSuc: How important to graduate from college**

*Location:* 2245-2248 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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".

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Not at all important	89	6.6 %	6.6%
2	Not too important	155	11.4 %	11.5%
3	Somewhat important	239	17.7 %	17.7%
4	Pretty important	230	17.0 %	17.0%
5	Very important	636	47.0 %	47.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,349 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0OPP02B: S0 OppSuc: How likely to graduate from college**

*Location:* 2249-2252 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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".

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Poor	213	15.7 %	15.8%
2	Fair	334	24.7 %	24.8%
3	Good	364	26.9 %	27.1%
4	Very Good	267	19.7 %	19.9%
5	Excellent	167	12.3 %	12.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	5	0.4 %	-

## - Study 29961 -

Based upon 1,345 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0OPP03A: S0 OppSuc: How important to earn a good living

*Location:* 2253-2256 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

#### Question:

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".

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Not at all important	6	0.4 %	0.4%
2	Not too important	16	1.2 %	1.2%
3	Somewhat important	79	5.8 %	5.9%
4	Pretty important	266	19.6 %	19.7%
5	Very important	983	72.6 %	72.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0OPP03B: S0 OppSuc: How likely to earn a good living

*Location:* 2257-2260 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

#### Question:

What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

- Study 29961 -

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".

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	Poor	30	2.2 %	2.2%
2	Fair	157	11.6 %	11.6%
3	Good	476	35.2 %	35.3%
4	Very Good	421	31.1 %	31.2%
5	Excellent	264	19.5 %	19.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,348 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0OPP04A: S0 OppSuc: How important to provide a good home for your family**

*Location:* 2261-2264 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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".

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Not at all important	5	0.4 %	0.4%
2	Not too important	7	0.5 %	0.5%
3	Somewhat important	36	2.7 %	2.7%
4	Pretty important	181	13.4 %	13.4%
5	Very important	1,118	82.6 %	83.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-
-8 (M)	Refused	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,347 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0OPP04B: S0 OppSuc: How likely to provide a good home for your family**

*Location:* 2265-2268 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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".

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Poor	29	2.1 %	2.2%
2	Fair	103	7.6 %	7.6%
3	Good	398	29.4 %	29.5%
4	Very Good	439	32.4 %	32.6%
5	Excellent	378	27.9 %	28.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-8 (M)	Refused	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,347 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0OPP05A: S0 OppSuc: How important to have a good marriage

*Location:* 2269-2272 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

#### Question:

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".

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Not at all important	112	8.3 %	8.3%
2	Not too important	88	6.5 %	6.5%
3	Somewhat important	154	11.4 %	11.4%
4	Pretty important	243	17.9 %	18.0%
5	Very important	750	55.4 %	55.7%

#### Missing Data

-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-
-8 (M)	Refused	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,347 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0OPP05B: S0 OppSuc: How likely to have a good marriage

*Location:* 2273-2276 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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".

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Poor	122	9.0 %	9.1%
2	Fair	178	13.1 %	13.3%
3	Good	355	26.2 %	26.4%
4	Very Good	374	27.6 %	27.8%
5	Excellent	314	23.2 %	23.4%

*Missing Data*

-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	5	0.4 %	-
-8 (M)	Refused	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,343 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0OPP06A: S0 OppSuc: How important to have a good relationship with your children**

Location: 2277-2280 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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

- Study 29961 -

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".

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	Not at all important	13	1.0 %	1.0%
2	Not too important	5	0.4 %	0.4%
3	Somewhat important	30	2.2 %	2.2%
4	Pretty important	102	7.5 %	7.6%
5	Very important	1,198	88.5 %	88.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-8 (M)	Refused	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,348 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0OPP06B: S0 OppSuc: How likely to have a good relationship with your children**

*Location:* 2281-2284 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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".

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	Poor	19	1.4 %	1.4%
2	Fair	29	2.1 %	2.2%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
3	Good	147	10.9 %	10.9%
4	Very Good	340	25.1 %	25.2%
5	Excellent	813	60.0 %	60.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-8 (M)	Refused	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,348 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0OPP07A: S0 OppSuc: How important to stay out of trouble with the law**

*Location:* 2285-2288 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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".

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Not at all important	14	1.0 %	1.0%
2	Not too important	23	1.7 %	1.7%
3	Somewhat important	78	5.8 %	5.8%
4	Pretty important	185	13.7 %	13.7%
5	Very important	1,049	77.5 %	77.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,349 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0OPP07B: S0 OppSuc: How likely to stay out of trouble with the law**

- Study 29961 -

Location: 2289-2292 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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".

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Poor	85	6.3 %	6.3%
2	Fair	211	15.6 %	15.7%
3	Good	303	22.4 %	22.5%
4	Very Good	335	24.7 %	24.9%
5	Excellent	414	30.6 %	30.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,348 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0OPP131: S0 OppSuc: How old do you think you will live to be**

Location: 2293-2296 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -999 , -998 , -200

**Question:**

How old do you think you will live to be?

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

- Study 29961 -

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".

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label
<i>Missing Data</i>	
-999 (M)	Dont Know
-998 (M)	Refused
-200 (M)	Data missing

\* Frequencies not displayed for this variable.

Based upon 1,257 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0OPPORT: S0 OppSucc: Aspirations for Work, Family and Law**

*Location:* 2297-2303 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

**Question:**

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".

- (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)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.17	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.67	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
2.00	Not too important	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.17	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.33	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
2.50	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
2.67	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
2.83	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
3.00	Somewhat important	14	1.0 %	1.0%
3.17	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
3.33	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
3.50	-	38	2.8 %	2.8%
3.67	-	45	3.3 %	3.3%
3.83	-	64	4.7 %	4.8%
4.00	Pretty important	83	6.1 %	6.2%
4.17	-	100	7.4 %	7.4%
4.33	-	135	10.0 %	10.0%
4.50	-	136	10.0 %	10.1%
4.67	-	164	12.1 %	12.2%
4.80	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
4.83	-	172	12.7 %	12.8%
5.00	Very important	325	24.0 %	24.1%

*Missing Data*

-300.00 (M)	Too few answers for computation	3	0.2 %	-
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,347 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0EXPECT: S0 OppSucc: Expectations to have Work, Family and Law**

*Location:* 2304-2310 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

**Question:**

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

- Study 29961 -

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".

- (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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	Poor	3	0.2 %	0.2%
1.33	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
1.50	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
1.67	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
1.80	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.83	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
2.00	Fair	30	2.2 %	2.2%
2.17	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
2.33	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
2.50	-	63	4.7 %	4.7%
2.60	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
2.67	-	88	6.5 %	6.5%
2.83	-	79	5.8 %	5.9%
3.00	Good	94	6.9 %	7.0%
3.17	-	103	7.6 %	7.7%
3.33	-	101	7.5 %	7.5%
3.50	-	84	6.2 %	6.2%
3.67	-	86	6.4 %	6.4%
3.83	-	101	7.5 %	7.5%
4.00	Very Good	83	6.1 %	6.2%
4.17	-	81	6.0 %	6.0%
4.33	-	72	5.3 %	5.4%
4.50	-	46	3.4 %	3.4%
4.60	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
4.67	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
4.83	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
5.00	Excellent	46	3.4 %	3.4%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-300.00 (M)	Too few answers for computation	6	0.4 %	-
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,344 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PESSIM: S0 OppSucc: Extent to which expectations fall short**

*Location:* 2311-2317 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00

**Question:**

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".

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-1.00	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-0.83	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
-0.67	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
-0.50	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
-0.33	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
-0.27	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-0.17	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
0.00	-	71	5.2 %	5.3%
0.17	-	71	5.2 %	5.3%
0.33	-	91	6.7 %	6.8%
0.50	-	104	7.7 %	7.7%
0.67	-	140	10.3 %	10.4%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0.83	-	126	9.3 %	9.4%
1.00	-	131	9.7 %	9.7%
1.17	-	106	7.8 %	7.9%
1.33	-	100	7.4 %	7.4%
1.50	-	73	5.4 %	5.4%
1.67	-	91	6.7 %	6.8%
1.83	-	54	4.0 %	4.0%
2.00	-	41	3.0 %	3.1%
2.07	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.17	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
2.20	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.33	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
2.40	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.50	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
2.67	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
2.83	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
3.00	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
3.17	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.33	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.50	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
3.67	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%

*Missing Data*

-300.00 (M)	Too few answers for computation	6	0.4 %	-
-200.00 (M)	Data Missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,344 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PJCOP: S0 ProJus: Procedural Justice - Police**

*Location:* 2318-2324 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -9 , -8 , -7

**Question:**

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

- Study 29961 -

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
<i>Missing Data</i>	
-300 (M)	Too few answers for computation
-200 (M)	Data missing
-9 (M)	Dont Know
-8 (M)	Refuse
-7 (M)	NA

\* Frequencies not displayed for this variable.

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PJCOPU: S0 ProJus: Procedural Justice - You - Police**

*Location:* 2325-2331 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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.").

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>
7	NA
<i>Missing Data</i>	
-300 (M)	Too few answers for computation
-200 (M)	Data missing
-9 (M)	Dont Know
-8 (M)	Refuse

\* Frequencies not displayed for this variable.

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0PJCOPO: S0 ProJus: Procedural Justice - Others - Police**

*Location:* 2332-2338 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -9.00 , -8.00 , -7.00

#### **Question:**

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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
1.05	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
1.25	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.30	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
1.45	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
1.50	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
1.55	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
1.65	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
1.70	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
1.75	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
1.80	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
1.83	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.85	-	64	4.7 %	4.7%
1.90	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
1.95	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
2.00	-	46	3.4 %	3.4%
2.05	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
2.10	-	95	7.0 %	7.0%
2.15	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
2.20	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
2.25	-	70	5.2 %	5.2%
2.30	-	33	2.4 %	2.4%
2.31	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.35	-	33	2.4 %	2.4%
2.38	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.40	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
2.45	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
2.50	-	99	7.3 %	7.3%
2.55	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
2.60	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
2.63	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.65	-	39	2.9 %	2.9%
2.67	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.70	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
2.75	-	53	3.9 %	3.9%
2.80	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
2.81	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.85	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
2.90	-	54	4.0 %	4.0%
2.95	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
3.00	-	78	5.8 %	5.8%
3.05	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
3.06	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
3.10	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
3.13	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.15	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
3.20	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
3.25	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
3.30	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
3.33	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
3.35	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
3.40	-	48	3.5 %	3.5%
3.45	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
3.50	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
3.55	-	25	1.8 %	1.8%
3.60	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
3.65	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
3.70	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
3.75	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
3.80	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
3.85	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.95	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
4.00	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
4.20	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
4.25	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
4.35	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
4.40	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
4.50	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
4.60	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
4.75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
4.80	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
5.00	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PJJUDG: S0 ProJus: Procedural Justice - Judge**

*Location:* 2339-2345 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -100 , -9 , -8 , -7

**Question:**

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)).

Value	Label
<i>Missing Data</i>	
-300 (M)	Too few answers for computation
-200 (M)	Data missing
-100 (M)	Did not skip into question
-9 (M)	Dont Know
-8 (M)	Refuse
-7 (M)	NA

\* Frequencies not displayed for this variable.

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PJJUDU: S0 ProJus: Procedural Justice - You - Court**

*Location:* 2346-2352 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -100 , -9 , -8 , -7

**Question:**

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

- Study 29961 -

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
<b>Missing Data</b>	
-300 (M)	Too few answers for computation
-200 (M)	Data missing
-100 (M)	Did not skip into question
-9 (M)	Dont Know
-8 (M)	Refuse
-7 (M)	NA

\* Frequencies not displayed for this variable.

Based upon 1,344 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0PJJUDO: S0 ProJus: Procedural Justice - Others - Court**

*Location:* 2353-2359 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -100 , -9 , -8 , -7

#### **Question:**

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.").

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label
<b>Missing Data</b>	
-300 (M)	Too few answers for computation
-200 (M)	Data missing
-100 (M)	Did not skip into question
-9 (M)	Dont Know
-8 (M)	Refuse
-7 (M)	NA

\* Frequencies not displayed for this variable.

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### **S0LEGIT: S0 ProJus: Procedural Justice - Legitimacy**

*Location:* 2360-2366 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -9.00 , -8.00 , -7.00

#### **Question:**

Legitimacy index; Mean 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)).

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	Strongly Disagree	13	1.0 %	1.0%
1.09	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
1.18	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
1.27	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
1.36	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
1.45	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
1.50	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
1.55	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
1.56	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
1.60	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
1.64	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
1.67	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
1.70	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.73	-	49	3.6 %	3.6%
1.75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.78	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
1.80	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
1.82	-	56	4.1 %	4.1%
1.83	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
1.88	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
1.89	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.90	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
1.91	-	64	4.7 %	4.7%
2.00	Somewhat Disagree	84	6.2 %	6.2%
2.09	-	72	5.3 %	5.3%
2.10	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
2.11	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
2.17	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.18	-	64	4.7 %	4.7%
2.20	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
2.22	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.27	-	56	4.1 %	4.1%
2.30	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
2.33	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
2.36	-	81	6.0 %	6.0%
2.38	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
2.40	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
2.44	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
2.45	-	77	5.7 %	5.7%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2.50	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
2.55	-	68	5.0 %	5.0%
2.56	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
2.60	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
2.64	-	63	4.7 %	4.7%
2.67	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
2.70	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
2.73	-	61	4.5 %	4.5%
2.75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.78	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
2.80	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
2.82	-	41	3.0 %	3.0%
2.83	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.89	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.90	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
2.91	-	44	3.2 %	3.3%
3.00	Somewhat Agree	40	3.0 %	3.0%
3.09	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
3.10	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
3.11	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.18	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
3.20	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
3.25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.27	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
3.30	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
3.36	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
3.40	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
3.45	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
3.50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.55	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
3.60	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
3.64	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
3.73	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
3.82	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
4.00	Strongly Agree	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

- Study 29961 -

Location: 2367-2373 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -300.00 , -200.00 , -9.00 , -8.00 , -7.00

**Question:**

Legal cynicism index; Mean 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	%	Valid %
1.00	Strongly Disagree	98	7.2 %	7.2%
1.20	-	73	5.4 %	5.4%
1.40	-	108	8.0 %	8.0%
1.60	-	171	12.6 %	12.6%
1.75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.80	-	117	8.6 %	8.6%
2.00	Somewhat Disagree	177	13.1 %	13.1%
2.20	-	184	13.6 %	13.6%
2.25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.40	-	127	9.4 %	9.4%
2.60	-	112	8.3 %	8.3%
2.80	-	89	6.6 %	6.6%
3.00	Somewhat Agree	32	2.4 %	2.4%
3.20	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
3.40	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
3.60	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
3.80	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
4.00	Strongly Agree	6	0.4 %	0.4%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### S0BYPCLS: S0 PCL: Total PCL Score

*Location:* 2374-2377 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -99

#### Question:

Total PCL Score: sum of all 20 items in the PCL-YV.

MEASURE: Psychopathy Checklist Youth Version (PCL-YV)

Youth Version (PCL-YV; Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003) assesses psychopathic characteristics among youth. Procedures advocated by the authors suggest a 60-90 minute, semi-structured interview to assess the youth's interpersonal style, obtain information on a variety of aspects of his/her history and current functioning, and assess the credibility of his/her statements. However, the Pathways study was unable to accommodate an interview of this length to assess psychopathy. This form lists 20 separate items for which the youth is rated on a 3-point ordinal scale: "0" item does not apply to the youth, "1" item applies to a certain extent and "2" item applies to the youth. The authors of the adult versions of the Psychopathy Checklist have reported a 2-factor structure underlying the item scores (see Forth et al, 2003, page 57); however, the PCL-YV has not replicated this factor structure. Instead, factor analytic work with the PCL-YV has produced both a 3-factor and a 4-factor structure that are acceptable to the PCL-YV authors, each with their own caveats.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
1	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
2	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
3	-	28	2.1 %	2.2%
4	-	37	2.7 %	2.8%
5	-	31	2.3 %	2.4%
6	-	30	2.2 %	2.3%
7	-	44	3.2 %	3.4%
8	-	41	3.0 %	3.2%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	-	53	3.9 %	4.1%
10	-	67	4.9 %	5.2%
11	-	70	5.2 %	5.4%
12	-	50	3.7 %	3.8%
13	-	64	4.7 %	4.9%
14	-	58	4.3 %	4.5%
15	-	58	4.3 %	4.5%
16	-	48	3.5 %	3.7%
17	-	46	3.4 %	3.5%
18	-	56	4.1 %	4.3%
19	-	57	4.2 %	4.4%
20	-	59	4.4 %	4.5%
21	-	52	3.8 %	4.0%
22	-	54	4.0 %	4.2%
23	-	52	3.8 %	4.0%
24	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
25	-	36	2.7 %	2.8%
26	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
27	-	27	2.0 %	2.1%
28	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
29	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
30	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
31	-	10	0.7 %	0.8%
32	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
33	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
34	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
35	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
36	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
37	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
39	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-99 (M)	PCL Missing - Unknown Reasons	54	4.0 %	-

Based upon 1,300 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0BYPCL1: S0 PCL: Factor 1 PCL Score**

*Location:* 2378-2381 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -99

**Question:**

Factor 1 PCL Score; sum of 8 items in this factor.

MEASURE: Psychopathy Checklist Youth Version (PCL-YV)

Youth Version (PCL-YV; Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003) assesses psychopathic characteristics among youth. Procedures advocated by the authors suggest a 60-90 minute, semi-structured interview to assess the youth's interpersonal style, obtain information on a variety of aspects of his/her history and current functioning, and assess the credibility of his/her statements. However, the Pathways study was unable to accommodate an interview of this length to assess psychopathy. This form lists 20 separate items for which the youth is rated on a 3-point ordinal scale: "0" item does not apply to the youth, "1" item applies to a certain extent and "2" item applies to the youth. The authors of the adult versions of the Psychopathy Checklist have reported a 2-factor structure underlying the item scores (see Forth et al, 2003, page 57); however, the PCL-YV has not replicated this factor structure. Instead, factor analytic work with the PCL-YV has produced both a 3-factor and a 4-factor structure that are acceptable to the PCL-YV authors, each with their own caveats.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	99	7.3 %	7.6%
1	-	132	9.7 %	10.2%
2	-	114	8.4 %	8.8%
3	-	153	11.3 %	11.8%
4	-	134	9.9 %	10.3%
5	-	143	10.6 %	11.0%
6	-	101	7.5 %	7.8%
7	-	117	8.6 %	9.0%
8	-	97	7.2 %	7.5%
9	-	69	5.1 %	5.3%
10	-	44	3.2 %	3.4%
11	-	40	3.0 %	3.1%
12	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
13	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
14	-	10	0.7 %	0.8%
15	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
16	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
19	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-99 (M)	PCL Missing - Unknown Reasons	54	4.0 %	-

Based upon 1,300 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0BYPCL2: S0 PCL: Factor 2 PCL Score**

- Study 29961 -

Location: 2382-2385 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values (M): -99

**Question:**

Factor 2 PCL Score; sum of 9 items included in this factor.

MEASURE: Psychopathy Checklist Youth Version (PCL-YV)

Youth Version (PCL-YV; Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003) assesses psychopathic characteristics among youth. Procedures advocated by the authors suggest a 60-90 minute, semi-structured interview to assess the youth's interpersonal style, obtain information on a variety of aspects of his/her history and current functioning, and assess the credibility of his/her statements. However, the Pathways study was unable to accommodate an interview of this length to assess psychopathy. This form lists 20 separate items for which the youth is rated on a 3-point ordinal scale: "0" item does not apply to the youth, "1" item applies to a certain extent and "2" item applies to the youth. The authors of the adult versions of the Psychopathy Checklist have reported a 2-factor structure underlying the item scores (see Forth et al, 2003, page 57); however, the PCL-YV has not replicated this factor structure. Instead, factor analytic work with the PCL-YV has produced both a 3-factor and a 4-factor structure that are acceptable to the PCL-YV authors, each with their own caveats.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
1	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
2	-	48	3.5 %	3.7%
3	-	64	4.7 %	4.9%
4	-	88	6.5 %	6.8%
5	-	111	8.2 %	8.5%
6	-	122	9.0 %	9.4%
7	-	105	7.8 %	8.1%
8	-	126	9.3 %	9.7%
9	-	121	8.9 %	9.3%
10	-	117	8.6 %	9.0%
11	-	77	5.7 %	5.9%
12	-	80	5.9 %	6.2%
13	-	69	5.1 %	5.3%
14	-	54	4.0 %	4.2%
15	-	45	3.3 %	3.5%
16	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
17	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
18	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
19	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
21	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-99 (M)	PCL Missing - Unknown Reasons	54	4.0 %	-

Based upon 1,300 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0BPCLYV: S0 PCL: Prorated Total PCL: YV Score**

*Location:* 2386-2389 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -99 , -98

**Question:**

Prorated Total PCL: YV Score.

MEASURE: Psychopathy Checklist Youth Version (PCL-YV)

Youth Version (PCL-YV; Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003) assesses psychopathic characteristics among youth. Procedures advocated by the authors suggest a 60-90 minute, semi-structured interview to assess the youth's interpersonal style, obtain information on a variety of aspects of his/her history and current functioning, and assess the credibility of his/her statements. However, the Pathways study was unable to accommodate an interview of this length to assess psychopathy. This form lists 20 separate items for which the youth is rated on a 3-point ordinal scale: "0" item does not apply to the youth, "1" item applies to a certain extent and "2" item applies to the youth. The authors of the adult versions of the Psychopathy Checklist have reported a 2-factor structure underlying the item scores (see Forth et al, 2003, page 57); however, the PCL-YV has not replicated this factor structure. Instead, factor analytic work with the PCL-YV has produced both a 3-factor and a 4-factor structure that are acceptable to the PCL-YV authors, each with their own caveats.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
1	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
2	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
3	-	28	2.1 %	2.2%
4	-	37	2.7 %	2.8%
5	-	31	2.3 %	2.4%
6	-	30	2.2 %	2.3%
7	-	44	3.2 %	3.4%
8	-	41	3.0 %	3.2%
9	-	53	3.9 %	4.1%
10	-	67	4.9 %	5.2%
11	-	70	5.2 %	5.4%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
12	-	50	3.7 %	3.8%
13	-	64	4.7 %	4.9%
14	-	58	4.3 %	4.5%
15	-	58	4.3 %	4.5%
16	-	48	3.5 %	3.7%
17	-	45	3.3 %	3.5%
18	-	56	4.1 %	4.3%
19	-	57	4.2 %	4.4%
20	-	59	4.4 %	4.5%
21	-	52	3.8 %	4.0%
22	-	54	4.0 %	4.2%
23	-	52	3.8 %	4.0%
24	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
25	-	36	2.7 %	2.8%
26	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
27	-	27	2.0 %	2.1%
28	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
29	-	19	1.4 %	1.5%
30	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
31	-	10	0.7 %	0.8%
32	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
33	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
34	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
35	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
36	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
37	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
39	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-99 (M)	PCL Missing - Unknown Reasons	54	4.0 %	-
-98 (M)	Item Missing - Unknown Reasons	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,299 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0BPCLYV1: S0 PCL: Prorated Factor 1 PCL YV Score**

*Location:* 2390-2393 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -99

**Question:**

Prorated Factor 1 PCL YV Score.

- Study 29961 -

**MEASURE:** Psychopathy Checklist Youth Version (PCL-YV)

Youth Version (PCL-YV; Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003) assesses psychopathic characteristics among youth. Procedures advocated by the authors suggest a 60-90 minute, semi-structured interview to assess the youth's interpersonal style, obtain information on a variety of aspects of his/her history and current functioning, and assess the credibility of his/her statements. However, the Pathways study was unable to accommodate an interview of this length to assess psychopathy. This form lists 20 separate items for which the youth is rated on a 3-point ordinal scale: "0" item does not apply to the youth, "1" item applies to a certain extent and "2" item applies to the youth. The authors of the adult versions of the Psychopathy Checklist have reported a 2-factor structure underlying the item scores (see Forth et al, 2003, page 57); however, the PCL-YV has not replicated this factor structure. Instead, factor analytic work with the PCL-YV has produced both a 3-factor and a 4-factor structure that are acceptable to the PCL-YV authors, each with their own caveats.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	99	7.3 %	7.6%
1	-	132	9.7 %	10.2%
2	-	114	8.4 %	8.8%
3	-	153	11.3 %	11.8%
4	-	134	9.9 %	10.3%
5	-	143	10.6 %	11.0%
6	-	101	7.5 %	7.8%
7	-	117	8.6 %	9.0%
8	-	97	7.2 %	7.5%
9	-	69	5.1 %	5.3%
10	-	44	3.2 %	3.4%
11	-	40	3.0 %	3.1%
12	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
13	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
14	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
15	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
16	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
19	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-99 (M)	PCL Missing - Unknown Reasons	54	4.0 %	-

Based upon 1,300 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0BPCLYV2: S0 PCL: Prorated Factor 2 PCL YV Score**

*Location:* 2394-2397 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -99 , -98

- Study 29961 -

**Question:**

Prorated Factor 2 PCL YV Score.

MEASURE: Psychopathy Checklist Youth Version (PCL-YV)

Youth Version (PCL-YV; Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003) assesses psychopathic characteristics among youth. Procedures advocated by the authors suggest a 60-90 minute, semi-structured interview to assess the youth's interpersonal style, obtain information on a variety of aspects of his/her history and current functioning, and assess the credibility of his/her statements. However, the Pathways study was unable to accommodate an interview of this length to assess psychopathy. This form lists 20 separate items for which the youth is rated on a 3-point ordinal scale: "0" item does not apply to the youth, "1" item applies to a certain extent and "2" item applies to the youth. The authors of the adult versions of the Psychopathy Checklist have reported a 2-factor structure underlying the item scores (see Forth et al, 2003, page 57); however, the PCL-YV has not replicated this factor structure. Instead, factor analytic work with the PCL-YV has produced both a 3-factor and a 4-factor structure that are acceptable to the PCL-YV authors, each with their own caveats.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
1	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
2	-	48	3.5 %	3.7%
3	-	63	4.7 %	4.8%
4	-	88	6.5 %	6.8%
5	-	111	8.2 %	8.5%
6	-	122	9.0 %	9.4%
7	-	105	7.8 %	8.1%
8	-	126	9.3 %	9.7%
9	-	121	8.9 %	9.3%
10	-	117	8.6 %	9.0%
11	-	77	5.7 %	5.9%
12	-	80	5.9 %	6.2%
13	-	69	5.1 %	5.3%
14	-	54	4.0 %	4.2%
15	-	45	3.3 %	3.5%
16	-	28	2.1 %	2.2%
17	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
18	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
19	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
21	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-99 (M)	PCL Missing - Unknown Reasons	54	4.0 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-98 (M)	Item Missing - Unknown Reasons	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,299 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PCL064: S0 PCL: Ever physically hurt animals on purpose**

*Location:* 2398-2401 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Have you ever physically hurt animals on purpose?

MEASURE: Psychopathy Checklist Youth Version (PCL-YV)

Youth Version (PCL-YV; Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003) assesses psychopathic characteristics among youth. Procedures advocated by the authors suggest a 60-90 minute, semi-structured interview to assess the youth's interpersonal style, obtain information on a variety of aspects of his/her history and current functioning, and assess the credibility of his/her statements. However, the Pathways study was unable to accommodate an interview of this length to assess psychopathy. This form lists 20 separate items for which the youth is rated on a 3-point ordinal scale: "0" item does not apply to the youth, "1" item applies to a certain extent and "2" item applies to the youth. The authors of the adult versions of the Psychopathy Checklist have reported a 2-factor structure underlying the item scores (see Forth et al, 2003, page 57); however, the PCL-YV has not replicated this factor structure. Instead, factor analytic work with the PCL-YV has produced both a 3-factor and a 4-factor structure that are acceptable to the PCL-YV authors, each with their own caveats.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,166	86.1 %	86.1%
1	Yes	188	13.9 %	13.9%

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

**S0NDAY8: S0 PCL: How long ago hurt animals on purpose (in days)**

*Location:* 2402-2409 (width: 8; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999999 , -999998 , -101

**Question:**

How long ago did you hurt animals on purpose (in days)?

MEASURE: Psychopathy Checklist Youth Version (PCL-YV)

Youth Version (PCL-YV; Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003) assesses psychopathic characteristics among

- Study 29961 -

youth. Procedures advocated by the authors suggest a 60-90 minute, semi-structured interview to assess the youth's interpersonal style, obtain information on a variety of aspects of his/her history and current functioning, and assess the credibility of his/her statements. However, the Pathways study was unable to accommodate an interview of this length to assess psychopathy. This form lists 20 separate items for which the youth is rated on a 3-point ordinal scale: "0" item does not apply to the youth, "1" item applies to a certain extent and "2" item applies to the youth. The authors of the adult versions of the Psychopathy Checklist have reported a 2-factor structure underlying the item scores (see Forth et al, 2003, page 57); however, the PCL-YV has not replicated this factor structure. Instead, factor analytic work with the PCL-YV has produced both a 3-factor and a 4-factor structure that are acceptable to the PCL-YV authors, each with their own caveats.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	0 - 7	20	1.5 %	10.8%
2	8 - 14	2	0.1 %	1.1%
3	15 - 30	8	0.6 %	4.3%
4	31 - 60	10	0.7 %	5.4%
5	61 - 180	18	1.3 %	9.7%
6	181 - 365	26	1.9 %	14.0%
7	366 - 730	31	2.3 %	16.7%
8	731 or More	71	5.2 %	38.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999999 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Never intentionally hurt animals	1,166	86.1 %	-

Based upon 186 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PCL048: S0 PCL: Think criminal record will effect life**

*Location:* 2410-2413 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Do you think that the criminal record will effect life?

MEASURE: Psychopathy Checklist Youth Version (PCL-YV)

Youth Version (PCL-YV; Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003) assesses psychopathic characteristics among youth. Procedures advocated by the authors suggest a 60-90 minute, semi-structured interview to assess the youth's interpersonal style, obtain information on a variety of aspects of his/her history and current functioning, and assess the credibility of his/her statements. However, the Pathways study was unable to accommodate an interview of this length to assess psychopathy. This form lists 20 separate items for which the youth is rated on a 3-point ordinal scale: "0" item does not apply to the youth, "1" item applies to a certain extent and "2" item applies to the youth. The authors of the adult versions of the Psychopathy Checklist have reported a 2-factor

- Study 29961 -

structure underlying the item scores (see Forth et al, 2003, page 57); however, the PCL-YV has not replicated this factor structure. Instead, factor analytic work with the PCL-YV has produced both a 3-factor and a 4-factor structure that are acceptable to the PCL-YV authors, each with their own caveats.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	505	37.3 %	37.9%
1	Yes	828	61.2 %	62.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	21	1.6 %	-

Based upon 1,333 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PCL033: S0 PCL: Rate self-esteem on a scale of 1 to 10**

*Location:* 2414-2417 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Rate your self-esteem on a scale of 1 to 10.

MEASURE: Psychopathy Checklist Youth Version (PCL-YV)

Youth Version (PCL-YV; Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003) assesses psychopathic characteristics among youth. Procedures advocated by the authors suggest a 60-90 minute, semi-structured interview to assess the youth's interpersonal style, obtain information on a variety of aspects of his/her history and current functioning, and assess the credibility of his/her statements. However, the Pathways study was unable to accommodate an interview of this length to assess psychopathy. This form lists 20 separate items for which the youth is rated on a 3-point ordinal scale: "0" item does not apply to the youth, "1" item applies to a certain extent and "2" item applies to the youth. The authors of the adult versions of the Psychopathy Checklist have reported a 2-factor structure underlying the item scores (see Forth et al, 2003, page 57); however, the PCL-YV has not replicated this factor structure. Instead, factor analytic work with the PCL-YV has produced both a 3-factor and a 4-factor structure that are acceptable to the PCL-YV authors, each with their own caveats.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	-	33	2.4 %	2.4%
2	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
3	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
4	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
5	-	157	11.6 %	11.6%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
6	-	83	6.1 %	6.2%
7	-	188	13.9 %	13.9%
8	-	269	19.9 %	20.0%
9	-	145	10.7 %	10.8%
10	-	395	29.2 %	29.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,348 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PCL055: S0 PCL: Anyone close to you whose death would upset you**

*Location:* 2418-2421 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Have you had anyone close to you whose death would upset you?

MEASURE: Psychopathy Checklist Youth Version (PCL-YV)

Youth Version (PCL-YV; Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003) assesses psychopathic characteristics among youth. Procedures advocated by the authors suggest a 60-90 minute, semi-structured interview to assess the youth's interpersonal style, obtain information on a variety of aspects of his/her history and current functioning, and assess the credibility of his/her statements. However, the Pathways study was unable to accommodate an interview of this length to assess psychopathy. This form lists 20 separate items for which the youth is rated on a 3-point ordinal scale: "0" item does not apply to the youth, "1" item applies to a certain extent and "2" item applies to the youth. The authors of the adult versions of the Psychopathy Checklist have reported a 2-factor structure underlying the item scores (see Forth et al, 2003, page 57); however, the PCL-YV has not replicated this factor structure. Instead, factor analytic work with the PCL-YV has produced both a 3-factor and a 4-factor structure that are acceptable to the PCL-YV authors, each with their own caveats.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	71	5.2 %	5.3%
1	Yes	1,281	94.6 %	94.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,352 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0NDAY5: S0 PCL: How long to get over this death (in days)**

- Study 29961 -

Location: 2422-2429 (width: 8; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -999999 , -999998 , -101

**Question:**

How long do you need to get over this death (in days)?

MEASURE: Psychopathy Checklist Youth Version (PCL-YV)

Youth Version (PCL-YV; Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003) assesses psychopathic characteristics among youth. Procedures advocated by the authors suggest a 60-90 minute, semi-structured interview to assess the youth's interpersonal style, obtain information on a variety of aspects of his/her history and current functioning, and assess the credibility of his/her statements. However, the Pathways study was unable to accommodate an interview of this length to assess psychopathy. This form lists 20 separate items for which the youth is rated on a 3-point ordinal scale: "0" item does not apply to the youth, "1" item applies to a certain extent and "2" item applies to the youth. The authors of the adult versions of the Psychopathy Checklist have reported a 2-factor structure underlying the item scores (see Forth et al, 2003, page 57); however, the PCL-YV has not replicated this factor structure. Instead, factor analytic work with the PCL-YV has produced both a 3-factor and a 4-factor structure that are acceptable to the PCL-YV authors, each with their own caveats.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	0 - 7	56	4.1 %	4.5%
2	8 - 14	22	1.6 %	1.8%
3	15 - 30	63	4.7 %	5.1%
4	31 - 60	50	3.7 %	4.0%
5	61 - 180	97	7.2 %	7.8%
6	181 - 365	139	10.3 %	11.2%
7	366 - 730	143	10.6 %	11.5%
8	731 or More	167	12.3 %	13.5%
9	Never	502	37.1 %	40.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999999 (M)	Dont Know	42	3.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: No ones death would upset subject	73	5.4 %	-

Based upon 1,239 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PCL068: S0 PCL: Did you/do you bully or threaten others often**

Location: 2430-2433 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -9 , -8

**Question:**

Did you/do you bully or threaten others often?

MEASURE: Psychopathy Checklist Youth Version (PCL-YV)

Youth Version (PCL-YV; Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003) assesses psychopathic characteristics among youth. Procedures advocated by the authors suggest a 60-90 minute, semi-structured interview to assess the youth's interpersonal style, obtain information on a variety of aspects of his/her history and current functioning, and assess the credibility of his/her statements. However, the Pathways study was unable to accommodate an interview of this length to assess psychopathy. This form lists 20 separate items for which the youth is rated on a 3-point ordinal scale: "0" item does not apply to the youth, "1" item applies to a certain extent and "2" item applies to the youth. The authors of the adult versions of the Psychopathy Checklist have reported a 2-factor structure underlying the item scores (see Forth et al, 2003, page 57); however, the PCL-YV has not replicated this factor structure. Instead, factor analytic work with the PCL-YV has produced both a 3-factor and a 4-factor structure that are acceptable to the PCL-YV authors, each with their own caveats.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,045	77.2 %	77.2%
1	Yes	309	22.8 %	22.8%

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

#### **S0PCL012: S0 PCL: How often bully or threaten others**

*Location:* 2434-2437 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -101 , -9 , -8

##### **Question:**

How often do you bully or threaten others?

MEASURE: Psychopathy Checklist Youth Version (PCL-YV)

Youth Version (PCL-YV; Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003) assesses psychopathic characteristics among youth. Procedures advocated by the authors suggest a 60-90 minute, semi-structured interview to assess the youth's interpersonal style, obtain information on a variety of aspects of his/her history and current functioning, and assess the credibility of his/her statements. However, the Pathways study was unable to accommodate an interview of this length to assess psychopathy. This form lists 20 separate items for which the youth is rated on a 3-point ordinal scale: "0" item does not apply to the youth, "1" item applies to a certain extent and "2" item applies to the youth. The authors of the adult versions of the Psychopathy Checklist have reported a 2-factor structure underlying the item scores (see Forth et al, 2003, page 57); however, the PCL-YV has not replicated this factor structure. Instead, factor analytic work with the PCL-YV has produced both a 3-factor and a 4-factor structure that are acceptable to the PCL-YV authors, each with their own caveats.

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	Daily	45	3.3 %	14.6%
2	3-6 times per week	31	2.3 %	10.1%
3	2 times per week	29	2.1 %	9.4%
4	1 time per week	32	2.4 %	10.4%
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	24	1.8 %	7.8%
6	1 time per month	31	2.3 %	10.1%
7	Less than monthly	116	8.6 %	37.7%

*Missing Data*

-101 (M)	Skipped: Does not bully others	1,045	77.2 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 308 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PCL085: S0 PCL: Ever been on parole (self-report)**

*Location:* 2438-2441 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

Ever been on parole (self-report)?

**MEASURE:** Psychopathy Checklist Youth Version (PCL-YV)

Youth Version (PCL-YV; Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003) assesses psychopathic characteristics among youth. Procedures advocated by the authors suggest a 60-90 minute, semi-structured interview to assess the youth's interpersonal style, obtain information on a variety of aspects of his/her history and current functioning, and assess the credibility of his/her statements. However, the Pathways study was unable to accommodate an interview of this length to assess psychopathy. This form lists 20 separate items for which the youth is rated on a 3-point ordinal scale: "0" item does not apply to the youth, "1" item applies to a certain extent and "2" item applies to the youth. The authors of the adult versions of the Psychopathy Checklist have reported a 2-factor structure underlying the item scores (see Forth et al, 2003, page 57); however, the PCL-YV has not replicated this factor structure. Instead, factor analytic work with the PCL-YV has produced both a 3-factor and a 4-factor structure that are acceptable to the PCL-YV authors, each with their own caveats.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	1,303	96.2 %	96.2%
1	Yes	51	3.8 %	3.8%

- Study 29961 -

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

**S0PCL086: S0 PCL: Ever been on probation (self-report)**

*Location:* 2442-2445 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9 , -8

**Question:**

S0 PCL: Ever been on probation (self-report)

MEASURE: Psychopathy Checklist Youth Version (PCL-YV)

Youth Version (PCL-YV; Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003) assesses psychopathic characteristics among youth. Procedures advocated by the authors suggest a 60-90 minute, semi-structured interview to assess the youth's interpersonal style, obtain information on a variety of aspects of his/her history and current functioning, and assess the credibility of his/her statements. However, the Pathways study was unable to accommodate an interview of this length to assess psychopathy. This form lists 20 separate items for which the youth is rated on a 3-point ordinal scale: "0" item does not apply to the youth, "1" item applies to a certain extent and "2" item applies to the youth. The authors of the adult versions of the Psychopathy Checklist have reported a 2-factor structure underlying the item scores (see Forth et al, 2003, page 57); however, the PCL-YV has not replicated this factor structure. Instead, factor analytic work with the PCL-YV has produced both a 3-factor and a 4-factor structure that are acceptable to the PCL-YV authors, each with their own caveats.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	223	16.5 %	16.5%
1	Yes	1,130	83.5 %	83.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PCL114: S0 PCL: Age first used alcohol or drugs**

*Location:* 2446-2449 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -400 , -200 , -111 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Age first used alcohol or drugs?

MEASURE: Psychopathy Checklist Youth Version (PCL-YV)

Youth Version (PCL-YV; Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003) assesses psychopathic characteristics among youth. Procedures advocated by the authors suggest a 60-90 minute, semi-structured interview to assess the youth's interpersonal style, obtain information on a variety of aspects of his/her

- Study 29961 -

history and current functioning, and assess the credibility of his/her statements. However, the Pathways study was unable to accommodate an interview of this length to assess psychopathy. This form lists 20 separate items for which the youth is rated on a 3-point ordinal scale: "0" item does not apply to the youth, "1" item applies to a certain extent and "2" item applies to the youth. The authors of the adult versions of the Psychopathy Checklist have reported a 2-factor structure underlying the item scores (see Forth et al, 2003, page 57); however, the PCL-YV has not replicated this factor structure. Instead, factor analytic work with the PCL-YV has produced both a 3-factor and a 4-factor structure that are acceptable to the PCL-YV authors, each with their own caveats.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 and Younger	65	4.8 %	8.8%
10	-	34	2.5 %	4.6%
11	-	50	3.7 %	6.8%
12	-	121	8.9 %	16.4%
13	-	158	11.7 %	21.4%
14	-	140	10.3 %	18.9%
15	-	97	7.2 %	13.1%
16	-	58	4.3 %	7.8%
17	-	17	1.3 %	2.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	532	39.3 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-111 (M)	Skipped: Never used drugs or alcohol	73	5.4 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	6	0.4 %	-

Based upon 740 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PCL076: S0 PCL: Satisfied the way your life is turning out**

*Location:* 2450-2453 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Satisfied the way your life is turning out?

MEASURE: Psychopathy Checklist Youth Version (PCL-YV)

Youth Version (PCL-YV; Forth, Kosson, & Hare, 2003) assesses psychopathic characteristics among youth. Procedures advocated by the authors suggest a 60-90 minute, semi-structured interview to assess the youth's interpersonal style, obtain information on a variety of aspects of his/her history and current functioning, and assess the credibility of his/her statements. However, the Pathways study was unable to accommodate an interview of this length to assess psychopathy. This form lists 20 separate items for which the youth is rated on a 3-point ordinal scale: "0" item does not apply to the youth, "1" item applies to a certain extent and "2" item applies to

- Study 29961 -

the youth. The authors of the adult versions of the Psychopathy Checklist have reported a 2-factor structure underlying the item scores (see Forth et al, 2003, page 57); however, the PCL-YV has not replicated this factor structure. Instead, factor analytic work with the PCL-YV has produced both a 3-factor and a 4-factor structure that are acceptable to the PCL-YV authors, each with their own caveats.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	728	53.8 %	54.2%
1	Yes	615	45.4 %	45.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	7	0.5 %	-

Based upon 1,343 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0PSMI: S0 PSMI: Overall

*Location:* 2454-2460 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00

#### Question:

PSMI - overall; 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 (exclusive of 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)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.10	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
1.27	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.60	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
1.63	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.64	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.67	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.73	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
1.77	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.80	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.83	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.90	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
1.93	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.97	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.00	Slightly Agree	2	0.1 %	0.1%
2.03	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
2.07	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
2.10	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
2.13	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
2.17	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
2.20	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
2.23	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
2.27	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
2.29	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.30	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
2.33	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
2.34	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.37	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
2.38	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.40	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
2.43	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
2.47	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
2.50	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
2.53	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
2.57	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
2.60	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
2.63	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
2.66	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.67	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
2.70	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
2.72	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2.73	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
2.77	-	44	3.2 %	3.3%
2.79	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
2.80	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
2.83	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
2.86	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.87	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
2.89	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.90	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
2.93	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
2.96	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.97	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
3.00	Slightly Disagree	39	2.9 %	2.9%
3.03	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
3.07	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
3.10	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
3.13	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
3.14	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.17	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
3.20	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
3.23	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
3.24	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.27	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
3.30	-	37	2.7 %	2.7%
3.33	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
3.34	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.36	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
3.37	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
3.38	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.40	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
3.43	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
3.47	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
3.50	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
3.52	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.53	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
3.55	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.57	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
3.60	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
3.63	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
3.66	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
3.67	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
3.70	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
3.73	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
3.77	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
3.80	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
3.83	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
3.86	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.87	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
3.90	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
3.93	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
4.00	Strongly Disagree	2	0.1 %	0.1%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0PSMISR: S0 PSMI: Self Reliance**

*Location:* 2461-2467 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00

#### **Question:**

PSMI - self reliance; Mean of 10 items in 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 (exclusive of 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)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	Strongly Agree	3	0.2 %	0.2%
1.20	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.30	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.60	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
1.70	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
1.80	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
1.90	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
2.00	Slightly Agree	12	0.9 %	0.9%
2.10	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
2.20	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
2.22	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.30	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
2.40	-	41	3.0 %	3.0%
2.44	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
2.50	-	53	3.9 %	3.9%
2.60	-	78	5.8 %	5.8%
2.67	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.70	-	61	4.5 %	4.5%
2.78	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
2.80	-	96	7.1 %	7.1%
2.88	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.89	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.90	-	108	8.0 %	8.0%
3.00	Slightly Disagree	86	6.4 %	6.4%
3.10	-	76	5.6 %	5.7%
3.20	-	72	5.3 %	5.4%
3.30	-	86	6.4 %	6.4%
3.38	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.40	-	81	6.0 %	6.0%
3.50	-	81	6.0 %	6.0%
3.60	-	73	5.4 %	5.4%
3.67	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.70	-	95	7.0 %	7.1%
3.78	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.80	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
3.90	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
4.00	Strongly Disagree	67	4.9 %	5.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-300.00 (M)	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,345 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0PSMIID: S0 PSMI: Identity

*Location:* 2468-2474 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00

#### Question:

PSMI - identity; 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 (exclusive of 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	%	Valid %
1.00	Strongly Agree	2	0.1 %	0.1%
1.10	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.40	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.70	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
1.80	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
1.90	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
2.00	Slightly Agree	13	1.0 %	1.0%
2.10	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
2.11	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2.20	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
2.30	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
2.40	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
2.50	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
2.56	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.60	-	48	3.5 %	3.6%
2.70	-	69	5.1 %	5.1%
2.80	-	75	5.5 %	5.6%
2.90	-	89	6.6 %	6.6%
3.00	Slightly Disagree	99	7.3 %	7.4%
3.10	-	91	6.7 %	6.8%
3.11	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.20	-	72	5.3 %	5.3%
3.30	-	72	5.3 %	5.3%
3.40	-	106	7.8 %	7.9%
3.44	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.50	-	77	5.7 %	5.7%
3.60	-	80	5.9 %	5.9%
3.67	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.70	-	105	7.8 %	7.8%
3.80	-	62	4.6 %	4.6%
3.90	-	56	4.1 %	4.2%
4.00	Strongly Disagree	96	7.1 %	7.1%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0PSMIWK: S0 PSMI: Work Orientation**

*Location:* 2475-2481 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00

#### **Question:**

PSMI - work orientation; Mean of 10 items in 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")

- Study 29961 -

{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 (exclusive of 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	Strongly Agree	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.10	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
1.30	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
1.40	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
1.50	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
1.60	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
1.70	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
1.80	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
1.90	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
2.00	Slightly Agree	38	2.8 %	2.8%
2.10	-	45	3.3 %	3.3%
2.20	-	65	4.8 %	4.8%
2.22	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.30	-	74	5.5 %	5.5%
2.33	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.40	-	78	5.8 %	5.8%
2.44	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
2.50	-	109	8.1 %	8.1%
2.60	-	98	7.2 %	7.3%
2.70	-	105	7.8 %	7.8%
2.80	-	108	8.0 %	8.0%
2.90	-	89	6.6 %	6.6%
3.00	Slightly Disagree	61	4.5 %	4.5%
3.10	-	70	5.2 %	5.2%
3.11	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.20	-	72	5.3 %	5.3%
3.22	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.30	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
3.40	-	64	4.7 %	4.8%
3.50	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
3.60	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
3.67	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
3.70	-	38	2.8 %	2.8%
3.80	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
3.90	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
4.00	Strongly Disagree	4	0.3 %	0.3%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0RELQLT: S0 RQual: Quality of Relationship - Quality**

*Location:* 2482-2488 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

##### **Question:**

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 adolescents romantic relationships (Pierce, 1994; Pierce, Sarason, Sarason, Solky-Butzel, and Nagle, 1997). The 26 items in the scale assess the Quality of Relationship, Knowledge of Behavior and Deviance, and Tolerance of Deviance. In addition, for those youth who live with their romantic partner, two additional questions assess how much the romantic partner monitors the behavior of the participant. Higher scores indicate a more symbiotic romantic relationship.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2.29	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
2.43	-	3	0.2 %	0.4%
2.57	-	6	0.4 %	0.8%
2.71	-	8	0.6 %	1.1%
2.86	-	6	0.4 %	0.8%
3.00	-	16	1.2 %	2.1%
3.14	-	10	0.7 %	1.3%
3.29	-	28	2.1 %	3.7%
3.43	-	32	2.4 %	4.2%
3.50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
3.57	-	34	2.5 %	4.5%
3.71	-	55	4.1 %	7.3%
3.83	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.86	-	58	4.3 %	7.7%
4.00	-	69	5.1 %	9.1%
4.14	-	70	5.2 %	9.3%
4.17	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
4.29	-	73	5.4 %	9.7%
4.33	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
4.43	-	84	6.2 %	11.1%
4.50	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
4.57	-	74	5.5 %	9.8%
4.67	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
4.71	-	56	4.1 %	7.4%
4.83	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
4.86	-	46	3.4 %	6.1%
5.00	-	15	1.1 %	2.0%
-100.00 (M)	Did not skip into section	599	44.2 %	-

Based upon 755 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0RELDEV: S0 RQual: Quality of Relationship - Deviance**

*Location:* 2489-2495 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200.0 , -100.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

#### **Question:**

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 adolescents romantic relationships (Pierce, 1994; Pierce, Sarason, Sarason, Solky-Butzel, and Nagle, 1997). The 26 items in the scale assess the Quality of Relationship, Knowledge of Behavior and Deviance, and Tolerance of Deviance. In addition, for those youth who live with their romantic partner, two additional questions assess how much the romantic partner monitors the behavior of the participant. Higher scores indicate a more symbiotic romantic relationship.

- (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

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.0	Would not care at all	25	1.8 %	3.3%
1.5	-	17	1.3 %	2.3%
2.0	Would be bothered, but would not say anything to me about it	58	4.3 %	7.7%
2.5	-	64	4.7 %	8.5%
3.0	Would be bothered and would talk to me about it	175	12.9 %	23.2%
3.5	-	116	8.6 %	15.4%
4.0	Would get very upset with me	298	22.0 %	39.6%
-100.0 (M)	Did not skip into section	599	44.2 %	-
-9.0 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 753 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0RELCON: S0 RQual: Quality of Relationship - Monitoring**

*Location:* 2496-2502 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

#### **Question:**

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 adolescents romantic relationships (Pierce, 1994; Pierce, Sarason, Sarason, Solky-Butzel, and Nagle, 1997). The 26 items in the scale assess the Quality of Relationship, Knowledge of Behavior and Deviance, and Tolerance of Deviance. In addition, for those youth who live with their romantic partner, two additional questions assess how much the romantic partner monitors the behavior of the participant. Higher scores indicate a more symbiotic romantic relationship.

- (1) Doesn't know at all
- (2) Knows a little bit
- (3) Knows a lot
- (4) Knows everything

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	Doesn't know at all	23	1.7 %	3.0%
1.20	-	20	1.5 %	2.6%
1.40	-	22	1.6 %	2.9%
1.60	-	30	2.2 %	4.0%
1.80	-	54	4.0 %	7.2%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
2.00	Knows a little bit	59	4.4 %	7.8%
2.20	-	56	4.1 %	7.4%
2.25	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
2.40	-	55	4.1 %	7.3%
2.60	-	58	4.3 %	7.7%
2.80	-	68	5.0 %	9.0%
3.00	Knows a lot	69	5.1 %	9.1%
3.20	-	37	2.7 %	4.9%
3.25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.40	-	40	3.0 %	5.3%
3.50	-	3	0.2 %	0.4%
3.60	-	40	3.0 %	5.3%
3.75	-	2	0.1 %	0.3%
3.80	-	29	2.1 %	3.8%
4.00	Knows everything	87	6.4 %	11.5%
-100.00 (M)	Did not skip into section	599	44.2 %	-

Based upon 755 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DEL: S0 RQual: Antisocial Influence (count of items endorsed)**

*Location:* 2503-2506 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200 , -100 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Romantic Relationship - Antisocial Influence, relies on items from the peer delinquency section to assess the antisocial influence from the romantic partner; Count 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 adolescents romantic relationships (Pierce, 1994; Pierce, Sarason, Sarason, Solky-Butzel, and Nagle, 1997). The 26 items in the scale assess the Quality of Relationship, Knowledge of Behavior and Deviance, and Tolerance of Deviance. In addition, for those youth who live with their romantic partner, two additional questions assess how much the romantic partner monitors the behavior of the participant. Higher scores indicate a more symbiotic romantic relationship.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	681	50.3 %	82.6%
1	-	95	7.0 %	11.5%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2	-	29	2.1 %	3.5%
3	-	8	0.6 %	1.0%
4	-	3	0.2 %	0.4%
5	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
7	-	7	0.5 %	0.8%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-100 (M)	Did not skip into section	525	38.8 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 824 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0PEERPR: S0 PEI: Resistance to Peer Influence

*Location:* 2507-2513 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

**Question:**

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, 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	%	Valid %
1.30	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
1.40	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
1.50	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.60	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
1.67	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.70	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
1.80	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
1.90	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
2.00	It's sort of true I'm influenced by my peers	16	1.2 %	1.2%
2.10	-	45	3.3 %	3.3%
2.20	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
2.30	-	53	3.9 %	3.9%
2.40	-	50	3.7 %	3.7%
2.50	-	66	4.9 %	4.9%
2.56	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.60	-	66	4.9 %	4.9%
2.70	-	76	5.6 %	5.6%
2.78	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.80	-	85	6.3 %	6.3%
2.90	-	78	5.8 %	5.8%
3.00	It's sort of true I prefer to be an individual	75	5.5 %	5.6%
3.10	-	73	5.4 %	5.4%
3.20	-	86	6.4 %	6.4%
3.22	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
3.30	-	80	5.9 %	5.9%
3.33	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
3.40	-	87	6.4 %	6.5%
3.50	-	64	4.7 %	4.8%
3.56	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.60	-	61	4.5 %	4.5%
3.67	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.70	-	72	5.3 %	5.3%
3.78	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
3.80	-	41	3.0 %	3.0%
3.88	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.89	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.90	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
4.00	It's really true I prefer to be an individual	45	3.3 %	3.3%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0RCMAST: S0 RCMAS: Total Anxiety Score (28)**

- Study 29961 -

Location: 2514-2517 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -300 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

RCMAS Total Anxiety Score.

MEASURE: Revised Childrens Manifest Anxiety Scale (RCMAS)

The Revised Children's Manifest Anxiety Scale (RCMAS; Reynolds & Richmond, 1985, 2000) is a 37-item, self-report instrument designed to assess the level and nature of anxiety. The subject responds to each statement by circling a "Yes" or "No" answer. A response of "Yes" indicates that the item is descriptive of the subject's feelings or actions, whereas a response of "No" indicates that the item is generally not descriptive. A Total Anxiety score is computed based on 28 items, which are divided into three anxiety subscales: physiological anxiety (10 items about somatic manifestations of anxiety such as sleep difficulties, nausea and fatigue), worry/oversensitivity (11 items measuring obsessive concerns about a variety of things, most of which are typically vague and ill-defined, as well as fears about being hurt or emotionally isolated), and social concerns/concentration (7 items measuring distracting thoughts and fears that have a social or interpersonal nature).

The remaining nine items on the RCMAS constitute the Lie subscale. Because scores are derived from affirmative responses, a high score indicates a high level of anxiety or lie on that subscale. A high score on the physiological anxiety scale suggests that the youth has certain kinds of physiological responses that are typically experienced during anxiety. A high score on the Worry/oversensitivity scale may suggest that the youth internalizes much of the anxiety and may thus become overburdened with trying to relieve the anxiety. Finally, a high score on the Social concerns/concentration subscale suggests that they youth may feel some anxiety that they are unable to live up to the expectations of other significant individuals in their lives. (Reynolds & Richmond, 2000).

The lie subscales are used to detect youth who are "faking good" (e.g., "I tell the truth every single time"). The lie score can range from 0 to 9. Validity of results is questionable when the Lie and Total Anxiety scores are two SD above their respective means (Reynolds & Richmond, 1985). As stated in the manual, Scores falling beyond 2 SD from the mean suggest the need for further information, consultation and follow-up. A higher score on the total anxiety score indicates higher levels of anxiety.

The RCMAS manual states use of the norms segregated by age, ethnicity, and sex is recommended. Our syntax only corrects the raw score for age and gender because the manual does not offer norms for Hispanic participants.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
1	-	46	3.4 %	3.4%
2	-	57	4.2 %	4.2%
3	-	71	5.2 %	5.2%
4	-	81	6.0 %	6.0%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
5	-	97	7.2 %	7.2%
6	-	86	6.4 %	6.4%
7	-	83	6.1 %	6.1%
8	-	85	6.3 %	6.3%
9	-	74	5.5 %	5.5%
10	-	59	4.4 %	4.4%
11	-	69	5.1 %	5.1%
12	-	77	5.7 %	5.7%
13	-	72	5.3 %	5.3%
14	-	55	4.1 %	4.1%
15	-	50	3.7 %	3.7%
16	-	45	3.3 %	3.3%
17	-	45	3.3 %	3.3%
18	-	37	2.7 %	2.7%
19	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
20	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
21	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
22	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
23	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
24	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
25	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
26	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
27	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
28	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%

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

**S0RCMASL: S0 RCMAS: Lie (9)**

*Location:* 2518-2521 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

RCMAS - Lie

MEASURE: Revised Childrens Manifest Anxiety Scale (RCMAS)

The Revised Children's Manifest Anxiety Scale (RCMAS; Reynolds & Richmond, 1985, 2000) is a 37-item, self-report instrument designed to assess the level and nature of anxiety. The subject responds to each statement by circling a "Yes" or "No" answer. A response of "Yes" indicates that the item is descriptive of the subject's feelings or actions, whereas a response of "No" indicates that the item is generally not descriptive. A Total Anxiety score is computed based on 28 items, which are divided into three anxiety subscales:

- Study 29961 -

physiological anxiety (10 items about somatic manifestations of anxiety such as sleep difficulties, nausea and fatigue), worry/oversensitivity (11 items measuring obsessive concerns about a variety of things, most of which are typically vague and ill-defined, as well as fears about being hurt or emotionally isolated), and social concerns/concentration (7 items measuring distracting thoughts and fears that have a social or interpersonal nature).

The remaining nine items on the RCMAS constitute the Lie subscale. Because scores are derived from affirmative responses, a high score indicates a high level of anxiety or lie on that subscale. A high score on the physiological anxiety scale suggests that the youth has certain kinds of physiological responses that are typically experienced during anxiety. A high score on the Worry/oversensitivity scale may suggest that the youth internalizes much of the anxiety and may thus become overburdened with trying to relieve the anxiety. Finally, a high score on the Social concerns/concentration subscale suggests that they youth my feel some anxiety that they are unable to live up to the expectations of other significant individuals in their lives. (Reynolds & Richmond, 2000).

The lie subscales are used to detect youth who are "faking good" (e.g., "I tell the truth every single time"). The lie score can range from 0 to 9. Validity of results is questionable when the Lie and Total Anxiety scores are two SD above their respective means (Reynolds & Richmond, 1985). As stated in the manual, Scores falling beyond 2 SD from the mean suggest the need for further information, consultation and follow-up. A higher score on the total anxiety score indicates higher levels of anxiety.

The RCMAS manual states use of the norms segregated by age, ethnicity, and sex is recommended. Our syntax only corrects the raw score for age and gender because the manual does not offer norms for Hispanic participants.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	237	17.5 %	17.5%
1	-	271	20.0 %	20.0%
2	-	215	15.9 %	15.9%
3	-	177	13.1 %	13.1%
4	-	177	13.1 %	13.1%
5	-	130	9.6 %	9.6%
6	-	84	6.2 %	6.2%
7	-	46	3.4 %	3.4%
8	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
9	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%

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

**S0CORLIE: S0 RCMAS: Corrected Lie Scale**

*Location:* 2522-2525 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

RCMAS - Corrected Lie Scale.

MEASURE: Revised Children Manifest Anxiety Scale (RCMAS)

The Revised Children's Manifest Anxiety Scale (RCMAS; Reynolds & Richmond, 1985, 2000) is a 37-item, self-report instrument designed to assess the level and nature of anxiety. The subject responds to each statement by circling a "Yes" or "No" answer. A response of "Yes" indicates that the item is descriptive of the subject's feelings or actions, whereas a response of "No" indicates that the item is generally not descriptive. A Total Anxiety score is computed based on 28 items, which are divided into three anxiety subscales: physiological anxiety (10 items about somatic manifestations of anxiety such as sleep difficulties, nausea and fatigue), worry/oversensitivity (11 items measuring obsessive concerns about a variety of things, most of which are typically vague and ill-defined, as well as fears about being hurt or emotionally isolated), and social concerns/concentration (7 items measuring distracting thoughts and fears that have a social or interpersonal nature).

The remaining nine items on the RCMAS constitute the Lie subscale. Because scores are derived from affirmative responses, a high score indicates a high level of anxiety or lie on that subscale. A high score on the physiological anxiety scale suggests that the youth has certain kinds of physiological responses that are typically experienced during anxiety. A high score on the Worry/oversensitivity scale may suggest that the youth internalizes much of the anxiety and may thus become overburdened with trying to relieve the anxiety. Finally, a high score on the Social concerns/concentration subscale suggests that they youth may feel some anxiety that they are unable to live up to the expectations of other significant individuals in their lives. (Reynolds & Richmond, 2000).

The lie subscales are used to detect youth who are "faking good" (e.g., "I tell the truth every single time"). The lie score can range from 0 to 9. Validity of results is questionable when the Lie and Total Anxiety scores are two SD above their respective means (Reynolds & Richmond, 1985). As stated in the manual, Scores falling beyond 2 SD from the mean suggest the need for further information, consultation and follow-up. A higher score on the total anxiety score indicates higher levels of anxiety.

The RCMAS manual states use of the norms segregated by age, ethnicity, and sex is recommended. Our syntax only corrects the raw score for age and gender because the manual does not offer norms for Hispanic participants.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
6	125	9.2 %	9.2%
7	112	8.3 %	8.3%
8	14	1.0 %	1.0%
9	257	19.0 %	19.0%
10	111	8.2 %	8.2%
11	245	18.1 %	18.1%
12	178	13.1 %	13.1%
13	171	12.6 %	12.6%
14	91	6.7 %	6.7%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
15	19	1.4 %	1.4%
16	31	2.3 %	2.3%

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

#### **S0RCMASP: S0 RCMAS: Physiological Anxiety (10)**

*Location:* 2526-2529 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -9 , -8

#### **Question:**

RCMAS - Physiological Anxiety; Sum of 10 items.

**MEASURE:** Revised Children Manifest Anxiety Scale (RCMAS)

The Revised Children's Manifest Anxiety Scale (RCMAS; Reynolds & Richmond, 1985, 2000) is a 37-item, self-report instrument designed to assess the level and nature of anxiety. The subject responds to each statement by circling a "Yes" or "No" answer. A response of "Yes" indicates that the item is descriptive of the subject's feelings or actions, whereas a response of "No" indicates that the item is generally not descriptive. A Total Anxiety score is computed based on 28 items, which are divided into three anxiety subscales: physiological anxiety (10 items about somatic manifestations of anxiety such as sleep difficulties, nausea and fatigue), worry/oversensitivity (11 items measuring obsessive concerns about a variety of things, most of which are typically vague and ill-defined, as well as fears about being hurt or emotionally isolated), and social concerns/concentration (7 items measuring distracting thoughts and fears that have a social or interpersonal nature).

The remaining nine items on the RCMAS constitute the Lie subscale. Because scores are derived from affirmative responses, a high score indicates a high level of anxiety or lie on that subscale. A high score on the physiological anxiety scale suggests that the youth has certain kinds of physiological responses that are typically experienced during anxiety. A high score on the Worry/oversensitivity scale may suggest that the youth internalizes much of the anxiety and may thus become overburdened with trying to relieve the anxiety. Finally, a high score on the Social concerns/concentration subscale suggests that they youth may feel some anxiety that they are unable to live up to the expectations of other significant individuals in their lives. (Reynolds & Richmond, 2000).

The lie subscales are used to detect youth who are "faking good" (e.g., "I tell the truth every single time"). The lie score can range from 0 to 9. Validity of results is questionable when the Lie and Total Anxiety scores are two SD above their respective means (Reynolds & Richmond, 1985). As stated in the manual, Scores falling beyond 2 SD from the mean suggest the need for further information, consultation and follow-up. A higher score on the total anxiety score indicates higher levels of anxiety.

The RCMAS manual states use of the norms segregated by age, ethnicity, and sex is recommended. Our syntax only corrects the raw score for age and gender because the manual does not offer norms for Hispanic participants.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	114	8.4 %	8.4%
1	-	223	16.5 %	16.5%
2	-	210	15.5 %	15.5%
3	-	227	16.8 %	16.8%
4	-	191	14.1 %	14.1%
5	-	153	11.3 %	11.3%
6	-	101	7.5 %	7.5%
7	-	71	5.2 %	5.2%
8	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
9	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
10	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%

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

### S0RCMASW: S0 RCMAS: Worry/Oversensitivity (11)

*Location:* 2530-2533 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -9 , -8

#### Question:

RCMAS - Worry/Oversensitivity; Sum of 11 items.

MEASURE: Revised Children's Manifest Anxiety Scale (RCMAS)

The Revised Children's Manifest Anxiety Scale (RCMAS; Reynolds & Richmond, 1985, 2000) is a 37-item, self-report instrument designed to assess the level and nature of anxiety. The subject responds to each statement by circling a "Yes" or "No" answer. A response of "Yes" indicates that the item is descriptive of the subject's feelings or actions, whereas a response of "No" indicates that the item is generally not descriptive. A Total Anxiety score is computed based on 28 items, which are divided into three anxiety subscales: physiological anxiety (10 items about somatic manifestations of anxiety such as sleep difficulties, nausea and fatigue), worry/oversensitivity (11 items measuring obsessive concerns about a variety of things, most of which are typically vague and ill-defined, as well as fears about being hurt or emotionally isolated), and social concerns/concentration (7 items measuring distracting thoughts and fears that have a social or interpersonal nature).

The remaining nine items on the RCMAS constitute the Lie subscale. Because scores are derived from affirmative responses, a high score indicates a high level of anxiety or lie on that subscale. A high score on the physiological anxiety scale suggests that the youth has certain kinds of physiological responses that are typically experienced during anxiety. A high score on the Worry/oversensitivity scale may suggest that the youth internalizes much of the anxiety and may thus become overburdened with trying to relieve the anxiety. Finally, a high score on the Social concerns/concentration subscale suggests that they youth may feel some anxiety that they are unable to live up to the expectations of other significant individuals in their lives. (Reynolds & Richmond, 2000).

The lie subscales are used to detect youth who are "faking good" (e.g., "I tell the truth

## - Study 29961 -

every single time"). The lie score can range from 0 to 9. Validity of results is questionable when the Lie and Total Anxiety scores are two SD above their respective means (Reynolds & Richmond, 1985). As stated in the manual, Scores falling beyond 2 SD from the mean suggest the need for further information, consultation and follow-up. A higher score on the total anxiety score indicates higher levels of anxiety.

The RCMAS manual states use of the norms segregated by age, ethnicity, and sex is recommended. Our syntax only corrects the raw score for age and gender because the manual does not offer norms for Hispanic participants.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	154	11.4 %	11.4%
1	-	163	12.0 %	12.0%
2	-	181	13.4 %	13.4%
3	-	159	11.7 %	11.7%
4	-	151	11.2 %	11.2%
5	-	126	9.3 %	9.3%
6	-	123	9.1 %	9.1%
7	-	87	6.4 %	6.4%
8	-	75	5.5 %	5.5%
9	-	68	5.0 %	5.0%
10	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
11	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%

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

### S0RCMASSC: S0 RCMAS: Social Concerns/Concentration (7)

*Location:* 2534-2537 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -9 , -8

#### Question:

RCMAS - Social concerns/Concentration; Sum of 7 items.

MEASURE: Revised Childrens Manifest Anxiety Scale (RCMAS)

The Revised Children's Manifest Anxiety Scale (RCMAS; Reynolds & Richmond, 1985, 2000) is a 37-item, self-report instrument designed to assess the level and nature of anxiety. The subject responds to each statement by circling a "Yes" or "No" answer. A response of "Yes" indicates that the item is descriptive of the subject's feelings or actions, whereas a response of "No" indicates that the item is generally not descriptive. A Total Anxiety score is computed based on 28 items, which are divided into three anxiety subscales: physiological anxiety (10 items about somatic manifestations of anxiety such as sleep difficulties, nausea and fatigue), worry/oversensitivity (11 items measuring obsessive concerns about a variety of things, most of which are typically vague and ill-defined, as

## - Study 29961 -

well as fears about being hurt or emotionally isolated), and social concerns/concentration (7 items measuring distracting thoughts and fears that have a social or interpersonal nature).

The remaining nine items on the RCMAS constitute the Lie subscale. Because scores are derived from affirmative responses, a high score indicates a high level of anxiety or lie on that subscale. A high score on the physiological anxiety scale suggests that the youth has certain kinds of physiological responses that are typically experienced during anxiety. A high score on the Worry/oversensitivity scale may suggest that the youth internalizes much of the anxiety and may thus become overburdened with trying to relieve the anxiety. Finally, a high score on the Social concerns/concentration subscale suggests that they youth my feel some anxiety that they are unable to live up to the expectations of other significant individuals in their lives. (Reynolds & Richmond, 2000).

The lie subscales are used to detect youth who are "faking good" (e.g., "I tell the truth every single time"). The lie score can range from 0 to 9. Validity of results is questionable when the Lie and Total Anxiety scores are two SD above their respective means (Reynolds & Richmond, 1985). As stated in the manual, Scores falling beyond 2 SD from the mean suggest the need for further information, consultation and follow-up. A higher score on the total anxiety score indicates higher levels of anxiety.

The RCMAS manual states use of the norms segregated by age, ethnicity, and sex is recommended. Our syntax only corrects the raw score for age and gender because the manual does not offer norms for Hispanic participants.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	189	14.0 %	14.0%
1	-	256	18.9 %	18.9%
2	-	237	17.5 %	17.5%
3	-	199	14.7 %	14.7%
4	-	183	13.5 %	13.5%
5	-	144	10.6 %	10.6%
6	-	95	7.0 %	7.0%
7	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%

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

### S0ROUT: S0 Rout: Unsupervised Routine Activities

*Location:* 2538-2544 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

#### Question:

Unsupervised routine activities; the mean of all four questions.

MEASURE: Routine Activities

- Study 29961 -

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. Items were previously scored independently without an "unstructured socializing" total score (Osgood, et al., 1996); however, a combined score was created for the purpose of this study.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
1.25	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
1.50	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
1.75	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
2.00	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
2.25	-	29	2.1 %	2.1%
2.50	-	39	2.9 %	2.9%
2.75	-	48	3.5 %	3.6%
3.00	-	74	5.5 %	5.5%
3.25	-	91	6.7 %	6.7%
3.50	-	134	9.9 %	9.9%
3.75	-	125	9.2 %	9.3%
4.00	-	161	11.9 %	11.9%
4.25	-	163	12.0 %	12.1%
4.50	-	187	13.8 %	13.9%
4.75	-	169	12.5 %	12.5%
5.00	-	66	4.9 %	4.9%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROS49: S0 SRO: Destroyed/damaged property - ever**

*Location:* 2545-2548 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject engaged in [purposely destroyed or damaged property that did not belong to you] in their lifetime.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

- Study 29961 -

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	629	46.5 %	46.6%
1	Yes	722	53.3 %	53.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROA49: S0 SRO: Destroy property - Age 1st time**

*Location:* 2549-2552 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subject's age at the first time the subject destroyed property.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
9	9 and Younger	120	8.9 %	16.8%
10	-	80	5.9 %	11.2%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
11	-	62	4.6 %	8.7%
12	-	101	7.5 %	14.1%
13	-	127	9.4 %	17.8%
14	-	119	8.8 %	16.7%
15	-	68	5.0 %	9.5%
16	-	31	2.3 %	4.3%
17	-	6	0.4 %	0.8%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	630	46.5 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 714 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRON49: S0 SRO: Destroy property - Num times in past yr**

*Location:* 2553-2556 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -200 , -101

**Question:**

Frequency of [purposely destroyed or damaged property that did not belong to you] over the past year.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	938	69.3 %	69.6%
1	-	121	8.9 %	9.0%
2	-	73	5.4 %	5.4%
3	-	34	2.5 %	2.5%
4	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
5	-	39	2.9 %	2.9%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
6	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
7	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
8	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
9	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
10	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
12	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
13	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
14	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
15	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
20	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
24	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
25	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
30	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
35	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
40	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
50	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
60	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
100	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
150	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
180	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
270	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
300	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
365	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
800	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	3	0.2 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,348 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROL64: S0 SRO: Destroy property - When was the last time**

*Location:* 2557-2560 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject's most recent destroy property offense.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted

- Study 29961 -

for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Within the past 30 days	45	3.3 %	6.2%
2	1-3 months ago (31-90 days)	127	9.4 %	17.6%
3	4-6 Months ago	113	8.3 %	15.7%
4	More than 6 Months ago	436	32.2 %	60.5%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	630	46.5 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 721 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROG88: S0 SRO: Destroy property - Was anyone with you last time**

*Location:* 2561-2564 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	183	13.5 %	25.5%
1	Yes	536	39.6 %	74.5%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	630	46.5 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 719 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROS50: S0 SRO: Set fire - ever**

*Location:* 2565-2568 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject engaged in [purposely set fire to a house, building, car or vacant lot] in their lifetime.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu))..

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,118	82.6 %	82.8%
1	Yes	233	17.2 %	17.2%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROA50: S0 SRO: Set fire - Age 1st time**

*Location:* 2569-2572 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subject's age at the first time the subject set fire.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 and Younger	45	3.3 %	19.5%
10	-	28	2.1 %	12.1%
11	-	19	1.4 %	8.2%
12	-	31	2.3 %	13.4%
13	-	32	2.4 %	13.9%
14	-	29	2.1 %	12.6%
15	-	33	2.4 %	14.3%
16	-	10	0.7 %	4.3%
17	-	4	0.3 %	1.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1,119	82.6 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

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

**S0SRON50: S0 SRO: Set fire - Num times in past yr**

Location: 2573-2576 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -999 , -998 , -200 , -101

**Question:**

Frequency of [purposely set fire to a house, building, car or vacant lot] over the past year.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

- Study 29961 -

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	1,284	94.8 %	95.1%
1	-	34	2.5 %	2.5%
2	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
3	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
4	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
6	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
7	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
8	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
10	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
15	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
45	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROL65: S0 SRO: Set fire - When was last time**

*Location:* 2577-2580 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subjects most recent set fire offense.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How

- Study 29961 -

old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Within the past 30 days	3	0.2 %	1.3%
2	1-3 months ago (31-90 days)	12	0.9 %	5.2%
3	4-6 Months ago	19	1.4 %	8.2%
4	More than 6 Months ago	199	14.7 %	85.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1,119	82.6 %	-

Based upon 233 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROG90: S0 SRO: Set fire - Was anyone with you last time**

*Location:* 2581-2584 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	50	3.7 %	21.6%
1	Yes	182	13.4 %	78.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1,119	82.6 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 232 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROS51: S0 SRO: Broke in to steal - ever**

*Location:* 2585-2588 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject engaged in [entered or broken into a building (home or business) to steal something] in their lifetime.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	910	67.2 %	67.4%
1	Yes	441	32.6 %	32.6%

*Missing Data*

-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROA51: S0 SRO: Broke in to steal - Age 1st time**

*Location:* 2589-2592 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subjects age at the first time the subject broke in to steal.

**MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)**

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 and Younger	23	1.7 %	5.2%
10	-	13	1.0 %	2.9%
11	-	30	2.2 %	6.8%
12	-	60	4.4 %	13.6%
13	-	76	5.6 %	17.2%
14	-	93	6.9 %	21.1%
15	-	87	6.4 %	19.7%
16	-	41	3.0 %	9.3%
17	-	18	1.3 %	4.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	911	67.3 %	-

Based upon 441 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRON51: S0 SRO: Broke in to steal - Num times in past yr**

*Location:* 2593-2596 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -200 , -101

**Question:**

Frequency of entered/broken into a building (home or business) steal something over past year.

**MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)**

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How

- Study 29961 -

old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	1,085	80.1 %	80.3%
1	-	131	9.7 %	9.7%
2	-	39	2.9 %	2.9%
3	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
4	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
5	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
6	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
7	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
8	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
9	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
10	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
12	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
13	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
14	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
15	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
16	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
17	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
18	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
30	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
40	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
60	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
100	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROL66: S0 SRO: Broke in to steal - When was the last time**

*Location:* 2597-2600 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject's most recent broke in to steal offense.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Within the past 30 days	11	0.8 %	2.5%
2	1-3 months ago (31-90 days)	66	4.9 %	15.0%
3	4-6 Months ago	93	6.9 %	21.1%
4	More than 6 Months ago	271	20.0 %	61.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	911	67.3 %	-

Based upon 441 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0SROG92: S0 SRO: Broke in to steal - Was anyone with you last time**

*Location:* 2601-2604 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

#### **Question:**

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-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	60	4.4 %	13.6%
1	Yes	381	28.1 %	86.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	911	67.3 %	-

Based upon 441 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROS52: S0 SRO: Shoplifted - ever**

*Location:* 2605-2608 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject engaged in [stolen something from a store (shoplifted)] in their lifetime.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	467	34.5 %	34.6%
1	Yes	884	65.3 %	65.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROA52: S0 SRO: Shoplift - Age 1st time**

*Location:* 2609-2612 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

- Study 29961 -

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subjects age at the first time the subject shoplifted.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 and Younger	264	19.5 %	29.9%
10	-	107	7.9 %	12.1%
11	-	109	8.1 %	12.4%
12	-	130	9.6 %	14.7%
13	-	111	8.2 %	12.6%
14	-	94	6.9 %	10.7%
15	-	50	3.7 %	5.7%
16	-	14	1.0 %	1.6%
17	-	3	0.2 %	0.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	468	34.6 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 882 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRON52: S0 SRO: Shoplift - Num times in past yr**

Location: 2613-2616 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -999 , -998 , -200 , -101

**Question:**

Frequency of [stolen something from a store (shoplifted)] over the past year.

- Study 29961 -

**MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)**

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	992	73.3 %	73.5%
1	-	65	4.8 %	4.8%
2	-	71	5.2 %	5.3%
3	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
4	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
5	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
6	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
7	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
8	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
9	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
10	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
12	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
13	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
14	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
15	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
20	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
26	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
30	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
35	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
40	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
43	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
45	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
50	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
60	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
80	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
90	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
100	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
120	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
125	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
150	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
151	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
200	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
300	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
305	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
350	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
995	Maximum value permitted	1	0.1 %	0.1%

**Missing Data**

-999 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROL67: S0 SRO: Shoplift - When was last time**

*Location:* 2617-2620 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subjects most recent shoplift offense.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Within the past 30 days	48	3.5 %	5.4%
2	1-3 months ago (31-90 days)	108	8.0 %	12.2%
3	4-6 Months ago	106	7.8 %	12.0%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
4	More than 6 Months ago	621	45.9 %	70.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	468	34.6 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 883 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROG94: S0 SRO: Shoplift - Was anyone with you last time**

*Location:* 2621-2624 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether subject was alone or if someone was with them last time they stole from a store (shoplifted).

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	333	24.6 %	38.0%
1	Yes	544	40.2 %	62.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	468	34.6 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	7	0.5 %	-

Based upon 877 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROS53: S0 SRO: Bought/received/sold stolen prop - ever**

*Location:* 2625-2628 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject engaged in [bought, received, sold something you knew was stolen] in their lifetime.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	582	43.0 %	43.1%
1	Yes	769	56.8 %	56.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROA53: S0 SRO: Receive stolen prop - Age 1st time**

*Location:* 2629-2632 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subject's age at the first time the subject received stolen property.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
9	9 and Younger	15	1.1 %	2.0%
10	-	24	1.8 %	3.1%
11	-	42	3.1 %	5.5%
12	-	81	6.0 %	10.6%
13	-	137	10.1 %	18.0%
14	-	179	13.2 %	23.5%
15	-	170	12.6 %	22.3%
16	-	87	6.4 %	11.4%
17	-	28	2.1 %	3.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	583	43.1 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	6	0.4 %	-

Based upon 763 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRON53: S0 SRO: Receive stolen prop - Num times in past yr**

*Location:* 2633-2636 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -200 , -101

**Question:**

Frequency of [bought, received, or sold something that you knew was stolen] over the past year.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	819	60.5 %	60.8%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	-	118	8.7 %	8.8%
2	-	98	7.2 %	7.3%
3	-	47	3.5 %	3.5%
4	-	37	2.7 %	2.7%
5	-	45	3.3 %	3.3%
6	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
7	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
8	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
9	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
10	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
11	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
12	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
13	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
14	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
15	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
16	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
17	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
18	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
23	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
25	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
30	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
35	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
40	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
45	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
50	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
52	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
60	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
70	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
100	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
200	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
300	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
400	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
900	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
995	Maximum value permitted	1	0.1 %	0.1%

*Missing Data*

-999 (M)	Dont Know	5	0.4 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROL68: S0 SRO: Receive stolen prop - When was the last time**

*Location:* 2637-2640 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject's most recent receive stolen property offense.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Within the past 30 days	59	4.4 %	7.7%
2	1-3 months ago (31-90 days)	159	11.7 %	20.7%
3	4-6 Months ago	169	12.5 %	22.0%
4	More than 6 Months ago	380	28.1 %	49.5%

**Missing Data**

-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	583	43.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 767 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROG96: S0 SRO: Receive stolen prop - Was anyone with you last time**

*Location:* 2641-2644 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted

- Study 29961 -

for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	306	22.6 %	39.8%
1	Yes	463	34.2 %	60.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	583	43.1 %	-

Based upon 769 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROS54: S0 SRO: Used check/credit card illegally - ever**

*Location:* 2645-2648 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject engaged in [used checks or credit cards illegally] in their lifetime.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	1,211	89.4 %	89.6%
1	Yes	140	10.3 %	10.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROA54: S0 SRO: Use credit card illegally - Age 1st time**

*Location:* 2649-2652 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subject's age at the first time the subject used a credit card illegally.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 and Younger	1	0.1 %	0.7%
11	-	2	0.1 %	1.4%
12	-	10	0.7 %	7.1%
13	-	9	0.7 %	6.4%
14	-	28	2.1 %	20.0%
15	-	35	2.6 %	25.0%
16	-	45	3.3 %	32.1%
17	-	9	0.7 %	6.4%
18	-	1	0.1 %	0.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1,212	89.5 %	-

Based upon 140 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRON54: S0 SRO: Use credit card illegally - Num times in past yr**

- Study 29961 -

Location: 2653-2656 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -999 , -998 , -200 , -101

**Question:**

Frequency of [used checks or credit cards illegally] over the past year.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	1,264	93.4 %	93.6%
1	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
2	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
3	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
4	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
5	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
6	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
7	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
8	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
9	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
10	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
12	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
13	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
15	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
20	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
30	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
100	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SR0L69: S0 SRO: Use credit card illegally - When was last time**

- Study 29961 -

*Location:* 2657-2660 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject's most recent use credit card illegally offense.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Within the past 30 days	4	0.3 %	2.9%
2	1-3 months ago (31-90 days)	19	1.4 %	13.6%
3	4-6 Months ago	37	2.7 %	26.4%
4	More than 6 Months ago	80	5.9 %	57.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1,212	89.5 %	-

Based upon 140 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROG98: S0 SRO: Use credit card illegally - Was anyone with you last time**

*Location:* 2661-2664 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are

- Study 29961 -

triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	47	3.5 %	33.6%
1	Yes	93	6.9 %	66.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1,212	89.5 %	-

Based upon 140 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROS55: S0 SRO: Stole car or motorcycle - ever**

*Location:* 2665-2668 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject engaged in [stolen a car or motorcycle to keep or sell] in their lifetime.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	928	68.5 %	68.7%
1	Yes	423	31.2 %	31.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROA55: S0 SRO: Stole car - Age 1st time**

*Location:* 2669-2672 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subject's age at the first time the subject stole a car.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
9	9 and Younger	6	0.4 %	1.4%
10	-	8	0.6 %	1.9%
11	-	10	0.7 %	2.4%
12	-	32	2.4 %	7.6%
13	-	78	5.8 %	18.4%
14	-	104	7.7 %	24.6%
15	-	109	8.1 %	25.8%
16	-	61	4.5 %	14.4%
17	-	15	1.1 %	3.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	929	68.6 %	-

Based upon 423 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRON55: S0 SRO: Stole car - Num times in past yr**

*Location:* 2673-2676 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -200 , -101

**Question:**

Frequency of [stolen a car or motorcycle to keep or sell] over the past year.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	1,093	80.7 %	81.0%
1	-	71	5.2 %	5.3%
2	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
3	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
4	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
5	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
6	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
7	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
8	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
9	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
10	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
12	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
13	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
14	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
15	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
16	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
19	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
22	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
25	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
30	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
35	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
40	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
50	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
53	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
70	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
100	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
200	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
203	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROL70: S0 SRO: Stole car - When was the last time**

*Location:* 2677-2680 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject's most recent stole car offense.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Within the past 30 days	14	1.0 %	3.3%
2	1-3 months ago (31-90 days)	84	6.2 %	19.9%
3	4-6 Months ago	87	6.4 %	20.6%
4	More than 6 Months ago	237	17.5 %	56.2%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	929	68.6 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 422 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRO100: S0 SRO: Stole car - Was anyone with you last time**

- Study 29961 -

*Location:* 2681-2684 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	89	6.6 %	21.0%
1	Yes	334	24.7 %	79.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	929	68.6 %	-

Based upon 423 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROS56: S0 SRO: Sold marijuana - ever**

*Location:* 2685-2688 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject engaged in [sold marijuana] in their lifetime.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports

- Study 29961 -

doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	668	49.3 %	49.4%
1	Yes	683	50.4 %	50.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROA56: S0 SRO: Sold marijuana - Age 1st time**

*Location:* 2689-2692 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subject's age at the first time the subject sold marijuana.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
9	9 and Younger	17	1.3 %	2.5%
10	-	12	0.9 %	1.8%
11	-	24	1.8 %	3.5%
12	-	74	5.5 %	10.8%
13	-	132	9.7 %	19.3%
14	-	169	12.5 %	24.7%
15	-	159	11.7 %	23.3%
16	-	75	5.5 %	11.0%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
17	-	21	1.6 %	3.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	669	49.4 %	-

Based upon 683 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRON56: S0 SRO: Sold marijuana - Num times in past yr**

*Location:* 2693-2696 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -200 , -101

**Question:**

Frequency of [sold marijuana] over the past year.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	886	65.4 %	66.7%
1	-	63	4.7 %	4.7%
2	-	41	3.0 %	3.1%
3	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
4	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
5	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
6	-	14	1.0 %	1.1%
7	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
8	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
9	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
10	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
11	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
12	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
13	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
14	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
15	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
16	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
18	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
22	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
23	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
24	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
25	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
30	-	10	0.7 %	0.8%
32	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
35	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
40	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
45	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
50	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
52	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
55	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
60	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
65	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
70	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
75	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
80	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
85	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
90	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
100	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
114	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
119	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
120	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
150	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
160	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
170	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
180	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
200	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
240	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
250	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
300	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
320	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
360	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
365	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
500	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
530	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
600	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
800	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
900	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
995	Maximum value permitted	21	1.6 %	1.6%

*Missing Data*

-999 (M)	Dont Know	22	1.6 %	-
-998 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,328 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROL71: S0 SRO: Sold marijuana - When was last time**

*Location:* 2697-2700 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject's most recent sold marijuana offense.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Within the past 30 days	49	3.6 %	7.2%
2	1-3 months ago (31-90 days)	142	10.5 %	20.8%
3	4-6 Months ago	139	10.3 %	20.4%
4	More than 6 Months ago	353	26.1 %	51.7%

*Missing Data*

-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
----------	--------------	---	-------	---

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	669	49.4 %	-

Based upon 683 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRO102: S0 SRO: Sold marijuana - Was anyone with you last time**

*Location:* 2701-2704 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [sold marijuana].

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	273	20.2 %	40.1%
1	Yes	408	30.1 %	59.9%

**Missing Data**

-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	669	49.4 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 681 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROS57: S0 SRO: Sold other drugs - ever**

*Location:* 2705-2708 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject engaged in [sold other illegal drugs (cocaine, crack, heroin)] in their lifetime.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	832	61.4 %	61.6%
1	Yes	519	38.3 %	38.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROA57: S0 SRO: Sold other drug - Age 1st time**

*Location:* 2709-2712 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subject's age at the first time the subject sold other drug.

MEASURE:Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 and Younger	6	0.4 %	1.2%
10	-	5	0.4 %	1.0%
11	-	22	1.6 %	4.2%
12	-	44	3.2 %	8.5%
13	-	62	4.6 %	11.9%
14	-	126	9.3 %	24.3%
15	-	146	10.8 %	28.1%
16	-	85	6.3 %	16.4%
17	-	23	1.7 %	4.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	833	61.5 %	-

Based upon 519 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0SRON57: S0 SRO: Sold other drug - Num times in past yr**

*Location:* 2713-2716 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -200 , -101

##### **Question:**

Frequency of [sold other illegal drugs (cocaine, crack, heroin)] over the past year.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	962	71.0 %	72.4%
1	-	30	2.2 %	2.3%
2	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
3	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
4	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
5	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
6	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
7	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
8	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
9	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
10	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
11	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
12	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
15	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
20	-	14	1.0 %	1.1%
30	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
32	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
40	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
45	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
48	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
50	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
55	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
60	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
65	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
70	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
75	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
80	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
90	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
99	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
100	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
120	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
150	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
160	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
180	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
200	-	14	1.0 %	1.1%
210	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
212	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
240	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
250	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
260	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
270	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
285	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
300	-	14	1.0 %	1.1%
305	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
340	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
360	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
365	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
380	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
400	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
500	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
700	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
800	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
900	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
995	Maximum value permitted	27	2.0 %	2.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	23	1.7 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,328 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROL72: S0 SRO: Sold other drug - When was last time**

*Location:* 2717-2720 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject's most recent sold other drug offense.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Within the past 30 days	22	1.6 %	4.2%
2	1-3 months ago (31-90 days)	138	10.2 %	26.6%
3	4-6 Months ago	126	9.3 %	24.3%
4	More than 6 Months ago	233	17.2 %	44.9%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	833	61.5 %	-

Based upon 519 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRO104: S0 SRO: Sold other drug - Was anyone with you last time**

*Location:* 2721-2724 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	168	12.4 %	32.5%
1	Yes	349	25.8 %	67.5%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	833	61.5 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 517 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROS58: S0 SRO: Carjacked - ever**

*Location:* 2725-2728 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject engaged in [carjacked someone] in their lifetime.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,229	90.8 %	91.0%
1	Yes	122	9.0 %	9.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### S0SROA58: S0 SRO: Carjacked - Age 1st time

Location: 2729-2732 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

#### Question:

The subject's age at the first time the subject carjacked.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
11	-	4	0.3 %	3.3%
12	-	6	0.4 %	4.9%
13	-	16	1.2 %	13.1%
14	-	25	1.8 %	20.5%
15	-	37	2.7 %	30.3%
16	-	26	1.9 %	21.3%
17	-	8	0.6 %	6.6%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1,230	90.8 %	-

Based upon 122 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRON58: S0 SRO: Carjacked - Num times in past yr**

*Location:* 2733-2736 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -200 , -101

**Question:**

Frequency of [carjacked someone] over the past year.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	1,287	95.1 %	95.3%
1	-	34	2.5 %	2.5%
2	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
3	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
4	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
5	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
6	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
7	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
8	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
10	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
15	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
30	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROL73: S0 SRO: Carjacked - When was last time**

*Location:* 2737-2740 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject's most recent carjacked offense.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Within the past 30 days	3	0.2 %	2.5%
2	1-3 months ago (31-90 days)	14	1.0 %	11.5%
3	4-6 Months ago	22	1.6 %	18.0%
4	More than 6 Months ago	83	6.1 %	68.0%

**Missing Data**

-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1,230	90.8 %	-

Based upon 122 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRO106: S0 SRO: Carjacked - Was anyone with you the last time**

- Study 29961 -

Location: 2741-2744 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [carjacked someone].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	31	2.3 %	25.4%
1	Yes	91	6.7 %	74.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1,230	90.8 %	-

Based upon 122 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRO107: S0 SRO: Carjacked - Did you have a gun the last time**

Location: 2745-2748 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject had a gun with them the last time they [carjacked someone].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the

- Study 29961 -

past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	46	3.4 %	37.7%
1	Yes	76	5.6 %	62.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1,230	90.8 %	-

Based upon 122 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROS59: S0 SRO: Drove drunk or high - ever**

*Location:* 2749-2752 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject engaged in [driven while you were drunk or high]  
in their lifetime.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	790	58.3 %	58.5%
1	Yes	561	41.4 %	41.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

- Study 29961 -

**S0SROA59: S0 SRO: Drove drunk - Age 1st time**

*Location:* 2753-2756 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subject's age at the first time the subject drove drunk.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 and Younger	7	0.5 %	1.3%
10	-	4	0.3 %	0.7%
11	-	8	0.6 %	1.4%
12	-	28	2.1 %	5.0%
13	-	76	5.6 %	13.6%
14	-	124	9.2 %	22.2%
15	-	158	11.7 %	28.3%
16	-	128	9.5 %	22.9%
17	-	24	1.8 %	4.3%
18	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	791	58.4 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 558 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRON59: S0 SRO: Drove drunk - Num times in past yr**

*Location:* 2757-2760 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -200 , -101

**Question:**

Frequency of [driven while you were drunk or high] over the past year.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	921	68.0 %	68.6%
1	-	87	6.4 %	6.5%
2	-	66	4.9 %	4.9%
3	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
4	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
5	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
6	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
7	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
8	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
9	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
10	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
12	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
13	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
14	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
15	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
17	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
23	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
25	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
30	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
37	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
40	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
50	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
52	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
55	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
60	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
65	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
70	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
90	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
100	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
120	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
140	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
200	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
210	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
250	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
300	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
335	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
360	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
365	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
400	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
500	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
600	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	8	0.6 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,343 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROL74: S0 SRO: Drove drunk - When was the last time**

*Location:* 2761-2764 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject's most recent drove drunk offense.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Within the past 30 days	40	3.0 %	7.1%
2	1-3 months ago (31-90 days)	135	10.0 %	24.1%
3	4-6 Months ago	139	10.3 %	24.8%
4	More than 6 Months ago	246	18.2 %	43.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	791	58.4 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 560 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRO108: S0 SRO: Drove drunk - Was anyone with you last time**

*Location:* 2765-2768 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	107	7.9 %	19.1%
1	Yes	454	33.5 %	80.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	791	58.4 %	-

Based upon 561 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROS60: S0 SRO: Paid for sex - ever**

*Location:* 2769-2772 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

- Study 29961 -

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject engaged in paid by someone for having sexual relations with them in their lifetime.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,296	95.7 %	96.0%
1	Yes	54	4.0 %	4.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROA60: S0 SRO: Paid for sex - Age 1st time**

Location: 2773-2776 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subject's age at the first time the subject paid for sex.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age

- Study 29961 -

of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
11	-	1	0.1 %	1.9%
12	-	2	0.1 %	3.7%
13	-	7	0.5 %	13.0%
14	-	14	1.0 %	25.9%
15	-	13	1.0 %	24.1%
16	-	13	1.0 %	24.1%
17	-	3	0.2 %	5.6%
18	-	1	0.1 %	1.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1,298	95.9 %	-

Based upon 54 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRON60: S0 SRO: Paid for sex - Num times in past yr**

*Location:* 2777-2780 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -200 , -101

**Question:**

Frequency of [been paid by someone for having sexual relations with them] over the past year.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	1,312	96.9 %	97.2%
1	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
3	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
4	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
5	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
14	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
100	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROL75: S0 SRO: Paid for sex - When was last time**

*Location:* 2781-2784 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject's most recent paid for sex offense.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Within the past 30 days	2	0.1 %	3.7%
2	1-3 months ago (31-90 days)	8	0.6 %	14.8%
3	4-6 Months ago	14	1.0 %	25.9%
4	More than 6 Months ago	30	2.2 %	55.6%

**Missing Data**

-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1,298	95.9 %	-

Based upon 54 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRO110: S0 SRO: Paid for sex - Was anyone with you last time**

- Study 29961 -

*Location:* 2785-2788 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [were paid by someone for having sexual relations with them].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	33	2.4 %	61.1%
1	Yes	21	1.6 %	38.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1,298	95.9 %	-

Based upon 54 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROS61: S0 SRO: Forced someone to have sex - ever**

*Location:* 2789-2793 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject engaged in [forced someone to have sex with you] in their lifetime.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the

- Study 29961 -

past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	-	1,354	100.0 %	100.0%

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

**S0SROA61: S0 SRO: Forced sex - Age 1st time**

*Location:* 2794-2798 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

The subject's age at the first time the subject forced sex.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,354	100.0 %	100.0%

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

**S0SRON61: S0 SRO: Forced sex - Num times in past yr**

*Location:* 2799-2803 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Frequency of [forced someone to have sex with you] over the past year.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

- Study 29961 -

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,354	100.0 %	100.0%

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

**S0SROL76: S0 SRO: Forced sex - When was last time**

*Location:* 2804-2808 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

The subject's most recent forced sex offense.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,354	100.0 %	100.0%

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

**S0SRO112: S0 SRO: Forced sex - Was anyone with you last time**

*Location:* 2809-2813 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

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-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,354	100.0 %	100.0%

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

**S0SRO113: S0 SRO: Forced sex - Did you have a gun the last time**

*Location:* 2814-2818 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

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-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,354	100.0 %	100.0%

- Study 29961 -

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

**S0SROS62: S0 SRO: Killed someone - ever**

*Location:* 2819-2823 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Whether the subject engaged in [killed someone] in their lifetime.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,354	100.0 %	100.0%

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

**S0SROA62: S0 SRO: Killed someone - Age 1st time**

*Location:* 2824-2828 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

The subject's age at the first time the subject killed someone.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,354	100.0 %	100.0%

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

**S0SRON62: S0 SRO: Killed someone - Num times in past yr**

*Location:* 2829-2833 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Frequency of [killed someone] over the past year.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,354	100.0 %	100.0%

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

**S0SROL77: S0 SRO: Killed someone - When was the last time**

*Location:* 2834-2838 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

The subject's most recent killed someone offense.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports

- Study 29961 -

doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,354	100.0 %	100.0%

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

**S0SRO114: S0 SRO: Killed someone - Was anyone with you last time**

*Location:* 2839-2843 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [killed someone].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,354	100.0 %	100.0%

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

**S0SRO115: S0 SRO: Killed someone - Did you have a gun the last time**

*Location:* 2844-2848 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Whether the subject had a gun with them the last time they [killed someone].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

- Study 29961 -

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1,354	100.0 %	100.0%

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

**S0SROS63: S0 SRO: Shot someone bullet hit - ever**

*Location:* 2849-2852 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject engaged in [shot someone (where bullet hit the victim)] in their lifetime.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,177	86.9 %	87.9%
1	Yes	162	12.0 %	12.1%

**Missing Data**

-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	11	0.8 %	-
-8 (M)	Refuse	2	0.1 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Based upon 1,339 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROA63: S0 SRO: Shot someone - Age 1st time**

*Location:* 2853-2856 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subject's age at the first time the subject shot someone.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
9	9 and Younger	5	0.4 %	3.1%
10	-	2	0.1 %	1.2%
11	-	3	0.2 %	1.9%
12	-	7	0.5 %	4.3%
13	-	30	2.2 %	18.6%
14	-	32	2.4 %	19.9%
15	-	31	2.3 %	19.3%
16	-	35	2.6 %	21.7%
17	-	16	1.2 %	9.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1,190	87.9 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 161 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRON63: S0 SRO: Shot someone - Num times in past yr**

*Location:* 2857-2860 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -200 , -101

**Question:**

Frequency of [shot someone (where bullet hit the victim)] over the past year.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	1,251	92.4 %	93.4%
1	-	45	3.3 %	3.4%
2	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
3	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
4	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
5	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
7	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
10	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
15	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	13	1.0 %	-

Based upon 1,339 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROL78: S0 SRO: Shot someone - When was the last time**

*Location:* 2861-2864 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject's most recent shot someone offense.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and

- Study 29961 -

illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	Within the past 30 days	2	0.1 %	1.2%
2	1-3 months ago (31-90 days)	20	1.5 %	12.3%
3	4-6 Months ago	32	2.4 %	19.8%
4	More than 6 Months ago	108	8.0 %	66.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1,190	87.9 %	-

Based upon 162 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRO116: S0 SRO: Shot someone - Was anyone with you the last time**

*Location:* 2865-2868 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	43	3.2 %	26.5%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Yes	119	8.8 %	73.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1,190	87.9 %	-

Based upon 162 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROS64: S0 SRO: Shot at someone no hit - ever**

*Location:* 2869-2872 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject engaged in [shot AT someone (where you pulled the trigger)] in lifetime.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,017	75.1 %	75.4%
1	Yes	332	24.5 %	24.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-
-8 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,349 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROA64: S0 SRO: Shot at someone - Age 1st time**

*Location:* 2873-2876 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subject's age at the first time the subject shot at someone.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 and Younger	9	0.7 %	2.7%
10	-	4	0.3 %	1.2%
11	-	9	0.7 %	2.7%
12	-	17	1.3 %	5.1%
13	-	57	4.2 %	17.2%
14	-	71	5.2 %	21.4%
15	-	88	6.5 %	26.5%
16	-	57	4.2 %	17.2%
17	-	20	1.5 %	6.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1,020	75.3 %	-

Based upon 332 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRON64: S0 SRO: Shot at someone - Num times in past yr**

*Location:* 2877-2880 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -200 , -101

**Question:**

Frequency of [shot AT someone (where you pulled the trigger)] over the past year.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted

- Study 29961 -

for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	1,151	85.0 %	85.4%
1	-	80	5.9 %	5.9%
2	-	37	2.7 %	2.7%
3	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
4	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
5	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
6	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
7	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
8	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
9	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
10	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
12	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
15	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
17	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
30	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
300	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,348 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROL79: S0 SRO: Shot at someone - When was last time**

*Location:* 2881-2884 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject's most recent shot at someone offense.

**MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)**

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Within the past 30 days	5	0.4 %	1.5%
2	1-3 months ago (31-90 days)	43	3.2 %	13.0%
3	4-6 Months ago	64	4.7 %	19.3%
4	More than 6 Months ago	220	16.2 %	66.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1,020	75.3 %	-

Based upon 332 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRO118: S0 SRO: Shot at someone - Was anyone with you last time**

*Location:* 2885-2888 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	82	6.1 %	24.7%
1	Yes	250	18.5 %	75.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1,020	75.3 %	-

Based upon 332 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROS65: S0 SRO: Took by force w/ weapon - ever**

*Location:* 2889-2892 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject engaged in [taken something from another person by force, using a weapon] in their lifetime.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,053	77.8 %	78.0%
1	Yes	297	21.9 %	22.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-
-8 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROA65: S0 SRO: Robbery with weapon - Age 1st time**

*Location:* 2893-2896 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subject's age at the first time the subject robbed with weapon.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 and Younger	5	0.4 %	1.7%
10	-	6	0.4 %	2.0%
11	-	8	0.6 %	2.7%
12	-	19	1.4 %	6.4%
13	-	42	3.1 %	14.1%
14	-	66	4.9 %	22.2%
15	-	78	5.8 %	26.3%
16	-	50	3.7 %	16.8%
17	-	22	1.6 %	7.4%
18	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1,055	77.9 %	-

Based upon 297 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRON65: S0 SRO: Robbery with weapon - Num times in past yr**

Location: 2897-2900 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -999 , -998 , -200 , -101

**Question:**

Frequency of [taken something from another person by force, using a weapon] over the past year.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

- Study 29961 -

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	1,162	85.8 %	86.1%
1	-	65	4.8 %	4.8%
2	-	39	2.9 %	2.9%
3	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
4	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
5	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
6	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
7	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
8	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
9	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
10	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
11	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
15	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
30	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
40	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
45	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
90	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
365	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,349 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROL80: S0 SRO: Robbery with weapon - When was last time**

*Location:* 2901-2904 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject's most recent robbery with weapon offense.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Within the past 30 days	11	0.8 %	3.7%
2	1-3 months ago (31-90 days)	48	3.5 %	16.2%
3	4-6 Months ago	62	4.6 %	20.9%
4	More than 6 Months ago	175	12.9 %	59.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1,055	77.9 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 296 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRO120: S0 SRO: Robbery with weapon - Was anyone with you last time**

*Location:* 2905-2908 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports

- Study 29961 -

doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	72	5.3 %	24.3%
1	Yes	224	16.5 %	75.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1,055	77.9 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 296 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRO121: S0 SRO: Robbery with weapon - Did you have a gun the last time**

*Location:* 2909-2912 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject had a gun with them the last time they [taken something from another person by force, using a weapon].

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	116	8.6 %	39.2%
1	Yes	180	13.3 %	60.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1,055	77.9 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Based upon 296 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROS66: S0 SRO: Took by force no weapon - ever**

*Location:* 2913-2916 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject engaged in [taken something from another person by force, without a weapon]in their lifetime.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	849	62.7 %	62.8%
1	Yes	502	37.1 %	37.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROA66: S0 SRO: Robbery no weapon - Age 1st time**

*Location:* 2917-2920 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subject's age at the first time the subject robbed without weapon

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in

- Study 29961 -

different types of crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
9	9 and Younger	30	2.2 %	6.0%
10	-	30	2.2 %	6.0%
11	-	22	1.6 %	4.4%
12	-	49	3.6 %	9.8%
13	-	86	6.4 %	17.2%
14	-	109	8.1 %	21.8%
15	-	87	6.4 %	17.4%
16	-	71	5.2 %	14.2%
17	-	13	1.0 %	2.6%
18	-	2	0.1 %	0.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	850	62.8 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 499 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRON66: S0 SRO: Robbery no weapon - Num times in past yr**

*Location:* 2921-2924 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -200 , -101

**Question:**

Frequency of [taken something from another person by force, without a weapon] over the past year.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	1,063	78.5 %	78.9%
1	-	89	6.6 %	6.6%
2	-	62	4.6 %	4.6%
3	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
4	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
5	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
6	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
7	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
8	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
9	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
10	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
12	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
13	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
15	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
16	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
25	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
30	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
35	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
40	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
50	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
60	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
100	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
340	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
350	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

  

<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	3	0.2 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,348 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROL81: S0 SRO: Robbery no weapon - When was last time**

*Location:* 2925-2928 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject's most recent robbery no weapon offense

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Within the past 30 days	32	2.4 %	6.4%
2	1-3 months ago (31-90 days)	87	6.4 %	17.3%
3	4-6 Months ago	88	6.5 %	17.5%
4	More than 6 Months ago	295	21.8 %	58.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	850	62.8 %	-

Based upon 502 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0SRO122: S0 SRO: Robbery no weapon - Was anyone with you last time**

*Location:* 2929-2932 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

#### **Question:**

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-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	171	12.6 %	34.1%
1	Yes	330	24.4 %	65.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	850	62.8 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 501 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRO129: S0 SRO: Fight part of gang - Did you have a gun the last time**

*Location:* 2933-2936 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject had a gun with them the last time they [beaten up, threatened, or physically attacked someone as part of a gang].

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	288	21.3 %	81.1%
1	Yes	67	4.9 %	18.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	996	73.6 %	-
-8 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 355 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROS67: S0 SRO: Beat up someone serious injury - ever**

*Location:* 2937-2940 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject engaged in [beaten up or physically attacked somebody so badly that they probably needed a doctor] in their lifetime.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	810	59.8 %	60.2%
1	Yes	535	39.5 %	39.8%

*Missing Data*

-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	7	0.5 %	-

Based upon 1,345 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROA67: S0 SRO: Beaten someone - Age 1st time**

*Location:* 2941-2944 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subject's age at the first time the subject beaten someone.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How

- Study 29961 -

old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 and Younger	24	1.8 %	4.5%
10	-	9	0.7 %	1.7%
11	-	20	1.5 %	3.7%
12	-	38	2.8 %	7.1%
13	-	86	6.4 %	16.1%
14	-	112	8.3 %	21.0%
15	-	116	8.6 %	21.7%
16	-	89	6.6 %	16.7%
17	-	39	2.9 %	7.3%
18	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	817	60.3 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 534 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0SRON67: S0 SRO: Beaten someone - Num times in past yr**

*Location:* 2945-2948 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -200 , -101

#### **Question:**

Frequency of [beaten up or physically attacked somebody so badly that they probably needed a doctor] over the past year.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	993	73.3 %	73.8%
1	-	192	14.2 %	14.3%
2	-	69	5.1 %	5.1%
3	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
4	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
5	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
6	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
7	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
8	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
9	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
10	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
15	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	7	0.5 %	-

Based upon 1,345 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROL82: S0 SRO: Beaten someone - When was last time**

*Location:* 2949-2952 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject's most recent beaten someone offense.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Within the past 30 days	33	2.4 %	6.2%
2	1-3 months ago (31-90 days)	80	5.9 %	15.0%
3	4-6 Months ago	115	8.5 %	21.5%
4	More than 6 Months ago	307	22.7 %	57.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	817	60.3 %	-

Based upon 535 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRO124: S0 SRO: Beaten someone - Was anyone with you last time**

*Location:* 2953-2956 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	147	10.9 %	27.5%
1	Yes	387	28.6 %	72.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	817	60.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 534 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROS68: S0 SRO: In a fight - ever**

*Location:* 2957-2960 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

- Study 29961 -

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject engaged in [been in a fight] in their lifetime.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	47	3.5 %	3.5%
1	Yes	1,304	96.3 %	96.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROA68: S0 SRO: In fight - Age 1st time**

Location: 2961-2964 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subject's age at the first time the subject was in a fight.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
9	9 and Younger	569	42.0 %	44.2%
10	-	153	11.3 %	11.9%
11	-	128	9.5 %	9.9%
12	-	157	11.6 %	12.2%
13	-	147	10.9 %	11.4%
14	-	74	5.5 %	5.7%
15	-	33	2.4 %	2.6%
16	-	22	1.6 %	1.7%
17	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%

**Missing Data**

-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	48	3.5 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	17	1.3 %	-

Based upon 1,287 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRON68: S0 SRO: In fight - Num times in past yr**

*Location:* 2965-2968 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -200 , -101

**Question:**

Frequency of [been in a fight] over the past year.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	433	32.0 %	32.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	-	214	15.8 %	15.9%
2	-	165	12.2 %	12.2%
3	-	118	8.7 %	8.8%
4	-	78	5.8 %	5.8%
5	-	74	5.5 %	5.5%
6	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
7	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
8	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
9	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
10	-	53	3.9 %	3.9%
11	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
12	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
13	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
14	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
15	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
16	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
17	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
20	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
24	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
25	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
30	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
35	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
36	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
40	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
50	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
52	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
60	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
70	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
100	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
120	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
200	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

**Missing Data**

-999 (M)	Dont Know	4	0.3 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,347 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROL83: S0 SRO: In fight - When was last time**

*Location:* 2969-2972 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject's most recent in fight offense.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Within the past 30 days	214	15.8 %	16.4%
2	1-3 months ago (31-90 days)	319	23.6 %	24.5%
3	4-6 Months ago	210	15.5 %	16.1%
4	More than 6 Months ago	560	41.4 %	43.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	48	3.5 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,303 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRO126: S0 SRO: In fight - Was anyone with you last time**

*Location:* 2973-2976 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports

- Study 29961 -

doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	550	40.6 %	42.2%
1	Yes	752	55.5 %	57.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	48	3.5 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,302 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROS69: S0 SRO: Beat someone as part of gang - ever**

*Location:* 2977-2980 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject engaged in [beaten up, threatened, or physically attacked someone as part of a gang] in their lifetime.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	995	73.5 %	73.6%
1	Yes	356	26.3 %	26.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

- Study 29961 -

**S0SROA69: S0 SRO: Fight part of gang - Age 1st time**

*Location:* 2981-2984 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subject's age at the first time the subject fought as part of a gang.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 and Younger	15	1.1 %	4.2%
10	-	11	0.8 %	3.1%
11	-	14	1.0 %	4.0%
12	-	40	3.0 %	11.3%
13	-	74	5.5 %	20.9%
14	-	86	6.4 %	24.3%
15	-	73	5.4 %	20.6%
16	-	29	2.1 %	8.2%
17	-	12	0.9 %	3.4%

**Missing Data**

-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	996	73.6 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

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

**S0SRON69: S0 SRO: Fight part of gang - Num times in past yr**

*Location:* 2985-2988 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -200 , -101

**Question:**

Frequency of [beaten up, threatened or physically attacked someone as part of a gang] over the past year.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	1,127	83.2 %	83.5%
1	-	70	5.2 %	5.2%
2	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
3	-	29	2.1 %	2.1%
4	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
5	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
6	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
7	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
8	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
9	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
10	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
11	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
15	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
16	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
24	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
30	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
48	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
60	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,349 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROL84: S0 SRO: Fight part of gang - When was the last time**

*Location:* 2989-2992 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject's most recent fight part of gang offense.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	Within the past 30 days	29	2.1 %	8.2%
2	1-3 months ago (31-90 days)	69	5.1 %	19.4%
3	4-6 Months ago	67	4.9 %	18.9%
4	More than 6 Months ago	190	14.0 %	53.5%

**Missing Data**

-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	996	73.6 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 355 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRO128: S0 SRO: Fight part of gang - Was anyone with you last time**

*Location:* 2993-2996 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted

- Study 29961 -

for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	57	4.2 %	16.1%
1	Yes	298	22.0 %	83.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	996	73.6 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 355 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0SROS70: S0 SRO: Carried a gun - ever**

*Location:* 2997-3000 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

#### **Question:**

Whether the subject engaged in [carried a gun] in their lifetime.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	713	52.7 %	52.8%
1	Yes	637	47.0 %	47.2%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-
-8 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROA70: S0 SRO: Carried gun - Age 1st time**

*Location:* 3001-3004 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subject's age at the first time the subject carried a gun.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 and Younger	23	1.7 %	3.6%
10	-	14	1.0 %	2.2%
11	-	29	2.1 %	4.6%
12	-	70	5.2 %	11.0%
13	-	116	8.6 %	18.2%
14	-	128	9.5 %	20.1%
15	-	135	10.0 %	21.2%
16	-	93	6.9 %	14.6%
17	-	28	2.1 %	4.4%

**Missing Data**

-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	715	52.8 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Based upon 636 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRON70: S0 SRO: Carried gun - Num times in past yr**

*Location:* 3005-3008 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -200 , -101

**Question:**

Frequency of [carried a gun] over the past year.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	859	63.4 %	64.3%
1	-	91	6.7 %	6.8%
2	-	58	4.3 %	4.3%
3	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
4	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
5	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
6	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
7	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
8	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
9	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
10	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
12	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
14	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
15	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
16	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
17	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
18	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
19	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
25	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
30	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
34	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
40	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
44	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
50	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
52	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
60	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
70	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
72	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
90	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
98	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
100	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
104	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
115	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
120	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
140	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
150	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
160	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
165	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
180	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
200	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
220	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
240	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
250	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
270	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
285	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
300	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
305	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
320	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
340	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
350	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
365	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
995	Maximum value permitted	5	0.4 %	0.4%

*Missing Data*

-999 (M)	Dont Know	14	1.0 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,336 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROL85: S0 SRO: Carried gun - When was the last time**

- Study 29961 -

*Location:* 3009-3012 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject's most recent carried gun offense.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Within the past 30 days	46	3.4 %	7.2%
2	1-3 months ago (31-90 days)	186	13.7 %	29.2%
3	4-6 Months ago	133	9.8 %	20.9%
4	More than 6 Months ago	272	20.1 %	42.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	715	52.8 %	-

Based upon 637 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROS71: S0 SRO: Broke into car to steal - ever**

*Location:* 3013-3016 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -400 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether subject engaged in [entered or broken into a car to steal something from it] in their lifetime.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are

- Study 29961 -

triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	524	38.7 %	64.0%
1	Yes	295	21.8 %	36.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	532	39.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 819 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROA71: S0 SRO: Enter car to steal - Age 1st time**

*Location:* 3017-3020 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -400 , -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subjects age at the first time the subject enter car to steal.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
9	9 and Younger	6	0.4 %	2.0%
10	-	8	0.6 %	2.7%
11	-	16	1.2 %	5.4%
12	-	43	3.2 %	14.6%
13	-	57	4.2 %	19.3%
14	-	64	4.7 %	21.7%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
15	-	50	3.7 %	16.9%
16	-	39	2.9 %	13.2%
17	-	12	0.9 %	4.1%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	532	39.3 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	527	38.9 %	-

Based upon 295 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRON71: S0 SRO: Enter car to steal - Num times in past yr**

*Location:* 3021-3024 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -400 , -200 , -101

**Question:**

Frequency of [entered or broken into a car to steal something from it] over the past year.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	120	8.9 %	41.1%
1	-	31	2.3 %	10.6%
2	-	40	3.0 %	13.7%
3	-	13	1.0 %	4.5%
4	-	10	0.7 %	3.4%
5	-	11	0.8 %	3.8%
6	-	5	0.4 %	1.7%
7	-	4	0.3 %	1.4%
8	-	4	0.3 %	1.4%
10	-	10	0.7 %	3.4%
12	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
13	-	3	0.2 %	1.0%
15	-	7	0.5 %	2.4%
20	-	10	0.7 %	3.4%
25	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
30	-	4	0.3 %	1.4%
35	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
40	-	3	0.2 %	1.0%
45	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
50	-	5	0.4 %	1.7%
70	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
100	-	3	0.2 %	1.0%
300	-	2	0.1 %	0.7%
400	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
500	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	3	0.2 %	-
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	532	39.3 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	527	38.9 %	-

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

**S0SROL86: S0 SRO: Enter car to steal - When was the last time**

*Location:* 3025-3028 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -400 , -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject's most recent enter car to steal offense.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Within the past 30 days	9	0.7 %	3.1%
2	1-3 months ago (31-90 days)	49	3.6 %	16.7%
3	4-6 Months ago	57	4.2 %	19.4%
4	More than 6 Months ago	179	13.2 %	60.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	532	39.3 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	527	38.9 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 294 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRO132: S0 SRO: Enter car to steal - Was anyone with you last time**

*Location:* 3029-3032 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -400 , -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	63	4.7 %	21.4%
1	Yes	232	17.1 %	78.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	532	39.3 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	527	38.9 %	-

Based upon 295 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROS72: S0 SRO: Went joyriding - ever**

*Location:* 3033-3036 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

- Study 29961 -

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -400 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject engaged in [gone joy-riding (stolen a car or motorcycle to ride around)] in their lifetime.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	387	28.6 %	47.2%
1	Yes	433	32.0 %	52.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	532	39.3 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 820 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROA72: S0 SRO: Gone joyriding - Age 1st time**

Location: 3037-3040 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -400 , -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subject's age at the first time the subject went joyriding.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age

- Study 29961 -

of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 and Younger	8	0.6 %	1.8%
10	-	11	0.8 %	2.5%
11	-	14	1.0 %	3.2%
12	-	53	3.9 %	12.2%
13	-	88	6.5 %	20.3%
14	-	92	6.8 %	21.2%
15	-	106	7.8 %	24.5%
16	-	44	3.2 %	10.2%
17	-	17	1.3 %	3.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	532	39.3 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	389	28.7 %	-

Based upon 433 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRON72: S0 SRO: Gone joyriding - Num times in past yr**

*Location:* 3041-3044 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -999 , -998 , -400 , -200 , -101

**Question:**

Frequency of [gone joy-riding (stolen a car or motorcycle to ride around)] over the past year.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	190	14.0 %	44.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	-	67	4.9 %	15.5%
2	-	51	3.8 %	11.8%
3	-	26	1.9 %	6.0%
4	-	17	1.3 %	3.9%
5	-	15	1.1 %	3.5%
6	-	3	0.2 %	0.7%
7	-	6	0.4 %	1.4%
8	-	3	0.2 %	0.7%
9	-	2	0.1 %	0.5%
10	-	11	0.8 %	2.6%
13	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
14	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
15	-	3	0.2 %	0.7%
19	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
20	-	9	0.7 %	2.1%
21	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
25	-	3	0.2 %	0.7%
30	-	3	0.2 %	0.7%
31	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
48	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
50	-	4	0.3 %	0.9%
63	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
70	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
80	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
100	-	3	0.2 %	0.7%
150	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
200	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
300	-	3	0.2 %	0.7%
305	-	1	0.1 %	0.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-999 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	532	39.3 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	389	28.7 %	-

Based upon 431 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROL87: S0 SRO: Gone joyriding - When was last time**

*Location:* 3045-3048 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -400 , -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject's most recent went joyriding offense.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Within the past 30 days	22	1.6 %	5.1%
2	1-3 months ago (31-90 days)	74	5.5 %	17.1%
3	4-6 Months ago	79	5.8 %	18.3%
4	More than 6 Months ago	257	19.0 %	59.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	532	39.3 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	389	28.7 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 432 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRO134: S0 SRO: Gone joyriding - Was anyone with you last time**

*Location:* 3049-3052 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -400 , -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [went joy-riding].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	55	4.1 %	12.7%
1	Yes	378	27.9 %	87.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-400 (M)	Not asked in this version	532	39.3 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Gate is NO	389	28.7 %	-

Based upon 433 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0AGE1STOFFENSE: S0 SRO: Age at First Offense (based on 22 -age first time- items)**

*Location:* 3053-3056 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -100

**Question:**

The subject's age at first offense. Computed based on response to 22 -age first time- items.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data at these two time points, making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, all SRO scores are 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
9	9 and Younger	675	49.9 %	50.3%
10	-	175	12.9 %	13.0%
11	-	130	9.6 %	9.7%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
12	-	138	10.2 %	10.3%
13	-	133	9.8 %	9.9%
14	-	46	3.4 %	3.4%
15	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
16	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
17	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-300 (M)	Too few values for computation	1	0.1 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-100 (M)	Did not skip into section	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,343 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROFRQ: S0 SRO: Frequency of Offending Past Year**

*Location:* 3057-3060 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -9

**Question:**

Frequency of Offending in the past year; Sum of the frequencies reported across all 22 acts.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data at these two time points, making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, all SRO scores are 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
<b>Missing Data</b>	

Value	Label
-300 (M)	Too few values for computation
-200 (M)	Data missing
-9 (M)	Refuse

\* Frequencies not displayed for this variable.

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0FRQND: S0 SRO: Frequency of Offending Past Year- No Drug**

*Location:* 3061-3064 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -9

#### **Question:**

Frequency of Offending in the past year - No Drug.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data at these two time points, making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, all SRO scores are 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
<i>Missing Data</i>	
-300 (M)	Too few values for computation
-200 (M)	Data missing
-9 (M)	Refuse

\* Frequencies not displayed for this variable.

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0SROPRV: S0 SRO: Total Offending Variety Proportion - Ever**

*Location:* 3065-3071 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200.00 , -9.00

**Question:**

Total Offending Variety - Ever; a proportion; the numerator is the number of different types of acts endorsed, regardless of when it was committed and the denominator is the number of items for which the subject gives either a yes or no answer. That is, all items which the subject refused to answer, replied don't know, or was not asked are removed from the denominator. The closer this figure is to 1, the greater the variety of offenses the youth is committing.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data at these two time points, making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, all SRO scores are 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	%	Valid %
0.00	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
0.05	-	87	6.4 %	6.4%
0.09	-	129	9.5 %	9.5%
0.14	-	129	9.5 %	9.5%
0.18	-	124	9.2 %	9.2%
0.19	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.23	-	124	9.2 %	9.2%
0.27	-	102	7.5 %	7.5%
0.29	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
0.32	-	79	5.8 %	5.8%
0.33	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.36	-	83	6.1 %	6.1%
0.41	-	83	6.1 %	6.1%
0.43	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0.45	-	55	4.1 %	4.1%
0.48	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
0.50	-	55	4.1 %	4.1%
0.52	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
0.55	-	56	4.1 %	4.1%
0.57	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
0.58	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.59	-	59	4.4 %	4.4%
0.62	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.64	-	50	3.7 %	3.7%
0.67	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.68	-	37	2.7 %	2.7%
0.71	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.73	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
0.75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.77	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
0.82	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
0.86	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
0.90	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.91	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
0.95	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0SRO6: S0 SRO: Total Offending Variety Proportion - Past 6 Months**

*Location:* 3072-3078 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -100.00 , -9.00

#### **Question:**

Total Offending Variety - past 6 months; a proportion in which the numerator is the number of acts which were committed in the prior 6 months. The denominator remains the same as in the total offending variety - ever.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in

- Study 29961 -

different types of crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data at these two time points, making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, all SRO scores are 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0.00	-	260	19.2 %	19.2%
0.05	-	272	20.1 %	20.1%
0.09	-	203	15.0 %	15.0%
0.10	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
0.14	-	158	11.7 %	11.7%
0.15	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.18	-	99	7.3 %	7.3%
0.19	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
0.23	-	65	4.8 %	4.8%
0.24	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.27	-	58	4.3 %	4.3%
0.32	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
0.33	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.35	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.36	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
0.38	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.41	-	33	2.4 %	2.4%
0.43	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.45	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
0.48	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.50	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
0.55	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
0.59	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
0.64	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
0.67	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.68	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
0.73	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0.77	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
0.82	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.91	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROEV: S0 SRO: Total Offending Variety Proportion - Acts Beyond 6 Months; No Acts Within 6 Months**

*Location:* 3079-3085 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200.00 , -100.00 , -9.00

**Question:**

Total Offending Variety - acts beyond 6 months; a proportion in which the numerator is a count of acts which were committed more than 6 months ago. Excludes acts that were done within the past 6 months. The denominator remains the same as in the total offending variety-ever calculation.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data at these two time points, making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, all SRO scores are 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	%	Valid %
0.00	-	123	9.1 %	9.1%
0.05	-	199	14.7 %	14.7%
0.09	-	220	16.2 %	16.3%
0.10	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0.14	-	207	15.3 %	15.3%
0.18	-	129	9.5 %	9.5%
0.19	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.23	-	131	9.7 %	9.7%
0.24	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
0.27	-	95	7.0 %	7.0%
0.29	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.32	-	59	4.4 %	4.4%
0.33	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.36	-	39	2.9 %	2.9%
0.41	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
0.43	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.45	-	33	2.4 %	2.4%
0.48	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.50	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
0.55	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
0.58	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.59	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
0.60	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.62	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.64	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
0.67	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.68	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
0.73	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.77	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
0.82	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROAGG: S0 SRO: Aggressive Offending Variety Proportion - Ever**

*Location:* 3086-3092 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200.00 , -100.00 , -9.00

**Question:**

Aggressive Offending Variety-Ever score; a proportion in which the numerator is the number of endorsed acts within this category, regardless of when it was committed and the denominator is the number of aggressive offenses about which the youth is questioned. There are total of 11 offenses

## - Study 29961 -

included which been categorized as aggressive.

### MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data at these two time points, making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, all SRO scores are 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	%	Valid %
0.00	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
0.09	-	282	20.8 %	20.9%
0.18	-	301	22.2 %	22.3%
0.20	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.27	-	218	16.1 %	16.1%
0.30	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.36	-	151	11.2 %	11.2%
0.40	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
0.44	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.45	-	108	8.0 %	8.0%
0.50	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.55	-	101	7.5 %	7.5%
0.60	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
0.64	-	64	4.7 %	4.7%
0.67	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.70	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.73	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
0.78	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.80	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.82	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
0.90	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.91	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0AGG6: S0 SRO: Aggressive Offending Variety Proportion - Past 6 Months**

*Location:* 3093-3099 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200.00 , -100.00 , -9.00

**Question:**

Aggressive Offending Variety - past 6 months; a proportion in which the numerator is the number of aggressive acts which were committed in the prior 6 months. The denominator remains the same as in the aggressive offending variety - ever calculation.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data at these two time points, making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, all SRO scores are 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	%	Valid %
0.00	-	441	32.6 %	32.6%
0.09	-	417	30.8 %	30.9%
0.10	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
0.18	-	212	15.7 %	15.7%
0.20	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
0.22	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0.27	-	126	9.3 %	9.3%
0.30	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.33	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.36	-	55	4.1 %	4.1%
0.40	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
0.45	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
0.50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.55	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
0.60	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.64	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
0.73	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
0.80	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.82	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
0.91	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0AGGEV: S0 SRO: Aggressive Offending Variety Proportion - Acts Beyond 6 Months; No Acts Within 6 Months**

*Location:* 3100-3106 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200.00 , -100.00 , -9.00

**Question:**

Aggressive Offending Variety - acts beyond 6 months; a proportion in which the numerator is a count of the acts which were committed more than 6 months ago. Excludes acts that were done within the past 6 months. The denominator remains the same as in the aggressive offending variety-ever calculation.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up

- Study 29961 -

interviews. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data at these two time points, making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, all SRO scores are 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0.00	-	268	19.8 %	19.8%
0.09	-	406	30.0 %	30.1%
0.10	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
0.18	-	309	22.8 %	22.9%
0.20	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
0.22	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.27	-	148	10.9 %	11.0%
0.30	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
0.36	-	89	6.6 %	6.6%
0.40	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.44	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.45	-	57	4.2 %	4.2%
0.50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.55	-	29	2.1 %	2.1%
0.60	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.64	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
0.67	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.70	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.73	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
0.82	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0AGGFRQ: S0 SRO: Aggressive Offending Frequency in Past Year**

*Location:* 3107-3110 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -9

**Question:**

Aggressive Offending Variety Frequency - past year.

**MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)**

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data at these two time points, making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, all SRO scores are 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
<i>Missing Data</i>	
-300 (M)	Too few values for computation
-200 (M)	Data missing
-9 (M)	Refuse

\* Frequencies not displayed for this variable.

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROINC: S0 SRO: Income Offending Variety Proportion - Ever**

*Location:* 3111-3117 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M)):* -200.00 , -100.00 , -9.00

**Question:**

Income Offending Variety-Ever score; a proportion in which the numerator is the number of endorsed acts within this category, regardless of when it was committed and the denominator is the number of income offenses about which the youth is questioned. There are a total of 11 offenses included which have been categorized as income offenses.

**MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)**

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the

- Study 29961 -

past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data at these two time points, making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, all SRO scores are 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	%	Valid %
0.00	-	144	10.6 %	10.7%
0.10	-	200	14.8 %	14.8%
0.11	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.20	-	217	16.0 %	16.1%
0.30	-	180	13.3 %	13.3%
0.40	-	155	11.4 %	11.5%
0.50	-	140	10.3 %	10.4%
0.56	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.60	-	121	8.9 %	9.0%
0.70	-	88	6.5 %	6.5%
0.80	-	69	5.1 %	5.1%
0.90	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
1.00	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0INC6: S0 SRO: Income Offending Variety Proportion - Past 6 Months**

*Location:* 3118-3124 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200.00 , -100.00 , -9.00

#### **Question:**

Income Offending Variety - past 6 months; a proportion in which the numerator is the number of income offenses which were committed in the prior 6 months. The denominator remains the same as in the income offending variety ever calculation.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

- Study 29961 -

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data at these two time points, making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, all SRO scores are 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	%	Valid %
0.00	-	558	41.2 %	41.3%
0.10	-	305	22.5 %	22.6%
0.11	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.20	-	167	12.3 %	12.4%
0.30	-	122	9.0 %	9.0%
0.40	-	74	5.5 %	5.5%
0.50	-	63	4.7 %	4.7%
0.60	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
0.70	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
0.80	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
0.90	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0INCEV: S0 SRO: Income Offending Variety Proportion - Acts Beyond 6 Months; No Acts Within 6 Months**

*Location:* 3125-3131 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200.00 , -100.00 , -9.00

**Question:**

Income Offending Variety - acts beyond 6 months; a proportion in which the numerator is a count

- Study 29961 -

of the acts which were committed more than 6 months ago. Excludes acts that were done within the past 6 months. The denominator remains the same as in the income offending variety-ever calculation.

**MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)**

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data at these two time points, making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, all SRO scores are 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	%	Valid %
0.00	-	314	23.2 %	23.2%
0.10	-	347	25.6 %	25.7%
0.11	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.20	-	277	20.5 %	20.5%
0.30	-	162	12.0 %	12.0%
0.40	-	105	7.8 %	7.8%
0.44	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.50	-	66	4.9 %	4.9%
0.60	-	38	2.8 %	2.8%
0.70	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
0.80	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
0.90	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0INCFRQ: S0 SRO: Income Offending Frequency in Past Year**

*Location:* 3132-3135 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

- Study 29961 -

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -300 , -200 , -9

**Question:**

Income Offending Frequency - past year.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data at these two time points, making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, all SRO scores are 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
<i>Missing Data</i>	
-300 (M)	Too few values for computation
-200 (M)	Data missing
-9 (M)	Refuse

\* Frequencies not displayed for this variable.

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRSEND: S0 SRO: Total Offending Variety Proportion - Ever No Drug**

*Location:* 3136-3142 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200.00 , -9.00

**Question:**

Total Offending Variety Proportion - No drug ever.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in

- Study 29961 -

different types of crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data at these two time points, making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, all SRO scores are 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0.00	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
0.05	-	115	8.5 %	8.5%
0.11	-	151	11.2 %	11.2%
0.16	-	168	12.4 %	12.4%
0.17	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.21	-	152	11.2 %	11.3%
0.22	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.26	-	131	9.7 %	9.7%
0.28	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.32	-	113	8.3 %	8.4%
0.33	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.37	-	90	6.6 %	6.7%
0.42	-	81	6.0 %	6.0%
0.44	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
0.47	-	59	4.4 %	4.4%
0.50	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
0.53	-	75	5.5 %	5.6%
0.56	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
0.58	-	59	4.4 %	4.4%
0.59	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.63	-	44	3.2 %	3.3%
0.67	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.68	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
0.72	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.74	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
0.76	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.79	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0.84	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
0.89	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
0.95	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SRO6ND: S0 SRO: Total Offending Variety Proportion - Past 6 Months - NO DRUG**

*Location:* 3143-3149 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -100.00 , -9.00

**Question:**

Total Offending Variety Proportion - No drug past six months.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data at these two time points, making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, all SRO scores are 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	%	Valid %
0.00	-	301	22.2 %	22.3%
0.05	-	314	23.2 %	23.2%
0.06	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
0.11	-	225	16.6 %	16.7%
0.16	-	160	11.8 %	11.8%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0.17	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.18	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.21	-	91	6.7 %	6.7%
0.22	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
0.26	-	58	4.3 %	4.3%
0.32	-	56	4.1 %	4.1%
0.33	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.35	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.37	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
0.39	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.42	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
0.47	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
0.53	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
0.58	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
0.63	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
0.67	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.68	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
0.74	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.79	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
0.89	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROEND: S0 SRO: Total Offending Variety Proportion - Acts Beyond 6 Months; No Acts Within 6 Months-NO DRUG**

*Location:* 3150-3156 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200.00 , -100.00 , -9.00

**Question:**

Total Offending Variety Proportion - No drug beyond six months.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age

- Study 29961 -

of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data at these two time points, making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, all SRO scores are 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0.00	-	145	10.7 %	10.7%
0.05	-	236	17.4 %	17.5%
0.06	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.11	-	254	18.8 %	18.8%
0.12	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.16	-	209	15.4 %	15.5%
0.17	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.21	-	137	10.1 %	10.1%
0.22	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.26	-	113	8.3 %	8.4%
0.28	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
0.32	-	85	6.3 %	6.3%
0.33	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.37	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
0.39	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.42	-	37	2.7 %	2.7%
0.44	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.47	-	34	2.5 %	2.5%
0.50	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.53	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
0.56	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.58	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
0.59	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.63	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
0.67	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
0.68	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
0.74	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
0.79	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
0.84	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SROIND: S0 SRO: Income Offending Variety Proportion - Ever -NO DRUG**

*Location:* 3157-3163 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200.00 , -100.00 , -9.00

**Question:**

Income offending ever.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data at these two time points, making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, all SRO scores are 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	%	Valid %
0.00	-	199	14.7 %	14.7%
0.13	-	282	20.8 %	20.9%
0.14	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.25	-	239	17.7 %	17.7%
0.38	-	205	15.1 %	15.2%
0.50	-	170	12.6 %	12.6%
0.57	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.63	-	121	8.9 %	9.0%
0.75	-	89	6.6 %	6.6%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0.88	-	41	3.0 %	3.0%
1.00	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0INC6ND: S0 SRO: Income Offending Variety Proportion - Past 6 Months-NO DRUG**

*Location:* 3164-3170 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200.00 , -100.00 , -9.00

**Question:**

Income Offending past six months.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data at these two time points, making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, all SRO scores are 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	%	Valid %
0.00	-	688	50.8 %	50.9%
0.13	-	307	22.7 %	22.7%
0.14	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.25	-	156	11.5 %	11.5%
0.38	-	90	6.6 %	6.7%
0.50	-	50	3.7 %	3.7%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0.63	-	34	2.5 %	2.5%
0.75	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
0.88	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0IEVND: S0 SRO: Income Offending Variety Proportion - Acts Beyond 6 Months; No Acts Within 6 Months-NO DRUG**

*Location:* 3171-3177 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200.00 , -100.00 , -9.00

**Question:**

Income Offending beyond six months.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data at these two time points, making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, all SRO scores are 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	%	Valid %
0.00	-	394	29.1 %	29.2%
0.13	-	397	29.3 %	29.4%
0.14	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.25	-	254	18.8 %	18.8%
0.38	-	145	10.7 %	10.7%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0.43	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
0.50	-	83	6.1 %	6.1%
0.63	-	50	3.7 %	3.7%
0.75	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
0.88	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	2	0.1 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### **S0ICFQND: S0 SRO: Income Offending Frequency in Past Year - No Drug**

*Location:* 3178-3181 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -9

#### **Question:**

Income Offending frequency in the past year.

**MEASURE:** Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Report of Offending (SRO; Huizinga, Esbensen, & Weihs, 1991) was adapted for this study 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 crime. For each endorsed item, a set of follow-up questions are triggered that collect more information regarding the reported offense (e.g., "How old were you the first time you did this?"; "How many times have you done this in the past year?"). The follow-up items can be used to identify whether the adolescent reports doing an act within the past six months or only prior to that period, as well as the age of onset and whether or not the act was committed alone or with a group.

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data at these two time points, making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, all SRO scores are 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>
<i>Missing Data</i>	
-300 (M)	Too few values for computation
-200 (M)	Data missing

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label
-9 (M)	Refuse

\* Frequencies not displayed for this variable.

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0SER1: S0 Services: D/A: Ever have an overnight stay**

*Location:* 3182-3185 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

#### **Question:**

The subject has had an overnight stay in a Drug or Alcohol facility.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,289	95.2 %	95.8%
1	Yes	57	4.2 %	4.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0SER2: S0 Services: D/A: Age 1st time stayed overnight**

*Location:* 3186-3189 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

#### **Question:**

The subject's age at first stay in a Drug and Alcohol facility.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed

- Study 29961 -

through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
9	9 or Younger	1	0.1 %	1.8%
11	-	3	0.2 %	5.3%
12	-	3	0.2 %	5.3%
13	-	4	0.3 %	7.0%
14	-	4	0.3 %	7.0%
15	-	17	1.3 %	29.8%
16	-	16	1.2 %	28.1%
17	-	8	0.6 %	14.0%
18	-	1	0.1 %	1.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,289	95.2 %	-

Based upon 57 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER3: S0 Services: D/A: Past 6 months had an overnight stay**

*Location:* 3190-3193 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has stayed overnight in a Drug or Alcohol facility in the past 6 months.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	38	2.8 %	66.7%
1	Yes	19	1.4 %	33.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,289	95.2 %	-

Based upon 57 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER4: S0 Services: Psych: Ever have an overnight stay**

*Location:* 3194-3197 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has had an overnight stay in a Psych facility.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	1,245	91.9 %	92.5%
1	Yes	101	7.5 %	7.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER5: S0 Services: Psych: Age 1st time stayed overnight**

*Location:* 3198-3201 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subjects age at first stay in a Psych facility.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 or Younger	6	0.4 %	6.0%
10	-	6	0.4 %	6.0%
11	-	5	0.4 %	5.0%
12	-	22	1.6 %	22.0%
13	-	17	1.3 %	17.0%
14	-	17	1.3 %	17.0%
15	-	16	1.2 %	16.0%
16	-	9	0.7 %	9.0%
17	-	2	0.1 %	2.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,245	91.9 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 100 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER6: S0 Services: Psych: Past 6 months had an overnight stay**

*Location:* 3202-3205 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has stayed overnight in a Psych facility in the past 6 months.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed

- Study 29961 -

through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	78	5.8 %	77.2%
1	Yes	23	1.7 %	22.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,245	91.9 %	-

Based upon 101 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER7: S0 Services: RTC: Ever have an overnight stay**

*Location:* 3206-3209 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has had an overnight stay in a RTC facility.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,095	80.9 %	81.4%
1	Yes	251	18.5 %	18.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER8: S0 Services: RTC: Age 1st time stayed overnight**

*Location:* 3210-3213 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subjects age at first stay in a RTC facility.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 or Younger	16	1.2 %	6.4%
10	-	7	0.5 %	2.8%
11	-	14	1.0 %	5.6%
12	-	29	2.1 %	11.6%
13	-	32	2.4 %	12.8%
14	-	46	3.4 %	18.4%
15	-	49	3.6 %	19.6%
16	-	43	3.2 %	17.2%
17	-	13	1.0 %	5.2%
18	-	1	0.1 %	0.4%

**Missing Data**

-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,095	80.9 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 250 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER9: S0 Services: RTC: Past 6 months had an overnight stay**

- Study 29961 -

*Location:* 3214-3217 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has stayed overnight in a RTC facility in the past 6 months.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	154	11.4 %	61.4%
1	Yes	97	7.2 %	38.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,095	80.9 %	-

Based upon 251 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER10: S0 Services: Foster: Ever have an overnight stay**

*Location:* 3218-3221 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has had an overnight stay in a Foster Care facility.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at

- Study 29961 -

the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,265	93.4 %	94.0%
1	Yes	81	6.0 %	6.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER12: S0 Services: Foster: Age 1st time stayed overnight**

*Location:* 3222-3225 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subjects age at first stay in a Foster Care facility.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 or Younger	42	3.1 %	53.2%
10	-	4	0.3 %	5.1%
11	-	5	0.4 %	6.3%
12	-	7	0.5 %	8.9%
13	-	5	0.4 %	6.3%
14	-	6	0.4 %	7.6%
15	-	6	0.4 %	7.6%
16	-	4	0.3 %	5.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,265	93.4 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 79 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER13: S0 Services: Foster: Past 6 months had an overnight stay**

*Location:* 3226-3229 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has stayed overnight in a Foster Care facility in the past 6 months.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	72	5.3 %	88.9%
1	Yes	9	0.7 %	11.1%

**Missing Data**

-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,265	93.4 %	-

Based upon 81 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER11: S0 Services: Foster: Number different foster families lived with**

*Location:* 3230-3233 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Number different foster families the subject has lived with.

- Study 29961 -

**MEASURE: Services and Medications**

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	-	46	3.4 %	58.2%
2	-	14	1.0 %	17.7%
3	-	5	0.4 %	6.3%
4	-	4	0.3 %	5.1%
5	-	2	0.1 %	2.5%
6	-	1	0.1 %	1.3%
8	-	1	0.1 %	1.3%
10	-	2	0.1 %	2.5%
17	-	1	0.1 %	1.3%
20	-	2	0.1 %	2.5%
74	-	1	0.1 %	1.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,265	93.4 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 79 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER14: S0 Services: Det: Ever have an overnight stay**

*Location:* 3234-3237 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has had an overnight stay in a Detention facility.

**MEASURE: Services and Medications**

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have

- Study 29961 -

received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	538	39.7 %	40.0%
1	Yes	808	59.7 %	60.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER15: S0 Services: Det: Age 1st time stayed overnight**

*Location:* 3238-3241 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subjects age at first stay in a Detention facility.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
9	9 or Younger	16	1.2 %	2.0%
10	-	17	1.3 %	2.1%
11	-	29	2.1 %	3.6%
12	-	73	5.4 %	9.0%
13	-	125	9.2 %	15.5%
14	-	186	13.7 %	23.0%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
15	-	186	13.7 %	23.0%
16	-	124	9.2 %	15.3%
17	-	50	3.7 %	6.2%
18	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	538	39.7 %	-

Based upon 808 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER16: S0 Services: Det: Past 6 months had an overnight stay**

*Location:* 3242-3245 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has stayed overnight in a Detention facility in the past 6 months.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	387	28.6 %	47.9%
1	Yes	421	31.1 %	52.1%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	538	39.7 %	-

Based upon 808 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER17: S0 Services: Shelter: Ever have an overnight stay**

*Location:* 3246-3249 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has had an overnight stay in a Shelter facility.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,236	91.3 %	91.8%
1	Yes	110	8.1 %	8.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER18: S0 Services: Shelter: Age 1st time stayed overnight**

*Location:* 3250-3253 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subjects age at first stay in a Shelter facility.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 or Younger	38	2.8 %	35.8%
10	-	14	1.0 %	13.2%
11	-	6	0.4 %	5.7%
12	-	10	0.7 %	9.4%
13	-	8	0.6 %	7.5%
14	-	14	1.0 %	13.2%
15	-	9	0.7 %	8.5%
16	-	4	0.3 %	3.8%
17	-	3	0.2 %	2.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,236	91.3 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 106 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER19: S0 Services: Shelter: Past 6 months had an overnight stay**

*Location:* 3254-3257 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has stayed overnight in a Shelter facility in the past 6 months.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	95	7.0 %	86.4%
1	Yes	15	1.1 %	13.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,236	91.3 %	-

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

**S0SER20: S0 Services: Other: Ever have an overnight stay**

*Location:* 3258-3261 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has had an overnight stay in a Other facility.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,308	96.6 %	97.2%
1	Yes	38	2.8 %	2.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER22: S0 Services: Other: Age 1st time stayed overnight**

*Location:* 3262-3265 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subjects age at first stay in a Other facility.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed

- Study 29961 -

through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
9	9 or Younger	1	0.1 %	2.6%
10	-	2	0.1 %	5.3%
11	-	2	0.1 %	5.3%
12	-	2	0.1 %	5.3%
13	-	5	0.4 %	13.2%
14	-	5	0.4 %	13.2%
15	-	10	0.7 %	26.3%
16	-	9	0.7 %	23.7%
17	-	2	0.1 %	5.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,308	96.6 %	-

Based upon 38 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER23: S0 Services: Other: Past 6 months had an overnight stay**

*Location:* 3266-3269 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has stayed overnight in a Other facility in the past 6 months.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	23	1.7 %	60.5%
1	Yes	15	1.1 %	39.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,308	96.6 %	-

Based upon 38 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0ANYIN: S0 Services: Any Overnight Stays in a Facility**

*Location:* 3270-3273 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

A marker for cases which have at least 1 residential service.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	418	30.9 %	31.1%
1	Yes	928	68.5 %	68.9%
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0OVERNT: S0 Services: Overnight Services By Type - Total Count**

*Location:* 3274-3277 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

A count of the number of residential services ever received.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	418	30.9 %	31.1%
1	-	581	42.9 %	43.2%
2	-	216	16.0 %	16.0%
3	-	98	7.2 %	7.3%
4	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
5	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER24: S0 CommBased: Ever go to psychologist/counselor/social worker**

*Location:* 3278-3281 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has gone to psychologist/counselor/social worker. An ever question.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	930	68.7 %	69.1%
1	Yes	416	30.7 %	30.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER25: S0 CommBased: Age 1st time went to psychologist/counselor/social worker**

*Location:* 3282-3285 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subjects age at 1st time went to psychologist/counselor/social worker.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 or Younger	61	4.5 %	14.8%
10	-	15	1.1 %	3.6%
11	-	25	1.8 %	6.1%
12	-	46	3.4 %	11.1%
13	-	61	4.5 %	14.8%
14	-	64	4.7 %	15.5%
15	-	73	5.4 %	17.7%
16	-	45	3.3 %	10.9%
17	-	21	1.6 %	5.1%
18	-	2	0.1 %	0.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	930	68.7 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 413 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER26: S0 CommBased: Past 6mo go to psychologist/counselor/social worker**

*Location:* 3286-3289 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has gone to psychologist/counselor/social worker in the past 6 months.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	180	13.3 %	43.3%
1	Yes	236	17.4 %	56.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	930	68.7 %	-

Based upon 416 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER27: S0 CommBased: Go to psychologist/counselor/social for d/a treatment**

*Location:* 3290-3293 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject currently goes to psychologist/counselor/social for drug or alcohol treatment.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	293	21.6 %	70.6%
1	Yes	122	9.0 %	29.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	930	68.7 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

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

**S0SER28: S0 CommBased: Ever go to community support groups**

*Location:* 3294-3297 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has gone to community support groups. An ever question.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,174	86.7 %	87.2%
1	Yes	172	12.7 %	12.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER29: S0 CommBased: Age 1st time went to community support groups**

*Location:* 3298-3301 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subjects age at 1st time went to community support groups.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 or Younger	2	0.1 %	1.2%
11	-	4	0.3 %	2.3%
12	-	9	0.7 %	5.2%
13	-	16	1.2 %	9.3%
14	-	28	2.1 %	16.3%
15	-	49	3.6 %	28.5%
16	-	41	3.0 %	23.8%
17	-	21	1.6 %	12.2%
18	-	2	0.1 %	1.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,174	86.7 %	-

Based upon 172 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0SER30: S0 CommBased: Past 6mo go to community support groups

Location: 3302-3305 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

#### Question:

The subject has gone to to community support groups in the past 6 months.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	80	5.9 %	46.5%
1	Yes	92	6.8 %	53.5%

#### Missing Data

-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,174	86.7 %	-

Based upon 172 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0SER31: S0 CommBased: Go to community support groups for d/a treatment

Location: 3306-3309 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

#### Question:

The subject currently goes to community support groups for drug or alcohol treatment.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and

- Study 29961 -

the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	35	2.6 %	20.3%
1	Yes	137	10.1 %	79.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,174	86.7 %	-

Based upon 172 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER32: S0 CommBased: Ever go to priest/minister/clergy/healer**

*Location:* 3310-3313 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has gone to priest/minister/clergy/healer. An ever question.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,292	95.4 %	96.0%
1	Yes	54	4.0 %	4.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER33: S0 CommBased: Age 1st time went to priest/minister/clergy/healer**

- Study 29961 -

Location: 3314-3317 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subjects age at 1st time went to priest/minister/clergy/healer.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 or Younger	4	0.3 %	7.4%
10	-	2	0.1 %	3.7%
11	-	1	0.1 %	1.9%
12	-	5	0.4 %	9.3%
13	-	3	0.2 %	5.6%
14	-	9	0.7 %	16.7%
15	-	13	1.0 %	24.1%
16	-	15	1.1 %	27.8%
17	-	2	0.1 %	3.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,292	95.4 %	-

Based upon 54 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER34: S0 CommBased: Past 6mo go to priest/minister/clergy/healer**

Location: 3318-3321 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has gone to to priest/minister/clergy/healer in the past 6 months

MEASURE: Services and Medications

- Study 29961 -

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	24	1.8 %	44.4%
1	Yes	30	2.2 %	55.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,292	95.4 %	-

Based upon 54 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER35: S0 CommBased: Go to priest/minister/clergy/healer for d/a treatment**

*Location:* 3322-3325 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject currently goes to priest/minister/clergy/healer for drug or alcohol treatment.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	38	2.8 %	70.4%
1	Yes	16	1.2 %	29.6%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,292	95.4 %	-

Based upon 54 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER36: S0 CommBased: Ever had people come into home for counseling**

*Location:* 3326-3329 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has had people come into home for counseling. An ever question.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,173	86.6 %	87.2%
1	Yes	172	12.7 %	12.8%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,345 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER37: S0 CommBased: Age 1st time had people come into home for counseling**

*Location:* 3330-3333 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subjects age at 1st time had people come into home for counseling.

- Study 29961 -

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 or Younger	6	0.4 %	3.5%
10	-	4	0.3 %	2.3%
11	-	10	0.7 %	5.8%
12	-	19	1.4 %	11.1%
13	-	22	1.6 %	12.9%
14	-	48	3.5 %	28.1%
15	-	32	2.4 %	18.7%
16	-	19	1.4 %	11.1%
17	-	11	0.8 %	6.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,174	86.7 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 171 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER38: S0 CommBased: Past 6mo had people come into home for counseling**

*Location:* 3334-3337 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has had people came into home for counseling in the past 6 months.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

- Study 29961 -

jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	102	7.5 %	59.3%
1	Yes	70	5.2 %	40.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,174	86.7 %	-

Based upon 172 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER39: S0 CommBased: Had people come into home for counseling for d/a treatment**

*Location:* 3338-3341 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has had People came into home for counseling for drug or alcohol treatment.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	139	10.3 %	81.3%
1	Yes	32	2.4 %	18.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,174	86.7 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Based upon 171 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER52: S0 CommBased: Ever go to partial hospitalization/day program**

*Location:* 3342-3345 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has gone to partial hospitalization/day program. An ever question.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,274	94.1 %	94.7%
1	Yes	72	5.3 %	5.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER53: S0 CommBased: Age 1st time went to partial hospitalization/day program**

*Location:* 3346-3349 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subjects age at 1st time went to partial hospitalization/day program.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and

- Study 29961 -

the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
10	-	4	0.3 %	5.6%
11	-	1	0.1 %	1.4%
12	-	8	0.6 %	11.1%
13	-	12	0.9 %	16.7%
14	-	18	1.3 %	25.0%
15	-	10	0.7 %	13.9%
16	-	14	1.0 %	19.4%
17	-	5	0.4 %	6.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,274	94.1 %	-

Based upon 72 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER54: S0 CommBased: Past 6mo went to partial hospitalization/day program**

*Location:* 3350-3353 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject went to partial hospitalization/day program in the past 6 months.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	50	3.7 %	69.4%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Yes	22	1.6 %	30.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,274	94.1 %	-

Based upon 72 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER55: S0 CommBased: Go to partial hospitalization/day program for d/a treatment**

*Location:* 3354-3357 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject currently goes to partial hospitalization/day prog for drug or alcohol treatment.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	35	2.6 %	48.6%
1	Yes	37	2.7 %	51.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,274	94.1 %	-

Based upon 72 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER40: S0 CommBased: Ever went to the ER**

*Location:* 3358-3361 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject went to the hospital emergency room. An ever question.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,282	94.7 %	95.2%
1	Yes	64	4.7 %	4.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER41: S0 CommBased: Age 1st time went to the ER**

*Location:* 3362-3365 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subjects age at 1st time went to the hospital emergency room.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 or Younger	3	0.2 %	4.7%
10	-	2	0.1 %	3.1%
11	-	1	0.1 %	1.6%
12	-	3	0.2 %	4.7%
13	-	8	0.6 %	12.5%
14	-	12	0.9 %	18.8%
15	-	10	0.7 %	15.6%
16	-	18	1.3 %	28.1%
17	-	7	0.5 %	10.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,282	94.7 %	-

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

**S0SER42: S0 CommBased: Past 6mo went to the ER**

*Location:* 3366-3369 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject went to the hospital emergency room in the past 6 months.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	43	3.2 %	67.2%
1	Yes	21	1.6 %	32.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,282	94.7 %	-

- Study 29961 -

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

**S0SER43: S0 CommBased: Went to the ER for d/a treatment**

*Location:* 3370-3373 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject went to the hospital emergency room for drug or alcohol treatment.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	17	1.3 %	26.6%
1	Yes	47	3.5 %	73.4%

*Missing Data*

-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,282	94.7 %	-

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

**S0SER44: S0 CommBased: Ever go to counselor/special teacher at school**

*Location:* 3374-3377 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has gone to counselor/special teacher at school. An ever question.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric

- Study 29961 -

treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	1,223	90.3 %	90.9%
1	Yes	123	9.1 %	9.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER45: S0 CommBased: Age 1st time went to counselor/special teacher at school**

*Location:* 3378-3381 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subjects age at 1st time went to counselor/special teacher at school.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
9	9 or Younger	11	0.8 %	9.0%
10	-	3	0.2 %	2.5%
11	-	6	0.4 %	4.9%
12	-	14	1.0 %	11.5%
13	-	15	1.1 %	12.3%
14	-	36	2.7 %	29.5%
15	-	17	1.3 %	13.9%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
16	-	14	1.0 %	11.5%
17	-	5	0.4 %	4.1%
18	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,223	90.3 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 122 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER46: S0 CommBased: Past 6mo went to counselor/special teacher at school**

*Location:* 3382-3385 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject went to counselor/special teacher at school in the past 6 months.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	82	6.1 %	66.7%
1	Yes	41	3.0 %	33.3%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,223	90.3 %	-

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

**S0SER47: S0 CommBased: Go to counselor/special teacher at school for d/a treatment**

*Location:* 3386-3389 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject goes to counselor/special teacher at school for drug or alcohol treatment.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	84	6.2 %	68.3%
1	Yes	39	2.9 %	31.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,223	90.3 %	-

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

**S0SER48: S0 CommBased: Ever go to school for kids with special needs**

*Location:* 3390-3393 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has gone to school for kids with special needs. An ever question.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,279	94.5 %	95.1%
1	Yes	66	4.9 %	4.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,345 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER49: S0 CommBased: Age 1st time went to school for kids with special needs**

*Location:* 3394-3397 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subjects age at 1st time went to school for kids with special needs.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 or Younger	2	0.1 %	3.0%
10	-	4	0.3 %	6.1%
11	-	2	0.1 %	3.0%
12	-	6	0.4 %	9.1%
13	-	21	1.6 %	31.8%
14	-	12	0.9 %	18.2%
15	-	12	0.9 %	18.2%
16	-	7	0.5 %	10.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,280	94.5 %	-

Based upon 66 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER50: S0 CommBased: Past 6mo went to school for kids with special needs**

*Location:* 3398-3401 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject went to school for kids with special needs in the past 6 months.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	41	3.0 %	62.1%
1	Yes	25	1.8 %	37.9%

**Missing Data**

-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,280	94.5 %	-

Based upon 66 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SER51: S0 CommBased: Went to school for kids with special needs for d/a treatment**

*Location:* 3402-3405 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject went to school for kids with special needs for drug or alcohol treatment.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and

- Study 29961 -

the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	56	4.1 %	84.8%
1	Yes	10	0.7 %	15.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Service not endorsed	1,280	94.5 %	-

Based upon 66 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0ANYCOM: S0 Services: Ever receive any community service**

*Location:* 3406-3409 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

A marker for cases which have had at least 1 community service. An ever question.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	726	53.6 %	53.9%
1	Yes	620	45.8 %	46.1%
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0COMMUN: S0 Services: Total number community services ever received - count by type**

*Location:* 3410-3413 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

- Study 29961 -

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -300 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

A count of the number of community services ever received. Count by type.

**MEASURE: Services and Medications**

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	726	53.6 %	53.9%
1	-	317	23.4 %	23.6%
2	-	179	13.2 %	13.3%
3	-	67	4.9 %	5.0%
4	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
5	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
6	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0INDIV: S0 Services: Ever receive individual community services**

Location: 3414-3417 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -300 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

A marker for cases which have been involved with individual services in the community. An ever question.

**MEASURE: Services and Medications**

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric

- Study 29961 -

treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	901	66.5 %	66.9%
1	Yes	445	32.9 %	33.1%
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0GROUP: S0 Services: Ever receive group community services**

*Location:* 3418-3421 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

A marker for cases which have been involved with group services in the community. An ever question.

**MEASURE: Services and Medications**

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,137	84.0 %	84.5%
1	Yes	209	15.4 %	15.5%
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0HOFAM: S0 Services: Ever receive in-home counseling for youth/family**

*Location:* 3422-3425 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

A marker for cases which have been involved with in-home services for youth/family. An ever question.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,174	86.7 %	87.2%
1	Yes	172	12.7 %	12.8%
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SCHOOL: S0 Services: Ever receive school services**

*Location:* 3426-3429 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

A marker for cases which have been involved with school-based services. An ever question.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,170	86.4 %	86.9%
1	Yes	176	13.0 %	13.1%
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MED53: S0 Medication: Age 1st time on prescription med**

*Location:* 3430-3433 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

The subjects age at 1st time on prescription medication.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	9 or Younger	65	4.8 %	22.3%
10	-	22	1.6 %	7.5%
11	-	23	1.7 %	7.9%
12	-	28	2.1 %	9.6%
13	-	39	2.9 %	13.4%
14	-	36	2.7 %	12.3%
15	-	36	2.7 %	12.3%
16	-	23	1.7 %	7.9%
17	-	18	1.3 %	6.2%
18	-	2	0.1 %	0.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	4	0.3 %	-

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

**S0MED54: S0 Medication: PRIOR to past 6 months: Number meds on**

*Location:* 3434-3437 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Number of medications taken PRIOR to the past 6 months.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	42	3.1 %	14.4%
1	-	140	10.3 %	47.9%
2	-	54	4.0 %	18.5%
3	-	27	2.0 %	9.2%
4	-	17	1.3 %	5.8%
5	-	4	0.3 %	1.4%
6	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
7	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
8	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
9	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
14	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
15	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
18	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
29	-	1	0.1 %	0.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	4	0.3 %	-

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

**S0PRIORMED01: S0 Medication: PRIOR to past 6 months: Coded name of Med01**

*Location:* 3438-3442 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -103 , -102 , -101

**Question:**

Coded name of Med01 taken PRIOR to the past 6 months.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	250	18.5 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data Missing	8	0.6 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Number of meds taken prior to past 6 months unknown	4	0.3 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken prior to past 6 months	42	3.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 250 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PRIORMEDCATEGORY01: S0 Medication: PRIOR to past 6 months: Category for Med01**

*Location:* 3443-3446 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -104 , -103 , -102 , -101

**Question:**

Category for Med01 taken PRIOR to the past 6 months.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
100	Antipsychotic	7	0.5 %	2.8%
200	Anti-manic	4	0.3 %	1.6%
300	Antidepressant	82	6.1 %	32.8%
500	Anxiolytic Drugs	2	0.1 %	0.8%
700	Anti-Convulsant	26	1.9 %	10.4%
800	Analgesics	121	8.9 %	48.4%
900	Drug dependency therapy	3	0.2 %	1.2%
999	Category Unknown	5	0.4 %	2.0%

*Missing Data*

-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Number of meds taken prior to past six months unknown	4	0.3 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken prior to past six months	42	3.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 250 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PRIORMED02: S0 Medication: PRIOR to past 6 months: Coded name of Med02**

*Location:* 3447-3451 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -104 , -103 , -102 , -101

**Question:**

Coded name of Med02 taken PRIOR to the past 6 months.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA;

- Study 29961 -

Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	110	8.1 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data Missing	8	0.6 %	-
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken prior to past 6 months	140	10.3 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Number of meds taken prior to past 6 months unknown	4	0.3 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken prior to past 6 months	42	3.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

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

**S0PRIORMEDCATEGORY02: S0 Medication: PRIOR to past 6 months: Category for Med02**

*Location:* 3452-3455 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -104 , -103 , -102 , -101

**Question:**

Category for Med02 taken PRIOR to the past 6 months.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
100	Antipsychotic	12	0.9 %	10.9%
200	Anti-manic	4	0.3 %	3.6%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
300	Antidepressant	34	2.5 %	30.9%
500	Anxiolytic Drugs	6	0.4 %	5.5%
700	Anti-Convulsant	14	1.0 %	12.7%
800	Analgesics	26	1.9 %	23.6%
900	Drug dependency therapy	8	0.6 %	7.3%
999	Category Unknown	6	0.4 %	5.5%

*Missing Data*

-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken prior to past six months	140	10.3 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Number of meds taken prior to past six months unknown	4	0.3 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken prior to past six months	42	3.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

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

**S0PRIORMED03: S0 Medication: PRIOR to past 6 months: Coded name of Med03**

*Location:* 3456-3460 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -104 , -103 , -102 , -101

**Question:**

Coded name of Med03 taken PRIOR to the past 6 months.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	56	4.1 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data Missing	8	0.6 %	-
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken prior to past 6 months	194	14.3 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Number of meds taken prior to past 6 months unknown	4	0.3 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-102 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken prior to past 6 months	42	3.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 56 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PRIORMEDCATEGORY03: S0 Medication: PRIOR to past 6 months: Category for Med03**

*Location:* 3461-3464 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -104 , -103 , -102 , -101

**Question:**

Category for Med03 taken PRIOR to the past 6 months.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
100	Antipsychotic	13	1.0 %	23.2%
300	Antidepressant	18	1.3 %	32.1%
500	Anxiolytic Drugs	2	0.1 %	3.6%
600	Anti-Parkinson	2	0.1 %	3.6%
700	Anti-Convulsant	6	0.4 %	10.7%
800	Analgesics	9	0.7 %	16.1%
900	Drug dependency therapy	3	0.2 %	5.4%
999	Category Unknown	3	0.2 %	5.4%

**Missing Data**

-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken prior to past six months	194	14.3 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Number of meds taken prior to past six months unknown	4	0.3 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken prior to past six months	42	3.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 56 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

- Study 29961 -

**S0PRIORMED04: S0 Medication: PRIOR to past 6 months: Coded name of Med04**

*Location:* 3465-3469 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -104 , -103 , -102 , -101

**Question:**

Coded name of Med04 taken PRIOR to the past 6 months.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	29	2.1 %	100.0%

**Missing Data**

-200 (M)	Data Missing	8	0.6 %	-
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken prior to past 6 months	221	16.3 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Number of meds taken prior to past 6 months unknown	4	0.3 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken prior to past 6 months	42	3.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 29 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PRIORMEDCATEGORY04: S0 Medication: PRIOR to past 6 months: Category for Med04**

*Location:* 3470-3473 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -104 , -103 , -102 , -101

**Question:**

Category for Med04 taken PRIOR to the past 6 months.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have

- Study 29961 -

received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
100	Antipsychotic	3	0.2 %	10.3%
200	Anti-manic	2	0.1 %	6.9%
300	Antidepressant	8	0.6 %	27.6%
500	Anxiolytic Drugs	1	0.1 %	3.4%
600	Anti-Parkinson	2	0.1 %	6.9%
700	Anti-Convulsant	4	0.3 %	13.8%
800	Analgesics	6	0.4 %	20.7%
900	Drug dependency therapy	1	0.1 %	3.4%
999	Category Unknown	2	0.1 %	6.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken prior to past six months	221	16.3 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Number of meds taken prior to past six months unknown	4	0.3 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken prior to past six months	42	3.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 29 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PRIORMED05: S0 Medication: PRIOR to past 6 months: Coded name of Med05**

*Location:* 3474-3478 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -104 , -103 , -102 , -101

**Question:**

Coded name of Med05 taken PRIOR to the past 6 months.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at

- Study 29961 -

the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	12	0.9 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data Missing	8	0.6 %	-
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken prior to past 6 months	238	17.6 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Number of meds taken prior to past 6 months unknown	4	0.3 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken prior to past 6 months	42	3.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 12 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PRIORMEDCATEGORY05: S0 Medication: PRIOR to past 6 months: Category for Med05**

*Location:* 3479-3482 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200 , -104 , -103 , -102 , -101

**Question:**

Category for Med05 taken PRIOR to the past 6 months.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
100	Antipsychotic	1	0.1 %	8.3%
300	Antidepressant	2	0.1 %	16.7%
700	Anti-Convulsant	2	0.1 %	16.7%
800	Analgesics	2	0.1 %	16.7%
999	Category Unknown	5	0.4 %	41.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken prior to past six months	238	17.6 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Number of meds taken prior to past six months unknown	4	0.3 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken prior to past six months	42	3.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 12 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PRIORMED06: S0 Medication: PRIOR to past 6 months: Coded name of Med06**

*Location:* 3483-3487 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -104 , -103 , -102 , -101

**Question:**

Coded name of Med06 taken PRIOR to the past 6 months.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	8	0.6 %	100.0%

**Missing Data**

-200 (M)	Data Missing	8	0.6 %	-
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken prior to past 6 months	242	17.9 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Number of meds taken prior to past 6 months unknown	4	0.3 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken prior to past 6 months	42	3.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 8 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PRIORMEDCATEGORY06: S0 Medication: PRIOR to past 6 months: Category for Med06**

*Location:* 3488-3491 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -104 , -103 , -102 , -101

**Question:**

Category for Med06 taken PRIOR to the past 6 months.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
300	Antidepressant	2	0.1 %	25.0%
999	Category Unknown	6	0.4 %	75.0%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-104 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken prior to past six months	242	17.9 %	-
-103 (M)	Skipped: Number of meds taken prior to past six months unknown	4	0.3 %	-
-102 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken prior to past six months	42	3.1 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 8 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MED61: S0 Medication: DURING past 6 months: Number meds on**

*Location:* 3492-3495 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

Number of medications taken DURING the past 6 months.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at

- Study 29961 -

the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	144	10.6 %	48.6%
1	-	72	5.3 %	24.3%
2	-	50	3.7 %	16.9%
3	-	17	1.3 %	5.7%
4	-	7	0.5 %	2.4%
5	-	6	0.4 %	2.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 296 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PAST6MOMED01: S0 Medication: DURING past 6 months: Coded name of Med01**

*Location:* 3496-3500 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200 , -105 , -101

**Question:**

Coded name of Med01 taken DURING the past 6 months.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	152	11.2 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data Missing	8	0.6 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken in past 6 months	144	10.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Based upon 152 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PAST6MOMEDCATEGORY01: S0 Medication: DURING past 6 months: Category for Med01**

*Location:* 3501-3504 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -101

**Question:**

Category for Med01 taken DURING the past 6 months.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
100	Antipsychotic	10	0.7 %	6.6%
200	Anti-manic	5	0.4 %	3.3%
300	Antidepressant	83	6.1 %	54.6%
500	Anxiolytic Drugs	2	0.1 %	1.3%
600	Anti-Parkinson	1	0.1 %	0.7%
700	Anti-Convulsant	20	1.5 %	13.2%
800	Analgesics	25	1.8 %	16.4%
900	Drug dependency therapy	1	0.1 %	0.7%
999	Category Unknown	5	0.4 %	3.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken in the past six months	144	10.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 152 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MED631: S0 Medication: Currently taking this med (Past 6mo Med01)**

*Location:* 3505-3508 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -105 , -104 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject is currently taking this med; the medication specified as (Past 6mo Med01).

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	30	2.2 %	19.7%
1	Yes	122	9.0 %	80.3%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-105 (M)	NA - not asking about this many meds	144	10.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 152 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0NHRS9: S0 Medication: Before interview when was last dose - in hours (Past 6mo Med01)**

*Location:* 3509-3516 (width: 8; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -9999999 , -9999998 , -200 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -101

**Question:**

The length of time between the last medication dose of the medication specified as (Past 6mo Med01) and the interview.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	-	10	0.7 %	8.2%
2	-	12	0.9 %	9.8%
3	-	5	0.4 %	4.1%
4	-	10	0.7 %	8.2%
5	-	6	0.4 %	4.9%
6	-	4	0.3 %	3.3%
7	-	4	0.3 %	3.3%
8	-	17	1.3 %	13.9%
9	-	6	0.4 %	4.9%
10	-	3	0.2 %	2.5%
11	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
12	-	9	0.7 %	7.4%
13	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
14	-	6	0.4 %	4.9%
15	-	3	0.2 %	2.5%
16	-	3	0.2 %	2.5%
18	-	2	0.1 %	1.6%
20	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
21	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
22	-	2	0.1 %	1.6%
24	-	7	0.5 %	5.7%
27	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
30	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
48	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
72	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
168	-	2	0.1 %	1.6%
336	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
504	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
840	-	1	0.1 %	0.8%
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: Not currently taking this med	30	2.2 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken in the past six months	144	10.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 122 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PAST6MOMED02: S0 Medication: DURING past 6 months: Coded name of Med02**

*Location:* 3517-3521 (*width:* 5; *decimal:* 0)

- Study 29961 -

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -106 , -105 , -101

**Question:**

Coded name of Med02 taken DURING the past 6 months.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	80	5.9 %	100.0%

**Missing Data**

-200 (M)	Data Missing	8	0.6 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken in the past 6 months	72	5.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken in past 6 months	144	10.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 80 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PAST6MOMEDCATEGORY02: S0 Medication: DURING past 6 months: Category for Med02**

Location: 3522-3525 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -101

**Question:**

Category for Med02 taken DURING the past 6 months.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at

- Study 29961 -

the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
100	Antipsychotic	19	1.4 %	23.8%
200	Anti-manic	4	0.3 %	5.0%
300	Antidepressant	25	1.8 %	31.2%
500	Anxiolytic Drugs	1	0.1 %	1.2%
600	Anti-Parkinson	1	0.1 %	1.2%
700	Anti-Convulsant	10	0.7 %	12.5%
800	Analgesics	8	0.6 %	10.0%
900	Drug dependency therapy	4	0.3 %	5.0%
999	Category Unknown	8	0.6 %	10.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken in the past six months	72	5.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken in the past six months	144	10.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 80 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MED632: S0 Medication: Currently taking this med (Past 6mo Med02)**

*Location:* 3526-3529 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -106 , -105 , -104 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject is currently taking this med; the medication specified as (Past 6mo Med02).

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	15	1.1 %	18.8%
1	Yes	65	4.8 %	81.2%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken in the past six months	72	5.3 %	-
-105 (M)	NA - not asking about this many meds	144	10.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 80 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0NHRS10: S0 Medication: Before interview when was last dose - in hours (Past 6mo Med02)**

*Location:* 3530-3537 (*width:* 8; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9999999 , -9999998 , -200 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -101

**Question:**

The length of time between the last medication dose of the medication specified as (Past 6mo Med02) and the interview.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	-	9	0.7 %	13.8%
2	-	4	0.3 %	6.2%
3	-	1	0.1 %	1.5%
4	-	4	0.3 %	6.2%
5	-	5	0.4 %	7.7%
6	-	2	0.1 %	3.1%
7	-	2	0.1 %	3.1%
8	-	6	0.4 %	9.2%
9	-	1	0.1 %	1.5%
10	-	2	0.1 %	3.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
11	-	1	0.1 %	1.5%
12	-	7	0.5 %	10.8%
13	-	2	0.1 %	3.1%
14	-	2	0.1 %	3.1%
15	-	3	0.2 %	4.6%
16	-	2	0.1 %	3.1%
18	-	1	0.1 %	1.5%
20	-	1	0.1 %	1.5%
21	-	1	0.1 %	1.5%
22	-	1	0.1 %	1.5%
23	-	1	0.1 %	1.5%
24	-	6	0.4 %	9.2%
672	-	1	0.1 %	1.5%
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: Not currently taking this med	15	1.1 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken in the past six months	72	5.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken in the past six months	144	10.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 65 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PAST6MOMED03: S0 Medication: DURING past 6 months: Coded name of Med03**

*Location:* 3538-3542 (*width:* 5; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200 , -106 , -105 , -101

**Question:**

Coded name of Med03 taken DURING the past 6 months.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	30	2.2 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data Missing	8	0.6 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken in the past 6 months	122	9.0 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken in past 6 months	144	10.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 30 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PAST6MOMEDCATEGORY03: S0 Medication: DURING past 6 months: Category for Med03**

*Location:* 3543-3546 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -101

**Question:**

Category for Med03 taken DURING the past 6 months.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
100	Antipsychotic	6	0.4 %	20.0%
200	Anti-manic	3	0.2 %	10.0%
300	Antidepressant	12	0.9 %	40.0%
500	Anxiolytic Drugs	1	0.1 %	3.3%
600	Anti-Parkinson	1	0.1 %	3.3%
700	Anti-Convulsant	3	0.2 %	10.0%
800	Analgesics	2	0.1 %	6.7%
999	Category Unknown	2	0.1 %	6.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken in the past six months	122	9.0 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-105 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken in the past six months	144	10.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 30 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MED633: S0 Medication: Currently taking this med (Past 6mo Med03)**

*Location:* 3547-3550 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -106 , -105 , -104 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject is currently taking this med; the medication specified as (Past 6mo Med03).

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	7	0.5 %	23.3%
1	Yes	23	1.7 %	76.7%

**Missing Data**

-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken in the past six months	122	9.0 %	-
-105 (M)	NA - not asking about this many meds	144	10.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 30 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0NHRS11: S0 Medication: Before interview when was last dose - in hours (Past 6mo Med03)**

*Location:* 3551-3558 (width: 8; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9999999 , -9999998 , -200 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -101

**Question:**

- Study 29961 -

The length of time between the last medication dose of the medication specified as (Past 6mo Med03) and the interview.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	-	2	0.1 %	8.7%
3	-	1	0.1 %	4.3%
4	-	2	0.1 %	8.7%
5	-	1	0.1 %	4.3%
6	-	1	0.1 %	4.3%
8	-	5	0.4 %	21.7%
10	-	1	0.1 %	4.3%
11	-	1	0.1 %	4.3%
12	-	3	0.2 %	13.0%
13	-	1	0.1 %	4.3%
14	-	2	0.1 %	8.7%
15	-	2	0.1 %	8.7%
24	-	1	0.1 %	4.3%
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: Not currently taking this med	7	0.5 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken in the past six months	122	9.0 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken in the past six months	144	10.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

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

**S0PAST6MOMED04: S0 Medication: DURING past 6 months: Coded name of Med04**

*Location:* 3559-3563 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -106 , -105 , -101

**Question:**

Coded name of Med04 taken DURING the past 6 months.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	13	1.0 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data Missing	8	0.6 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken in the past 6 months	139	10.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken in past 6 months	144	10.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 13 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PAST6MOMEDCATEGORY04: S0 Medication: DURING past 6 months: Category for Med04**

*Location:* 3564-3567 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -101

**Question:**

Category for Med04 taken DURING the past 6 months.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
100	Antipsychotic	5	0.4 %	38.5%
200	Anti-manic	1	0.1 %	7.7%
300	Antidepressant	1	0.1 %	7.7%
600	Anti-Parkinson	2	0.1 %	15.4%
800	Analgesics	3	0.2 %	23.1%
999	Category Unknown	1	0.1 %	7.7%

*Missing Data*

-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken in the past six months	139	10.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken in the past six months	144	10.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 13 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MED634: S0 Medication: Currently taking this med (Past 6mo Med04)**

*Location:* 3568-3571 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -106 , -105 , -104 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject is currently taking this med; the medication specified as (Past 6mo Med04).

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	7	0.5 %	53.8%
1	Yes	6	0.4 %	46.2%

*Missing Data*

-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken in the past six months	139	10.3 %	-
-105 (M)	NA - not asking about this many meds	144	10.6 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

Based upon 13 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0NHRS12: S0 Medication: Before interview when was last dose - in hours (Past 6mo Med04)**

*Location:* 3572-3579 (width: 8; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9999999 , -9999998 , -200 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -101

**Question:**

The length of time between the last medication dose of the medication specified as (Past 6mo Med04) and the interview.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	-	1	0.1 %	16.7%
4	-	1	0.1 %	16.7%
8	-	2	0.1 %	33.3%
11	-	1	0.1 %	16.7%
24	-	1	0.1 %	16.7%
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: Not currently taking this med	7	0.5 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken in the past six months	139	10.3 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken in the past six months	144	10.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

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

**S0PAST6MOMED05: S0 Medication: DURING past 6 months: Coded name of Med05**

*Location:* 3580-3584 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -106 , -105 , -101

**Question:**

Coded name of Med05 taken DURING the past 6 months.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	6	0.4 %	100.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data Missing	8	0.6 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken in the past 6 months	146	10.8 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken in past 6 months	144	10.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

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

**S0PAST6MOMEDCATEGORY05: S0 Medication: DURING past 6 months: Category for Med05**

*Location:* 3585-3588 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -101

**Question:**

Category for Med05 taken DURING the past 6 months.

MEASURE: Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
100	Antipsychotic	1	0.1 %	16.7%
300	Antidepressant	3	0.2 %	50.0%
700	Anti-Convulsant	1	0.1 %	16.7%
999	Category Unknown	1	0.1 %	16.7%

  

<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken in the past six months	146	10.8 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken in the past six months	144	10.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

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

#### **S0MED635: S0 Medication: Currently taking this med (Past 6mo Med05)**

*Location:* 3589-3592 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -106 , -105 , -104 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

#### **Question:**

The subject is currently taking this med; the medication specified as (Past 6mo Med05).

#### **MEASURE: Services and Medications**

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	2	0.1 %	33.3%
1	Yes	4	0.3 %	66.7%

  

<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken in the past six months	146	10.8 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-105 (M)	NA - not asking about this many meds	144	10.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

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

**S0NHRS13: S0 Medication: Before interview when was last dose - in hours (Past 6mo Med05)**

*Location:* 3593-3600 (width: 8; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -9999999 , -9999998 , -200 , -107 , -106 , -105 , -101

**Question:**

The length of time between the last medication dose of the medication specified as (Past 6mo Med05) and the interview.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
3	-	1	0.1 %	25.0%
8	-	2	0.1 %	50.0%
17	-	1	0.1 %	25.0%
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-
-107 (M)	Skipped: Not currently taking this med	2	0.1 %	-
-106 (M)	Skipped: No additional meds taken in the past six months	146	10.8 %	-
-105 (M)	Skipped: Zero meds taken in the past six months	144	10.6 %	-
-101 (M)	Skipped: Subject has never been on medication	1,050	77.5 %	-

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

**S0MEDSEV: S0 Medication: Ever on Px Meds**

*Location:* 3601-3604 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

The subject has taken prescription medications. An ever question.

**MEASURE:** Services and Medications

Participation in both residential and community-based social services is assessed through a modified version of the Child and Adolescent Services Assessment (CASA; Burns, et al., 1992). At the baseline interview, subjects are asked if they have received services in a range of settings (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment, psychiatric treatment, hospitalizations, foster care, family counseling, detention /prison / jail stays, priest/minister/clergy visitations) across both the juvenile justice and the mental health sector. A history of medication use is also obtained (medication name and recency of last dose). Once endorsed, follow-up questions obtain the age at the initial receipt of the treatment and the recency of this service use.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	1,050	77.5 %	78.0%
1	Yes	296	21.9 %	22.0%
-200 (M)	Data missing	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SOCAP2: S0 SocCap: Social Integration**

*Location:* 3605-3611 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

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?"). 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)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	None/Never	20	1.5 %	1.5%
1.20	-	37	2.7 %	2.7%
1.25	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
1.40	-	74	5.5 %	5.5%
1.50	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
1.60	-	121	8.9 %	8.9%
1.67	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
1.75	-	34	2.5 %	2.5%
1.80	-	149	11.0 %	11.0%
2.00	A few/Rarely	191	14.1 %	14.1%
2.20	-	171	12.6 %	12.6%
2.25	-	25	1.8 %	1.8%
2.33	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
2.40	-	143	10.6 %	10.6%
2.50	-	25	1.8 %	1.8%
2.60	-	104	7.7 %	7.7%
2.67	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.75	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
2.80	-	73	5.4 %	5.4%
3.00	Many/Sometimes	58	4.3 %	4.3%
3.20	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
3.25	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
3.33	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.40	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
3.50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.60	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
3.75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.80	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
4.00	Most/Often	5	0.4 %	0.4%

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

**S0SOCAP3: S0 SocCap: Perceived Opportunity for Work**

*Location:* 3612-3618 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

**Question:**

Social Capital - Perceived opportunity for work; mean of 5 items.

MEASURE: Social Capital

- Study 29961 -

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?"). 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	Strongly Disagree	11	0.8 %	0.8%
1.20	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.40	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
1.60	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
1.80	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
2.00	Disagree	53	3.9 %	3.9%
2.20	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
2.25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.40	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
2.60	-	39	2.9 %	2.9%
2.80	-	80	5.9 %	5.9%
3.00	Neither Agree nor Disagree	91	6.7 %	6.7%
3.20	-	125	9.2 %	9.2%
3.25	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
3.33	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.40	-	121	8.9 %	8.9%
3.50	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
3.60	-	194	14.3 %	14.3%
3.75	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
3.80	-	151	11.2 %	11.2%
4.00	Agree	226	16.7 %	16.7%
4.20	-	76	5.6 %	5.6%
4.25	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
4.40	-	38	2.8 %	2.8%
4.50	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
4.60	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
4.80	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
5.00	Strongly Agree	11	0.8 %	0.8%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-9.00 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,353 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0SCCLINT: S0 SocCap: Closure and Integration

*Location:* 3619-3625 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

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

#### Question:

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?"). 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)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.00	None	8	0.6 %	0.6%
1.13	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
1.25	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
1.29	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
1.38	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
1.40	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
1.50	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
1.57	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
1.60	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.63	-	29	2.1 %	2.1%
1.71	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
1.75	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
1.86	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
1.88	-	68	5.0 %	5.0%
2.00	A Few	83	6.1 %	6.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2.13	-	75	5.5 %	5.5%
2.14	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
2.17	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
2.25	-	93	6.9 %	6.9%
2.29	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
2.38	-	110	8.1 %	8.1%
2.43	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
2.50	-	111	8.2 %	8.2%
2.57	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
2.63	-	99	7.3 %	7.3%
2.67	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
2.71	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
2.75	-	86	6.4 %	6.4%
2.80	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
2.83	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
2.86	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
2.88	-	100	7.4 %	7.4%
3.00	Many	82	6.1 %	6.1%
3.13	-	63	4.7 %	4.7%
3.14	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
3.17	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
3.20	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.25	-	39	2.9 %	2.9%
3.29	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
3.38	-	25	1.8 %	1.8%
3.43	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
3.50	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
3.57	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
3.60	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
3.63	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
3.67	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.75	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
3.88	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
4.00	Most	4	0.3 %	0.3%

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

**S0MOEDUC: S0 SES: Mothers education level**

Location: 3626-3629 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -102 , -101 , -100 , -99 , -97

**Question:**

Education level of biological mother.

MEASURE: SES

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Some grad or prof school/prof or grad school	11	0.8 %	0.9%
2	College graduate	50	3.7 %	3.9%
3	Business or trade school/some college/grad of 2-yr college	222	16.4 %	17.3%
4	High school diploma	414	30.6 %	32.2%
5	Some high school	434	32.1 %	33.8%
6	Grade school or less	153	11.3 %	11.9%

*Missing Data*

-102 (M)	BL = DK, Collat = single parent hh w/o mom	3	0.2 %	-
-101 (M)	BL = single parent hh w/o mom, Collat missing	5	0.4 %	-
-100 (M)	BL = DK, Collateral missing	24	1.8 %	-
-99 (M)	Both BL and Collateral = DK	6	0.4 %	-
-97 (M)	Both BL and Collateral = single parent hh w/o mom	32	2.4 %	-

Based upon 1,284 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0FAEDUC: S0 SES: Fathers education level**

*Location:* 3630-3633 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -103 , -102 , -101 , -100 , -99 , -97

**Question:**

Education level of biological father.

MEASURE: SES

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Some grad or prof school/prof or grad school	12	0.9 %	1.3%
2	College graduate	35	2.6 %	3.8%
3	Business or trade school/some college/grad of 2-yr college	119	8.8 %	13.0%
4	High school diploma	388	28.7 %	42.5%
5	Some high school	226	16.7 %	24.8%
6	Grade school or less	133	9.8 %	14.6%

*Missing Data*

-103 (M)	BL = single parent hh w/o dad, Collat = DK	15	1.1 %	-
----------	--	----	-------	---

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-102 (M)	BL = DK, Collat = single parent hh w/o dad	22	1.6 %	-
-101 (M)	BL = single parent hh w/o dad, Collat missing	58	4.3 %	-
-100 (M)	BL = DK, Collateral missing	24	1.8 %	-
-99 (M)	Both BL and Collateral = DK	6	0.4 %	-
-97 (M)	Both BL and Collateral = single parent hh w/o dad	316	23.3 %	-

Based upon 913 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PAEDUC: S0 SES: Parents education level**

*Location:* 3634-3640 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -97.0

**Question:**

The SES score is the mean of the biological mother and father's education level. Higher SES values reflect lower levels of education.

**MEASURE: SES**

Socioeconomic status; our SES measure relies solely on the level of education attained by the biological parents. Both the subject and the collateral report on the parent's education level, so this score relies on the lowest level of education as reported from either source.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.0	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
1.5	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
2.0	-	22	1.6 %	1.7%
2.5	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
3.0	-	129	9.5 %	9.7%
3.5	-	117	8.6 %	8.8%
4.0	-	350	25.8 %	26.3%
4.5	-	210	15.5 %	15.8%
5.0	-	292	21.6 %	22.0%
5.5	-	61	4.5 %	4.6%
6.0	-	109	8.1 %	8.2%

**Missing Data**

-97.0 (M)	Cannot compute: both subject and parent reports are either missing, DK or NA	25	1.8 %	-
-----------	--	----	-------	---

Based upon 1,329 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0MOM\_ISP: S0 SES: Mother Index of Social Position**

*Location:* 3641-3644 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -97

**Question:**

Mother Index of Social Position.

MEASURE: SES

A second set of SES variables is computed based on both education and occupation. Reported parental occupation and education were coded using a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (unskilled employees; professional degree) to 7 (unskilled employees; less than seven years of school) based on Hollingshead's index of social position (see Hollingshead, 1957). Both the subject and collateral report of the parent's education and occupation were used. More weight was given to the collateral report when the parent was the collateral reporter.

Otherwise, the lower education and occupation level was taken as reported from either source.

We then computed a parental Index of Social Position (ISP) which is based on the formula ((Occupation score X 7) + (Education score X 4)) (see Hollingshead, 1971). When both the occupation and education for the parent was unknown, the individual parent ISP score was not computed. If only one of the two components was known, the missing information was derived using the available data. A marker variable is included for both mother and father, noting when either the occupation or education score was imputed.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
11	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
15	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
18	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
19	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
22	-	27	2.0 %	2.1%
25	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
26	-	27	2.0 %	2.1%
27	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
29	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
30	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
33	-	51	3.8 %	3.9%
34	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
36	-	18	1.3 %	1.4%
37	-	32	2.4 %	2.5%
38	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
40	-	161	11.9 %	12.3%
41	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
42	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
44	-	184	13.6 %	14.1%
45	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
46	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
47	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
48	-	120	8.9 %	9.2%
50	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
51	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
52	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
54	-	31	2.3 %	2.4%
55	-	85	6.3 %	6.5%
56	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
58	-	51	3.8 %	3.9%
59	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
61	-	22	1.6 %	1.7%
62	-	52	3.8 %	4.0%
63	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
65	-	63	4.7 %	4.8%
66	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
69	-	109	8.1 %	8.4%
70	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
73	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
77	-	62	4.6 %	4.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-97 (M)	Cannot compute: Occupation and Education data unavailable	49	3.6 %	-

Based upon 1,305 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DERIVED\_MOMISP: S0 SES: Mother - flag indicating if either occupation or education was derived**

*Location:* 3645-3648 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -97

**Question:**

Mother - flag indicating if either occupation or education was derived.

MEASURE: SES

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No - neither occupation nor education were derived	1,138	84.0 %	87.2%
1	Yes - either occupation or education was derived	167	12.3 %	12.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-97 (M)	NA: Mother ISP score not computed due to insufficient data	49	3.6 %	-

Based upon 1,305 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DAD\_ISP: S0 SES: Father Index of Social Position**

*Location:* 3649-3652 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -97

**Question:**

Father Index of Social Position.

MEASURE: SES

A second set of SES variables is computed based on both education and occupation. Reported parental occupation and education were coded using a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (unskilled employees; professional degree) to 7 (unskilled employees; less than seven years of school) based on Hollingshead's index of social position (see Hollingshead, 1957). Both the subject and collateral report of the parent's education and occupation were used. More weight was given to the collateral report when the parent was the collateral reporter. Otherwise, the lower education and occupation level was taken as reported from either source.

We then computed a parental Index of Social Position (ISP) which is based on the formula ((Occupation score X 7) + (Education score X 4)) (see Hollingshead, 1971). When both the occupation and education for the parent was unknown, the individual parent ISP score was not computed. If only one of the two components was known, the missing information was derived using the available data. A marker variable is included for both mother and father, noting when either the occupation or education score was imputed.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
11	-	3	0.2 %	0.3%
15	-	3	0.2 %	0.3%
18	-	4	0.3 %	0.4%
19	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
22	-	14	1.0 %	1.5%
23	-	6	0.4 %	0.6%
25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
26	-	5	0.4 %	0.5%
27	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
29	-	4	0.3 %	0.4%
30	-	4	0.3 %	0.4%
32	-	4	0.3 %	0.4%
33	-	33	2.4 %	3.5%
36	-	12	0.9 %	1.3%
37	-	20	1.5 %	2.1%
39	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
40	-	34	2.5 %	3.6%
41	-	6	0.4 %	0.6%
44	-	136	10.0 %	14.3%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
46	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
47	-	25	1.8 %	2.6%
48	-	21	1.6 %	2.2%
49	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
50	-	4	0.3 %	0.4%
51	-	73	5.4 %	7.7%
52	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
54	-	19	1.4 %	2.0%
55	-	91	6.7 %	9.6%
56	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
57	-	3	0.2 %	0.3%
58	-	75	5.5 %	7.9%
59	-	12	0.9 %	1.3%
61	-	17	1.3 %	1.8%
62	-	39	2.9 %	4.1%
63	-	9	0.7 %	0.9%
65	-	66	4.9 %	6.9%
66	-	37	2.7 %	3.9%
69	-	66	4.9 %	6.9%
70	-	13	1.0 %	1.4%
73	-	21	1.6 %	2.2%
77	-	61	4.5 %	6.4%

*Missing Data*

-97 (M)	Cannot compute: Occupation and Education data unavailable	404	29.8 %	-
---------	---	-----	--------	---

Based upon 950 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DERIVED\_DADISP: S0 SES: Father - flag indicating if either occupation or education was derived**

*Location:* 3653-3656 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -97

**Question:**

Father - flag indicating if either occupation or education was derived.

MEASURE: SES

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No - neither occupation nor education were derived	749	55.3 %	78.8%
1	Yes - either occupation or education was derived	201	14.8 %	21.2%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-97 (M)	NA: Father ISP score not computed due to insufficient data	404	29.8 %	-

Based upon 950 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### **S0PARENT\_ISP: S0 SES: Parent Index of Social Position**

*Location:* 3657-3663 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -97.0

#### **Question:**

Parent Index of Social Position - mean of the mother and father ISP scores.

#### **MEASURE: SES**

A second set of SES variables is computed based on both education and occupation. Reported parental occupation and education were coded using a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (unskilled employees; professional degree) to 7 (unskilled employees; less than seven years of school) based on Hollingshead's index of social position (see Hollingshead, 1957). Both the subject and collateral report of the parent's education and occupation were used. More weight was given to the collateral report when the parent was the collateral reporter.

Otherwise, the lower education and occupation level was taken as reported from either source.

We then computed a parental Index of Social Position (ISP) which is based on the formula ((Occupation score X 7) + (Education score X 4)) (see Hollingshead, 1971). When both the occupation and education for the parent was unknown, the individual parent ISP score was not computed. If only one of the two components was known, the missing information was derived using the available data. A marker variable is included for both mother and father, noting when either the occupation or education score was imputed.

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
11.0	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
16.5	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
18.0	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
21.5	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
22.0	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
23.0	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
24.0	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
24.5	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
26.0	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
27.0	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
27.5	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
28.0	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
29.0	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
29.5	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
30.0	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
31.0	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
31.5	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
32.0	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
32.5	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
33.0	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
33.5	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
34.0	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
34.5	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
35.0	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
35.5	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
36.0	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
36.5	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
37.0	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
38.0	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
38.5	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
39.0	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
39.5	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
40.0	-	71	5.2 %	5.3%
40.5	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
41.0	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
41.5	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
42.0	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
42.5	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
43.0	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
43.5	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
44.0	-	103	7.6 %	7.7%
45.0	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
45.5	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
46.0	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
46.5	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
47.0	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
47.5	-	37	2.7 %	2.7%
48.0	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
48.5	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
49.0	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
49.5	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
50.0	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
50.5	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
51.0	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
51.5	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
52.0	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
52.5	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
53.0	-	38	2.8 %	2.8%
53.5	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
54.0	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
54.5	-	34	2.5 %	2.5%
55.0	-	45	3.3 %	3.3%
56.0	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
56.5	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
57.0	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
57.5	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
58.0	-	34	2.5 %	2.5%
58.5	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
59.0	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
59.5	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
60.0	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
60.5	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
61.0	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
61.5	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
62.0	-	46	3.4 %	3.4%
62.5	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
63.0	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
63.5	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
64.0	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
64.5	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
65.0	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
65.5	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
66.0	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
66.5	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
67.0	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
67.5	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
69.0	-	57	4.2 %	4.2%
69.5	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
70.0	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
71.0	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
71.5	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
73.0	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
73.5	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
75.0	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
77.0	-	37	2.7 %	2.7%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-97.0 (M)	Cannot compute: Occupation and Education data missing for both parents	8	0.6 %	-

Based upon 1,346 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0PREDWORD: S0 Stroop: Predicted Word Score

*Location:* 3664-3667 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -503 , -502 , -501 , -300

#### Question:

Predicted Word Score.

MEASURE: Stroop

Cognitive dysfunction related to impairment to the frontal cortex of the brain is assessed through the use of two well-accepted neurological tests, the Stroop Color-Word Test and the Trail Making Test. The dimensions tapped by the Stroop have been associated with cognitive flexibility, resistance to interference from outside stimuli, creativity, psychopathology and cognitive complexity (see Golden, 1978).

The Stroop Color and Word Test (Golden, 1978) is used to examine the effects of interference on reading ability. The Stroop contains three parts: word page (the names of colors printed in black ink), color page (rows of X's printed in colored ink) and word-color page (the words from the first page are printed in the colors from the second page; however, the word meanings and ink colors are mismatched), each with 5 columns containing 20 items. The subject's task is to look at each sheet and move down the columns, reading words or naming the ink colors as quickly as possible, within a given time limit (45 seconds). Three scores, as well as an interference score, are generated using the number of items completed on each page, with higher scores reflecting better performance and less interference on reading ability. The Stroop can be used on both children and adults (Grade 2 through adult), and testing can be done in approximately 5 minutes.

#### General Notes

1. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores of 40 or less are considered "low."
2. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores above 40 or are considered "normal."
3. In order for one score to be considered "higher" or "lower" than another, a 10 point or greater T score difference is required.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
90	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
91	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
92	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
93	-	67	4.9 %	4.9%
94	-	308	22.7 %	22.7%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
95	-	94	6.9 %	6.9%
96	-	332	24.5 %	24.5%
97	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
98	-	323	23.9 %	23.9%
100	-	149	11.0 %	11.0%
102	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%

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

#### **S0DWORD: S0 Stroop: Deviation Word Score**

*Location:* 3668-3671 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -503 , -502 , -501 , -300

#### **Question:**

Deviation Word Score.

**MEASURE:** Stroop

Cognitive dysfunction related to impairment to the frontal cortex of the brain is assessed through the use of two well-accepted neurological tests, the Stroop Color-Word Test and the Trail Making Test. The dimensions tapped by the Stroop have been associated with cognitive flexibility, resistance to interference from outside stimuli, creativity, psychopathology and cognitive complexity (see Golden, 1978).

The Stroop Color and Word Test (Golden, 1978) is used to examine the effects of interference on reading ability. The Stroop contains three parts: word page (the names of colors printed in black ink), color page (rows of X's printed in colored ink) and word-color page (the words from the first page are printed in the colors from the second page; however, the word meanings and ink colors are mismatched), each with 5 columns containing 20 items. The subject's task is to look at each sheet and move down the columns, reading words or naming the ink colors as quickly as possible, within a given time limit (45 seconds). Three scores, as well as an interference score, are generated using the number of items completed on each page, with higher scores reflecting better performance and less interference on reading ability. The Stroop can be used on both children and adults (Grade 2 through adult), and testing can be done in approximately 5 minutes.

#### General Notes

1. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores of 40 or less are considered "low."
2. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores above 40 or are considered "normal."
3. In order for one score to be considered "higher" or "lower" than another, a 10 point or greater T score difference is required.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-84	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-65	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
-64	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-58	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-57	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
-55	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-53	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
-50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-49	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-48	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
-47	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-46	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-45	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
-44	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
-43	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
-42	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
-41	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
-40	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
-39	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
-38	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
-37	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
-36	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
-35	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
-34	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
-33	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
-32	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
-31	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
-30	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
-29	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
-28	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
-27	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
-26	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
-25	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
-24	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
-23	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
-22	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
-21	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
-20	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
-19	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
-18	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
-17	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
-16	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
-15	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
-14	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
-13	-	44	3.2 %	3.3%
-12	-	37	2.7 %	2.8%
-11	-	41	3.0 %	3.1%
-10	-	45	3.3 %	3.4%
-9	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
-8	-	37	2.7 %	2.8%
-7	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
-6	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
-5	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
-4	-	34	2.5 %	2.5%
-3	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
-2	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
-1	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
0	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
1	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
2	-	39	2.9 %	2.9%
3	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
4	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
5	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
6	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
7	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
8	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
9	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
10	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
11	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
12	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
13	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
14	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
15	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
16	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
17	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
18	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
19	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
20	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
21	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
22	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
23	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
24	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
26	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
27	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
28	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
30	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
31	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
34	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
38	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
45	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
68	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

**Missing Data**

-503 (M)	Stroop is missing or has incomplete data	7	0.5 %	-
-502 (M)	Subject cant read - stroop skipped	1	0.1 %	-
-501 (M)	Subject is colorblind - stroop skipped	9	0.7 %	-

Based upon 1,337 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0TWORD: S0 Stroop: T-Score Word**

*Location:* 3672-3675 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -503 , -502 , -501 , -300

**Question:**

T-Score Word.

**MEASURE:** Stroop

Cognitive dysfunction related to impairment to the frontal cortex of the brain is assessed through the use of two well-accepted neurological tests, the Stroop Color-Word Test and the Trail Making Test. The dimensions tapped by the Stroop have been associated with cognitive flexibility, resistance to interference from outside stimuli, creativity, psychopathology and cognitive complexity (see Golden, 1978).

The Stroop Color and Word Test (Golden, 1978) is used to examine the effects of interference on reading ability. The Stroop contains three parts: word page (the names of colors printed in black ink), color page (rows of X's printed in colored ink) and word-color page (the words from the first page are printed in the colors from the second page; however, the word meanings and ink colors are mismatched), each with 5 columns containing 20 items. The subject's task is to look at each sheet and move down the columns, reading words or naming the ink colors as quickly as possible, within a given time limit (45 seconds). Three scores, as well as an interference score, are generated using the number of items completed on each page, with higher scores reflecting better performance and less interference on reading ability. The Stroop can be used on both children and adults (Grade 2 through adult), and testing can be done in approximately 5 minutes.

**General Notes**

1. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores of 40 or less are considered "low."
2. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores above 40 or are considered "normal."
3. In order for one score to be considered "higher" or "lower" than another, a 10 point

- Study 29961 -

or greater T score difference is required.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
15	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
16	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
17	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
18	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
19	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
20	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
21	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
22	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
23	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
24	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
25	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
26	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
27	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
28	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
29	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
30	-	38	2.8 %	2.8%
31	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
32	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
33	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
34	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
35	-	39	2.9 %	2.9%
36	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
37	-	52	3.8 %	3.9%
38	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
39	-	65	4.8 %	4.9%
40	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
41	-	44	3.2 %	3.3%
42	-	78	5.8 %	5.8%
43	-	45	3.3 %	3.4%
44	-	70	5.2 %	5.2%
45	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
46	-	73	5.4 %	5.5%
47	-	34	2.5 %	2.5%
48	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
49	-	50	3.7 %	3.7%
50	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
51	-	62	4.6 %	4.6%
52	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
53	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
54	-	54	4.0 %	4.0%
55	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
56	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
57	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
58	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
59	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
60	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
61	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
62	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
63	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
64	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
65	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
66	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
67	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
68	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
69	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
70	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
71	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
72	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
74	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
77	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
82	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
85	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

**Missing Data**

-503 (M)	Stroop is missing or has incomplete data	7	0.5 %	-
-502 (M)	Subject cant read - stroop skipped	1	0.1 %	-
-501 (M)	Subject is colorblind - stroop skipped	9	0.7 %	-

Based upon 1,337 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PREDCOL: S0 Stroop: Predicted Color Score**

*Location:* 3676-3679 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -503 , -502 , -501 , -300

**Question:**

Predicted Color Score.

## - Study 29961 -

### MEASURE: Stroop

Cognitive dysfunction related to impairment to the frontal cortex of the brain is assessed through the use of two well-accepted neurological tests, the Stroop Color-Word Test and the Trail Making Test. The dimensions tapped by the Stroop have been associated with cognitive flexibility, resistance to interference from outside stimuli, creativity, psychopathology and cognitive complexity (see Golden, 1978).

The Stroop Color and Word Test (Golden, 1978) is used to examine the effects of interference on reading ability. The Stroop contains three parts: word page (the names of colors printed in black ink), color page (rows of X's printed in colored ink) and word-color page (the words from the first page are printed in the colors from the second page; however, the word meanings and ink colors are mismatched), each with 5 columns containing 20 items. The subject's task is to look at each sheet and move down the columns, reading words or naming the ink colors as quickly as possible, within a given time limit (45 seconds). Three scores, as well as an interference score, are generated using the number of items completed on each page, with higher scores reflecting better performance and less interference on reading ability. The Stroop can be used on both children and adults (Grade 2 through adult), and testing can be done in approximately 5 minutes.

#### General Notes

1. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores of 40 or less are considered "low."
2. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores above 40 or are considered "normal."
3. In order for one score to be considered "higher" or "lower" than another, a 10 point or greater T score difference is required.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
72	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
73	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
74	-	100	7.4 %	7.4%
75	-	403	29.8 %	29.8%
76	-	359	26.5 %	26.5%
77	-	294	21.7 %	21.7%
78	-	148	10.9 %	10.9%
79	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%

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

### S0DCOLOR: S0 Stroop: Deviation Color Score

*Location:* 3680-3683 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -503 , -502 , -501 , -300

#### Question:

Deviation Color Score.

### MEASURE: Stroop

Cognitive dysfunction related to impairment to the frontal cortex of the brain is assessed through

## - Study 29961 -

the use of two well-accepted neurological tests, the Stroop Color-Word Test and the Trail Making Test. The dimensions tapped by the Stroop have been associated with cognitive flexibility, resistance to interference from outside stimuli, creativity, psychopathology and cognitive complexity (see Golden, 1978).

The Stroop Color and Word Test (Golden, 1978) is used to examine the effects of interference on reading ability. The Stroop contains three parts: word page (the names of colors printed in black ink), color page (rows of X's printed in colored ink) and word-color page (the words from the first page are printed in the colors from the second page; however, the word meanings and ink colors are mismatched), each with 5 columns containing 20 items. The subject's task is to look at each sheet and move down the columns, reading words or naming the ink colors as quickly as possible, within a given time limit (45 seconds). Three scores, as well as an interference score, are generated using the number of items completed on each page, with higher scores reflecting better performance and less interference on reading ability. The Stroop can be used on both children and adults (Grade 2 through adult), and testing can be done in approximately 5 minutes.

### General Notes

1. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores of 40 or less are considered "low."
2. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores above 40 or are considered "normal."
3. In order for one score to be considered "higher" or "lower" than another, a 10 point or greater T score difference is required.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-45	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
-44	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-43	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-42	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-41	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
-39	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
-38	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
-37	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
-36	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
-35	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
-34	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
-33	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
-32	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
-31	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
-30	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
-29	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
-28	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
-27	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
-26	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
-25	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
-24	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
-23	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
-22	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
-21	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
-20	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
-19	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
-18	-	37	2.7 %	2.8%
-17	-	56	4.1 %	4.2%
-16	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
-15	-	52	3.8 %	3.9%
-14	-	63	4.7 %	4.7%
-13	-	50	3.7 %	3.7%
-12	-	47	3.5 %	3.5%
-11	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
-10	-	41	3.0 %	3.1%
-9	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
-8	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
-7	-	39	2.9 %	2.9%
-6	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
-5	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
-4	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
-3	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
-2	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
-1	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
0	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
1	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
2	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
3	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
4	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
5	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
6	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
7	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
8	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
9	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
10	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
11	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
12	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
13	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
14	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
15	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
16	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
17	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
18	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
20	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
22	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
24	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
26	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
29	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
33	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

**Missing Data**

-503 (M)	Stroop is missing or has incomplete data	7	0.5 %	-
-502 (M)	Subject cant read - stroop skipped	1	0.1 %	-
-501 (M)	Subject is colorblind - stroop skipped	9	0.7 %	-

Based upon 1,337 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0TCOLOR: S0 Stroop: T-Score Color**

*Location:* 3684-3687 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -503 , -502 , -501 , -300

**Question:**

T-Score Color.

MEASURE: Stroop

Cognitive dysfunction related to impairment to the frontal cortex of the brain is assessed through the use of two well-accepted neurological tests, the Stroop Color-Word Test and the Trail Making Test. The dimensions tapped by the Stroop have been associated with cognitive flexibility, resistance to interference from outside stimuli, creativity, psychopathology and cognitive complexity (see Golden, 1978).

The Stroop Color and Word Test (Golden, 1978) is used to examine the effects of interference on reading ability. The Stroop contains three parts: word page (the names of colors printed in black ink), color page (rows of X's printed in colored ink) and word-color page (the words from the first page are printed in the colors from the second page; however, the word meanings and ink colors are mismatched), each with 5 columns containing 20 items. The subject's task is to look at each sheet and move down the columns, reading words or naming the ink colors as quickly as possible, within a given time limit (45 seconds). Three scores, as well as an interference score, are generated using the number of items completed on each page, with higher scores reflecting better performance and less interference on reading ability. The Stroop can be used on both children and adults (Grade 2 through adult), and testing can be done in approximately 5 minutes.

**General Notes**

1. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores of 40 or less are considered "low."
2. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores above 40 or are considered "normal."
3. In order for one score to be considered "higher" or "lower" than another, a 10 point or greater T score difference is required.

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
13	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
14	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
15	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
16	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
18	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
19	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
20	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
21	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
22	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
23	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
24	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
25	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
26	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
27	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
28	-	41	3.0 %	3.1%
29	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
30	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
31	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
32	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
33	-	64	4.7 %	4.8%
34	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
35	-	37	2.7 %	2.8%
36	-	56	4.1 %	4.2%
37	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
38	-	115	8.5 %	8.6%
39	-	50	3.7 %	3.7%
40	-	47	3.5 %	3.5%
41	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
42	-	41	3.0 %	3.1%
43	-	79	5.8 %	5.9%
44	-	39	2.9 %	2.9%
45	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
46	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
47	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
48	-	59	4.4 %	4.4%
49	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
50	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
51	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
52	-	45	3.3 %	3.4%
53	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
54	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
55	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
56	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
57	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
58	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
59	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
60	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
61	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
62	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
63	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
64	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
65	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
67	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
68	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
70	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
71	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
72	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
74	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
77	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

*Missing Data*

-503 (M)	Stroop is missing or has incomplete data	7	0.5 %	-
-502 (M)	Subject cant read - stroop skipped	1	0.1 %	-
-501 (M)	Subject is colorblind - stroop skipped	9	0.7 %	-

Based upon 1,337 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PREDCW: S0 Stroop: Predicted Color-Word Score**

*Location:* 3688-3691 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -503 , -502 , -501 , -300

**Question:**

Predicted Color-Word Score.

MEASURE: Stroop

Cognitive dysfunction related to impairment to the frontal cortex of the brain is assessed through the use of two well-accepted neurological tests, the Stroop Color-Word Test and the Trail Making Test. The dimensions tapped by the Stroop have been associated with cognitive flexibility, resistance to interference from outside stimuli, creativity, psychopathology and cognitive complexity (see Golden, 1978).

## - Study 29961 -

The Stroop Color and Word Test (Golden, 1978) is used to examine the effects of interference on reading ability. The Stroop contains three parts: word page (the names of colors printed in black ink), color page (rows of X's printed in colored ink) and word-color page (the words from the first page are printed in the colors from the second page; however, the word meanings and ink colors are mismatched), each with 5 columns containing 20 items. The subject's task is to look at each sheet and move down the columns, reading words or naming the ink colors as quickly as possible, within a given time limit (45 seconds). Three scores, as well as an interference score, are generated using the number of items completed on each page, with higher scores reflecting better performance and less interference on reading ability. The Stroop can be used on both children and adults (Grade 2 through adult), and testing can be done in approximately 5 minutes.

### General Notes

1. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores of 40 or less are considered "low."
2. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores above 40 or are considered "normal."
3. In order for one score to be considered "higher" or "lower" than another, a 10 point or greater T score difference is required.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
36	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
37	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
38	-	41	3.0 %	3.0%
39	-	237	17.5 %	17.5%
40	-	225	16.6 %	16.6%
41	-	329	24.3 %	24.3%
42	-	323	23.9 %	23.9%
43	-	131	9.7 %	9.7%
44	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
45	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%

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

### S0DCOLWOR: S0 Stroop: Deviation Color-Word Score

*Location:* 3692-3695 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -503 , -502 , -501 , -300

### Question:

Deviation Color-Word Score.

MEASURE: Stroop

Cognitive dysfunction related to impairment to the frontal cortex of the brain is assessed through the use of two well-accepted neurological tests, the Stroop Color-Word Test and the Trail Making Test. The dimensions tapped by the Stroop have been associated with cognitive flexibility, resistance to interference from outside stimuli, creativity, psychopathology and cognitive complexity (see Golden, 1978).

## - Study 29961 -

The Stroop Color and Word Test (Golden, 1978) is used to examine the effects of interference on reading ability. The Stroop contains three parts: word page (the names of colors printed in black ink), color page (rows of X's printed in colored ink) and word-color page (the words from the first page are printed in the colors from the second page; however, the word meanings and ink colors are mismatched), each with 5 columns containing 20 items. The subject's task is to look at each sheet and move down the columns, reading words or naming the ink colors as quickly as possible, within a given time limit (45 seconds). Three scores, as well as an interference score, are generated using the number of items completed on each page, with higher scores reflecting better performance and less interference on reading ability. The Stroop can be used on both children and adults (Grade 2 through adult), and testing can be done in approximately 5 minutes.

### General Notes

1. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores of 40 or less are considered "low."
2. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores above 40 or are considered "normal."
3. In order for one score to be considered "higher" or "lower" than another, a 10 point or greater T score difference is required.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
-41	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-34	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-32	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-31	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-26	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-25	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
-24	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
-23	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
-22	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
-21	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
-20	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
-19	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
-18	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
-17	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
-16	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
-15	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
-14	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
-13	-	41	3.0 %	3.1%
-12	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
-11	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
-10	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
-9	-	48	3.5 %	3.6%
-8	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
-7	-	64	4.7 %	4.8%
-6	-	61	4.5 %	4.6%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-5	-	53	3.9 %	4.0%
-4	-	57	4.2 %	4.3%
-3	-	60	4.4 %	4.5%
-2	-	69	5.1 %	5.2%
-1	-	60	4.4 %	4.5%
0	-	70	5.2 %	5.2%
1	-	65	4.8 %	4.9%
2	-	47	3.5 %	3.5%
3	-	46	3.4 %	3.4%
4	-	48	3.5 %	3.6%
5	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
6	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
7	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
8	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
9	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
10	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
11	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
12	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
13	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
14	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
15	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
16	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
17	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
18	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
19	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
20	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
22	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
26	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
27	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%

**Missing Data**

-503 (M)	Stroop is missing or has incomplete data	7	0.5 %	-
-502 (M)	Subject cant read - stroop skipped	1	0.1 %	-
-501 (M)	Subject is colorblind - stroop skipped	9	0.7 %	-
-300 (M)	Too few values for computation	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,335 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0TCOLWOR: S0 Stroop: T-Score Color-Word**

*Location:* 3696-3699 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -503 , -502 , -501 , -300

**Question:**

T-Score Color-Word.

MEASURE: Stroop

Cognitive dysfunction related to impairment to the frontal cortex of the brain is assessed through the use of two well-accepted neurological tests, the Stroop Color-Word Test and the Trail Making Test. The dimensions tapped by the Stroop have been associated with cognitive flexibility, resistance to interference from outside stimuli, creativity, psychopathology and cognitive complexity (see Golden, 1978).

The Stroop Color and Word Test (Golden, 1978) is used to examine the effects of interference on reading ability. The Stroop contains three parts: word page (the names of colors printed in black ink), color page (rows of X's printed in colored ink) and word-color page (the words from the first page are printed in the colors from the second page; however, the word meanings and ink colors are mismatched), each with 5 columns containing 20 items. The subject's task is to look at each sheet and move down the columns, reading words or naming the ink colors as quickly as possible, within a given time limit (45 seconds). Three scores, as well as an interference score, are generated using the number of items completed on each page, with higher scores reflecting better performance and less interference on reading ability. The Stroop can be used on both children and adults (Grade 2 through adult), and testing can be done in approximately 5 minutes.

**General Notes**

1. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores of 40 or less are considered "low."
2. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores above 40 or are considered "normal."
3. In order for one score to be considered "higher" or "lower" than another, a 10 point or greater T score difference is required.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
10	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
17	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
19	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
26	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
27	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
28	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
29	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
30	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
31	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
32	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
33	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
34	-	37	2.7 %	2.8%
35	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
36	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
37	-	41	3.0 %	3.1%
38	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
39	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
40	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
41	-	48	3.5 %	3.6%
42	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
43	-	64	4.7 %	4.8%
44	-	61	4.5 %	4.6%
45	-	53	3.9 %	4.0%
46	-	57	4.2 %	4.3%
47	-	60	4.4 %	4.5%
48	-	69	5.1 %	5.2%
49	-	60	4.4 %	4.5%
50	-	70	5.2 %	5.2%
51	-	65	4.8 %	4.9%
52	-	47	3.5 %	3.5%
53	-	46	3.4 %	3.4%
54	-	48	3.5 %	3.6%
55	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
56	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
57	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
58	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
59	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
60	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
61	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
62	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
63	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
64	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
65	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
66	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
67	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
68	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
69	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
71	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
76	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%

*Missing Data*

-503 (M)	Stroop is missing or has incomplete data	7	0.5 %	-
-502 (M)	Subject cant read - stroop skipped	1	0.1 %	-
-501 (M)	Subject is colorblind - stroop skipped	9	0.7 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-300 (M)	Too few values for computation	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,335 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0DIFCW: S0 Stroop: Interference Score for CW - Predicted CW

*Location:* 3700-3703 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -503 , -502 , -501 , -300

#### Question:

Interference Score for Color-Word - Predicted Color-Word.

#### MEASURE: Stroop

Cognitive dysfunction related to impairment to the frontal cortex of the brain is assessed through the use of two well-accepted neurological tests, the Stroop Color-Word Test and the Trail Making Test. The dimensions tapped by the Stroop have been associated with cognitive flexibility, resistance to interference from outside stimuli, creativity, psychopathology and cognitive complexity (see Golden, 1978).

The Stroop Color and Word Test (Golden, 1978) is used to examine the effects of interference on reading ability. The Stroop contains three parts: word page (the names of colors printed in black ink), color page (rows of X's printed in colored ink) and word-color page (the words from the first page are printed in the colors from the second page; however, the word meanings and ink colors are mismatched), each with 5 columns containing 20 items. The subject's task is to look at each sheet and move down the columns, reading words or naming the ink colors as quickly as possible, within a given time limit (45 seconds). Three scores, as well as an interference score, are generated using the number of items completed on each page, with higher scores reflecting better performance and less interference on reading ability. The Stroop can be used on both children and adults (Grade 2 through adult), and testing can be done in approximately 5 minutes.

#### General Notes

1. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores of 40 or less are considered "low."
2. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores above 40 or are considered "normal."
3. In order for one score to be considered "higher" or "lower" than another, a 10 point or greater T score difference is required.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-36	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-34	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-24	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-21	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-20	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
-19	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
-18	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
-17	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
-16	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-15	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
-14	-	10	0.7 %	0.8%
-13	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
-12	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
-11	-	18	1.3 %	1.4%
-10	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
-9	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
-8	-	34	2.5 %	2.6%
-7	-	44	3.2 %	3.3%
-6	-	46	3.4 %	3.5%
-5	-	56	4.1 %	4.2%
-4	-	58	4.3 %	4.4%
-3	-	68	5.0 %	5.1%
-2	-	79	5.8 %	5.9%
-1	-	79	5.8 %	5.9%
0	-	75	5.5 %	5.6%
1	-	84	6.2 %	6.3%
2	-	70	5.2 %	5.3%
3	-	85	6.3 %	6.4%
4	-	73	5.4 %	5.5%
5	-	62	4.6 %	4.7%
6	-	53	3.9 %	4.0%
7	-	49	3.6 %	3.7%
8	-	30	2.2 %	2.3%
9	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
10	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
11	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
12	-	18	1.3 %	1.4%
13	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
14	-	10	0.7 %	0.8%
15	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
16	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
17	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
18	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
19	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
20	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
21	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
23	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
24	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
28	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
29	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
39	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-503 (M)	Stroop is missing or has incomplete data	7	0.5 %	-
-502 (M)	Subject cant read - stroop skipped	1	0.1 %	-
-501 (M)	Subject is colorblind - stroop skipped	9	0.7 %	-
-300 (M)	Too few values for compuation	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,333 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0TDIFCW: S0 Stroop: Interference T-Score for Calculated Difference between CW and Predicted CW

*Location:* 3704-3707 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -503 , -502 , -501 , -300

#### Question:

Interference T-Score for Calculated Difference between Color-Word and Predicted Color-Word.

MEASURE: Stroop

Cognitive dysfunction related to impairment to the frontal cortex of the brain is assessed through the use of two well-accepted neurological tests, the Stroop Color-Word Test and the Trail Making Test. The dimensions tapped by the Stroop have been associated with cognitive flexibility, resistance to interference from outside stimuli, creativity, psychopathology and cognitive complexity (see Golden, 1978).

The Stroop Color and Word Test (Golden, 1978) is used to examine the effects of interference on reading ability. The Stroop contains three parts: word page (the names of colors printed in black ink), color page (rows of X's printed in colored ink) and word-color page (the words from the first page are printed in the colors from the second page; however, the word meanings and ink colors are mismatched), each with 5 columns containing 20 items. The subject's task is to look at each sheet and move down the columns, reading words or naming the ink colors as quickly as possible, within a given time limit (45 seconds). Three scores, as well as an interference score, are generated using the number of items completed on each page, with higher scores reflecting better performance and less interference on reading ability. The Stroop can be used on both children and adults (Grade 2 through adult), and testing can be done in approximately 5 minutes.

#### General Notes

1. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores of 40 or less are considered "low."
2. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores above 40 or are considered "normal."
3. In order for one score to be considered "higher" or "lower" than another, a 10 point or greater T score difference is required.

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
21	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
26	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
29	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
30	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
31	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
32	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
33	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
34	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
35	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
36	-	10	0.7 %	0.8%
37	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
38	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
39	-	18	1.3 %	1.4%
40	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
41	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
42	-	34	2.5 %	2.6%
43	-	44	3.2 %	3.3%
44	-	46	3.4 %	3.5%
45	-	56	4.1 %	4.2%
46	-	58	4.3 %	4.4%
47	-	68	5.0 %	5.1%
48	-	79	5.8 %	5.9%
49	-	79	5.8 %	5.9%
50	-	75	5.5 %	5.6%
51	-	84	6.2 %	6.3%
52	-	70	5.2 %	5.3%
53	-	85	6.3 %	6.4%
54	-	73	5.4 %	5.5%
55	-	62	4.6 %	4.7%
56	-	53	3.9 %	4.0%
57	-	49	3.6 %	3.7%
58	-	30	2.2 %	2.3%
59	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
60	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
61	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
62	-	18	1.3 %	1.4%
63	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
64	-	10	0.7 %	0.8%
65	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
66	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
67	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
68	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
69	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
70	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
71	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
73	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
74	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
78	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
79	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
80	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

**Missing Data**

-503 (M)	Stroop is missing or has incomplete data	7	0.5 %	-
-502 (M)	Subject cant read - stroop skipped	1	0.1 %	-
-501 (M)	Subject is colorblind - stroop skipped	9	0.7 %	-
-300 (M)	Too few values for computuation	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,333 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0PREFONT: S0 Stroop: Diagnosed Prefrontal Disorders - Stroop**

*Location:* 3708-3711 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Marker for Diagnosed Prefrontal Disorders.

**MEASURE:** Stroop

Cognitive dysfunction related to impairment to the frontal cortex of the brain is assessed through the use of two well-accepted neurological tests, the Stroop Color-Word Test and the Trail Making Test. The dimensions tapped by the Stroop have been associated with cognitive flexibility, resistance to interference from outside stimuli, creativity, psychopathology and cognitive complexity (see Golden, 1978).

The Stroop Color and Word Test (Golden, 1978) is used to examine the effects of interference on reading ability. The Stroop contains three parts: word page (the names of colors printed in black ink), color page (rows of X's printed in colored ink) and word-color page (the words from the first page are printed in the colors from the second page; however, the word meanings and ink colors are mismatched), each with 5 columns containing 20 items. The subject's task is to look at each sheet and move down the columns, reading words or naming the ink colors as quickly as possible, within a given time limit (45 seconds). Three scores, as well as an interference score, are generated using the number of items completed on each page, with higher scores reflecting better performance and less interference on reading ability. The Stroop can be used on both children and adults (Grade 2 through adult), and testing can be done in

- Study 29961 -

approximately 5 minutes.

**General Notes**

1. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores of 40 or less are considered "low."
2. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores above 40 or are considered "normal."
3. In order for one score to be considered "higher" or "lower" than another, a 10 point or greater T score difference is required.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,304	96.3 %	96.3%
1	Yes	50	3.7 %	3.7%

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

**S0PREPATH: S0 Stroop: Diagnosed Prefrontal Pathology - Stroop**

*Location:* 3712-3715 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

**Question:**

Marker for Diagnosed Prefrontal Disorders.

**MEASURE:** Stroop

Cognitive dysfunction related to impairment to the frontal cortex of the brain is assessed through the use of two well-accepted neurological tests, the Stroop Color-Word Test and the Trail Making Test. The dimensions tapped by the Stroop have been associated with cognitive flexibility, resistance to interference from outside stimuli, creativity, psychopathology and cognitive complexity (see Golden, 1978).

The Stroop Color and Word Test (Golden, 1978) is used to examine the effects of interference on reading ability. The Stroop contains three parts: word page (the names of colors printed in black ink), color page (rows of X's printed in colored ink) and word-color page (the words from the first page are printed in the colors from the second page; however, the word meanings and ink colors are mismatched), each with 5 columns containing 20 items. The subject's task is to look at each sheet and move down the columns, reading words or naming the ink colors as quickly as possible, within a given time limit (45 seconds). Three scores, as well as an interference score, are generated using the number of items completed on each page, with higher scores reflecting better performance and less interference on reading ability. The Stroop can be used on both children and adults (Grade 2 through adult), and testing can be done in approximately 5 minutes.

**General Notes**

1. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores of 40 or less are considered "low."
2. Word, color, and color-word T-Scores above 40 or are considered "normal."
3. In order for one score to be considered "higher" or "lower" than another, a 10 point or greater T score difference is required.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,318	97.3 %	97.3%
1	Yes	36	2.7 %	2.7%

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

**S0SUBUSE: S0 Subuse: Whats most EVER used alcohol**

*Location:* 3716-3719 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

What is the most that you have EVER used alcohol (such as beer, wine, wine coolers, hard liquor, vodka, gin, or whiskey)?

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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
1	Not at all/not used in lifetime	260	19.2 %	19.3%
2	1-2 times	217	16.0 %	16.1%
3	Less than 1x per month	128	9.5 %	9.5%
4	Once per month	91	6.7 %	6.7%
5	2-3 times per month	133	9.8 %	9.9%
6	Once per week	115	8.5 %	8.5%
7	2-3 times per week	168	12.4 %	12.4%
8	4-5 times per week	107	7.9 %	7.9%
9	Everyday	131	9.7 %	9.7%

**Missing Data**

-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
----------	--------------	---	-------	---

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBUS2: S0 Subuse: Past 6 months how often used alcohol**

*Location:* 3720-3723 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

- Study 29961 -

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

In the past six months, how often have you had alcohol to 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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
1	Not at all	633	46.8 %	46.9%
2	1-2 times	207	15.3 %	15.3%
3	Less than 1x per month	111	8.2 %	8.2%
4	Once per month	51	3.8 %	3.8%
5	2-3 times per month	80	5.9 %	5.9%
6	Once per week	73	5.4 %	5.4%
7	2-3 times per week	109	8.1 %	8.1%
8	4-5 times per week	47	3.5 %	3.5%
9	Everyday	38	2.8 %	2.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,349 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBUS3: S0 Subuse: How many drinks do you usually have**

Location: 3724-3727 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

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

- Study 29961 -

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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	633	46.8 %	47.0%
1	-	74	5.5 %	5.5%
2	-	82	6.1 %	6.1%
3	-	94	6.9 %	7.0%
4	-	70	5.2 %	5.2%
5	-	49	3.6 %	3.6%
6	-	73	5.4 %	5.4%
7	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
8	-	44	3.2 %	3.3%
9	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
10	-	62	4.6 %	4.6%
11	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
12	-	50	3.7 %	3.7%
13	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
14	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
15	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
16	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
17	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
18	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
20	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
24	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
25	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
30	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
35	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
36	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
40	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
42	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
45	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
65	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	2	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,348 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBUS4: S0 Subuse: Past 6 months how often had 5 or more drinks at time**

*Location:* 3728-3731 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

In the past six months, how often did you have five or more drinks at one time?

**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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
1	Not at all	846	62.5 %	62.7%
2	1-2 times	149	11.0 %	11.0%
3	Less than 1x per month	74	5.5 %	5.5%
4	Once per month	36	2.7 %	2.7%
5	2-3 times per month	51	3.8 %	3.8%
6	Once per week	54	4.0 %	4.0%
7	2-3 times per week	74	5.5 %	5.5%
8	4-5 times per week	38	2.8 %	2.8%
9	Everyday	27	2.0 %	2.0%

**Missing Data**

-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,349 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBUS5: S0 Subuse: Past 6 months num times been drunk on alcohol**

- Study 29961 -

Location: 3732-3735 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

In the past six months, how many times have you been drunk on 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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
1	Not at all	806	59.5 %	59.7%
2	1-2 times	188	13.9 %	13.9%
3	Less than 1x per month	114	8.4 %	8.4%
4	Once per month	27	2.0 %	2.0%
5	2-3 times per month	42	3.1 %	3.1%
6	Once per week	48	3.5 %	3.6%
7	2-3 times per week	70	5.2 %	5.2%
8	4-5 times per week	39	2.9 %	2.9%
9	Everyday	16	1.2 %	1.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBUS6: S0 Subuse: Whats most EVER used marijuana**

Location: 3736-3739 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

What is the most that you have ever . . . used marijuana or hashish to get high?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

- Study 29961 -

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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
1	Not at all/not used in lifetime	202	14.9 %	15.0%
2	1-2 times	131	9.7 %	9.7%
3	Less than 1x per month	34	2.5 %	2.5%
4	Once per month	31	2.3 %	2.3%
5	2-3 times per month	48	3.5 %	3.6%
6	Once per week	38	2.8 %	2.8%
7	2-3 times per week	86	6.4 %	6.4%
8	4-5 times per week	111	8.2 %	8.2%
9	Everyday	669	49.4 %	49.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0SUBUS7: S0 Subuse: Past 6 months num times used marijuana**

*Location:* 3740-3743 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -103 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

In the past six months how many times . . . did you use marijuana or hashish?

**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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	Not at all	581	42.9 %	43.1%
2	1-2 times	111	8.2 %	8.2%
3	Less than 1x per month	60	4.4 %	4.4%
4	Once per month	25	1.8 %	1.9%
5	2-3 times per month	53	3.9 %	3.9%
6	Once per week	32	2.4 %	2.4%
7	2-3 times per week	83	6.1 %	6.2%
8	4-5 times per week	109	8.1 %	8.1%
9	Everyday	295	21.8 %	21.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,349 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### **S0SUBUS8: S0 Subuse: Most EVER used sedatives to get high**

*Location:* 3744-3747 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -99 , -98

#### **Question:**

What is the most that you have ever . . . used sedatives or tranquilizers to get high (this includes sleeping pills, barbiturates, seconal, valium, librium, xanax, qualludes, etc.)?

**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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	Not at all/not used in lifetime	1,064	78.6 %	78.9%
2	1-2 times	92	6.8 %	6.8%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
3	Less than 1x per month	27	2.0 %	2.0%
4	Once per month	32	2.4 %	2.4%
5	2-3 times per month	29	2.1 %	2.1%
6	Once per week	17	1.3 %	1.3%
7	2-3 times per week	43	3.2 %	3.2%
8	4-5 times per week	19	1.4 %	1.4%
9	Everyday	26	1.9 %	1.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-
-99 (M)	Dont Know	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,349 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBUS9: S0 Subuse: Past 6 months num times used sedatives**

*Location:* 3748-3751 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -103 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

In the past six months how many times . . . have you used sedatives or tranquilizers to get high?

**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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
1	Not at all	1,194	88.2 %	88.4%
2	1-2 times	58	4.3 %	4.3%
3	Less than 1x per month	17	1.3 %	1.3%
4	Once per month	16	1.2 %	1.2%
5	2-3 times per month	17	1.3 %	1.3%
6	Once per week	8	0.6 %	0.6%
7	2-3 times per week	22	1.6 %	1.6%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
8	4-5 times per week	8	0.6 %	0.6%
9	Everyday	10	0.7 %	0.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBU10: S0 Subuse: Most EVER used stimulants to get high**

*Location:* 3752-3755 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

What is the most that you have ever . . . used stimulants or amphetamines to get high (like diet pills, benzedrine, methamphetamine)?

**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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
1	Not at all/not used in lifetime	1,144	84.5 %	84.7%
2	1-2 times	53	3.9 %	3.9%
3	Less than 1x per month	14	1.0 %	1.0%
4	Once per month	8	0.6 %	0.6%
5	2-3 times per month	9	0.7 %	0.7%
6	Once per week	13	1.0 %	1.0%
7	2-3 times per week	23	1.7 %	1.7%
8	4-5 times per week	19	1.4 %	1.4%
9	Everyday	67	4.9 %	5.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBU11: S0 Subuse: Past 6 months num times used stimulants**

*Location:* 3756-3759 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -103 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

In the past six months how many times . . . have you used stimulants or tranquilizers to get high?

**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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	Not at all	1,228	90.7 %	91.0%
2	1-2 times	23	1.7 %	1.7%
3	Less than 1x per month	16	1.2 %	1.2%
4	Once per month	4	0.3 %	0.3%
5	2-3 times per month	8	0.6 %	0.6%
6	Once per week	9	0.7 %	0.7%
7	2-3 times per week	16	1.2 %	1.2%
8	4-5 times per week	22	1.6 %	1.6%
9	Everyday	24	1.8 %	1.8%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBU12: S0 Subuse: Most EVER used cocaine**

*Location:* 3760-3763 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

What is the most that you have ever . . . used cocaine (including powder, crack, free base,

- Study 29961 -

cocaleaves, or paste)?

**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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	Not at all/not used in lifetime	1,035	76.4 %	76.7%
2	1-2 times	110	8.1 %	8.1%
3	Less than 1x per month	21	1.6 %	1.6%
4	Once per month	21	1.6 %	1.6%
5	2-3 times per month	35	2.6 %	2.6%
6	Once per week	25	1.8 %	1.9%
7	2-3 times per week	42	3.1 %	3.1%
8	4-5 times per week	22	1.6 %	1.6%
9	Everyday	39	2.9 %	2.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBU13: S0 Subuse: Past 6 months num times used cocaine**

*Location:* 3764-3767 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -103 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

In the past six months how many times . . . have you used cocaine (including powder, crack, free base, coca leaves, or paste)?

**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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or

- Study 29961 -

drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	Not at all	1,183	87.4 %	87.6%
2	1-2 times	50	3.7 %	3.7%
3	Less than 1x per month	29	2.1 %	2.1%
4	Once per month	9	0.7 %	0.7%
5	2-3 times per month	15	1.1 %	1.1%
6	Once per week	19	1.4 %	1.4%
7	2-3 times per week	22	1.6 %	1.6%
8	4-5 times per week	10	0.7 %	0.7%
9	Everyday	13	1.0 %	1.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0SUBU14: S0 Subuse: Most EVER used Opiates**

*Location:* 3768-3771 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -99 , -98

#### **Question:**

What is the most that you have ever . . . used opiates (such as heroin, codeine, demoral, morphine, percoden, methadone, darvon, Opium, dilaudid, or talwin)?

**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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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)).

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	Not at all/not used in lifetime	1,248	92.2 %	92.4%
2	1-2 times	42	3.1 %	3.1%
3	Less than 1x per month	15	1.1 %	1.1%
4	Once per month	9	0.7 %	0.7%
5	2-3 times per month	10	0.7 %	0.7%
6	Once per week	5	0.4 %	0.4%
7	2-3 times per week	7	0.5 %	0.5%
8	4-5 times per week	8	0.6 %	0.6%
9	Everyday	6	0.4 %	0.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0SUBU15: S0 Subuse: Past 6 months num times used opiates

*Location:* 3772-3775 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -103 , -99 , -98

#### Question:

In the past six months how many times . . . have you used opiates?

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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	Not at all	1,300	96.0 %	96.3%
2	1-2 times	21	1.6 %	1.6%
3	Less than 1x per month	7	0.5 %	0.5%
4	Once per month	6	0.4 %	0.4%
5	2-3 times per month	4	0.3 %	0.3%
6	Once per week	2	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
7	2-3 times per week	5	0.4 %	0.4%
8	4-5 times per week	5	0.4 %	0.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBU16: S0 Subuse: Most EVER used ecstasy to get high**

*Location:* 3776-3779 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

What is the most that you have ever . . . used ecstasy to get high?

**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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
1	Not at all/not used in lifetime	1,130	83.5 %	83.7%
2	1-2 times	99	7.3 %	7.3%
3	Less than 1x per month	28	2.1 %	2.1%
4	Once per month	16	1.2 %	1.2%
5	2-3 times per month	22	1.6 %	1.6%
6	Once per week	15	1.1 %	1.1%
7	2-3 times per week	24	1.8 %	1.8%
8	4-5 times per week	6	0.4 %	0.4%
9	Everyday	10	0.7 %	0.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBU17: S0 Subuse: Past 6 months num times used ecstasy**

- Study 29961 -

Location: 3780-3783 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -103 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

In the past six months how many times . . . have you used ecstasy?

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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
1	Not at all	1,240	91.6 %	91.9%
2	1-2 times	57	4.2 %	4.2%
3	Less than 1x per month	12	0.9 %	0.9%
4	Once per month	11	0.8 %	0.8%
5	2-3 times per month	13	1.0 %	1.0%
6	Once per week	4	0.3 %	0.3%
7	2-3 times per week	11	0.8 %	0.8%
8	4-5 times per week	1	0.1 %	0.1%
9	Everyday	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBU18: S0 Subuse: Most EVER used hallucinogens**

Location: 3784-3787 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

What is the most that you have ever . . . used hallucinogens (these include acid, LSD, mescaline, peyote, DMT, psilocybin, mushrooms, PCP, angel dust, etc.)?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

- Study 29961 -

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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
1	Not at all/not used in lifetime	983	72.6 %	72.8%
2	1-2 times	142	10.5 %	10.5%
3	Less than 1x per month	39	2.9 %	2.9%
4	Once per month	14	1.0 %	1.0%
5	2-3 times per month	38	2.8 %	2.8%
6	Once per week	31	2.3 %	2.3%
7	2-3 times per week	37	2.7 %	2.7%
8	4-5 times per week	22	1.6 %	1.6%
9	Everyday	44	3.2 %	3.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0SUBU19: S0 Subuse: Past 6 months num times used hallucinogens**

*Location:* 3788-3791 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -103 , -99 , -98

#### **Question:**

In the past six months how many times . . . have you used hallucinogens to get high?

**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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	Not at all	1,193	88.1 %	88.4%
2	1-2 times	57	4.2 %	4.2%
3	Less than 1x per month	22	1.6 %	1.6%
4	Once per month	11	0.8 %	0.8%
5	2-3 times per month	17	1.3 %	1.3%
6	Once per week	11	0.8 %	0.8%
7	2-3 times per week	12	0.9 %	0.9%
8	4-5 times per week	15	1.1 %	1.1%
9	Everyday	12	0.9 %	0.9%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBU20: S0 Subuse: Most EVER used inhalants to get high**

*Location:* 3792-3795 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

What is the most that you have ever . . . used inhalants (like glue, cleaning fluids, gasoline, toluene, or paint)?

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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	Not at all/not used in lifetime	1,170	86.4 %	86.7%
2	1-2 times	89	6.6 %	6.6%
3	Less than 1x per month	19	1.4 %	1.4%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
4	Once per month	9	0.7 %	0.7%
5	2-3 times per month	17	1.3 %	1.3%
6	Once per week	5	0.4 %	0.4%
7	2-3 times per week	14	1.0 %	1.0%
8	4-5 times per week	7	0.5 %	0.5%
9	Everyday	20	1.5 %	1.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBU21: S0 Subuse: Past 6 months num times used inhalants**

*Location:* 3796-3799 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -103 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

In the past six months how many times . . . have you used inhalants to get high?

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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
1	Not at all	1,297	95.8 %	96.1%
2	1-2 times	22	1.6 %	1.6%
3	Less than 1x per month	4	0.3 %	0.3%
4	Once per month	3	0.2 %	0.2%
5	2-3 times per month	8	0.6 %	0.6%
6	Once per week	4	0.3 %	0.3%
7	2-3 times per week	4	0.3 %	0.3%
8	4-5 times per week	6	0.4 %	0.4%
9	Everyday	2	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBU22: S0 Subuse: Most EVER used amyl nitrate odorizers**

*Location:* 3800-3803 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

What is the most that you have ever . . . used amyl nitrate, odorizers, or rush?

**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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
1	Not at all/not used in lifetime	1,297	95.8 %	96.1%
2	1-2 times	29	2.1 %	2.1%
3	Less than 1x per month	4	0.3 %	0.3%
4	Once per month	3	0.2 %	0.2%
5	2-3 times per month	4	0.3 %	0.3%
6	Once per week	2	0.1 %	0.1%
7	2-3 times per week	2	0.1 %	0.1%
8	4-5 times per week	3	0.2 %	0.2%
9	Everyday	6	0.4 %	0.4%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBU23: S0 Subuse: Past 6 months num times used amyl nitrate**

*Location:* 3804-3807 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

- Study 29961 -

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -103 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

In the past six months how many times . . . have you used amyl nitrate, odorizers, or rush to get high?

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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
1	Not at all	1,328	98.1 %	98.4%
2	1-2 times	7	0.5 %	0.5%
3	Less than 1x per month	2	0.1 %	0.1%
4	Once per month	3	0.2 %	0.2%
5	2-3 times per month	2	0.1 %	0.1%
6	Once per week	3	0.2 %	0.2%
7	2-3 times per week	1	0.1 %	0.1%
8	4-5 times per week	2	0.1 %	0.1%
9	Everyday	2	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBU24: S0 Subuse: Most EVER used any OTHER drugs**

Location: 3808-3811 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

What is the most that you have ever . . . used any other drugs?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by

- Study 29961 -

Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
1	Not at all/not used in lifetime	1,335	98.6 %	98.9%
2	1-2 times	6	0.4 %	0.4%
3	Less than 1x per month	3	0.2 %	0.2%
5	2-3 times per month	1	0.1 %	0.1%
6	Once per week	1	0.1 %	0.1%
7	2-3 times per week	1	0.1 %	0.1%
8	4-5 times per week	2	0.1 %	0.1%
9	Everyday	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBU25: S0 Subuse: Past 6 months used any other things get high**

*Location:* 3812-3815 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -103 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

In the past six months have you used any other 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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,344	99.3 %	99.6%
1	Yes	6	0.4 %	0.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBU26: S0 Subuse: Past 6 months num times used other to get high**

*Location:* 3816-3819 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -104 , -103 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

In the past six months how many times . . . have you used any other 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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
1	Not at all	1,344	99.3 %	99.6%
2	1-2 times	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3	Less than 1x per month	1	0.1 %	0.1%
6	Once per week	1	0.1 %	0.1%
7	2-3 times per week	2	0.1 %	0.1%
9	Everyday	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBU27: S0 Subuse: Used any drugs past 24 hours**

*Location:* 3820-3823 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Have you used any drugs in the past 24 hours?

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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
0	No	1,291	95.3 %	95.6%
1	Yes	59	4.4 %	4.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBU35: S0 Subuse: Most EVER used prescribed medications (own or someone elses)**

*Location:* 3824-3827 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -800 , -200

**Question:**

What is the most that you have ever . . . used prescription medications (own or someone elses) to get high?

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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
2	1-2 times	1	0.1 %	25.0%
4	Once per month	1	0.1 %	25.0%
7	2-3 times per week	2	0.1 %	50.0%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-800 (M)	Data unavailable	1,346	99.4 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

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

**S0SUBU36: S0 Subuse: Past 6 months num times used prescribed medications (own or someone elses)**

*Location:* 3828-3831 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -800 , -200

**Question:**

In the past six months how many times . . . have you used prescription medications (own or someone elses) to get high?

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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
1	Not at all/not used in lifetime	1	0.1 %	33.3%
7	2-3 times per week	1	0.1 %	33.3%
8	4-5 times per week	1	0.1 %	33.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-800 (M)	Data unavailable	1,347	99.5 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

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

**S0SUBU31: S0 SubUse: EVER smoked cigarettes**

*Location:* 3832-3835 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

- Study 29961 -

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Have you ever smoked cigarettes?

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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
0	No	370	27.3 %	27.4%
1	Yes	981	72.5 %	72.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBU32: S0 SubUse: When smoking the most how often**

Location: 3836-3839 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -200 , -108 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

At the point in your lifetime when you were smoking the most, how often did you smoke?

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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	Never smoked in lifetime	370	27.3 %	27.4%
1	1-2 times	143	10.6 %	10.6%
2	Once per month	57	4.2 %	4.2%
3	2-3 times/week	108	8.0 %	8.0%
4	4-5 times/week	55	4.1 %	4.1%
5	Every day	618	45.6 %	45.7%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBU33: S0 SubUse: Past 6 months how often smoke cigarettes**

*Location:* 3840-3843 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -108 , -99 , -98

**Question:**

In the past 6 months, how often have you smoked cigarettes?

**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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	Not at all	629	46.5 %	46.6%
2	1-2 times	64	4.7 %	4.7%
3	3-5 times	47	3.5 %	3.5%
4	1x per month	18	1.3 %	1.3%
5	2-3x per month	32	2.4 %	2.4%
6	1x per week	22	1.6 %	1.6%
7	2-3x per week	63	4.7 %	4.7%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
8	4-5x per week	65	4.8 %	4.8%
9	Everyday	411	30.4 %	30.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0SUBU34: S0 SubUse: Past 6 months how many cigarettes in a day**

*Location:* 3844-3847 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200 , -109 , -108 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

In the past 6 months, how many cigarettes did you smoke in a typical day?

**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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
1	0 cigarettes	640	47.3 %	47.4%
2	1-4 cigarettes	304	22.5 %	22.5%
3	5-9 cigarettes	142	10.5 %	10.5%
4	10-15 cigarettes	104	7.7 %	7.7%
5	16-20 cigarettes	105	7.8 %	7.8%
6	More than a pack a day	56	4.1 %	4.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0QFBRMO: S0 SubUse: Quant/freq used beer/wine/liquor past 6 mo**

*Location:* 3848-3851 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -100 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

In the past 6 months the Quant/freq used beer/wine/liquor ?

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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use? / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
0	-	633	46.8 %	47.0%
1	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
2	-	50	3.7 %	3.7%
3	-	34	2.5 %	2.5%
4	-	33	2.4 %	2.4%
5	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
6	-	38	2.8 %	2.8%
7	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
8	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
9	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
10	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
11	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
12	-	46	3.4 %	3.4%
14	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
15	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
16	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
18	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
20	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
21	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
24	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
25	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
26	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
28	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
30	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
32	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
35	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
36	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
40	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
42	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
45	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
48	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
49	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
50	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
54	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
56	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
60	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
64	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
65	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
70	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
72	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
78	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
80	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
84	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
90	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
96	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
98	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
100	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
105	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
108	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
112	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
119	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
120	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
126	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
128	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
140	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
144	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
150	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
160	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
175	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
180	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
192	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
210	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
240	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
252	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
280	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
315	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-300 (M)	Too few answers for computation	3	0.2 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,347 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0EVRUSE: S0 SubUse: Number drugs used in lifetime**

*Location:* 3852-3855 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -100 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

How many drugs did you use in your lifetime?

**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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	190	14.0 %	14.1%
1	-	551	40.7 %	40.8%
2	-	174	12.9 %	12.9%
3	-	145	10.7 %	10.7%
4	-	101	7.5 %	7.5%
5	-	80	5.9 %	5.9%
6	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
7	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
8	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
9	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

- Study 29961 -

**S06MOUSE: S0 SubUse: Number drugs used past 6 mo**

*Location:* 3856-3859 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -100 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

How many drugs did you use in the past 6 months?

**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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	532	39.3 %	39.4%
1	-	477	35.2 %	35.3%
2	-	134	9.9 %	9.9%
3	-	86	6.4 %	6.4%
4	-	53	3.9 %	3.9%
5	-	37	2.7 %	2.7%
6	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
7	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
8	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
9	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
-200 (M)	Data missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1,350 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0QFSMK6: S0 SubUse: Quant/Freq used cigarettes past 6 mo**

*Location:* 3860-3866 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.0 , -200.0 , -100.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

**Question:**

What is the Quant/Freq used cigarettes past 6 months?

- Study 29961 -

**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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
0.0	-	640	47.3 %	47.4%
2.5	-	53	3.9 %	3.9%
5.0	-	34	2.5 %	2.5%
7.0	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
7.5	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
10.0	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
12.5	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
14.0	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
15.0	-	46	3.4 %	3.4%
17.5	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
18.0	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
20.0	-	90	6.6 %	6.7%
21.0	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
25.0	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
28.0	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
35.0	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
36.0	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
37.5	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
40.0	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
42.0	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
49.0	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
50.0	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
54.0	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
56.0	-	101	7.5 %	7.5%
62.5	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
72.0	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
75.0	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
80.0	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
87.5	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
100.0	-	82	6.1 %	6.1%
108.0	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
126.0	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
140.0	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
144.0	-	87	6.4 %	6.4%
160.0	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
-200.0 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0ALSC2: S0 SubUse: Lifetime Alcohol Consequences**

*Location:* 3867-3870 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200

**Question:**

Lifetime Alcohol Consequences.

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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
0	-	704	52.0 %	52.1%
1	-	153	11.3 %	11.3%
2	-	114	8.4 %	8.4%
3	-	76	5.6 %	5.6%
4	-	67	4.9 %	5.0%
5	-	49	3.6 %	3.6%
6	-	41	3.0 %	3.0%
7	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
8	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
9	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
10	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
11	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
12	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
13	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
14	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
15	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0A6SC2: S0 SubUse: Past 6 mo Alcohol consequences**

*Location:* 3871-3874 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200

**Question:**

Past 6 months Alcohol consequences.

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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
0	-	972	71.8 %	71.9%
1	-	125	9.2 %	9.3%
2	-	64	4.7 %	4.7%
3	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
4	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
5	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
6	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
7	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
8	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
9	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
10	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
11	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
12	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
13	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
14	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
15	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DLSC2: S0 SubUse: Lifetime Drug Consequences**

*Location:* 3875-3878 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200

**Question:**

Lifetime Drug Consequences.

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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	509	37.6 %	37.7%
1	-	131	9.7 %	9.7%
2	-	116	8.6 %	8.6%
3	-	98	7.2 %	7.3%
4	-	95	7.0 %	7.0%
5	-	53	3.9 %	3.9%
6	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
7	-	55	4.1 %	4.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
8	-	62	4.6 %	4.6%
9	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
10	-	37	2.7 %	2.7%
11	-	39	2.9 %	2.9%
12	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
13	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
14	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
15	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
16	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### **S0D6SC2: S0 SubUse: Past 6 mo Drug consequences**

*Location:* 3879-3882 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200

#### **Question:**

Past 6 months Drug consequences.

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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
0	-	849	62.7 %	62.8%
1	-	112	8.3 %	8.3%
2	-	89	6.6 %	6.6%
3	-	65	4.8 %	4.8%
4	-	46	3.4 %	3.4%
5	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
6	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
7	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
8	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
9	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
10	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
11	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
12	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
13	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
14	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
15	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0ALDP2: S0 SubUse: Lifetime alcohol dependence symptoms**

*Location:* 3883-3886 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200

**Question:**

Lifetime alcohol dependence symptoms.

**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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
0	-	959	70.8 %	71.0%
1	-	163	12.0 %	12.1%
2	-	75	5.5 %	5.6%
3	-	57	4.2 %	4.2%
4	-	29	2.1 %	2.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
5	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
6	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
7	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
8	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
9	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
10	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0A6DP2: S0 SubUse: Past 6 months alcohol dependence symptoms**

*Location:* 3887-3890 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200

**Question:**

Past 6 months alcohol dependence symptoms.

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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
0	-	1,139	84.1 %	84.3%
1	-	85	6.3 %	6.3%
2	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
3	-	33	2.4 %	2.4%
4	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
5	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
6	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
7	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
8	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
9	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
10	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DLDP2: S0 SubUse: Lifetime drugs dependence symptoms**

*Location:* 3891-3894 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200

**Question:**

Lifetime drugs dependence symptoms.

**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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
0	-	685	50.6 %	50.7%
1	-	153	11.3 %	11.3%
2	-	138	10.2 %	10.2%
3	-	85	6.3 %	6.3%
4	-	61	4.5 %	4.5%
5	-	66	4.9 %	4.9%
6	-	48	3.5 %	3.6%
7	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
8	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
9	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
10	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0D6DP2: S0 SubUse: Past 6 months drugs dependence symptoms**

*Location:* 3895-3898 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200

**Question:**

Past 6 months drugs dependence symptoms.

**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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	972	71.8 %	71.9%
1	-	90	6.6 %	6.7%
2	-	80	5.9 %	5.9%
3	-	50	3.7 %	3.7%
4	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
5	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
6	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
7	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
8	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
9	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
10	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0TOTSCL: S0 SubUse: Lifetime total substance use consequences**

*Location:* 3899-3902 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200

**Question:**

Lifetime total substance use consequences.

**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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
0	-	414	30.6 %	30.6%
1	-	127	9.4 %	9.4%
2	-	112	8.3 %	8.3%
3	-	85	6.3 %	6.3%
4	-	107	7.9 %	7.9%
5	-	77	5.7 %	5.7%
6	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
7	-	60	4.4 %	4.4%
8	-	58	4.3 %	4.3%
9	-	56	4.1 %	4.1%
10	-	45	3.3 %	3.3%
11	-	54	4.0 %	4.0%
12	-	29	2.1 %	2.1%
13	-	33	2.4 %	2.4%
14	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
15	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
16	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0TOTSC6: S0 SubUse: Past 6 mos total substance use consequences**

*Location:* 3903-3906 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200

**Question:**

Past 6 months total substance use consequences.

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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use? / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
0	-	748	55.2 %	55.4%
1	-	135	10.0 %	10.0%
2	-	109	8.1 %	8.1%
3	-	64	4.7 %	4.7%
4	-	64	4.7 %	4.7%
5	-	47	3.5 %	3.5%
6	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
7	-	37	2.7 %	2.7%
8	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
9	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
10	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
11	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
12	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
13	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
14	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
15	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0TOTDSL: S0 SubUse: Lifetime total substance use dependency symptoms**

*Location:* 3907-3910 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200

**Question:**

- Study 29961 -

Lifetime total substance use dependency symptoms.

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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
0	-	615	45.4 %	45.5%
1	-	169	12.5 %	12.5%
2	-	139	10.3 %	10.3%
3	-	98	7.2 %	7.3%
4	-	76	5.6 %	5.6%
5	-	66	4.9 %	4.9%
6	-	53	3.9 %	3.9%
7	-	50	3.7 %	3.7%
8	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
9	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
10	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0TOTDS6: S0 SubUse: Past 6 mos total substance use dependency symptoms**

*Location:* 3911-3914 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200

**Question:**

Past 6 months total substance use dependency symptoms.

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

- Study 29961 -

adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	926	68.4 %	68.5%
1	-	102	7.5 %	7.5%
2	-	85	6.3 %	6.3%
3	-	60	4.4 %	4.4%
4	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
5	-	39	2.9 %	2.9%
6	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
7	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
8	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
9	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
10	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0ALTRTY: S0 SubUse: Lifetime alcohol treatment**

*Location:* 3915-3918 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200

**Question:**

Lifetime 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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

- Study 29961 -

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	1,195	88.3 %	88.5%
1	Yes	156	11.5 %	11.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0ALTRTM: S0 SubUse: Past 6 month alcohol treatment**

*Location:* 3919-3922 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200

**Question:**

Past 6 month 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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	No	1,276	94.2 %	94.4%
1	Yes	75	5.5 %	5.6%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DGRTY: S0 SubUse: Lifetime drug treatment**

*Location:* 3923-3926 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200

**Question:**

Lifetime 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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
0	No	1,115	82.3 %	82.5%
1	Yes	236	17.4 %	17.5%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0DGTRTM: S0 SubUse: Past 6 month drug treatment**

*Location:* 3927-3930 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -200

**Question:**

Past 6 month 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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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)).

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	No	1,225	90.5 %	90.7%
1	Yes	126	9.3 %	9.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0TRTY: S0 SubUse: Lifetime Alcohol or Drug Treatment**

*Location:* 3931-3934 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200

**Question:**

Lifetime 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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
0	No	1,066	78.7 %	78.9%
1	Yes	285	21.0 %	21.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0TRTM: S0 SubUse: Past 6 Month Alcohol or Drug Treatment**

*Location:* 3935-3938 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -200

**Question:**

Past 6 Month 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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
0	No	1,198	88.5 %	88.7%
1	Yes	153	11.3 %	11.3%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0FALSC: S0 SubUse: Alcohol Social Consequences - Father**

*Location:* 3939-3942 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -100 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Alcohol Social Consequences - Father.

**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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
0	-	678	50.1 %	58.8%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	-	102	7.5 %	8.8%
2	-	83	6.1 %	7.2%
3	-	77	5.7 %	6.7%
4	-	66	4.9 %	5.7%
5	-	58	4.3 %	5.0%
6	-	41	3.0 %	3.6%
7	-	27	2.0 %	2.3%
8	-	14	1.0 %	1.2%
9	-	8	0.6 %	0.7%
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	196	14.5 %	-
-8 (M)	Refuse	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,154 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### S0MALSC: S0 SubUse: Alcohol Social Consequences - Mother

*Location:* 3943-3946 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300 , -200 , -100 , -9 , -8

##### Question:

Alcohol Social Consequences - Mother.

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 adolescents use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the course of his/her lifetime and in the past six-months. 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 ever had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you ever wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother ever 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	%	Valid %
0	-	1,072	79.2 %	81.2%
1	-	76	5.6 %	5.8%
2	-	54	4.0 %	4.1%
3	-	42	3.1 %	3.2%
4	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
5	-	14	1.0 %	1.1%
6	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
7	-	14	1.0 %	1.1%
8	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
9	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
-200 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-
-9 (M)	Dont Know	30	2.2 %	-

Based upon 1,321 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0TCO1: S0 TCO: Past 7 days mind dominated by forces beyond control**

*Location:* 3947-3950 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of Missing Values (M):* -400 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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, & 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 adolescents 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 symptom.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Never	931	68.8 %	86.9%
2	Almost Never	50	3.7 %	4.7%
3	Sometimes	59	4.4 %	5.5%
4	Often	16	1.2 %	1.5%
5	Very Often	15	1.1 %	1.4%

**Missing Data**

-400 (M)	Measure does not exist for this version	278	20.5 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	5	0.4 %	-

Based upon 1,071 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0TCO2: S0 TCO: Past 7 days how often thoughts in head not own**

- Study 29961 -

Location: 3951-3954 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -400 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

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, & 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 adolescents 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 symptom.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Never	906	66.9 %	84.6%
2	Almost Never	72	5.3 %	6.7%
3	Sometimes	62	4.6 %	5.8%
4	Often	23	1.7 %	2.1%
5	Very Often	8	0.6 %	0.7%

*Missing Data*

-400 (M)	Measure does not exist for this version	278	20.5 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	5	0.4 %	-

Based upon 1,071 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0TCO3: S0 TCO: Past 7 days how often people wished you to do harm**

Location: 3955-3958 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -400 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

=

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, & 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

- Study 29961 -

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 adolescents 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 symptom.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Never	735	54.3 %	68.6%
2	Almost Never	119	8.8 %	11.1%
3	Sometimes	119	8.8 %	11.1%
4	Often	59	4.4 %	5.5%
5	Very Often	39	2.9 %	3.6%

  

<i>Missing Data</i>				
-400 (M)	Measure does not exist for this version	278	20.5 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	5	0.4 %	-

Based upon 1,071 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0TCOCNT: S0 TCO: Count based on 3 variables**

*Location:* 3959-3962 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -400 , -300 , -200 , -9 , -8

**Question:**

Count of the number of symptoms the person has experienced.

MEASURE: Threat Control Override (TCO)

The Threat/Control Override Psychotic Symptoms Scale (TCO; Link, Stueve, & 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 adolescents 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 symptom.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0	-	650	48.0 %	60.7%
1	-	273	20.2 %	25.5%
2	-	76	5.6 %	7.1%
3	-	72	5.3 %	6.7%

  

<i>Missing Data</i>				
---------------------	--	--	--	--

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
-400 (M)	Measure does not exist for this version	278	20.5 %	-
-200 (M)	Data missing	5	0.4 %	-

Based upon 1,071 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### S0TRAILSA: S0 Trails: Trail Making Test Categories - Part A

*Location:* 3963-3966 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -501 , -101

**Question:**

Trail Making Test Categories - Part A.

**MEASURE:** Trail-Making Test

Cognitive dysfunction related to impairment to the frontal cortex of the brain is assessed through the use of two well-accepted neurological tests, the Stroop Color-word test and the Trail Making Test. The Stroop is described in another section of the codebook.

The Trail-making test is a measure of general brain function (see Reitan, 1979). The skills required in completing the Trail-Making Test (Reitan, 1979) are indicative of the presence of brain damage. The test has two parts: Part A involves a series of numbers and the participant is required to connect the numbers in sequential order (similar to a dot-to-dot). Part B involves a series of numbers and letters and the participant is required to alternately connect letters and numbers in sequential order. The test generally requires ability to sequence (Parts A and B), ability to shift cognitive set (Part B), and processing speed (Parts A and B). Part A and Part B are scored separately and expressed in terms of the number of seconds it takes the participant to complete each section. Longer completion times (Child: Part A, greater than 18 seconds / Part B, greater than 37 seconds; Adult: Part A, greater than 39 seconds / Part B, greater than 85 seconds) are indicative of neurological deficit. Versions for adults (15 and older) and children (9-14) are available.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Perfectly Normal	549	40.5 %	41.1%
2	Normal	514	38.0 %	38.5%
3	Mild / Moderately Impaired	176	13.0 %	13.2%
4	Moderately / Severely Impaired	97	7.2 %	7.3%

**Missing Data**

-501 (M)	Missing or incomplete trails	17	1.3 %	-
-101 (M)	Subject has a broken arm, could not complete trails	1	0.1 %	-

Based upon 1,336 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### S0TRAILSB: S0 Trails: Trail Making Test Categories - Part B

- Study 29961 -

Location: 3967-3970 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -501 , -101

**Question:**

Trail Making Test Categories - Part B.

MEASURE: Trail-Making Test

Cognitive dysfunction related to impairment to the frontal cortex of the brain is assessed through the use of two well-accepted neurological tests, the Stroop Color-word test and the Trail Making Test. The Stroop is described in another section of the codebook.

The Trail-making test is a measure of general brain function (see Reitan, 1979). The skills required in completing the Trail-Making Test (Reitan, 1979) are indicative of the presence of brain damage. The test has two parts: Part A involves a series of numbers and the participant is required to connect the numbers in sequential order (similar to a dot-to-dot). Part B involves a series of numbers and letters and the participant is required to alternately connect letters and numbers in sequential order. The test generally requires ability to sequence (Parts A and B), ability to shift cognitive set (Part B), and processing speed (Parts A and B). Part A and Part B are scored separately and expressed in terms of the number of seconds it takes the participant to complete each section. Longer completion times (Child: Part A, greater than 18 seconds / Part B, greater than 37 seconds; Adult: Part A, greater than 39 seconds / Part B, greater than 85 seconds) are indicative of neurological deficit. Versions for adults (15 and older) and children (9-14) are available.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1	Perfectly Normal	468	34.6 %	34.9%
2	Normal	363	26.8 %	27.1%
3	Mild / Moderately Impaired	356	26.3 %	26.6%
4	Moderately / Severely Impaired	153	11.3 %	11.4%

**Missing Data**

-501 (M)	Missing or incomplete trails	13	1.0 %	-
-101 (M)	Subject has a broken arm, could not complete trails	1	0.1 %	-

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

**S0FSIQ: S0 WASI: Enter Full Scale IQ**

Location: 3971-3974 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values (M): -102 , -101

**Question:**

Enter Full Scale IQ.

- Study 29961 -

**MEASURE:** Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (WASI)

The Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (WASI; Wechsler, 1999) produces an estimate of general intellectual ability based on two subtests, Vocabulary (42 total items that require the subject to orally define 4 images and 37 words presented both orally and visually) and Matrix Reasoning (35 incomplete grid patterns that require the participant to select the correct response from five possible choices). Administered in approximately 15 minutes, the WASI is a quick estimate of an individual's level of intellectual functioning, with higher scores indicating greater intellectual ability. The WASI is linked to both the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC-III) and the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS-III), and has been normed for individuals' ages 6 to 89 years.

In the Pathways study, the WASI is administered on paper. Only the calculated scores (as indicated below) are entered into the database.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
55	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
56	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
57	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
58	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
59	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
60	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
61	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
62	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
63	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
64	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
65	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
66	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
67	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
68	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
69	-	37	2.7 %	2.8%
70	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
71	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
72	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
73	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
74	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
75	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
76	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
77	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
78	-	33	2.4 %	2.5%
79	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
80	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
81	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
82	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
83	-	59	4.4 %	4.4%
84	-	56	4.1 %	4.2%
85	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
86	-	69	5.1 %	5.1%
87	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
88	-	53	3.9 %	3.9%
89	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
90	-	70	5.2 %	5.2%
91	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
92	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
93	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
94	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
95	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
96	-	46	3.4 %	3.4%
97	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
98	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
99	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
100	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
101	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
102	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
103	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
104	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
105	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
106	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
107	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
108	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
109	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
110	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
111	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
112	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
113	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
114	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
115	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
116	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
118	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
119	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
126	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
128	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-102 (M)	Subject refused to complete WASI	1	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	WASI incomplete	11	0.8 %	-

Based upon 1,342 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0WASITI: S0 WASI: Enter the WASI Percentile Rank**

*Location:* 3975-3980 (*width:* 6; *decimal:* 1)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -102.0 , -101.0

**Question:**

Enter the WASI Percentile Rank.

**MEASURE:** Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (WASI)

The Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (WASI; Wechsler, 1999) produces an estimate of general intellectual ability based on two subtests, Vocabulary (42 total items that require the subject to orally define 4 images and 37 words presented both orally and visually) and Matrix Reasoning (35 incomplete grid patterns that require the participant to select the correct response from five possible choices). Administered in approximately 15 minutes, the WASI is a quick estimate of an individual's level of intellectual functioning, with higher scores indicating greater intellectual ability. The WASI is linked to both the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC-III) and the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS-III), and has been normed for individuals' ages 6 to 89 years.

In the Pathways study, the WASI is administered on paper. Only the calculated scores (as indicated below) are entered into the database.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0.1	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
0.2	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
0.3	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
0.4	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
0.5	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
1.0	-	86	6.4 %	6.4%
2.0	-	66	4.9 %	4.9%
3.0	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
4.0	-	55	4.1 %	4.1%
5.0	-	69	5.1 %	5.1%
6.0	-	41	3.0 %	3.1%
7.0	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
8.0	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
9.0	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
10.0	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
12.0	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
13.0	-	61	4.5 %	4.5%
14.0	-	57	4.2 %	4.2%
16.0	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
17.0	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
18.0	-	67	4.9 %	5.0%
19.0	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
21.0	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
23.0	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
25.0	-	66	4.9 %	4.9%
27.0	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
30.0	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
32.0	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
34.0	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
37.0	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
39.0	-	45	3.3 %	3.4%
42.0	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
45.0	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
47.0	-	38	2.8 %	2.8%
50.0	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
53.0	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
55.0	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
58.0	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
61.0	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
63.0	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
66.0	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
68.0	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
70.0	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
73.0	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
75.0	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
77.0	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
78.0	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
79.0	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
81.0	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
82.0	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
83.0	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
84.0	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
85.0	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
86.0	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
88.0	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
90.0	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
95.0	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
96.0	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
97.0	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<b>Missing Data</b>				
-102.0 (M)	Subject refused to complete WASI	1	0.1 %	-
-101.0 (M)	WASI incomplete	11	0.8 %	-

Based upon 1,342 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0WASISU: S0 WASI: Sum of the Vocab and Reasoning T Scores**

*Location:* 3981-3984 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -102 , -101

**Question:**

Sum of the Vocab and Reasoning T Scores.

**MEASURE:** Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (WASI)

The Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (WASI; Wechsler, 1999) produces an estimate of general intellectual ability based on two subtests, Vocabulary (42 total items that require the subject to orally define 4 images and 37 words presented both orally and visually) and Matrix Reasoning (35 incomplete grid patterns that require the participant to select the correct response from five possible choices). Administered in approximately 15 minutes, the WASI is a quick estimate of an individual's level of intellectual functioning, with higher scores indicating greater intellectual ability. The WASI is linked to both the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC-III) and the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS-III), and has been normed for individuals' ages 6 to 89 years.

In the Pathways study, the WASI is administered on paper. Only the calculated scores (as indicated below) are entered into the database.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
40	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
41	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
42	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
43	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
44	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
45	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
46	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
47	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
48	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
49	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
50	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
51	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
52	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
53	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
54	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
55	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
56	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
57	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
58	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
59	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
60	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
61	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
62	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
63	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
64	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
65	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
66	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
67	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
68	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
69	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
70	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
71	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
72	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
73	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
74	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
75	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
76	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
77	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
78	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
79	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
80	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
81	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
82	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
83	-	45	3.3 %	3.4%
84	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
85	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
86	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
87	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
88	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
89	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
90	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
91	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
92	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
93	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
94	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
95	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
96	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
97	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
98	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
99	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
100	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
101	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
102	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
103	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
104	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
105	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
106	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
107	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
108	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
109	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
110	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
111	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
112	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
113	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
115	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
116	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
117	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
118	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
120	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
122	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
129	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
131	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-102 (M)	Subject refused to complete WASI	1	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	WASI incomplete	11	0.8 %	-

- Study 29961 -

Based upon 1,342 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0WASIRE: S0 WASI: Enter WASI Matrix Reasoning T Score**

*Location:* 3985-3988 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -102 , -101

**Question:**

Enter WASI Matrix Reasoning T Score.

**MEASURE:** Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (WASI)

The Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (WASI; Wechsler, 1999) produces an estimate of general intellectual ability based on two subtests, Vocabulary (42 total items that require the subject to orally define 4 images and 37 words presented both orally and visually) and Matrix Reasoning (35 incomplete grid patterns that require the participant to select the correct response from five possible choices). Administered in approximately 15 minutes, the WASI is a quick estimate of an individual's level of intellectual functioning, with higher scores indicating greater intellectual ability. The WASI is linked to both the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC-III) and the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS-III), and has been normed for individuals' ages 6 to 89 years.

In the Pathways study, the WASI is administered on paper. Only the calculated scores (as indicated below) are entered into the database.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
13	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
20	-	98	7.2 %	7.3%
21	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
22	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
23	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
24	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
25	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
26	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
27	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
28	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
29	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
30	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
31	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
32	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
33	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
34	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
35	-	38	2.8 %	2.8%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
36	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
37	-	41	3.0 %	3.1%
38	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
39	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
40	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
41	-	49	3.6 %	3.6%
42	-	37	2.7 %	2.8%
43	-	77	5.7 %	5.7%
44	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
45	-	52	3.8 %	3.9%
46	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
47	-	62	4.6 %	4.6%
48	-	47	3.5 %	3.5%
49	-	58	4.3 %	4.3%
50	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
51	-	67	4.9 %	5.0%
52	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
53	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
54	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
55	-	46	3.4 %	3.4%
56	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
57	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
58	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
59	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
60	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
61	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
62	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
63	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
64	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
66	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
-101 (M)	WASI incomplete	10	0.7 %	-

Based upon 1,344 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0VOCABSCORE: S0 WASI: Vocabulary T score (combined - matrix reasoning T scores)**

*Location:* 3989-3992 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -102 , -101

**Question:**

Vocabulary T score (combined - matrix reasoning T scores).

- Study 29961 -

**MEASURE: Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (WASI)**

The Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (WASI; Wechsler, 1999) produces an estimate of general intellectual ability based on two subtests, Vocabulary (42 total items that require the subject to orally define 4 images and 37 words presented both orally and visually) and Matrix Reasoning (35 incomplete grid patterns that require the participant to select the correct response from five possible choices). Administered in approximately 15 minutes, the WASI is a quick estimate of an individual's level of intellectual functioning, with higher scores indicating greater intellectual ability. The WASI is linked to both the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC-III) and the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS-III), and has been normed for individuals' ages 6 to 89 years.

In the Pathways study, the WASI is administered on paper. Only the calculated scores (as indicated below) are entered into the database.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information ([www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu](http://www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu)).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
20	-	78	5.8 %	5.8%
21	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
22	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
23	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
24	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
25	-	34	2.5 %	2.5%
26	-	39	2.9 %	2.9%
27	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
28	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
29	-	34	2.5 %	2.5%
30	-	38	2.8 %	2.8%
31	-	46	3.4 %	3.4%
32	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
33	-	49	3.6 %	3.7%
34	-	49	3.6 %	3.7%
35	-	45	3.3 %	3.4%
36	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
37	-	45	3.3 %	3.4%
38	-	59	4.4 %	4.4%
39	-	61	4.5 %	4.5%
40	-	60	4.4 %	4.5%
41	-	63	4.7 %	4.7%
42	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
43	-	61	4.5 %	4.5%
44	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
45	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
46	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
47	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
48	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
49	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
50	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
51	-	29	2.1 %	2.2%
52	-	20	1.5 %	1.5%
53	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
54	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
55	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
56	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
57	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
58	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
59	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
60	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
61	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
62	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
63	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
64	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
65	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
67	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
68	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
70	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
75	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
<i>Missing Data</i>				
-102 (M)	Subject refused to complete WASI	1	0.1 %	-
-101 (M)	WASI incomplete	11	0.8 %	-

Based upon 1,342 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0IMPULS: S0 WAI: Impulse Control**

*Location:* 3993-3999 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

**Question:**

Impulse Control - the mean of 8 items which comprise the scale. 7 of the 8 items are reverse coded.

**MEASURE:** Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI)

The Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI; Weinberger & Schwartz, 1990) is an assessment of an

- Study 29961 -

individual's social-emotional adjustment within the context of external constraints. 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. The scale is divided into four areas: 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 (combines items from impulse control and suppression of aggression).

Higher scores indicated 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)).

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.00	False	13	1.0 %	1.0%
1.13	-	11	0.8 %	0.8%
1.25	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
1.38	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
1.50	-	55	4.1 %	4.1%
1.63	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
1.75	-	34	2.5 %	2.5%
1.88	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
2.00	Somewhat False	50	3.7 %	3.7%
2.13	-	48	3.5 %	3.6%
2.25	-	38	2.8 %	2.8%
2.38	-	60	4.4 %	4.4%
2.50	-	67	4.9 %	5.0%
2.63	-	65	4.8 %	4.8%
2.75	-	56	4.1 %	4.1%
2.88	-	61	4.5 %	4.5%
3.00	Not sure	92	6.8 %	6.8%
3.13	-	55	4.1 %	4.1%
3.25	-	56	4.1 %	4.1%
3.38	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
3.50	-	79	5.8 %	5.8%
3.63	-	57	4.2 %	4.2%
3.75	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
3.88	-	44	3.2 %	3.3%
4.00	Somewhat True	41	3.0 %	3.0%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
4.13	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
4.25	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
4.38	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
4.50	-	52	3.8 %	3.8%
4.63	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
4.75	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
4.88	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
5.00	True	26	1.9 %	1.9%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

### S0SUPAGG: S0 WAI: Suppression of Aggression

*Location:* 4000-4006 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

#### Question:

Suppression of Aggression - is the mean of 7 items which comprise the score. Each item is reverse coded.

MEASURE: Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI)

The Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI; Weinberger & Schwartz, 1990) is an assessment of an individual's social-emotional adjustment within the context of external constraints. 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. The scale is divided into four areas: 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 (combines items from impulse control and suppression of aggression).

Higher scores indicated 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	%	Valid %
1.00	False	36	2.7 %	2.7%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.14	-	28	2.1 %	2.1%
1.29	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
1.43	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
1.57	-	60	4.4 %	4.4%
1.71	-	65	4.8 %	4.8%
1.86	-	52	3.8 %	3.8%
2.00	Somewhat False	63	4.7 %	4.7%
2.14	-	102	7.5 %	7.5%
2.29	-	60	4.4 %	4.4%
2.43	-	62	4.6 %	4.6%
2.57	-	59	4.4 %	4.4%
2.71	-	84	6.2 %	6.2%
2.86	-	75	5.5 %	5.6%
3.00	Not sure	60	4.4 %	4.4%
3.14	-	58	4.3 %	4.3%
3.29	-	62	4.6 %	4.6%
3.43	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
3.57	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
3.71	-	39	2.9 %	2.9%
3.86	-	58	4.3 %	4.3%
4.00	Somewhat True	39	2.9 %	2.9%
4.14	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
4.29	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
4.43	-	59	4.4 %	4.4%
4.57	-	18	1.3 %	1.3%
4.71	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
4.86	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
5.00	True	26	1.9 %	1.9%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

**S0CONSID: S0 WAI: Consideration of Others**

*Location:* 4007-4013 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

**Question:**

Consideration of Others - is the mean of 7 items which comprise the score.

MEASURE: Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI)

- Study 29961 -

The Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI; Weinberger & Schwartz, 1990) is an assessment of an individual's social-emotional adjustment within the context of external constraints. 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. The scale is divided into four areas: 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 (combines items from impulse control and suppression of aggression).

Higher scores indicated 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	%	Valid %
1.00	False	15	1.1 %	1.1%
1.14	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
1.29	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
1.43	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
1.57	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
1.71	-	8	0.6 %	0.6%
1.86	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
2.00	Somewhat False	14	1.0 %	1.0%
2.14	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
2.29	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
2.43	-	39	2.9 %	2.9%
2.57	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
2.71	-	75	5.5 %	5.6%
2.86	-	51	3.8 %	3.8%
3.00	Not sure	57	4.2 %	4.2%
3.14	-	65	4.8 %	4.8%
3.29	-	102	7.5 %	7.5%
3.43	-	90	6.6 %	6.7%
3.57	-	82	6.1 %	6.1%
3.71	-	90	6.6 %	6.7%
3.86	-	86	6.4 %	6.4%
4.00	Somewhat True	87	6.4 %	6.4%
4.14	-	65	4.8 %	4.8%
4.29	-	59	4.4 %	4.4%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
4.43	-	73	5.4 %	5.4%
4.57	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
4.71	-	35	2.6 %	2.6%
4.86	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
5.00	True	63	4.7 %	4.7%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

#### S0TEMPER: S0 WAI: Temperance

*Location:* 4014-4020 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

*Variable Type:* numeric

*(Range of) Missing Values (M):* -300.00 , -200.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

#### Question:

Temperance - 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 & Schwartz, 1990) is an assessment of an individual's social-emotional adjustment within the context of external constraints. 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. The scale is divided into four areas: 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 (combines items from impulse control and suppression of aggression).

Higher scores indicated 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	%	Valid %
1.00	False	4	0.3 %	0.3%
1.07	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
1.13	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
1.20	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%

- Study 29961 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
1.27	-	14	1.0 %	1.0%
1.33	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
1.40	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
1.47	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
1.53	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
1.60	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
1.67	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
1.73	-	21	1.6 %	1.6%
1.80	-	27	2.0 %	2.0%
1.87	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
1.93	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
2.00	Somewhat False	23	1.7 %	1.7%
2.07	-	43	3.2 %	3.2%
2.13	-	33	2.4 %	2.4%
2.20	-	30	2.2 %	2.2%
2.27	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
2.33	-	45	3.3 %	3.3%
2.40	-	39	2.9 %	2.9%
2.47	-	40	3.0 %	3.0%
2.53	-	29	2.1 %	2.1%
2.60	-	54	4.0 %	4.0%
2.67	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
2.73	-	37	2.7 %	2.7%
2.80	-	26	1.9 %	1.9%
2.87	-	38	2.8 %	2.8%
2.93	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
3.00	Not sure	32	2.4 %	2.4%
3.07	-	45	3.3 %	3.3%
3.13	-	41	3.0 %	3.0%
3.20	-	41	3.0 %	3.0%
3.27	-	22	1.6 %	1.6%
3.33	-	32	2.4 %	2.4%
3.40	-	42	3.1 %	3.1%
3.47	-	23	1.7 %	1.7%
3.53	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%
3.57	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.60	-	36	2.7 %	2.7%
3.67	-	25	1.8 %	1.9%
3.73	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
3.80	-	24	1.8 %	1.8%

- Study 29961 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
3.87	-	16	1.2 %	1.2%
3.93	-	31	2.3 %	2.3%
4.00	Somewhat True	16	1.2 %	1.2%
4.07	-	15	1.1 %	1.1%
4.13	-	17	1.3 %	1.3%
4.20	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
4.27	-	13	1.0 %	1.0%
4.33	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
4.40	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
4.47	-	19	1.4 %	1.4%
4.53	-	9	0.7 %	0.7%
4.60	-	5	0.4 %	0.4%
4.67	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
4.73	-	12	0.9 %	0.9%
4.80	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
4.87	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
4.93	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
5.00	True	5	0.4 %	0.4%
-200.00 (M)	Data missing	3	0.2 %	-

Based upon 1,351 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.