

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 12 Month Follow-up Data

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

Terms of Use

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

Information about Copyrighted Content

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

**NOTICE
WARNING CONCERNING COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS**

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

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTES

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

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

VARIABLE GROUP CROSSWALK ACROSS WAVES

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

ICPSR 29961

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

Variable Description and Frequencies

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

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

12 Month Follow-Up

LINEID: Line Identification Number

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

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

CASEID: S2 IntInfo: Subject ID

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

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

S2INTCOMPSTAT: S2 IntInfo: Interview completion status

Completion status of the interview.

MEASURE: Interview Information

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Complete	1253	92.5 %
2	Partial	9	0.7 %
4	Incomplete	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

S2QVERSION: S2 IntInfo: Version number associated with programming changes to the interview

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
01.07	-	125	9.2 %
01.08	-	140	10.3 %
01.09	-	163	12.0 %
01.10	-	83	6.1 %
01.11	-	165	12.2 %
01.12	-	401	29.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
01.14	-	182	13.4 %
01.15	-	3	0.2 %
INC	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	0	0.0 %
Inc	-	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: character

S2INTYR: S2 IntInfo: Year of Interview

What year did the interview take place in?

MEASURE: Interview Information

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2001	-	24	1.8 %
2002	-	629	46.5 %
2003	-	605	44.7 %
2004	-	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -201

S2INTLOC: S2 IntInfo: Interview location

Where did this interview take place?

MEASURE: Interview Information

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Subject's home	664	49.0 %
2	At the placement	469	34.6 %
3	Somewhere else	129	9.5 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -201

S2PLCCOD: S2 IntInfo: Interview location - facility code

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	469	34.6 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	NA: Interview not conducted at the placement	793	58.6 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 469 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2PLCTYPE: S2 IntInfo: Interview location - facility type

What type of facility did the interview take place in?

MEASURE: Interview Information

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
8	Residential treatment center (centralized staff, institutional setting)	153	11.3 %
14	Secure	110	8.1 %
15	Jail / Prison	171	12.6 %
16	Detention	25	1.8 %
20	Other	10	0.7 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	NA: Interview conducted not at placement	793	58.6 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 469 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2MONTHS: S2 IntInfo: Number of months covered in the recall period

Number of months in the recall period.

MEASURE: Interview Information

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	-	1	0.1 %
3	-	11	0.8 %
4	-	84	6.2 %
5	-	302	22.3 %
6	-	532	39.3 %
7	-	260	19.2 %
8	-	72	5.3 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -201

S2DAYINRP: S2 IntInfo: Number of days covered in the recall period

Number of days in the recall period.

MEASURE: Interview Information

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
61	-	1	0.1 %
79	-	1	0.1 %
86	-	1	0.1 %
88	-	1	0.1 %
89	-	1	0.1 %
90	-	2	0.1 %
91	-	1	0.1 %
92	-	4	0.3 %
100	-	1	0.1 %
103	-	1	0.1 %
105	-	1	0.1 %
106	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
108	-	1	0.1 %
109	-	1	0.1 %
110	-	1	0.1 %
112	-	1	0.1 %
114	-	3	0.2 %
115	-	3	0.2 %
116	-	2	0.1 %
118	-	2	0.1 %
119	-	2	0.1 %
120	-	13	1.0 %
121	-	7	0.5 %
122	-	29	2.1 %
123	-	16	1.2 %
134	-	1	0.1 %
135	-	1	0.1 %
136	-	3	0.2 %
137	-	9	0.7 %
138	-	7	0.5 %
139	-	10	0.7 %
140	-	7	0.5 %
141	-	4	0.3 %
142	-	4	0.3 %
143	-	11	0.8 %
144	-	10	0.7 %
145	-	6	0.4 %
146	-	10	0.7 %
147	-	7	0.5 %
148	-	9	0.7 %
149	-	6	0.4 %
150	-	27	2.0 %
151	-	79	5.8 %
152	-	3	0.2 %
153	-	87	6.4 %
158	-	1	0.1 %
163	-	1	0.1 %
165	-	2	0.1 %
166	-	11	0.8 %
167	-	15	1.1 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -201

S2SITE: S2 DEM: Study Site Location

The geographic site where the subject is located.

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

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

S2SGEND: S2 DEM: Subject gender

Subject's gender.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Male	1087	80.3 %
2	Female	175	12.9 %
	Missing Data		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2AGE: S2 DEM: Subject Age as of the interview date - Truncated

Subject's age at the time of the interview (Truncated); interview date

minus the subject's DOB truncated to a whole number.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
15	-	150	11.1 %
16	-	243	17.9 %
17	-	383	28.3 %
18	-	370	27.3 %
19	-	115	8.5 %
20	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -201

S2CTAGE: S2 DEM: Subject Age as of the interview date - Continuous

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

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1262	93.2 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -201

S2BL_ETH: S2 DEM: Ethnicity stated at Baseline

Ethnicity (from baseline).

MEASURE: Demographics

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

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

S2ETHN_R: S2 DEM: Subjects Ethnicity - Recoded

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

MEASURE: Demographics

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

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

S2DEMO_PARDTH: S2 FamStr: Biological parents passed away during recall period

Whether either biological parent passed away in the recall period.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1249	92.2 %
1	Yes - Mom	4	0.3 %
2	Yes - Dad	4	0.3 %
3	Yes - Both	1	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,258 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_PMONDTN: S2 FamStr: Primary caregiver pass away during recall period

Whether a primary caregiver passed away in the recall period.

MEASURE: Demographics

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	820	60.6 %
1	Yes	8	0.6 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Subject didnt have a primary caregiver	433	32.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 828 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2ARMSA_MEXAM: S2 ARSMA: Consider yourself to be Mexican American

Background Mexican American.

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

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	948	70.0 %
1	Yes	313	23.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,261 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2AOS: S2 ARSMA: Anglo Orientation Subscale

Anglo Orientation - General; Mean of 11 items.

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

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

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all	0	0.0 %
2.00	Very little or not very often	0	0.0 %
2.45	-	1	0.1 %
2.55	-	3	0.2 %
2.64	-	1	0.1 %
2.73	-	2	0.1 %
2.82	-	3	0.2 %
2.91	-	1	0.1 %
3.00	Moderately	4	0.3 %
3.09	-	8	0.6 %
3.18	-	9	0.7 %
3.27	-	9	0.7 %
3.36	-	2	0.1 %
3.45	-	15	1.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.55	-	5	0.4 %
3.64	-	12	0.9 %
3.73	-	13	1.0 %
3.82	-	21	1.6 %
3.91	-	21	1.6 %
4.00	More or very often	15	1.1 %
4.09	-	11	0.8 %
4.18	-	22	1.6 %
4.20	-	1	0.1 %
4.27	-	15	1.1 %
4.36	-	23	1.7 %
4.45	-	18	1.3 %
4.55	-	17	1.3 %
4.64	-	16	1.2 %
4.73	-	15	1.1 %
4.82	-	12	0.9 %
4.91	-	7	0.5 %
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	11	0.8 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into ARSMA	948	70.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 76-82 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2ANGAFF: S2 ARSMA: Anglo Affiliation Subscale

Anglo Orientation - Affiliation; Mean of 3 items.

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

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

(1) Not at all

(2) Very little or not very often

- (3) Moderately
- (4) More or very often
- (5) Extremely often or almost always

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all	25	1.8 %
1.33	-	11	0.8 %
1.67	-	17	1.3 %
2.00	Very little or not very often	23	1.7 %
2.33	-	24	1.8 %
2.67	-	35	2.6 %
3.00	Moderately	41	3.0 %
3.33	-	34	2.5 %
3.67	-	37	2.7 %
4.00	More or very often	19	1.4 %
4.33	-	20	1.5 %
4.67	-	11	0.8 %
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	16	1.2 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into ARSMA	948	70.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2ENGLNG: S2 ARSMA: English Language Subscale

Anglo Orientation - Language; Mean of 8 items.

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

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

- (1) Not at all
- (2) Very little or not very often

- (3) Moderately
- (4) More or very often
- (5) Extremely often or almost always

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all	0	0.0 %
2.00	Very little or not very often	0	0.0 %
2.50	-	1	0.1 %
2.63	-	1	0.1 %
2.75	-	1	0.1 %
2.88	-	2	0.1 %
3.00	Moderately	2	0.1 %
3.13	-	7	0.5 %
3.25	-	2	0.1 %
3.38	-	10	0.7 %
3.50	-	5	0.4 %
3.63	-	6	0.4 %
3.75	-	14	1.0 %
3.88	-	4	0.3 %
4.00	More or very often	24	1.8 %
4.13	-	14	1.0 %
4.25	-	11	0.8 %
4.38	-	17	1.3 %
4.50	-	24	1.8 %
4.63	-	17	1.3 %
4.75	-	21	1.6 %
4.88	-	19	1.4 %
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	111	8.2 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into ARSMA	948	70.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2MOS: S2 ARSMA: Mexican Orientation Subscale

Mexican Orientation - General; Mean of 12 items.

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

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

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all	0	0.0 %
1.08	-	1	0.1 %
1.25	-	1	0.1 %
1.33	-	2	0.1 %
1.42	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	3	0.2 %
1.58	-	4	0.3 %
1.64	-	1	0.1 %
1.67	-	8	0.6 %
1.75	-	11	0.8 %
1.83	-	8	0.6 %
1.92	-	9	0.7 %
2.00	Very little or not very often	15	1.1 %
2.08	-	5	0.4 %
2.17	-	12	0.9 %
2.25	-	11	0.8 %
2.33	-	13	1.0 %
2.42	-	10	0.7 %
2.50	-	5	0.4 %
2.58	-	11	0.8 %
2.67	-	9	0.7 %
2.75	-	10	0.7 %
2.83	-	8	0.6 %
2.92	-	9	0.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.00	Moderately	4	0.3 %
3.08	-	7	0.5 %
3.17	-	12	0.9 %
3.25	-	10	0.7 %
3.33	-	4	0.3 %
3.42	-	3	0.2 %
3.50	-	7	0.5 %
3.58	-	2	0.1 %
3.67	-	7	0.5 %
3.75	-	6	0.4 %
3.83	-	7	0.5 %
3.92	-	5	0.4 %
4.00	More or very often	9	0.7 %
4.08	-	3	0.2 %
4.17	-	2	0.1 %
4.25	-	3	0.2 %
4.33	-	5	0.4 %
4.42	-	7	0.5 %
4.50	-	3	0.2 %
4.58	-	4	0.3 %
4.67	-	5	0.4 %
4.75	-	3	0.2 %
4.83	-	5	0.4 %
4.92	-	6	0.4 %
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	17	1.3 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into ARSMA	948	70.0 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2MEXAFF: S2 ARSMA: Mexican Affiliation Subscale

Mexican Orientation - Affiliation; Mean of 3 items.

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

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

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all	0	0.0 %
1.33	-	1	0.1 %
1.67	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	Very little or not very often	1	0.1 %
2.33	-	6	0.4 %
2.67	-	5	0.4 %
3.00	Moderately	13	1.0 %
3.33	-	19	1.4 %
3.67	-	43	3.2 %
4.00	More or very often	40	3.0 %
4.33	-	37	2.7 %
4.67	-	43	3.2 %
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	104	7.7 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into ARSMA	948	70.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SPALNG: S2 ARSMA: Spanish Language Subscale

Mexican Orientation - Language; Mean of 9 items.

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

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

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all	30	2.2 %
1.11	-	9	0.7 %
1.13	-	1	0.1 %
1.22	-	14	1.0 %
1.33	-	12	0.9 %
1.38	-	1	0.1 %
1.44	-	12	0.9 %
1.56	-	9	0.7 %
1.67	-	8	0.6 %
1.78	-	9	0.7 %
1.89	-	11	0.8 %
2.00	Very little or not very often	14	1.0 %
2.11	-	10	0.7 %
2.22	-	11	0.8 %
2.33	-	6	0.4 %
2.44	-	9	0.7 %
2.56	-	10	0.7 %
2.67	-	6	0.4 %
2.78	-	5	0.4 %
2.89	-	6	0.4 %
3.00	Moderately	7	0.5 %
3.11	-	9	0.7 %
3.22	-	6	0.4 %
3.33	-	3	0.2 %
3.44	-	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.56	-	8	0.6 %
3.67	-	8	0.6 %
3.78	-	7	0.5 %
3.89	-	4	0.3 %
4.00	More or very often	5	0.4 %
4.11	-	4	0.3 %
4.22	-	2	0.1 %
4.33	-	7	0.5 %
4.44	-	5	0.4 %
4.56	-	6	0.4 %
4.67	-	4	0.3 %
4.78	-	7	0.5 %
4.89	-	3	0.2 %
5.00	Extremely often or almost always	21	1.6 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into ARSMA	948	70.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2BSISOM: S2 BSI: Somatization

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

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

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

(0) Not at all

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	Not at all	496	36.6 %
0.14	-	151	11.2 %
0.29	-	87	6.4 %
0.43	-	65	4.8 %
0.57	-	55	4.1 %
0.71	-	31	2.3 %
0.86	-	17	1.3 %
1.00	A little bit	14	1.0 %
1.14	-	9	0.7 %
1.29	-	14	1.0 %
1.43	-	6	0.4 %
1.57	-	4	0.3 %
1.71	-	3	0.2 %
1.86	-	6	0.4 %
2.00	Moderately	7	0.5 %
2.14	-	2	0.1 %
2.29	-	2	0.1 %
2.43	-	4	0.3 %
2.57	-	2	0.1 %
2.86	-	3	0.2 %
3.00	Quite a bit	3	0.2 %
3.29	-	2	0.1 %
3.57	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Extremely	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97.00	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SOM_T: S2 BSI: Somatization Clinically Significant

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

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	not clinically significant	945	69.8 %
1	clinical range	39	2.9 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 125-128 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2BSIOC: S2 BSI: Obsessive-Compulsive

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

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

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

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

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	Not at all	260	19.2 %
0.17	-	136	10.0 %
0.33	-	110	8.1 %
0.50	-	93	6.9 %
0.67	-	82	6.1 %
0.83	-	58	4.3 %
1.00	A little bit	46	3.4 %
1.17	-	40	3.0 %
1.33	-	31	2.3 %
1.50	-	30	2.2 %
1.67	-	14	1.0 %
1.83	-	18	1.3 %
2.00	Moderately	13	1.0 %
2.17	-	10	0.7 %
2.33	-	10	0.7 %
2.50	-	5	0.4 %
2.67	-	6	0.4 %
2.83	-	3	0.2 %
3.00	Quite a bit	4	0.3 %
3.17	-	3	0.2 %
3.33	-	1	0.1 %
3.50	-	5	0.4 %
3.67	-	2	0.1 %
4.00	Extremely	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-97.00	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 129-135 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2OC_T: S2 BSI: Obsessive-Compulsive Clinically Significant

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

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms.

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	not clinically significant	918	67.8 %
1	clinical range	66	4.9 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 136-139 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2BSIIS: S2 BSI: Interpersonal Sensitivity

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

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms.

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

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	Not at all	510	37.7 %
0.25	-	159	11.7 %
0.50	-	106	7.8 %
0.75	-	68	5.0 %
1.00	A little bit	47	3.5 %
1.25	-	24	1.8 %
1.50	-	27	2.0 %
1.75	-	14	1.0 %
2.00	Moderately	11	0.8 %
2.25	-	5	0.4 %
2.50	-	4	0.3 %
2.75	-	3	0.2 %
3.00	Quite a bit	3	0.2 %
3.25	-	1	0.1 %
3.50	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Extremely	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97.00	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 140-146 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2IS_T: S2 BSI: Interpersonal Sensitivity Clinically Significant

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

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4="extremely") in the past week by various symptoms.

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	not clinically significant	966	71.3 %
1	clinical range	18	1.3 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 147-150 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2BSIDEP: S2 BSI: Depression

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

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4 = "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms.

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

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	Not at all	396	29.2 %
0.17	-	140	10.3 %
0.33	-	111	8.2 %
0.50	-	83	6.1 %
0.67	-	58	4.3 %
0.83	-	29	2.1 %
1.00	A little bit	30	2.2 %
1.17	-	24	1.8 %
1.33	-	26	1.9 %
1.50	-	12	0.9 %
1.67	-	11	0.8 %
1.83	-	8	0.6 %
2.00	Moderately	16	1.2 %
2.17	-	10	0.7 %
2.33	-	7	0.5 %
2.50	-	4	0.3 %
2.67	-	5	0.4 %
2.83	-	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.00	Quite a bit	4	0.3 %
3.17	-	4	0.3 %
3.33	-	1	0.1 %
3.50	-	1	0.1 %
3.67	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Extremely	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97.00	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 151-157 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEP_T: S2 BSI: Depression Clinically Significant

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

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	not clinically significant	928	68.5 %
1	clinical range	56	4.1 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 158-161 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2BSIANX: S2 BSI: Anxiety

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

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

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

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	Not at all	406	30.0 %
0.17	-	178	13.1 %
0.33	-	97	7.2 %
0.50	-	72	5.3 %
0.67	-	70	5.2 %
0.83	-	35	2.6 %
1.00	A little bit	24	1.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.17	-	29	2.1 %
1.33	-	22	1.6 %
1.50	-	10	0.7 %
1.67	-	10	0.7 %
1.83	-	7	0.5 %
2.00	Moderately	8	0.6 %
2.17	-	1	0.1 %
2.33	-	2	0.1 %
2.67	-	6	0.4 %
3.00	Quite a bit	2	0.1 %
3.17	-	1	0.1 %
3.33	-	3	0.2 %
3.50	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Extremely	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97.00	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 162-168 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2ANX_T: S2 BSI: Anxiety Clinically Significant

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

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	not clinically significant	953	70.4 %
1	clinical range	31	2.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 169-172 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2BSIHOS: S2 BSI: Hostility

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

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

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

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.0	Not at all	258	19.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.2	-	175	12.9 %
0.4	-	121	8.9 %
0.6	-	92	6.8 %
0.8	-	86	6.4 %
1.0	A little bit	66	4.9 %
1.2	-	34	2.5 %
1.4	-	33	2.4 %
1.6	-	27	2.0 %
1.8	-	26	1.9 %
2.0	Moderately	10	0.7 %
2.2	-	11	0.8 %
2.4	-	10	0.7 %
2.6	-	9	0.7 %
2.8	-	15	1.1 %
3.0	Quite a bit	3	0.2 %
3.2	-	2	0.1 %
3.4	-	3	0.2 %
3.6	-	1	0.1 %
4.0	Extremely	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.0	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97.0	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9.0	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total			1,354
			100%

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 173-179 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2HOS_T: S2 BSI: Hostility Clinically Significant

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

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 = "not at all" to 4= "extremely") in the past week by various symptoms.

The BSI has nine subscales designed to assess individual symptom groups: somatization (SOM, e.g., "Faintness or dizziness"), obsessive-compulsive (OC, e.g., "Having to check and double-check what you do"), interpersonal sensitivity (INT, e.g., "Feeling

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	not clinically significant	937	69.2 %
1	clinical range	47	3.5 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 180-183 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2BSIPHB: S2 BSI: Phobic Anxiety

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

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

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

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.0	Not at all	659	48.7 %
0.2	-	123	9.1 %
0.4	-	65	4.8 %
0.6	-	38	2.8 %
0.8	-	31	2.3 %
1.0	A little bit	22	1.6 %
1.2	-	11	0.8 %
1.4	-	10	0.7 %
1.6	-	10	0.7 %
1.8	-	4	0.3 %
2.0	Moderately	3	0.2 %
2.2	-	1	0.1 %
2.4	-	3	0.2 %
2.6	-	1	0.1 %
3.0	Quite a bit	3	0.2 %
4.0	Extremely	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202.0	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97.0	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9.0	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 184-190 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2PHB_T: S2 BSI: Phobic Anxiety Clinically Significant

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

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

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

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	not clinically significant	956	70.6 %
1	clinical range	28	2.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 191-194 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2BSIPAR: S2 BSI: Paranoid Ideation

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

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

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

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.0	Not at all	224	16.5 %
0.2	-	143	10.6 %
0.4	-	99	7.3 %
0.6	-	105	7.8 %
0.8	-	91	6.7 %
1.0	A little bit	70	5.2 %
1.2	-	59	4.4 %
1.4	-	41	3.0 %
1.6	-	45	3.3 %
1.8	-	29	2.1 %
2.0	Moderately	20	1.5 %
2.2	-	12	0.9 %
2.4	-	16	1.2 %
2.6	-	7	0.5 %
2.8	-	7	0.5 %
3.0	Quite a bit	7	0.5 %
3.2	-	6	0.4 %
3.4	-	1	0.1 %
3.6	-	1	0.1 %
3.8	-	1	0.1 %
4.0	Extremely	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202.0	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97.0	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9.0	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 195-201 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2PAR_T: S2 BSI: Paranoid Ideation Clinically Significant

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

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	not clinically significant	936	69.1 %
1	clinical range	48	3.5 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 202-205 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2BSIPSY: S2 BSI: Psychoticism

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

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

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

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.0	Not at all	431	31.8 %
0.2	-	169	12.5 %
0.4	-	110	8.1 %
0.6	-	73	5.4 %
0.8	-	55	4.1 %
1.0	A little bit	36	2.7 %
1.2	-	36	2.7 %
1.4	-	13	1.0 %
1.6	-	22	1.6 %
1.8	-	7	0.5 %
2.0	Moderately	7	0.5 %
2.2	-	13	1.0 %
2.4	-	4	0.3 %
2.6	-	2	0.1 %
2.8	-	3	0.2 %
3.0	Quite a bit	1	0.1 %
3.2	-	2	0.1 %
4.0	Extremely	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202.0	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97.0	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9.0	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 206-212 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2PSY_T: S2 BSI: Psychoticism Clinically Significant

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

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	not clinically significant	945	69.8 %
1	clinical range	39	2.9 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 213-216 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SIGSI: S2 BSI: Global Severity Index

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

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

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

psychological distress.

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	Not at all	0	0.0 %
0.02	-	50	3.7 %
0.04	-	57	4.2 %
0.06	-	41	3.0 %
0.08	-	43	3.2 %
0.09	-	30	2.2 %
0.11	-	24	1.8 %
0.13	-	30	2.2 %
0.15	-	44	3.2 %
0.17	-	34	2.5 %
0.19	-	27	2.0 %
0.21	-	18	1.3 %
0.23	-	32	2.4 %
0.25	-	30	2.2 %
0.26	-	26	1.9 %
0.28	-	17	1.3 %
0.30	-	19	1.4 %
0.32	-	11	0.8 %
0.34	-	12	0.9 %
0.36	-	12	0.9 %
0.38	-	10	0.7 %
0.40	-	28	2.1 %
0.42	-	18	1.3 %
0.43	-	14	1.0 %
0.45	-	14	1.0 %
0.47	-	13	1.0 %
0.49	-	20	1.5 %
0.51	-	14	1.0 %
0.53	-	10	0.7 %
0.55	-	9	0.7 %
0.57	-	9	0.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.58	-	7	0.5 %
0.60	-	8	0.6 %
0.62	-	9	0.7 %
0.64	-	10	0.7 %
0.66	-	8	0.6 %
0.68	-	8	0.6 %
0.70	-	8	0.6 %
0.72	-	12	0.9 %
0.74	-	11	0.8 %
0.75	-	5	0.4 %
0.77	-	9	0.7 %
0.79	-	9	0.7 %
0.81	-	7	0.5 %
0.83	-	10	0.7 %
0.85	-	7	0.5 %
0.87	-	4	0.3 %
0.89	-	4	0.3 %
0.91	-	9	0.7 %
0.92	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97.00	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 217-223 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2GSI_T: S2 BSI: GSI Clinically Significant

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

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Melisara, 1983) is a 53-item self-report inventory in which participants rate the extent to which they have been bothered (0 ="not at all" to 4="extremely") in the past week by various symptoms.

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	not clinically significant	954	70.5 %
1	clinical range	30	2.2 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 224-227 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2BSIPST: S2 BSI: Positive Symptom Total

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

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	73	5.4 %
2	-	78	5.8 %
3	-	52	3.8 %
4	-	55	4.1 %
5	-	50	3.7 %
6	-	51	3.8 %
7	-	38	2.8 %
8	-	30	2.2 %
9	-	32	2.4 %
10	-	38	2.8 %
11	-	30	2.2 %
12	-	35	2.6 %
13	-	26	1.9 %
14	-	22	1.6 %
15	-	31	2.3 %
16	-	22	1.6 %
17	-	24	1.8 %
18	-	13	1.0 %
19	-	26	1.9 %
20	-	24	1.8 %
21	-	16	1.2 %
22	-	25	1.8 %
23	-	16	1.2 %
24	-	23	1.7 %
25	-	15	1.1 %
26	-	13	1.0 %
27	-	12	0.9 %
28	-	14	1.0 %
29	-	9	0.7 %
30	-	9	0.7 %
31	-	8	0.6 %
32	-	9	0.7 %
33	-	3	0.2 %
34	-	6	0.4 %
35	-	7	0.5 %
36	-	3	0.2 %
37	-	5	0.4 %
38	-	5	0.4 %
39	-	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
40	-	8	0.6 %
41	-	4	0.3 %
42	-	2	0.1 %
43	-	1	0.1 %
44	-	2	0.1 %
45	-	1	0.1 %
46	-	1	0.1 %
47	-	3	0.2 %
48	-	2	0.1 %
49	-	2	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 228-231 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2BSIPSD: S2 BSI: Positive Symptom Distress Index

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

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

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

(0) Not at all

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	Not at all	0	0.0 %
1.00	A little bit	245	18.1 %
1.05	-	3	0.2 %
1.06	-	3	0.2 %
1.08	-	6	0.4 %
1.09	-	4	0.3 %
1.10	-	7	0.5 %
1.11	-	8	0.6 %
1.12	-	1	0.1 %
1.13	-	7	0.5 %
1.14	-	6	0.4 %
1.15	-	5	0.4 %
1.16	-	3	0.2 %
1.17	-	11	0.8 %
1.18	-	7	0.5 %
1.19	-	2	0.1 %
1.20	-	11	0.8 %
1.21	-	3	0.2 %
1.22	-	5	0.4 %
1.23	-	2	0.1 %
1.24	-	4	0.3 %
1.25	-	13	1.0 %
1.26	-	2	0.1 %
1.27	-	9	0.7 %
1.28	-	1	0.1 %
1.29	-	11	0.8 %
1.30	-	6	0.4 %
1.31	-	3	0.2 %
1.32	-	2	0.1 %
1.33	-	23	1.7 %
1.35	-	4	0.3 %
1.36	-	3	0.2 %
1.37	-	4	0.3 %
1.38	-	7	0.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.39	-	3	0.2 %
1.40	-	20	1.5 %
1.41	-	3	0.2 %
1.42	-	7	0.5 %
1.43	-	3	0.2 %
1.44	-	9	0.7 %
1.45	-	4	0.3 %
1.46	-	5	0.4 %
1.47	-	3	0.2 %
1.50	-	25	1.8 %
1.51	-	1	0.1 %
1.52	-	6	0.4 %
1.53	-	4	0.3 %
1.54	-	1	0.1 %
1.55	-	4	0.3 %
1.56	-	7	0.5 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97.00	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 232-238 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2BSIDX1: S2 BSI: Subscale Diagnosis Significant

Number of subscales which reach clinical significance.

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

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

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	829	61.2 %
1	-	78	5.8 %
2	-	26	1.9 %
3	-	18	1.3 %
4	-	15	1.1 %
5	-	4	0.3 %
6	-	4	0.3 %
7	-	2	0.1 %
8	-	2	0.1 %
9	-	6	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 239-242 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2BSIDX: S2 BSI: Clinically Significant

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

MEASURE: Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)

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

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	not clinically significant	907	67.0 %
1	clinical range	77	5.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97	Invalid Test	275	20.3 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 984 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 243-246 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2CADPRE: S2 CarAdlt: Domains of Social Support

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

MEASURE: Caring Adult

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	82	6.1 %
1	-	29	2.1 %
2	-	38	2.8 %
3	-	40	3.0 %
4	-	62	4.6 %
5	-	72	5.3 %
6	-	152	11.2 %
7	-	487	36.0 %
8	-	299	22.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,261 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 247-250 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2CADFM: S2 CarAdlt: Domains of Social Support - Family

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

MEASURE: Caring Adult

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

Within Domains). Finally, the Depth of Social Support assesses the number of caring adults who are mentioned in more than two domains, and further distinguishes between sources of support that are familial versus non-familial.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	67	4.9 %
1	-	72	5.3 %
2	-	71	5.2 %
3	-	71	5.2 %
4	-	95	7.0 %
5	-	118	8.7 %
6	-	171	12.6 %
7	-	348	25.7 %
8	-	166	12.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100	Did not skip into CaringAdlt measure	82	6.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,179 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 251-254 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2CADNFM: S2 CarAdlt: Domains of Social Support - Non-Family

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

MEASURE: Caring Adult

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

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	730	53.9 %
1	-	153	11.3 %
2	-	86	6.4 %
3	-	61	4.5 %
4	-	42	3.1 %
5	-	41	3.0 %
6	-	24	1.8 %
7	-	29	2.1 %
8	-	13	1.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100	Did not skip into CaringAdlt measure	82	6.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,179 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2CADETH: S2 CarAdlt: Domains with either Family or Non-Family support

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

MEASURE: Caring Adult

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

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	30	2.2 %
2	-	40	3.0 %
3	-	42	3.1 %
4	-	61	4.5 %
5	-	72	5.3 %
6	-	155	11.4 %
7	-	483	35.7 %
8	-	296	21.9 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100	Did not skip into CaringAdlt measure	82	6.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,179 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2CADRNG: S2 CarAdlt: Total Number of Adults Mentioned

Total Number of Adults Mentioned.

MEASURE:Caring Adult

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

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	18	1.3 %
2	-	27	2.0 %
3	-	28	2.1 %
4	-	27	2.0 %
5	-	35	2.6 %
6	-	44	3.2 %
7	-	85	6.3 %
8	-	78	5.8 %
9	-	57	4.2 %
10	-	51	3.8 %
11	-	49	3.6 %
12	-	58	4.3 %
13	-	50	3.7 %
14	-	53	3.9 %
15	-	48	3.5 %
16	-	30	2.2 %
17	-	23	1.7 %
18	-	39	2.9 %
19	-	22	1.6 %
20	-	23	1.7 %
21	-	35	2.6 %
22	-	16	1.2 %
23	-	24	1.8 %
24	-	11	0.8 %
25	-	16	1.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
26	-	11	0.8 %
27	-	16	1.2 %
28	-	13	1.0 %
29	-	9	0.7 %
30	-	19	1.4 %
31	-	7	0.5 %
32	-	9	0.7 %
33	-	7	0.5 %
34	-	11	0.8 %
35	-	10	0.7 %
36	-	11	0.8 %
37	-	5	0.4 %
38	-	4	0.3 %
39	-	6	0.4 %
40	-	8	0.6 %
41	-	4	0.3 %
42	-	2	0.1 %
43	-	3	0.2 %
44	-	2	0.1 %
45	-	3	0.2 %
46	-	6	0.4 %
47	-	5	0.4 %
48	-	3	0.2 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
52	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100	Did not skip into CaringAdlt measure	82	6.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Based upon 1,179 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2CADMDV: S2 CarAdlt: Maximum Diversity within Domains

Maximum diversity within domain; Count of adults mentioned in the

domain with the highest number of adults mentioned.

MEASURE: Caring Adult

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	180	13.3 %
2	-	264	19.5 %
3	-	223	16.5 %
4	-	114	8.4 %
5	-	133	9.8 %
6	-	43	3.2 %
7	-	20	1.5 %
8	-	18	1.3 %
9	-	7	0.5 %
10	-	93	6.9 %
11	-	2	0.1 %
12	-	7	0.5 %
13	-	1	0.1 %
14	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	10	0.7 %
16	-	3	0.2 %
18	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	33	2.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
23	-	1	0.1 %
25	-	4	0.3 %
26	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	7	0.5 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	2	0.1 %
50	-	3	0.2 %
70	-	1	0.1 %
90	-	6	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100	Did not skip into CaringAdlt measure	82	6.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,179 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2CADDIV: S2 CarAdlt: Diversity of Social Support

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

MEASURE: Caring Adult

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

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	82	6.1 %
1	-	289	21.3 %
2	-	397	29.3 %
3	-	294	21.7 %
4	-	143	10.6 %
5	-	45	3.3 %
6	-	10	0.7 %
7	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,261 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEPSUP: S2 CarAdlt: Depth of Social Support - Number of unique adults mentioned 3 or more times

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

MEASURE: Caring Adult

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

also calculating the number of caring adults mentioned in the particular domain in which the youth identifies the highest number of caring adults (Maximum Diversity Within Domains). Finally, the Depth of Social Support assesses the number of caring adults who are mentioned in more than two domains, and further distinguishes between sources of support that are familial versus non-familial.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	274	20.2 %
1	-	881	65.1 %
2	-	106	7.8 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,261 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2CADNFD: S2 CarAdlt: Diversity of Non-Family Social Support

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

MEASURE: Caring Adult

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	812	60.0 %
1	-	284	21.0 %
2	-	111	8.2 %
3	-	44	3.2 %
4	-	8	0.6 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
6	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,261 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -202 , -201

S2DEPNFS: S2 CarAdlt: Depth of Non-Family Social Support - Number of Adults mentioned more than 2 times

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

MEASURE: Caring Adult

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

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

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1108	81.8 %
1	-	150	11.1 %
2	-	3	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,261 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_FMCRIM: S2 FamCrim: Anyone in family involved in criminal activity during recall period

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1018	75.2 %
1	Yes	228	16.8 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-9	Dont Know	14	1.0 %
-8	Refused	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,246 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_FAMCRIM1_FCREL: S2 FamCrim: Rel01 - Relationship of relative involved in crime - recall period

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	36	2.7 %
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	105	7.8 %
3	Significant Other (spouse, fiance, boyfriend/girlfriend)	1	0.1 %
4	Child (biological, step)	0	0.0 %
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	77	5.7 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	7	0.5 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1033	76.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 228 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_FAMCRIM1_FCARR: S2 FamCrim: Rel01 - Was relative involved in crime arrested

Whether relative 1 involved in criminal activity was arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	52	3.8 %
1	Yes	175	12.9 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1033	76.3 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_FAMCRIM1_FCJAI: S2 FamCrim: Rel01 - Was relative involved in crime jailed

Whether relative 1 involved in criminal activity was jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	31	2.3 %
1	Yes	144	10.6 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-103	Skipped: Subject doesn't know if this family member was arrested	53	3.9 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1033	76.3 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 175 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_FAMCRIM1_FCATH: S2 FamCrim: Rel01 - Does relative involved in crime live at home address

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	145	10.7 %
1	Yes	83	6.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1033	76.3 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 228 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_FAMCRIM2_FCREL: S2 FamCrim: Rel02 - Relationship of relative involved in crime - recall period

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	5	0.4 %
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	27	2.0 %
3	Significant Other (spouse, fiance, boyfriend/girlfriend)	0	0.0 %
4	Child (biological, step)	0	0.0 %
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	25	1.8 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	2	0.1 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1033	76.3 %
-97	Not Applicable	165	12.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_FAMCRIM2_FCARR: S2 FamCrim: Rel02 - Was relative involved in crime arrested

Whether relative 2 involved in criminal activity was arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	23	1.7 %
1	Yes	40	3.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	165	12.2 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1033	76.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_FAMCRIM2_FCJAI: S2 FamCrim: Rel02 - Was relative involved in crime jailed

Whether relative 2 involved in criminal activity was jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	9	0.7 %
1	Yes	31	2.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-103	Skipped: Subject doesn't know if this family member was arrested	23	1.7 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	165	12.2 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1033	76.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_FAMCRIM2_FCATH: S2 FamCrim: Rel02 - Does relative involved in crime live at home address

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	48	3.5 %
1	Yes	15	1.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	165	12.2 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1033	76.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_FAMCRIM3_FCREL: S2 FamCrim: Rel03 - Relationship of relative involved in crime - recall period

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	2	0.1 %
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	4	0.3 %
3	Significant Other (spouse, fiance, boyfriend/girlfriend)	0	0.0 %
4	Child (biological, step)	0	0.0 %
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	11	0.8 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	0	0.0 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	2	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	165	12.2 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1033	76.3 %
-97	Not Applicable	39	2.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_FAMCRIM3_FCARR: S2 FamCrim: Rel03 - Was relative involved in crime arrested

Whether relative 3 involved in criminal activity was arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	7	0.5 %
1	Yes	15	1.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	2	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	204	15.1 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1033	76.3 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_FAMCRIM3_FCJAI: S2 FamCrim: Rel03 - Was relative involved in crime jailed

Whether relative 3 involved in criminal activity was jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	2	0.1 %
1	Yes	13	1.0 %
	Missing Data		
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	2	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-103	Skipped: Subject doesnt know if this family member was arrested	7	0.5 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	204	15.1 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1033	76.3 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_FAMCRIM3_FCATH: S2 FamCrim: Rel03 - Does relative involved in crime live at home address

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	19	1.4 %
1	Yes	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	2	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	204	15.1 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1033	76.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_FAMCRIM4_FCREL: S2 FamCrim: Rel04 - Relationship of relative involved in crime - recall period

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	0	0.0 %
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	3	0.2 %
3	Significant Other (spouse, fiance, boyfriend/girlfriend)	0	0.0 %
4	Child (biological, step)	0	0.0 %
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	2	0.1 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	2	0.1 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	2	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	204	15.1 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1033	76.3 %
-97	Not Applicable	14	1.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_FAMCRIM4_FCARR: S2 FamCrim: Rel04 - Was relative involved in crime arrested

Whether relative 4 involved in criminal activity was arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	4	0.3 %
1	Yes	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	2	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	218	16.1 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1033	76.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_FAMCRIM4_FCJAI: S2 FamCrim: Rel04 - Was relative involved in crime jailed

Whether relative 4 involved in criminal activity was jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	0	0.0 %
1	Yes	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	2	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-103	Skipped: Subject doesnt know if this family member was arrested	4	0.3 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	218	16.1 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1033	76.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_FAMCRIM4_FCATH: S2 FamCrim: Rel04 - Does relative involved in crime live at home address

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	7	0.5 %
1	Yes	1	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	2	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	218	16.1 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1033	76.3 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_FAMCRIM5_FCREL: S2 FamCrim: Rel05 - Relationship of relative involved in crime - recall period

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	2	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	218	16.1 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1033	76.3 %
-97	Not Applicable	5	0.4 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_FAMCRIM5_FCARR: S2 FamCrim: Rel05 - Was relative involved in crime arrested

Whether relative 5 involved in criminal activity was arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1	0.1 %
1	Yes	2	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	2	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	223	16.5 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1033	76.3 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_FAMCRIM5_FCJAI: S2 FamCrim: Rel05 - Was relative involved in crime jailed

Whether relative 5 involved in criminal activity was jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	0	0.0 %
1	Yes	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	2	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-103	Skipped: Subject doesnt know if this family member was arrested	1	0.1 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	223	16.5 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1033	76.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_FAMCRIM5_FCATH: S2 FamCrim: Rel05 - Does relative involved in crime live at home address

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	3	0.2 %
1	Yes	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-600	Data missing for unknown reasons	2	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	223	16.5 %
-101	Skipped: No family members involved in crime in recall period	1033	76.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2CRIMEATH: S2 FamCrim: A recall period marker for any family members involved in crime and living at subj home address

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - family member(s) involved in crime but none live at subj home address	74	5.5 %
1	Yes - at least one family member involved in crime also lives at subj home address	37	2.7 %
	Missing Data		
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	538	39.7 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100	No family members involved in crime	610	45.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FCATH: S2 FamCrim: A recall period count of the number of family members involved in crime and living at subj home address

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	74	5.5 %
1	-	35	2.6 %
2	-	2	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	538	39.7 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100	No family members involved in crime	610	45.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2CRIMEATH_REL1: S2 FamCrim: Relationship of fam member 1 if living at subj home address

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	2	0.1 %
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	27	2.0 %
3	Significant Other (spouse, fiance, boyfriend/girlfriend)	0	0.0 %
4	Child (biological, step)	0	0.0 %
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	5	0.4 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	2	0.1 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	538	39.7 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-105	Family involved in crime, but this relative doesn't live at subject's home address	75	5.5 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100	Skipped: No family members involved in crime	610	45.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 36 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2CRIMEATH_REL2: S2 FamCrim: Relationship of fam member 2 if living at subj home address

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	1	0.1 %
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	Significant Other (spouse, fiance, boyfriend/girlfriend)	0	0.0 %
4	Child (biological, step)	0	0.0 %
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	0	0.0 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	0	0.0 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	538	39.7 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-105	Family involved in crime, but this relative doesn't live at subject's home address	19	1.4 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100	Skipped: No family members involved in crime	610	45.1 %
-97	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	89	6.6 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2CRIMEATH_REL3: S2 FamCrim: Relationship of fam member 3 if living at subj home address

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	0	0.0 %
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	0	0.0 %
3	Significant Other (spouse, fiance, boyfriend/girlfriend)	0	0.0 %
4	Child (biological, step)	0	0.0 %
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	0	0.0 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	0	0.0 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	538	39.7 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-105	Family involved in crime, but this relative doesn't live at subject's home address	7	0.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100	Skipped: No family members involved in crime	610	45.1 %
-97	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	104	7.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2CRIMEATH_REL4: S2 FamCrim: Relationship of fam member 4 if living at subj home address

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	0	0.0 %
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	0	0.0 %
3	Significant Other (spouse, fiance, boyfriend/girlfriend)	0	0.0 %
4	Child (biological, step)	0	0.0 %
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	0	0.0 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	0	0.0 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	538	39.7 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-105	Family involved in crime, but this relative doesn't live at subject's home address	2	0.1 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100	Skipped: No family members involved in crime	610	45.1 %
-97	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	109	8.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2CRIMEATH_REL5: S2 FamCrim: Relationship of fam member 5 if living at subj home address

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Parents (biological, step, adopted, foster)	0	0.0 %
2	Siblings (biological, step, adopted, foster)	0	0.0 %
3	Significant Other (spouse, fiance, boyfriend/girlfriend)	0	0.0 %
4	Child (biological, step)	0	0.0 %
5	Male Relatives (grandpa, uncle, nephew, male cousin)	0	0.0 %
6	Female Relatives (grandma, aunt, niece, female cousin)	0	0.0 %
7	Other (friends, roommates, others non-biologically related)	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	538	39.7 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100	Skipped: No family members involved in crime	610	45.1 %
-97	Skipped: No additional family members involved in crime	111	8.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2PCRIMEATH: S2 FamCrim: Proportion family members involved in crime that live at subj home address

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	74	5.5 %
0.33	-	1	0.1 %
0.50	-	1	0.1 %
1.00	-	35	2.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
-500.00	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	538	39.7 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101.00	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100.00	No family members involved in crime	610	45.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

Location: 399-405 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FAMJAILATH_COUNT: S2 FamCrim: Count of family members that were jailed and living at subj home address

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	39	2.9 %
1	-	62	4.6 %
2	-	9	0.7 %
3	-	1	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	538	39.7 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100	No family members involved in crime	610	45.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

Location: 406-409 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2PJAILEDATH: S2 FamCrim: Proportion family members involved in crime, live at subj home address and were jailed

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

have been jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	39	2.9 %
0.50	-	4	0.3 %
0.67	-	2	0.1 %
1.00	-	66	4.9 %
	Missing Data		
-500.00	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	538	39.7 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101.00	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100.00	No family members involved in crime	610	45.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

Location: 410-416 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2ARRDAD: S2 FamCrim: Biological father arrested or jailed in recall period

Biological father arrested or jailed in recall period.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	Biological father was not arrested or jailed	106	7.8 %
1	Biological father was arrested or jailed	5	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	538	39.7 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100	No family members involved in crime	610	45.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

Location: 417-420 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2ARRMOM: S2 FamCrim: Biological mother arrested or jailed in recall period

Biological mother arrested or jailed in recall period.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	Biological mother was not arrested or jailed	111	8.2 %
1	Biological mother was arrested or jailed	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	538	39.7 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100	No family members involved in crime	610	45.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 421-424 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2ARRBTH: S2 FamCrim: Both biological parents arrested or jailed in recall period

Both biological parents arrested or jailed in recall period.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	Neither biological parent arrested or jailed	106	7.8 %
1	Both biological parents were arrested or jailed	0	0.0 %
2	Biological mother or biological father arrested or jailed, but not both	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-500	Not computed: Subject in facility most (>half) of recall period	538	39.7 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Cannot compute: Subject DK if family involved in crime	2	0.1 %
-100	No family members involved in crime	610	45.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 425-428 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2LIVCAL_MAINFREEID: S2 LivCal: Recall Period - Unique ID associated with main community location

Recall Period - Unique ID associated with main community location.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	898	66.3 %
	Missing Data		
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-112	Unknown: Main community location mistakenly set to an institution	5	0.4 %
-102	Skipped: No community locations mentioned on the calendar	359	26.5 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 898 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 429-433 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2LIVCAL_MAINFREETYPE: S2 LivCal: Recall Period - Main community location type

Recall Period - Main community location type.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Own place	45	3.3 %
2	Private home: birth/adoptive family/partners home	714	52.7 %
3	Private home: foster family	5	0.4 %
4	Private home: friends/partners family	38	2.8 %
5	Private home: other relatives	67	4.9 %
7	Group home, supervised living in community	14	1.0 %
11	Shelter/emergency shelter	5	0.4 %
12	Place to place, different people	5	0.4 %
13	Streets/homeless	0	0.0 %
17	College Dorm	0	0.0 %
18	Community Location NOS	3	0.2 %
96	Other (specify)	2	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-112	Unknown: Main community location mistakenly set to an institution	5	0.4 %
-102	Skipped: No community locations mentioned on the calendar	359	26.5 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 898 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 434-437 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2HOMEQ_HHNUM: S2 HHComp: Recall Period - Number of people (other than subj) living in the household (associated w/location stored in S2LivCal_MainLocID)

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	8	0.6 %
1	-	78	5.8 %
2	-	133	9.8 %
3	-	175	12.9 %
4	-	128	9.5 %
5	-	95	7.0 %
6	-	42	3.1 %
7	-	34	2.5 %
8	-	13	1.0 %
9	9 or More	16	1.2 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	537	39.7 %
-99	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 722 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 438-441 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2HOMEQ_BIOFATHER: S2 HHComp: Recall Period - Biological father living in the household

Recall Period - Biological father living in the household.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	554	40.9 %
1	Yes	168	12.4 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	537	39.7 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 722 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 442-445 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2HOMEQ_BIOMOTHER: S2 HHComp: Recall Period - Biological mother living in the household

Recall Period - Biological mother living in the household.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	236	17.4 %
1	Yes	486	35.9 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	537	39.7 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 722 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 446-449 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2HOMEQ_BIOSISTER: S2 HHComp: Recall Period - Biological sister living in the household

Recall Period - Biological sister living in the household.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	398	29.4 %
1	Yes	324	23.9 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	537	39.7 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 722 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2HOMEQ_BIOBROTHER: S2 HHComp: Recall Period - Biological brother living in the household

Recall Period - Biological brother living in the household.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	417	30.8 %
1	Yes	305	22.5 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	537	39.7 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 722 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2HOMEQ_BIOGRANDMOTHER: S2 HHComp: Recall Period - Biological grandmother living in the household

Recall Period - Biological grandmother living in the household.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	638	47.1 %
1	Yes	84	6.2 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	537	39.7 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 722 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2HOMEQ_BIOGRANDFATHER: S2 HHComp: Recall Period - Biological grandfather living in the household

Recall Period - Biological grandfather living in the household.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	692	51.1 %
1	Yes	30	2.2 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	537	39.7 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 722 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2HOMEQ_OTHDAD: S2 HHComp: Recall Period - Other fathers (step, adopted, foster) living in the household

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	610	45.1 %
1	Yes	112	8.3 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	537	39.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 722 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2HOMEQ_OTHMOM: S2 HHComp: Recall Period - Other mothers (step, adopted, foster) living in the household

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	692	51.1 %
1	Yes	30	2.2 %
Missing Data			
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	537	39.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 722 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2HOMEQ_OTH SIB: S2 HHComp: Recall Period - Other siblings (step, adopted, foster) living in the household

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	696	51.4 %
1	Yes	26	1.9 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	537	39.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 722 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2HOMEQ_SIGOTH: S5 HHComp: Recall Period - Significant others (gf, bf, fiance, parent of child) living in the household

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	644	47.6 %
1	Yes	78	5.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	537	39.7 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 722 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2HOMEQ_CHILD: S5 HHComp: Recall Period - Your child / step-child living in the household

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	689	50.9 %
1	Yes	33	2.4 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	537	39.7 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 722 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2HOMEQ_RELATIVE: S2 HHComp: Recall Period - Other relatives living in the household

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

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	548	40.5 %
1	Yes	174	12.9 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	537	39.7 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 722 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2HOMEQ_FRIEND: S2 HHComp: Recall Period - Friends living in the household

Recall Period - Friends / roommates living in the household.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	674	49.8 %
1	Yes	48	3.5 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	537	39.7 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 722 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2HOMEQ_OTHERS: S2 HHComp: Recall Period - Others living in the household

Recall Period - Any other person living in the household.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Family

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	637	47.0 %
1	Yes	85	6.3 %
	Missing Data		
-700	Data missing: Result of a programming error	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Subject DK/RF number of persons living in the household	1	0.1 %
-101	Skipped: Section only asked if main location type is 1/2/3/4/5/12/13/96	537	39.7 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 722 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2PEERCHAR_NFRND: S2 CharFriends: Number of close friends

How many close friends subject has.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	66	4.9 %
1	-	247	18.2 %
2	-	284	21.0 %
3	-	231	17.1 %
4	-	155	11.4 %
5	-	108	8.0 %
6	-	36	2.7 %
7	-	28	2.1 %
8	-	15	1.1 %
9	-	8	0.6 %
10	-	31	2.3 %
12	-	4	0.3 %
14	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	7	0.5 %
16	-	1	0.1 %
18	-	1	0.1 %
19	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	16	1.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
22	-	1	0.1 %
23	-	1	0.1 %
25	-	3	0.2 %
30	-	4	0.3 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	8	0.6 %
55	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,261 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FRIENDS1_SAMEAS: S2 CharFriends: Friend1 - Was this friend mentioned in last interview

Friend1 - Was this friend mentioned in last interview.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Same friend as friend 1 from previous interview	374	27.6 %
2	Same friend as friend 2 from previous interview	128	9.5 %
3	Same friend as friend 3 from previous interview	52	3.8 %
4	Same friend as friend 4 from previous interview	29	2.1 %
5	No, this is not one of those people (this is a new friend)	612	45.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	66	4.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,195 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FRIENDS1_GENFR: S2 CharFriends: Friend1 - Gender (male/female)

Gender of friend 1 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Male	888	65.6 %
2	Female	307	22.7 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	66	4.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,195 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FRIENDS1_AGEFR: S2 CharFriends: Friend1 - Age

Age of friend 1 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	-	1	0.1 %
6	-	1	0.1 %
12	-	1	0.1 %
13	-	6	0.4 %
14	-	27	2.0 %
15	-	103	7.6 %
16	-	177	13.1 %
17	-	257	19.0 %
18	-	223	16.5 %
19	-	126	9.3 %
20	-	68	5.0 %
21	-	46	3.4 %
22	-	33	2.4 %
23	-	29	2.1 %
24	-	13	1.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
25	-	9	0.7 %
26	-	7	0.5 %
27	-	4	0.3 %
28	-	3	0.2 %
29	-	2	0.1 %
30	-	4	0.3 %
31	-	3	0.2 %
32	-	3	0.2 %
33	-	6	0.4 %
34	-	3	0.2 %
35	-	4	0.3 %
36	-	8	0.6 %
37	-	3	0.2 %
38	-	2	0.1 %
39	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	5	0.4 %
42	-	2	0.1 %
43	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	3	0.2 %
46	-	1	0.1 %
47	-	1	0.1 %
48	-	1	0.1 %
49	-	1	0.1 %
51	-	1	0.1 %
52	-	1	0.1 %
54	-	1	0.1 %
59	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	66	4.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,193 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FR1_ARRESTREC: S2 CharFriends: Friend1 - Has this friend EVER been arrested

Marker for friend 1 ever being arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never been arrested	584	43.1 %
1	Yes - friend has been arrested	606	44.8 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	66	4.9 %
-9	Subject DK if friend was ever arrested	5	0.4 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,190 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FR1_JAILEDREC: S2 CharFriends: Friend1 - Has this friend EVER been in jail

Marker for friend 1 ever in jail.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never been in jail	727	53.7 %
1	Yes - friend has been in jail	462	34.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	66	4.9 %
-9	Subject DK if friend was ever in jail	6	0.4 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FRIENDS1_CONT: S2 CharFriends: Friend1 - Frequency of contact

Contact frequency with friend 1.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	638	47.1 %
2	3-6 times per week	150	11.1 %
3	2 times per week	85	6.3 %
4	1 time per week	116	8.6 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	46	3.4 %
6	1 time per month	59	4.4 %
7	Less than monthly	100	7.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	66	4.9 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FRIENDS2_SAMEAS: S2 CharFriends: Friend2 - Was this friend mentioned in last interview

Friend2 - Was this friend mentioned in last interview.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Same friend as friend 1 from previous interview	131	9.7 %
2	Same friend as friend 2 from previous interview	145	10.7 %
3	Same friend as friend 3 from previous interview	62	4.6 %
4	Same friend as friend 4 from previous interview	39	2.9 %
5	No, this is not one of those people (this is a new friend)	571	42.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	247	18.2 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	66	4.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FRIENDS2_GENFR: S2 CharFriends: Friend2 - Gender (male/female)

Gender of friend 2 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Male	726	53.6 %
2	Female	222	16.4 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	247	18.2 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	66	4.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FRIENDS2_AGEFR: S2 CharFriends: Friend2 - Age

Age of friend 2 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
6	-	1	0.1 %
7	-	2	0.1 %
10	-	1	0.1 %
11	-	1	0.1 %
12	-	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
13	-	4	0.3 %
14	-	27	2.0 %
15	-	84	6.2 %
16	-	149	11.0 %
17	-	186	13.7 %
18	-	165	12.2 %
19	-	114	8.4 %
20	-	45	3.3 %
21	-	41	3.0 %
22	-	19	1.4 %
23	-	15	1.1 %
24	-	15	1.1 %
25	-	7	0.5 %
26	-	9	0.7 %
27	-	9	0.7 %
29	-	3	0.2 %
30	-	5	0.4 %
31	-	2	0.1 %
32	-	1	0.1 %
35	-	3	0.2 %
36	-	4	0.3 %
37	-	1	0.1 %
38	-	3	0.2 %
40	-	5	0.4 %
41	-	1	0.1 %
42	-	1	0.1 %
43	-	2	0.1 %
44	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	5	0.4 %
46	-	1	0.1 %
49	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	3	0.2 %
53	-	1	0.1 %
59	-	1	0.1 %
65	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	247	18.2 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	66	4.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 946 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FR2_ARRESTREC: S2 CharFriends: Friend2 - Has this friend EVER been arrested

Marker for friend 2 ever being arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never been arrested	452	33.4 %
1	Yes - friend has been arrested	494	36.5 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	313	23.1 %
-9	Subject DK if friend was ever arrested	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 946 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FR2_JAILEDREC: S2 CharFriends: Friend2 - Has this friend EVER been in jail

Marker for friend 2 ever in jail.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never been in jail	584	43.1 %
1	Yes - friend has been in jail	360	26.6 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	313	23.1 %
-9	Subject DK if friend was ever in jail	4	0.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FRIENDS2_CONT: S2 CharFriends: Friend2 - Frequency of contact

Contact frequency with friend 2.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	441	32.6 %
2	3-6 times per week	149	11.0 %
3	2 times per week	86	6.4 %
4	1 time per week	93	6.9 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	46	3.4 %
6	1 time per month	46	3.4 %
7	Less than monthly	87	6.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	247	18.2 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	66	4.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FRIENDS3_SAMEAS: S2 CharFriends: Friend3 - Was this friend mentioned in last interview

Friend3 - Was this friend mentioned in last interview.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Same friend as friend 1 from previous interview	57	4.2 %
2	Same friend as friend 2 from previous interview	52	3.8 %
3	Same friend as friend 3 from previous interview	52	3.8 %
4	Same friend as friend 4 from previous interview	32	2.4 %
5	No, this is not one of those people (this is a new friend)	470	34.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	531	39.2 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	66	4.9 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FRIENDS3_GENFR: S2 CharFriends: Friend3 - Gender (male/female)

Gender of friend 3 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Male	504	37.2 %
2	Female	160	11.8 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	531	39.2 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	66	4.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FRIENDS3_AGEFR: S2 CharFriends: Friend3 - Age

Age of friend 3 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	-	1	0.1 %
7	-	1	0.1 %
9	-	1	0.1 %
13	-	2	0.1 %
14	-	18	1.3 %
15	-	56	4.1 %
16	-	110	8.1 %
17	-	144	10.6 %
18	-	110	8.1 %
19	-	69	5.1 %
20	-	42	3.1 %
21	-	24	1.8 %
22	-	17	1.3 %
23	-	12	0.9 %
24	-	9	0.7 %
25	-	8	0.6 %
26	-	4	0.3 %
27	-	2	0.1 %
28	-	4	0.3 %
29	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	2	0.1 %
31	-	2	0.1 %
32	-	2	0.1 %
33	-	1	0.1 %
34	-	2	0.1 %
35	-	3	0.2 %
36	-	1	0.1 %
38	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
42	-	1	0.1 %
43	-	2	0.1 %
45	-	1	0.1 %
48	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
52	-	1	0.1 %
53	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
55	-	1	0.1 %
56	-	1	0.1 %
61	-	1	0.1 %
74	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	531	39.2 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	66	4.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 662 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FR3_ARRESTREC: S2 CharFriends: Friend3 - Has this friend EVER been arrested

Marker for friend 3 ever being arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never been arrested	336	24.8 %
1	Yes - friend has been arrested	321	23.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	597	44.1 %
-9	Subject DK if friend was ever arrested	7	0.5 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 657 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 562-565 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FR3_JAILEDREC: S2 CharFriends: Friend3 - Has this friend EVER been in jail

Marker for friend 3 ever in jail.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never been in jail	409	30.2 %
1	Yes - friend has been in jail	246	18.2 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	597	44.1 %
-9	Subject DK if friend was ever in jail	9	0.7 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 655 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FRIENDS3_CONT: S2 CharFriends: Friend3 - Frequency of contact

Contact frequency with friend 3.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	286	21.1 %
2	3-6 times per week	104	7.7 %
3	2 times per week	69	5.1 %
4	1 time per week	52	3.8 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	43	3.2 %
6	1 time per month	41	3.0 %
7	Less than monthly	69	5.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	531	39.2 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	66	4.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FRIENDS4_SAMEAS: S2 CharFriends: Friend4 - Was this friend mentioned in last interview

Friend4 - Was this friend mentioned in last interview.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Same friend as friend 1 from previous interview	35	2.6 %
2	Same friend as friend 2 from previous interview	31	2.3 %
3	Same friend as friend 3 from previous interview	41	3.0 %
4	Same friend as friend 4 from previous interview	22	1.6 %
5	No, this is not one of those people (this is a new friend)	303	22.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	762	56.3 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	66	4.9 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 432 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 574-577 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FRIENDS4_GENFR: S2 CharFriends: Friend4 - Gender (male/female)

Gender of friend 4 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Male	341	25.2 %
2	Female	92	6.8 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	762	56.3 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	66	4.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 433 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FRIENDS4_AGEFR: S2 CharFriends: Friend4 - Age

Age of friend 4 named.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	1	0.1 %
2	-	1	0.1 %
12	-	2	0.1 %
13	-	3	0.2 %
14	-	9	0.7 %
15	-	38	2.8 %
16	-	74	5.5 %
17	-	84	6.2 %
18	-	66	4.9 %
19	-	51	3.8 %
20	-	19	1.4 %
21	-	17	1.3 %
22	-	15	1.1 %
23	-	11	0.8 %
24	-	5	0.4 %
25	-	6	0.4 %
26	-	5	0.4 %
27	-	4	0.3 %
28	-	4	0.3 %
31	-	1	0.1 %
34	-	1	0.1 %
35	-	2	0.1 %
37	-	1	0.1 %
39	-	2	0.1 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
42	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	2	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
56	-	1	0.1 %
65	-	1	0.1 %
67	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
68	-	1	0.1 %
70	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	762	56.3 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	66	4.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 432 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FR4_ARRESTREC: S2 CharFriends: Friend4 - Has this friend EVER been arrested

Marker for friend 4 ever being arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never been arrested	223	16.5 %
1	Yes - friend has been arrested	207	15.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	828	61.2 %
-9	Subject DK if friend was ever arrested	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 430 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FR4_JAILEDREC: S2 CharFriends: Friend4 - Has this friend EVER been in jail

Marker for friend 4 ever in jail.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No - friend has never been in jail	271	20.0 %
1	Yes - friend has been in jail	156	11.5 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100	Subject does not have this many friends	828	61.2 %
-9	Subject DK if friend was ever in jail	6	0.4 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 427 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FRIENDS4_CONT: S2 CharFriends: Friend4 - Frequency of contact

Contact frequency with friend 4.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	188	13.9 %
2	3-6 times per week	69	5.1 %
3	2 times per week	37	2.7 %
4	1 time per week	38	2.8 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	31	2.3 %
6	1 time per month	29	2.1 %
7	Less than monthly	41	3.0 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: No additional friends	762	56.3 %
-101	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	66	4.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 433 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FRARR: S2 CharFriends: Count of 4 closest friends ever arrested

Count of 4 closest friends ever arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	321	23.7 %
1	-	412	30.4 %
2	-	235	17.4 %
3	-	162	12.0 %
4	-	65	4.8 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	66	4.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,195 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2ARRDEN: S2 CharFriends: Denominator for number of friends mentioned-arrest

Denominator for number of friends mentioned-arrest.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	247	18.2 %
2	-	284	21.0 %
3	-	231	17.1 %
4	-	433	32.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	66	4.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,195 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2PFRARR: S2 CharFriends: Proportion of 4 closest friends ever arrested

The proportion of the 4 closest friends who have been arrested.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	321	23.7 %
0.25	-	97	7.2 %
0.33	-	71	5.2 %
0.50	-	197	14.5 %
0.67	-	67	4.9 %
0.75	-	119	8.8 %
1.00	-	323	23.9 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	66	4.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,195 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 606-612 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FRJAIL: S2 CharFriends: Count of 4 closest friends ever in jail

Count of 4 closest friends ever in jail.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	465	34.3 %
1	-	416	30.7 %
2	-	176	13.0 %
3	-	96	7.1 %
4	-	42	3.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	66	4.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,195 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 613-616 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2JAIDEN: S2 CharFriends: Denominator for number of friends mentioned-jailed

Denominator for number of friends mentioned-jailed.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	247	18.2 %
2	-	284	21.0 %
3	-	231	17.1 %
4	-	433	32.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	66	4.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,195 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 617-620 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2PFRJAI: S2 CharFriends: Proportion of 4 closest friends ever in jail

The proportion of the 4 closest friends who have been in jail.

MEASURE: Characteristics of Friends

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	465	34.3 %
0.25	-	112	8.3 %
0.33	-	83	6.1 %
0.50	-	190	14.0 %
0.67	-	46	3.4 %
0.75	-	72	5.3 %
1.00	-	227	16.8 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Skipped: Subject reported zero friends	66	4.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,195 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 621-627 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2WALDEN: S2 Walden: Self-Regulation Scale

Walden self-regulation scale; Mean of the 9 items included.

MEASURE: Children's Emotional Intensity Child Report (Walden)

The Children's Emotion Regulation scale was adapted for this study to serve as a self-report measure of the adolescent's ability to regulate emotions (Walden, Harris, Weiss, and Catron, 1995). Only a subset (n=12) of the 33 original items contained in this scale are included in the Pathway's version. Examples of items are "I know things to do to make myself more happy," and "I can change my feelings by thinking of something else". Participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all like me" to "Really like me". Higher scores indicate a better ability to regulate emotion.

- (1) Not at all like me
- (2) A little like me
- (3) Kind of like me
- (4) Really like me

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all like me	5	0.4 %
1.11	-	2	0.1 %
1.22	-	5	0.4 %
1.33	-	8	0.6 %
1.44	-	17	1.3 %
1.56	-	14	1.0 %
1.67	-	23	1.7 %
1.78	-	28	2.1 %
1.89	-	36	2.7 %
2.00	A little bit like me	57	4.2 %
2.11	-	42	3.1 %
2.22	-	53	3.9 %
2.33	-	62	4.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.38	-	1	0.1 %
2.44	-	63	4.7 %
2.50	-	1	0.1 %
2.56	-	57	4.2 %
2.63	-	1	0.1 %
2.67	-	81	6.0 %
2.78	-	65	4.8 %
2.89	-	83	6.1 %
3.00	Kind of like me	96	7.1 %
3.11	-	65	4.8 %
3.22	-	59	4.4 %
3.33	-	58	4.3 %
3.38	-	1	0.1 %
3.44	-	40	3.0 %
3.56	-	43	3.2 %
3.67	-	59	4.4 %
3.78	-	31	2.3 %
3.89	-	40	3.0 %
4.00	Really like me	64	4.7 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 628-634 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2COM6MO: S2 ComIn: Involvement in Community Activities - Recall period

Involvement in community activities; count of endorsed activities, independent of the recency of involvement.

MEASURE: Community Involvement

The Community Involvement scale (Elliot, 1990) was modified for this study to assess the adolescent's involvement in structured community activities. Scores indicate the extent of an adolescent's involvement in four different community organizations (e.g., sports teams, scouts, church related groups, and volunteer work).

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	717	53.0 %
1	-	135	10.0 %
2	-	32	2.4 %
3	-	9	0.7 %
4	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100	Did not skip into ComInv measure	366	27.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 894 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 635-638 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCHCAL_MAINSCHOOLID: S2 Education: Unique ID associated with the primary school (independent of type)

The unique ID marker associated with the primary school. It can be used to link the primary school with the follow-up data from the school calendar for that school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	996	73.6 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	6	0.4 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	259	19.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 996 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 639-643 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCHCAL_MAINSCHOOLTYPE: S2 Education: Primary school - type

The school type associated with the primary school (e.g., regular public, charter, institution, etc.).

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Regular/public	219	16.2 %
2	Parochial/private	2	0.1 %
3	Private approved	15	1.1 %
4	Institution school	489	36.1 %
5	Alternative public	45	3.3 %
6	Trade/vocation	57	4.2 %
7	College/junior college	15	1.1 %
8	Charter school	124	9.2 %
9	Home-schooling	3	0.2 %
10	GED program	27	2.0 %
96	Other (specify)	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	6	0.4 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	259	19.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 996 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 644-647 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCHCAL_MAINSCHOOLTYPE_SPEC: S2 Education: Primary school - institution type specified

This variable will only have a value if the school type is 4 (institution), and provides the specific type of schooling the subject received in the institution (e.g., GED classes, online courses, etc.).

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Institution: Online or Correspondence	0	0.0 %
2	Institution: College	2	0.1 %
3	Institution: GED/ HSD/ High School Continuation	167	12.3 %
4	Institution: Unspecified	320	23.6 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	6	0.4 %
-108	NA: This is a community based school	507	37.4 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	259	19.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 489 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 648-651 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCHCAL_MAINSCHOOLCOUNT: S2 Education: Number of months subject attended the primary school

A count of the number of months the subject attended the primary school, based on the school calendar data.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	51	3.8 %
2	-	88	6.5 %
3	-	158	11.7 %
4	-	179	13.2 %
5	-	199	14.7 %
6	-	224	16.5 %
7	-	72	5.3 %
8	-	11	0.8 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	6	0.4 %
-107	Data missing: Subject was enrolled in a GED program but months unknown	14	1.0 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	259	19.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 652-655 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCHCAL_MAINFREEID: S2 Education: Community school - Unique ID associated with community school attended the most

The unique ID associated with the primary community school. It can be used to link the primary community school with the school calendar monthly data (where the school ID is plotted by month).

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	568	41.9 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-117	Skipped: Not enrolled in any community based schools	428	31.6 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	6	0.4 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	259	19.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 568 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 656-660 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCHCAL_MAINFREETYPE: S2 Education: Community school - Primary community school - type

The school type associated with the primary school (e.g., regular public, charter school, GED classes, etc.).

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Regular/public	241	17.8 %
2	Parochial/private	2	0.1 %
3	Private approved	16	1.2 %
4	Institution school	0	0.0 %
5	Alternative public	56	4.1 %
6	Trade/vocation	66	4.9 %
7	College/junior college	18	1.3 %
8	Charter school	130	9.6 %
9	Home-schooling	3	0.2 %
10	GED program	34	2.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
96	Other (specify)	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-117	Skipped: Not enrolled in any community based schools	428	31.6 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	6	0.4 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	259	19.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 568 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 661-664 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCHCAL_MAINFREECOUNT: S2 Education: Community school - Number of months subject attended the primary community school

A count of the number of months the subject attended the primary school, based on the school calendar data.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	71	5.2 %
2	-	75	5.5 %
3	-	89	6.6 %
4	-	97	7.2 %
5	-	95	7.0 %
6	-	94	6.9 %
7	-	34	2.5 %
8	-	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-117	Skipped: Not enrolled in any community based schools	428	31.6 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	6	0.4 %
-107	Data missing: Subject was enrolled in a GED program but months unknown	8	0.6 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	259	19.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 560 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 665-668 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_REGQHOMEWORK: S2 Education: Community school - Hours per week spent on homework

Hours per week spent on homework - community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	None, or Homework given but none done	92	6.8 %
1	Less than one hour	84	6.2 %
2	One to five hours	150	11.1 %
3	Six to ten hours	20	1.5 %
4	More than ten hours	6	0.4 %
7	NA (No homework assigned)	188	13.9 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	10	0.7 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	709	52.4 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 540 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 669-672 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_REGQ_SCHQ18: S2 Education: Community school - Days per week on Student govt

Student Government activities participated in - community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	530	39.1 %
1	-	2	0.1 %
2	-	1	0.1 %
3	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	12	0.9 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	709	52.4 %
-9	Dont Know	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 536 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 673-676 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_REGQ_SCHQ19: S2 Education: Community school - Days per week athletic teams

Athletic Teams activities participated in - community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	471	34.8 %
1	-	4	0.3 %
2	-	8	0.6 %
3	-	10	0.7 %
4	-	10	0.7 %
5	-	25	1.8 %
6	-	6	0.4 %
7	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	12	0.9 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	709	52.4 %
-9	Dont Know	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 536 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 677-680 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_REGQ_SCHQ20: S2 Education: Community school - Days per week sport team

Cheerleading or other sport-related team activities participated in - community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	534	39.4 %
2	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	12	0.9 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	709	52.4 %
-9	Dont Know	5	0.4 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 536 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 681-684 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_REGQ_SCHQ21: S2 Education: Community school - Days per week music/band

Music/Band activities participated in - community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	530	39.1 %
1	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	4	0.3 %
7	-	1	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	12	0.9 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	709	52.4 %
-9	Dont Know	5	0.4 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 536 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 685-688 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_REGQ_SCHQ22: S2 Education: Community school - Days per week school clubs

School Clubs activities participated in - community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	518	38.3 %
1	-	4	0.3 %
2	-	8	0.6 %
3	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	12	0.9 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	709	52.4 %
-9	Dont Know	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 536 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 689-692 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_REGQ_SCHQ23: S2 Education: Community school - Days per week National Honors Soc

National Honor Society activities participated in - community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	536	39.6 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	12	0.9 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	709	52.4 %
-9	Dont Know	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 536 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 693-696 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_REGQ_SCHQ24: S2 Education: Community school - Days per week newspaper/yearbook

Newspaper/Yearbook activities in - community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	526	38.8 %
1	-	1	0.1 %
2	-	3	0.2 %
3	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	12	0.9 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	709	52.4 %
-9	Dont Know	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 536 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 697-700 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_REGQ_SCHQ25: S2 Education: Community school - Days per week attend events

Attending athletic events, plays or school dances in - community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	454	33.5 %
1	-	59	4.4 %
2	-	13	1.0 %
3	-	6	0.4 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	12	0.9 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	709	52.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-9	Dont Know	8	0.6 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 533 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 701-704 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_REGQ_SCHQ26: S2 Education: Community school - How important participate in these activities

[If any time is more than 0] How important was it for you to participate in these activities in - community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	9	0.7 %
2	Not too important	25	1.8 %
3	Somewhat important	32	2.4 %
4	Pretty important	31	2.3 %
5	Very important	33	2.4 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	12	0.9 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-113	Skipped: Not involved in any school activities	411	30.4 %
-112	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	709	52.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 705-708 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -113 , -112 , -9 , -8

S2TTOTEXA: S2 Education: Community school - Total Number Extracurricular School Activities

Total number extracurricular community school activities.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	406	30.0 %
1	-	80	5.9 %
2	-	44	3.2 %
3	-	6	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	12	0.9 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	709	52.4 %
-9	Dont Know	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 536 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 709-712 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCHTCH: S2 Education: Community school - Bonding to Teachers

Bonding to teachers; mean of 3 items in the scale for community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

The school attachment items included are taken from the work of Cernkovich and Giordano (1992). The items are used to evaluate the adolescent's educational experience along two dimensions: Bonding to Teachers (e.g., "Most of my teachers treat me fairly.") and School Orientation (e.g., "Schoolwork is very important to me."). Respondents rate 13 statements, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of academic commitment. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in an institution for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the institutional school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree or Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Disagree	3	0.2 %
1.33	-	7	0.5 %
1.67	-	8	0.6 %
2.00	Disagree	25	1.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.33	-	28	2.1 %
2.67	-	49	3.6 %
3.00	Neither Agree or Disagree	42	3.1 %
3.33	-	96	7.1 %
3.67	-	57	4.2 %
4.00	Agree	154	11.4 %
4.33	-	26	1.9 %
4.67	-	12	0.9 %
5.00	Strongly Agree	27	2.0 %
Missing Data			
-800.00	Data missing: Data cleaning	10	0.7 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	709	52.4 %
-9.00	Dont Know	9	0.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 534 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 713-719 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCHATC: S2 Education: Community school - School Orientation

School orientation; mean of 7 items in the scale for community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

The school attachment items included are taken from the work of Cernkovich and Giordano (1992). The items are used to evaluate the adolescent's educational experience along two dimensions: Bonding to Teachers (e.g., "Most of my teachers treat me fairly.") and School Orientation (e.g., "Schoolwork is very important to me."). Respondents rate 13 statements, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of academic commitment. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in an institution for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the institutional school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree or Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0 %
1.14	-	1	0.1 %
1.57	-	1	0.1 %
1.71	-	1	0.1 %
1.86	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	Disagree	2	0.1 %
2.14	-	1	0.1 %
2.29	-	8	0.6 %
2.43	-	6	0.4 %
2.57	-	11	0.8 %
2.71	-	8	0.6 %
2.83	-	1	0.1 %
2.86	-	23	1.7 %
3.00	Neither Agree or Disagree	22	1.6 %
3.14	-	26	1.9 %
3.29	-	24	1.8 %
3.43	-	29	2.1 %
3.57	-	35	2.6 %
3.71	-	44	3.2 %
3.83	-	1	0.1 %
3.86	-	48	3.5 %
4.00	Agree	118	8.7 %
4.14	-	25	1.8 %
4.29	-	18	1.3 %
4.43	-	19	1.4 %
4.57	-	17	1.3 %
4.71	-	15	1.1 %
4.86	-	15	1.1 %
5.00	Strongly Agree	15	1.1 %
Missing Data			
-800.00	Data missing: Data cleaning	10	0.7 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	709	52.4 %
-9.00	Dont Know	8	0.6 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 535 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 720-726 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_HSSATISFACTION: S2 Education: Community school - Satisfaction with School - Community School

Satisfaction - Community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

The school attachment items included are taken from the work of Cernkovich and Giordano (1992). The items are used to evaluate the adolescent's educational experience along two dimensions: Bonding to Teachers (e.g., "Most of my teachers treat me fairly.") and School Orientation (e.g., "Schoolwork is very important to me."). Respondents rate 13 statements, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of academic commitment. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in an institution for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the institutional school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree or Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.0	Strongly disagree	9	0.7 %
1.5	-	7	0.5 %
2.0	Disagree	40	3.0 %
2.5	-	41	3.0 %
3.0	Neither agree nor disagree	94	6.9 %
3.5	-	80	5.9 %
4.0	Agree	206	15.2 %
4.5	-	31	2.3 %
5.0	Strongly agree	27	2.0 %
Missing Data			
-800.0	Data missing: Data cleaning	10	0.7 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.0	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	709	52.4 %
-9.0	Dont Know	8	0.6 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 535 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 727-733 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_HSENGAGEMENT: S2 Education: Community school - High School Engagement - Community School

Engagement - Community school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

The school attachment items included are taken from the work of Cernkovich and Giordano (1992). The items are used to evaluate the adolescent's educational experience along two dimensions: Bonding to Teachers (e.g., "Most of my teachers treat me fairly.") and School Orientation (e.g., "Schoolwork is very important to me."). Respondents rate 13 statements, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of academic commitment. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in an institution for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the institutional school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree or Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly disagree	1	0.1 %
1.25	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	2	0.1 %
1.75	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	Disagree	14	1.0 %
2.25	-	7	0.5 %
2.50	-	20	1.5 %
2.75	-	20	1.5 %
3.00	Neither agree nor disagree	43	3.2 %
3.25	-	23	1.7 %
3.50	-	64	4.7 %
3.75	-	74	5.5 %
4.00	Agree	163	12.0 %
4.25	-	24	1.8 %
4.50	-	35	2.6 %
4.75	-	14	1.0 %
5.00	Strongly agree	29	2.1 %
Missing Data			
-800.00	Data missing: Data cleaning	10	0.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Skipped: Did not skip into community school section	709	52.4 %
-9.00	Dont Know	8	0.6 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 535 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 734-740 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCHCAL_MAINDETID: S2 Education: Institutional school - Unique ID associated with the primary institution school

The unique ID marker associated with the primary institutional school.

It can be used to link the primary institutional school with the school calendar monthly data (where the school ID is plotted by month).

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	556	41.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-116	Skipped: Not enrolled in any institution schools	440	32.5 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	6	0.4 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	259	19.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 556 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 741-745 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCHCAL_MAINDETTYPE: S2 Education: Institutional school - Primary institution school - type

The school type associated with the primary institution school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	Institution school	556	41.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-116	Skipped: Not enrolled in any institution schools	440	32.5 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	6	0.4 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	259	19.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 556 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 746-749 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCHCAL_MAINDETTYPE_SPEC: S2 Education: Institutional school - Primary institution school - institution type specified

The specific type of schooling the subject received in the institution
(e.g., GED classes, online courses, etc.).

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Institution: Online or Correspondence	0	0.0 %
2	Institution: College	2	0.1 %
3	Institution: GED/ HSD/ High School Continuation	169	12.5 %
4	Institution: Unspecified	385	28.4 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-116	Skipped: Not enrolled in any institution schools	440	32.5 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	6	0.4 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	259	19.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 556 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 750-753 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCHCAL_MAINDETCOUNT: S2 Education: Institutional school - Number of months subject attended the primary institution school

A count of the number of months the subject attended the primary

institutional school based on the school calendar data.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	48	3.5 %
2	-	63	4.7 %
3	-	76	5.6 %
4	-	85	6.3 %
5	-	104	7.7 %
6	-	130	9.6 %
7	-	38	2.8 %
8	-	6	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-116	Skipped: Not enrolled in any institution schools	440	32.5 %
-114	Skipped: Enrolled in recall period but all months are not enrolled and/or not in session	6	0.4 %
-107	Data missing: Subject was enrolled in a GED program but months unknown	6	0.4 %
-102	Skipped: Subject not enrolled in school during recall period	259	19.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 550 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 754-757 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_DETQ_DETHWRK: S2 Education: Institutional school - Hours per week spent on homework

Hours per week spent on homework - institutional school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	None	276	20.4 %
1	Less than one hour	36	2.7 %
2	One to Five hours	71	5.2 %
3	One to ten hours	28	2.1 %
4	More than 10 hours	12	0.9 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	20	1.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-110	Skipped: Enrolled in institutional school but for less than three months	111	8.2 %
-109	Skipped: Not enrolled in institutional school	705	52.1 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-8	Refuse	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 423 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 758-761 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_DETQ_DETACT0: S2 Education: Institutional school - Involved in any activities

Involved activities in - institutional school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	253	18.7 %
1	Yes	171	12.6 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	22	1.6 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-110	Skipped: Enrolled in institutional school but for less than three months	111	8.2 %
-109	Skipped: Not enrolled in institutional school	705	52.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 424 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 762-765 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_DETQ_DETDYS1: S2 Education: Institutional school - Days per week on activity 1

Number of days participated in activities - institutional school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	14	1.0 %
2	-	15	1.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	-	19	1.4 %
4	-	7	0.5 %
5	-	75	5.5 %
6	-	15	1.1 %
7	-	25	1.8 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	22	1.6 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-111	Skipped: Not involved in any school activities	253	18.7 %
-110	Skipped: Enrolled in institutional school but for less than three months	111	8.2 %
-109	Skipped: Not enrolled in institutional school	705	52.1 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 170 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 766-771 (width: 6; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_DETQ_DETDYS2: S2 Education: Institutional school - Days per week on activity 2

Number of days participated in activities - institutional school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	7	0.5 %
2	-	7	0.5 %
3	-	7	0.5 %
4	-	4	0.3 %
5	-	12	0.9 %
6	-	4	0.3 %
7	-	7	0.5 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	22	1.6 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-114	Skipped: Only involved in one school activity	123	9.1 %
-111	Skipped: Not involved in any school activities	253	18.7 %
-110	Skipped: Enrolled in institutional school but for less than three months	111	8.2 %
-109	Skipped: Not enrolled in institutional school	705	52.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 48 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 772-775 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_DETQ_DETDYS3: S2 Education: Institutional school - Days per week on activity 3

Number of days participated in activities - institutional school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	1	0.1 %
2	-	1	0.1 %
3	-	3	0.2 %
5	-	2	0.1 %
6	-	1	0.1 %
7	-	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	22	1.6 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-115	Skipped: Only involved in two school activities	36	2.7 %
-114	Skipped: Only involved in one school activity	123	9.1 %
-111	Skipped: Not involved in any school activities	253	18.7 %
-110	Skipped: Enrolled in institutional school but for less than three months	111	8.2 %
-109	Skipped: Not enrolled in institutional school	705	52.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 12 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 776-779 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_DETQ_DETQ26: S2 Education: Institutional school - How important participate in these activities

Importance to subject to participate in these school activities in - institutional school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	13	1.0 %
2	Not too important	10	0.7 %
3	Somewhat important	19	1.4 %
4	Pretty important	48	3.5 %
5	Very important	81	6.0 %
Missing Data			
-800	Data missing: Data cleaning	22	1.6 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-111	Skipped: Not involved in any school activities	253	18.7 %
-110	Skipped: Enrolled in institutional school but for less than three months	111	8.2 %
-109	Skipped: Not enrolled in institutional school	705	52.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 171 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 780-783 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DETTCH: S2 Education: Institutional school - Bonding to Teachers

Bonding to teachers - institutional school; mean of 3 items in the scale for institutional school

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

The school attachment items included are taken from the work of Cernkovich and Giordano (1992). The items are used to evaluate the adolescent's educational experience along two dimensions: Bonding to Teachers (e.g., "Most of my teachers treat me fairly.") and School Orientation (e.g., "Schoolwork is very important to me."). Respondents rate 13 statements, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of academic commitment. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in an institution for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the institutional school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree or Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Disagree	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.33	-	3	0.2 %
1.67	-	6	0.4 %
2.00	Disagree	35	2.6 %
2.33	-	18	1.3 %
2.67	-	39	2.9 %
3.00	Neither Agree or Disagree	59	4.4 %
3.33	-	88	6.5 %
3.67	-	25	1.8 %
4.00	Agree	121	8.9 %
4.33	-	18	1.3 %
4.67	-	6	0.4 %
5.00	Strongly Agree	8	0.6 %
Missing Data			
-800.00	Data missing: Data cleaning	18	1.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Skipped: Did not skip into institutional school section	816	60.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 428 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 784-790 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DETATC: S2 Education: Institutional school - School Orientation

School orientation - institutional school; mean of 7 items in the scale for institutional school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

The school attachment items included are taken from the work of Cernkovich and Giordano (1992). The items are used to evaluate the adolescent's educational experience along two dimensions: Bonding to Teachers (e.g., "Most of my teachers treat me fairly.") and School Orientation (e.g., "Schoolwork is very important to me."). Respondents rate 13 statements, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of academic commitment. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in an institution for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the institutional school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree or Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0 %
1.57	-	2	0.1 %
1.83	-	1	0.1 %
1.86	-	4	0.3 %
2.00	Disagree	2	0.1 %
2.14	-	3	0.2 %
2.29	-	5	0.4 %
2.43	-	1	0.1 %
2.50	-	1	0.1 %
2.57	-	8	0.6 %
2.71	-	4	0.3 %
2.86	-	13	1.0 %
3.00	Neither Agree or Disagree	12	0.9 %
3.14	-	21	1.6 %
3.17	-	1	0.1 %
3.29	-	12	0.9 %
3.43	-	37	2.7 %
3.57	-	28	2.1 %
3.71	-	33	2.4 %
3.86	-	44	3.2 %
4.00	Agree	110	8.1 %
4.14	-	17	1.3 %
4.29	-	14	1.0 %
4.43	-	6	0.4 %
4.57	-	12	0.9 %
4.71	-	11	0.8 %
4.83	-	1	0.1 %
4.86	-	12	0.9 %
5.00	Strongly Agree	13	1.0 %
Missing Data			
-800.00	Data missing: Data cleaning	18	1.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Skipped: Did not skip into institutional school section	816	60.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 428 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 791-797 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_DETSATISFACTION: S2 Education: Institutional school - Satisfaction with School

Satisfaction - Institutional school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

The school attachment items included are taken from the work of Cernkovich and Giordano (1992). The items are used to evaluate the adolescent's educational experience along two dimensions: Bonding to Teachers (e.g., "Most of my teachers treat me fairly.") and School Orientation (e.g., "Schoolwork is very important to me."). Respondents rate 13 statements, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of academic commitment. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in an institution for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the institutional school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree or Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.0	Strongly disagree	5	0.4 %
1.5	-	7	0.5 %
2.0	Disagree	38	2.8 %
2.5	-	30	2.2 %
3.0	Neither agree nor disagree	68	5.0 %
3.5	-	62	4.6 %
4.0	Agree	182	13.4 %
4.5	-	23	1.7 %
5.0	Strongly agree	13	1.0 %
Missing Data			
-800.0	Data missing: Data cleaning	18	1.3 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.0	Skipped: Did not skip into institutional school section	816	60.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 428 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 798-804 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_DETENGAGEMENT: S2 Education: Institutional school - High School Engagement

Engagement - Institutional school.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

The school attachment items included are taken from the work of Cernkovich and Giordano (1992). The items are used to evaluate the adolescent's educational experience along two dimensions: Bonding to Teachers (e.g., "Most of my teachers treat me fairly.") and School Orientation (e.g., "Schoolwork is very important to me."). Respondents rate 13 statements, using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of academic commitment. The items are first asked regarding the community school which the youth attends and, for youths housed in an institution for three or more months during the recall period, the items are repeated to attain the degree of academic commitment regarding the institutional school.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree or Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly Agree

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly disagree	0	0.0 %
1.50	-	1	0.1 %
1.67	-	1	0.1 %
1.75	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	Disagree	9	0.7 %
2.25	-	8	0.6 %
2.33	-	1	0.1 %
2.50	-	14	1.0 %
2.67	-	1	0.1 %
2.75	-	10	0.7 %
3.00	Neither agree nor disagree	26	1.9 %
3.25	-	21	1.6 %
3.50	-	46	3.4 %
3.75	-	62	4.6 %
4.00	Agree	148	10.9 %
4.25	-	21	1.6 %
4.50	-	21	1.6 %
4.75	-	11	0.8 %
5.00	Strongly agree	26	1.9 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-800.00	Data missing: Data cleaning	18	1.3 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Skipped: Did not skip into institutional school section	816	60.3 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 428 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 805-811 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCHOOL_PERFORMANCE: S2 Education: School Performance/Grades

School performance (based on average grades) during the recall period.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Mostly A's	123	9.1 %
2	About half As and half Bs	213	15.7 %
3	Mostly Bs	114	8.4 %
4	About half Bs and half Cs	182	13.4 %
5	Mostly Cs	94	6.9 %
6	About half Cs and half Ds	53	3.9 %
7	Mostly Ds	24	1.8 %
8	Mostly below Ds	25	1.8 %
9	No grades given	162	12.0 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-104	01.14+: Skipped if not enrolled in school in recall period	259	19.1 %
-99	Dont Know	11	0.8 %
-98	Refuse	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 990 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 812-815 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_BEHAVIOR: S2 Education: Count of academic or Behavioral Problems in School (suspension/expulsion, truancy, academic problems limiting college enrollment)

Academic or Behavioral problems during the recall period.

MEASURE: Education (Follow-ups): School Bonding Grades Activities and Orientation

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	794	58.6 %
1	-	253	18.7 %
2	-	38	2.8 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-108	Skipped: Not enrolled in school in recall period	177	13.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,085 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 816-819 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2JOBCAL_NWEEKSF: S2 JobCal: FACILITY : Total weeks worked in recall period across all facility jobs

FACILITY : Total weeks worked in recall period across all facility jobs.

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	1067	78.8 %
2.17	-	32	2.4 %
4.33	-	26	1.9 %
6.50	-	11	0.8 %
8.67	-	26	1.9 %
9.75	-	1	0.1 %
10.83	-	13	1.0 %
13.00	-	18	1.3 %
14.08	-	1	0.1 %
15.17	-	13	1.0 %
17.33	-	7	0.5 %
18.42	-	1	0.1 %
19.50	-	11	0.8 %
21.67	-	15	1.1 %
23.83	-	8	0.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
26.00	-	11	0.8 %
28.17	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total			1,354 100%

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

Location: 820-826 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -888.00 , -201.00

S2JOBCAL_NWEEKSCU: S2 JobCal: COMMUNITY & UNDER-THE-TABLE: Total weeks worked in recall period across all community and under-the-table jobs

COMMUNITY & UNDER-THE-TABLE: Total weeks worked in recall period across all community and under-the-table jobs.

MEASURE: Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	782	57.8 %
2.17	-	90	6.6 %
4.33	-	83	6.1 %
5.42	-	1	0.1 %
6.50	-	27	2.0 %
8.67	-	54	4.0 %
9.75	-	1	0.1 %
10.83	-	18	1.3 %
13.00	-	31	2.3 %
14.08	-	2	0.1 %
15.17	-	28	2.1 %
16.25	-	1	0.1 %
17.33	-	32	2.4 %
18.42	-	1	0.1 %
19.50	-	17	1.3 %
21.67	-	30	2.2 %
23.83	-	12	0.9 %
26.00	-	18	1.3 %
27.08	-	1	0.1 %
28.17	-	9	0.7 %
30.33	-	16	1.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
32.50	-	1	0.1 %
34.67	-	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-166.00	Unknown - under-the-table work	4	0.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,258 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 827-833 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2EXPWIT: S2 ExpV: Witnessed score

Exposure to Violence - Witnessed; count of items subject witnessed.

MEASURE: Exposure to Violence (ETV)

The Exposure to Violence Inventory (ETV; Selner-O'Hagan, Kindlon, Buka, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1998) was modified for this study to assess the frequency of exposure to violent events. Items from the ETV document the types of violence the adolescent has both experienced (i.e., Victim - 6 items, e.g., "Have you been chased where you thought you might be seriously hurt in the past N months?") and observed (i.e., Witnessed - 7 items, e.g., "Have you seen someone else being raped, an attempt made to rape someone or any other type of sexual attack in the past N months?"). Higher scores indicate a greater exposure to violence.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	649	47.9 %
1	-	226	16.7 %
2	-	177	13.1 %
3	-	97	7.2 %
4	-	53	3.9 %
5	-	46	3.4 %
6	-	12	0.9 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 834-837 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: -202, -201, -100

S2EXPVIC: S2 ExpV: Victim score

Exposure to Violence - Victim; count of items where subject was victim.

MEASURE: Exposure to Violence (ETV)

The Exposure to Violence Inventory (ETV; Selner-O'Hagan, Kindlon, Buka, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1998) was modified for this study to assess the frequency of exposure to violent events. Items from the ETV document the types of violence the adolescent has both experienced (i.e., Victim - 6 items, e.g., "Have you been chased where you thought you might be seriously hurt in the past N months?") and observed (i.e., Witnessed - 7 items, e.g., "Have you seen someone else being raped, an attempt made to rape someone or any other type of sexual attack in the past N months?"). Higher scores indicate a greater exposure to violence.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1084	80.1 %
1	-	111	8.2 %
2	-	45	3.3 %
3	-	15	1.1 %
4	-	4	0.3 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 838-841 (width: 4; decimal: 0)
Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: -202, -201, -100

S2EXPTOT: S2 ExpV: Total score - witnessed plus victim

Exposure to Violence - Total; sum of the victim and witness scales endorsed.

MEASURE: Exposure to Violence (ETV)

The Exposure to Violence Inventory (ETV; Selner-O'Hagan, Kindlon, Buka, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1998) was modified for this study to assess the frequency of exposure to violent events. Items from the ETV document the types of violence the adolescent has both experienced (i.e., Victim - 6

items, e.g., "Have you been chased where you thought you might be seriously hurt in the past N months?" and observed (i.e., Witnessed - 7 items, e.g., "Have you seen someone else being raped, an attempt made to rape someone or any other type of sexual attack in the past N months?"). Higher scores indicate a greater exposure to violence.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	620	45.8 %
1	-	224	16.5 %
2	-	172	12.7 %
3	-	94	6.9 %
4	-	49	3.6 %
5	-	43	3.2 %
6	-	31	2.3 %
7	-	15	1.1 %
8	-	10	0.7 %
9	-	1	0.1 %
11	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 842-845 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FRDQLT: S2 FQual: Friendship - Quality of Relationship

Friendship Quality of Relationship; mean of 10 items in the scale, at least 7 must contain valid data.

MEASURE: Friendship Quality

The items in the Friendship Quality scale are an adaptation of those included in the Quality of Relationships Inventory (Pierce, et al. 1994). The original scale was designed to measure interpersonal support from a single romantic partner but our adaptation changed the focus to a global rating regarding the youth's five closest friends (participant's are asked to average the rating across these closest friends). The scale contains 10 items which vary the context of support offered (e.g. "How much can you count on the people for help with a problem", "How close do you think you will be to these people in ten years" and "How much do you depend on these friends"). The youth responds on a 4-point likert scale ranging from "not at all" to "very much".

- (1) Not at all
- (2) A little
- (3) Quite a bit
- (4) Very much

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all	0	0.0 %
1.30	-	1	0.1 %
1.60	-	1	0.1 %
1.70	-	4	0.3 %
1.89	-	1	0.1 %
1.90	-	5	0.4 %
2.00	A little	4	0.3 %
2.10	-	10	0.7 %
2.20	-	13	1.0 %
2.22	-	1	0.1 %
2.30	-	15	1.1 %
2.40	-	15	1.1 %
2.44	-	1	0.1 %
2.50	-	19	1.4 %
2.60	-	26	1.9 %
2.63	-	1	0.1 %
2.70	-	48	3.5 %
2.75	-	1	0.1 %
2.78	-	2	0.1 %
2.80	-	38	2.8 %
2.89	-	1	0.1 %
2.90	-	53	3.9 %
3.00	Quite a bit	55	4.1 %
3.10	-	67	4.9 %
3.11	-	1	0.1 %
3.13	-	1	0.1 %
3.20	-	81	6.0 %
3.22	-	2	0.1 %
3.30	-	81	6.0 %
3.33	-	4	0.3 %
3.38	-	1	0.1 %
3.40	-	88	6.5 %
3.44	-	2	0.1 %
3.50	-	74	5.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.56	-	2	0.1 %
3.60	-	99	7.3 %
3.67	-	1	0.1 %
3.70	-	113	8.3 %
3.80	-	83	6.1 %
3.90	-	77	5.7 %
4.00	Very much	103	7.6 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into FriendQuality section	66	4.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,195 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 846-852 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FUTURE: S2 FOI: Future Orientation Inventory Scale

Future Outlook Inventory; mean of the eight items included in the computation; 7 items in the scale are not considered in the total score.

MEASURE: Future Outlook Inventory (FOI)

The Future Outlook Inventory is a 15-item scale used in this study to assess the degree each participant gives consideration to future planning. The scale was developed by Cauffman and Woolard (1999; unpublished), using items from the Life Orientation Task (Scheier and Carver, 1985), the Zimbardo Time Perspective Scale (Zimbardo, 1980), and the Consideration of Future Consequences Scale (Strathman, Gleicher, Boninger, and Edwards, 1994). The Future Outlook Inventory asks participants to rank from 1 to 4 (1=Never True to 4=Always True) the degree to which each statement reflects how they usually are (e.g., I will keep working at difficult, boring tasks if I know they will help me get ahead later). Higher scores indicate a greater degree of future consideration and planning.

- (1) Never true
- (2) Rarely true
- (3) Often true
- (4) Always true

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never True	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.13	-	1	0.1 %
1.25	-	7	0.5 %
1.38	-	15	1.1 %
1.50	-	28	2.1 %
1.63	-	27	2.0 %
1.75	-	42	3.1 %
1.88	-	55	4.1 %
2.00	Rarely True	82	6.1 %
2.13	-	103	7.6 %
2.25	-	97	7.2 %
2.38	-	129	9.5 %
2.50	-	109	8.1 %
2.63	-	111	8.2 %
2.75	-	84	6.2 %
2.88	-	86	6.4 %
3.00	Often True	67	4.9 %
3.13	-	49	3.6 %
3.14	-	1	0.1 %
3.25	-	54	4.0 %
3.29	-	1	0.1 %
3.38	-	25	1.8 %
3.50	-	30	2.2 %
3.63	-	23	1.7 %
3.75	-	10	0.7 %
3.88	-	3	0.2 %
4.00	Always True	18	1.3 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 853-859 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2GANG_OGNG1: S2 Gang: Still a member of gang from the last interview

Still a member of gang from the last interview.

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	51	3.8 %
1	Yes	112	8.3 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Not in a gang during last interview	1097	81.0 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 163 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 860-863 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2GANG_LASTGANG_CODE: S2 Gang: Unique ID associated with the gang from the last interview

Unique ID associated with the gang from the last interview.

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	48	3.5 %
	Missing Data		
-9992	AZ: Subj doesnt know name of the gang	1	0.1 %
-9991	PA: Subj doesnt know name of the gang	1	0.1 %
-9981	PA: Subj refused to provide name of gang	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 48 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 864-868 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2GANG_LASTGANG_WHENLEFT: S2 Gang: Recall period month (s#m#) subject left the gang from the last interview

Recall period month (s#m#) subject left the gang from the last interview.

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
DATE UNKNOWN	-	9	0.7 %
IntCompStat = 2	-	2	0.1 %
IntCompStat = 4	-	92	6.8 %
NA: Has not left gang	-	112	8.3 %
NA: Not in gang last RP	-	1097	81.0 %
S2M01	-	19	1.4 %
S2M02	-	9	0.7 %
S2M03	-	4	0.3 %
S2M04	-	4	0.3 %
S2M05	-	4	0.3 %
S2M06	-	1	0.1 %
SUBJ DOES NOT KNOW DATE	-	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

Location: 869-893 (width: 25; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: character

S2GANG_NGNG1: S2 Gang: Join a gang during this recall period

Join a gang during this recall period.

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1116	82.4 %
1	Yes	32	2.4 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	112	8.3 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,148 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 894-897 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2GANG_CURRENT_CODE: S2 Gang: Unique ID associated with the gang that is the focus of all followup items

Unique ID associated with the gang that is the focus of all followup items.

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	140	10.3 %
	Missing Data		
-9991	PA: Subj doesnt know name of the gang	1	0.1 %
-9982	AZ: Subj refused to provide name of gang	1	0.1 %
-9981	PA: Subj refused to provide name of gang	1	0.1 %
-9971	PA: Gang does not have a name	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 140 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 898-902 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2GANG_GANG5: S2 Gang: How many members in gang (associated with gang from current_code)

How many members in gang (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	-	2	0.1 %
8	-	2	0.1 %
10	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	1	0.1 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
57	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	5	0.4 %
115	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
120	-	1	0.1 %
150	-	1	0.1 %
250	-	1	0.1 %
300	-	1	0.1 %
350	-	2	0.1 %
600	-	2	0.1 %
2000	-	1	0.1 %
2356	-	1	0.1 %
4000	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-9999	Dont Know	5	0.4 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1116	82.4 %
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	112	8.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 903-907 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2GANG_GANG6: S2 Gang: Age oldest member of gang (associated with gang from current_code)

Age oldest member of gang (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
15	-	1	0.1 %
17	-	2	0.1 %
18	-	1	0.1 %
19	-	1	0.1 %
22	-	1	0.1 %
23	-	1	0.1 %
24	-	2	0.1 %
28	-	2	0.1 %
30	-	1	0.1 %
34	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
37	-	1	0.1 %
38	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
42	-	2	0.1 %
45	-	4	0.3 %
50	-	2	0.1 %
60	-	1	0.1 %
75	-	1	0.1 %
86	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1116	82.4 %
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	112	8.3 %
-99	Dont Know	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 908-911 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2GANG_GANG7: S2 Gang: Have any colors (associated with gang from current_code)

Have any colors (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	8	0.6 %
1	Yes	24	1.8 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1116	82.4 %
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	112	8.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 32 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 912-915 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2GANG_GANG8: S2 Gang: Have any rules (associated with gang from current_code)

Have any rules (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	15	1.1 %
1	Yes	17	1.3 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1116	82.4 %
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	112	8.3 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 32 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 916-919 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2GANG_GANG9: S2 Gang: Share money (associated with gang from current_code)

Share money (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	13	1.0 %
1	Yes	19	1.4 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1116	82.4 %
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	112	8.3 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 32 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 920-923 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2GANG_GANG10: S2 Gang: Share drugs (associated with gang from current_code)

Share drugs (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	8	0.6 %
1	Yes	24	1.8 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1116	82.4 %
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	112	8.3 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 32 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 924-927 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2GANG_GANG11: S2 Gang: Have punishments breaking rules (associated with gang from current_code)

Have punishments breaking rules (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	15	1.1 %
1	Yes	17	1.3 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1116	82.4 %
-102	Skipped: Still in gang from last recall period	112	8.3 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 32 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 928-931 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2GANG_GANG12: S2 Gang: How often contact (associated with gang from current_code)

How often contact (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	59	4.4 %
2	3-6 times per week	6	0.4 %
3	twice per week	9	0.7 %
4	Once per week	19	1.4 %
5	Less weekly, ore than monthly	6	0.4 %
6	Once per month	10	0.7 %
7	Less than monthly	35	2.6 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1116	82.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 144 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 932-935 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2GANG_GNGNOW: S2 Gang: Still member new gang (associated with gang from current_code)

Still member new gang (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	5	0.4 %
1	Yes	139	10.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1116	82.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 144 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

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

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2GANG_CURRENT_WHENLEFT: S2 Gang: Recall period month (s2m#) subject left the current gang (associated with gang from current_code)

Recall period month (s2m#) subject left the current gang (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
DATE UNKNOWN	-	1	0.1 %
IntCompStat = 2	-	2	0.1 %
IntCompStat = 4	-	92	6.8 %
NA: Has not left new gang	-	139	10.3 %
NA: Not in any gang in RP	-	1116	82.4 %
S2M03	-	2	0.1 %
S2M06	-	2	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

Location: 940-964 (width: 25; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: character

S2GANG_GANG13: S2 Gang: Position in the gang (associated with gang from current_code)

Position in the gang (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Leader	5	0.4 %
2	Not leader, but one of the top people	24	1.8 %
3	Member	114	8.4 %
4	Something else (other)	1	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1116	82.4 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 144 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 965-968 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2GANG_GANG16: S2 Gang: How important to you (associated with gang from current_code)

How important to you (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	Not at all	32	2.4 %
1	A little bit	44	3.2 %
2	Moderately	23	1.7 %
3	Quite a bit	27	2.0 %
4	Extremely	18	1.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1116	82.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 144 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 969-972 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2GANG_GANG17: S2 Gang: How many friend not members (associated with gang from current_code)

How many friends not members (associated with gang from current_code).

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	None (all are members)	23	1.7 %
2	A few are not	72	5.3 %
3	Half are not	20	1.5 %
4	Most are not	23	1.7 %
5	All (none are members)	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-103	Skipped: Not in any gang during recall period	1116	82.4 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

Location: 973-976 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2GNGINV: S2 GANG: Involved in a gang during the recall period

Involved in a gang during the recall period.

MEASURE: Gang Involvement

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1116	82.4 %
1	Yes	144	10.6 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 977-980 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SOCCAP17: S2 GunAccess: Person wants to buy a gun he/she can

If a young person in this neighborhood wants to buy a gun, he/she can.

MEASURE: Gun Accessibility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Agree	103	7.6 %
2	Agree	383	28.3 %
3	Neither Agree nor Disagree	172	12.7 %
4	Disagree	169	12.5 %
5	Strongly Disagree	56	4.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Subject locked up for entire recall period	366	27.0 %
-9	Dont Know	10	0.7 %
-8	Refused	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 883 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 981-984 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SOCCAP18: S2 GunAccess: How much to buy a 9mm gun

How much would it cost to buy a 9mm gun?

MEASURE: Gun Accessibility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
20	-	6	0.4 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	2	0.1 %
40	-	3	0.2 %
45	-	2	0.1 %
50	-	19	1.4 %
60	-	7	0.5 %
65	-	3	0.2 %
70	-	4	0.3 %
75	-	9	0.7 %
78	-	1	0.1 %
80	-	19	1.4 %
85	-	1	0.1 %
90	-	6	0.4 %
100	-	75	5.5 %
115	-	1	0.1 %
120	-	7	0.5 %
125	-	7	0.5 %
130	-	3	0.2 %
140	-	1	0.1 %
150	-	66	4.9 %
160	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
175	-	6	0.4 %
180	-	2	0.1 %
200	-	76	5.6 %
210	-	1	0.1 %
220	-	1	0.1 %
225	-	1	0.1 %
250	-	38	2.8 %
275	-	4	0.3 %
280	-	3	0.2 %
300	-	50	3.7 %
329	-	1	0.1 %
350	-	24	1.8 %
375	-	1	0.1 %
400	-	35	2.6 %
450	-	10	0.7 %
500	-	19	1.4 %
600	-	9	0.7 %
650	-	2	0.1 %
700	-	3	0.2 %
800	-	2	0.1 %
900	-	1	0.1 %
995	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	359	26.5 %
-998	Refused	2	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Subject locked up for entire recall period	366	27.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Based upon 534 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 985-988 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SOCCAP19: S2 GunAccess: How much to buy a .38

How much would it cost to buy a .38?

MEASURE: Gun Accessibility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
20	-	5	0.4 %
30	-	4	0.3 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
38	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	10	0.7 %
45	-	2	0.1 %
50	-	19	1.4 %
55	-	1	0.1 %
57	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	13	1.0 %
70	-	10	0.7 %
75	-	9	0.7 %
80	-	19	1.4 %
85	-	3	0.2 %
90	-	7	0.5 %
100	-	70	5.2 %
120	-	10	0.7 %
125	-	7	0.5 %
130	-	2	0.1 %
150	-	73	5.4 %
154	-	1	0.1 %
160	-	4	0.3 %
175	-	4	0.3 %
180	-	4	0.3 %
200	-	67	4.9 %
225	-	1	0.1 %
245	-	1	0.1 %
250	-	48	3.5 %
260	-	1	0.1 %
275	-	3	0.2 %
280	-	2	0.1 %
300	-	31	2.3 %
325	-	1	0.1 %
330	-	1	0.1 %
350	-	17	1.3 %
400	-	10	0.7 %
450	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
500	-	8	0.6 %
550	-	1	0.1 %
600	-	1	0.1 %
800	-	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	415	30.6 %
-998	Refused	2	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Subject locked up for entire recall period	366	27.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 478 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 989-992 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2HEADIN: S2 HeadInj: Head Injury in the recall period where lost consciousness or needed medical treatment

A marker for the presence of a head injury which caused unconsciousness or needed medical attention.

MEASURE: Head Injury

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1220	90.1 %
1	Yes	40	3.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 993-996 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2HEADINJ_HEADN: S2 HeadInj: Number of head injuries in recall period where lost consciousness or needed medical treatment

Number of head injuries in recall period where lost consciousness or needed medical treatment.

MEASURE: Head Injury

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1220	90.1 %
1	-	39	2.9 %
3	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 997-1000 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2RLG1: S2 Religion: During recall period how often attend religious service

During recall period how often did you attend church, synagogue, or other religious activities?

MEASURE: Importance of Spirituality

The Importance of Spirituality measure, developed by Maton (1989), is a highly reliable assessment of spirituality (Maton, Teti, Corns, Vieira-Baker, Lavine, Gouze, and Keating, 1996). The scale contains three items that ask participants to indicate how much their actions are influenced by belief in a god. Participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all true" to "Completely true," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of spirituality. These three items are summed into a single scale score. Two additional items are included to evaluate the importance of one's religion (e.g., "How important has religion been in your life?"), as well as the participant's average yearly service attendance (e.g., "During the past year, how often did you attend church, synagogue, or other religious service?"). These are left as individual items.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	716	52.9 %
2	Several times a year	159	11.7 %
3	Once or twice per month	128	9.5 %
4	Once a week	212	15.7 %
5	Several times per week	45	3.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1001-1004 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2RLG2: S2 Religion: How important has religion been in your life

How important has religion been in your life?

MEASURE: Importance of Spirituality

The Importance of Spirituality measure, developed by Maton (1989), is a highly reliable assessment of spirituality (Maton, Teti, Corns, Vieira-Baker, Lavine, Gouze, and Keating, 1996). The scale contains three items that ask participants to indicate how much their actions are influenced by belief in a god. Participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all true" to "Completely true," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of spirituality. These three items are summed into a single scale score. Two additional items are included to evaluate the importance of one's religion (e.g., "How important has religion been in your life?"), as well as the participant's average yearly service attendance (e.g., "During the past year, how often did you attend church, synagogue, or other religious service?"). These are left as individual items.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	209	15.4 %
2	Not too important	210	15.5 %
3	Somewhat important	347	25.6 %
4	Pretty important	223	16.5 %
5	Very important	270	19.9 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,259 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1005-1008 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2RLG3: S2 Religion: I experience Gods love and caring on a regular basis

I experience God's love and caring on a regular basis.

MEASURE: Importance of Spirituality

The Importance of Spirituality measure, developed by Maton (1989), is a highly reliable assessment of spirituality (Maton, Teti, Corns, Vieira-Baker, Lavine, Gouze, and Keating, 1996). The scale contains three items that ask participants to indicate how much their actions are influenced by belief in a god. Participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all true" to "Completely true," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of spirituality. These three items are summed into a single scale score. Two additional items are included to evaluate the importance of one's religion (e.g., "How important has religion been in your life?"), as well as the participant's average yearly service attendance (e.g., "During the past year, how often did you attend church, synagogue, or other religious service?"). These are left as individual items.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all true	201	14.8 %
2	Not very true	178	13.1 %
3	Somewhat true	364	26.9 %
4	Pretty true	254	18.8 %
5	Completely true	260	19.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,257 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1009-1012 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2RLG4: S2 Religion: I experience a close personal relationship to God

I experience a close personal relationship to God.

MEASURE: Importance of Spirituality

The Importance of Spirituality measure, developed by Maton (1989), is a highly reliable assessment of spirituality (Maton, Teti, Corns, Vieira-Baker, Lavine, Gouze, and Keating, 1996). The scale contains three items that ask participants to indicate how much their actions are influenced by belief in a god. Participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all true" to "Completely true," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of spirituality. These three items are summed into a single scale score. Two additional items are included to evaluate the importance of one's religion (e.g., "How important has religion been

in your life?"), as well as the participant's average yearly service attendance (e.g., "During the past year, how often did you attend church, synagogue, or other religious service?"). These are left as individual items.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all true	212	15.7 %
2	Not very true	203	15.0 %
3	Somewhat true	356	26.3 %
4	Pretty true	251	18.5 %
5	Completely true	237	17.5 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,259 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1013-1016 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2RLG5: S2 Religion: Religion helps me to deal with my problems

Religion helps me to deal with my problems.

MEASURE: Importance of Spirituality

The Importance of Spirituality measure, developed by Maton (1989), is a highly reliable assessment of spirituality (Maton, Teti, Corns, Vieira-Baker, Lavine, Gouze, and Keating, 1996). The scale contains three items that ask participants to indicate how much their actions are influenced by belief in a god. Participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all true" to "Completely true," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of spirituality. These three items are summed into a single scale score. Two additional items are included to evaluate the importance of one's religion (e.g., "How important has religion been in your life?"), as well as the participant's average yearly service attendance (e.g., "During the past year, how often did you attend church, synagogue, or other religious service?"). These are left as individual items.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all true	299	22.1 %
2	Not very true	242	17.9 %
3	Somewhat true	310	22.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	Pretty true	199	14.7 %
5	Completely true	210	15.5 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1017-1020 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2RELIGN: S2 Religion: Importance of Spirituality

Importance of spirituality; Mean of three items.

MEASURE: Importance of Spirituality

The Importance of Spirituality measure, developed by Maton (1989), is a highly reliable assessment of spirituality (Maton, Teti, Corns, Vieira-Baker, Lavine, Gouze, and Keating, 1996). The scale contains three items that ask participants to indicate how much their actions are influenced by belief in a god. Participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all true" to "Completely true," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of spirituality. These three items are summed into a single scale score. Two additional items are included to evaluate the importance of one's religion (e.g., "How important has religion been in your life?"), as well as the participant's average yearly service attendance (e.g., "During the past year, how often did you attend church, synagogue, or other religious service?"). These are left as individual items.

- (1) Not at all true
- (2) Not very true
- (3) Somewhat true
- (4) Pretty true
- (5) Completely true

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all true	176	13.0 %
1.33	-	11	0.8 %
1.50	-	1	0.1 %
1.67	-	39	2.9 %
2.00	Not very true	130	9.6 %
2.33	-	72	5.3 %
2.67	-	98	7.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.00	Somewhat true	184	13.6 %
3.33	-	94	6.9 %
3.67	-	84	6.2 %
4.00	Pretty true	113	8.3 %
4.33	-	54	4.0 %
4.50	-	1	0.1 %
4.67	-	57	4.2 %
5.00	Competely true	145	10.7 %
Missing Data			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,259 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1021-1027 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2PUNOTH: S2 PainCost: Certainty of Punishment - Other

Certainty of punishment - others; Mean of 7 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is comprised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {Others and You (e.g., "How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?")}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., "If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?"), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., "Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?")}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., "If I take things, other people my age will respect me more."}), and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g., "How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?"). \

(0) No chance

(10) Absolutely certain to be caught

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	No chance	21	1.6 %
0.14	-	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.29	-	2	0.1 %
0.43	-	1	0.1 %
0.57	-	3	0.2 %
0.71	-	7	0.5 %
0.86	-	1	0.1 %
1.00	-	4	0.3 %
1.14	-	6	0.4 %
1.29	-	4	0.3 %
1.33	-	1	0.1 %
1.43	-	9	0.7 %
1.57	-	3	0.2 %
1.71	-	3	0.2 %
1.86	-	5	0.4 %
2.00	-	13	1.0 %
2.14	-	13	1.0 %
2.29	-	8	0.6 %
2.43	-	4	0.3 %
2.57	-	17	1.3 %
2.71	-	15	1.1 %
2.86	-	16	1.2 %
3.00	-	10	0.7 %
3.14	-	20	1.5 %
3.29	-	20	1.5 %
3.43	-	11	0.8 %
3.57	-	18	1.3 %
3.71	-	40	3.0 %
3.86	-	18	1.3 %
4.00	-	27	2.0 %
4.14	-	32	2.4 %
4.25	-	1	0.1 %
4.29	-	56	4.1 %
4.43	-	26	1.9 %
4.57	-	26	1.9 %
4.71	-	31	2.3 %
4.86	-	32	2.4 %
5.00	-	52	3.8 %
5.14	-	25	1.8 %
5.29	-	28	2.1 %
5.33	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5.43	-	32	2.4 %
5.57	-	23	1.7 %
5.71	-	40	3.0 %
5.86	-	26	1.9 %
6.00	-	26	1.9 %
6.14	-	25	1.8 %
6.29	-	30	2.2 %
6.43	-	27	2.0 %
6.57	-	17	1.3 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-99.00	Dont Know	14	1.0 %
-98.00	Refuse	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Based upon 1,244 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1028-1034 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -99.00 , -98.00

S2PUNYOU: S2 PainCost: Certainty of Punishment - You

Certainty of punishment - you; Mean of 7 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is comprised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {Others and You (e.g., "How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?")}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., "If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?"), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., "Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?")}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., "If I take things, other people my age will respect me more.")}, and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g., "How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?").

(0) No chance

(10) Absolutely certain to be caught

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	No chance	74	5.5 %
0.14	-	4	0.3 %
0.29	-	6	0.4 %
0.43	-	2	0.1 %
0.57	-	2	0.1 %
0.71	-	12	0.9 %
0.86	-	13	1.0 %
1.00	-	13	1.0 %
1.14	-	3	0.2 %
1.29	-	6	0.4 %
1.43	-	20	1.5 %
1.57	-	6	0.4 %
1.67	-	1	0.1 %
1.71	-	15	1.1 %
1.86	-	8	0.6 %
2.00	-	8	0.6 %
2.14	-	15	1.1 %
2.29	-	9	0.7 %
2.43	-	13	1.0 %
2.57	-	14	1.0 %
2.71	-	10	0.7 %
2.86	-	24	1.8 %
3.00	-	14	1.0 %
3.14	-	10	0.7 %
3.29	-	27	2.0 %
3.43	-	14	1.0 %
3.57	-	26	1.9 %
3.71	-	22	1.6 %
3.86	-	18	1.3 %
4.00	-	22	1.6 %
4.14	-	24	1.8 %
4.29	-	34	2.5 %
4.43	-	19	1.4 %
4.57	-	19	1.4 %
4.71	-	19	1.4 %
4.86	-	18	1.3 %
5.00	-	44	3.2 %
5.14	-	27	2.0 %
5.29	-	17	1.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5.33	-	1	0.1 %
5.43	-	19	1.4 %
5.57	-	12	0.9 %
5.71	-	26	1.9 %
5.86	-	23	1.7 %
6.00	-	16	1.2 %
6.14	-	18	1.3 %
6.29	-	13	1.0 %
6.43	-	20	1.5 %
6.57	-	19	1.4 %
6.67	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-99.00	Dont Know	13	1.0 %
-98.00	Refuse	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Based upon 1,246 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1035-1041 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -99.00 , -98.00

S2SOCCST: S2 PainCost: Social Costs of Punishment

Social costs of punishment; Mean of 6 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is comprised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {Others and You (e.g., "How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?")}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., "If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?"), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., "Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?")}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., "If I take things, other people my age will respect me more.")}, and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g., "How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?").

- (1) Very unlikely
- (2) Somewhat unlikely

- (3) Neither likely nor unlikely
- (4) Somewhat likely
- (5) Very likely

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Very unlikely	27	2.0 %
1.17	-	9	0.7 %
1.33	-	9	0.7 %
1.50	-	25	1.8 %
1.60	-	1	0.1 %
1.67	-	54	4.0 %
1.80	-	1	0.1 %
1.83	-	25	1.8 %
2.00	Somewhat unlikely	63	4.7 %
2.17	-	40	3.0 %
2.20	-	2	0.1 %
2.33	-	61	4.5 %
2.40	-	3	0.2 %
2.50	-	64	4.7 %
2.60	-	3	0.2 %
2.67	-	71	5.2 %
2.80	-	2	0.1 %
2.83	-	71	5.2 %
3.00	Neither likely or unlikely	75	5.5 %
3.17	-	84	6.2 %
3.20	-	2	0.1 %
3.33	-	87	6.4 %
3.50	-	92	6.8 %
3.67	-	101	7.5 %
3.80	-	1	0.1 %
3.83	-	76	5.6 %
4.00	Somewhat likely	63	4.7 %
4.17	-	44	3.2 %
4.20	-	1	0.1 %
4.33	-	30	2.2 %
4.40	-	1	0.1 %
4.50	-	15	1.1 %
4.67	-	21	1.6 %
4.83	-	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5.00	Very likely	32	2.4 %
	Missing Data		
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1042-1048 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2WGTCST: S2 PainCost: Punishment Costs - Weight

Punishment costs - weight; Mean of 18 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is comprised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {Others and You (e.g., "How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?")}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., "If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?"), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., "Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?")}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., "If I take things, other people my age will respect me more.")}, and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g., "How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?").

- (1) Not at all
- (2) A little
- (3) Quite a bit
- (4) Very much

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all	103	7.6 %
1.11	-	1	0.1 %
1.20	-	2	0.1 %
1.22	-	1	0.1 %
1.29	-	1	0.1 %
1.33	-	6	0.4 %
1.50	-	13	1.0 %
1.67	-	7	0.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.75	-	2	0.1 %
1.77	-	1	0.1 %
1.80	-	1	0.1 %
1.82	-	2	0.1 %
1.88	-	2	0.1 %
1.92	-	1	0.1 %
1.94	-	2	0.1 %
2.00	A little	83	6.1 %
2.06	-	1	0.1 %
2.10	-	2	0.1 %
2.12	-	1	0.1 %
2.13	-	2	0.1 %
2.18	-	1	0.1 %
2.20	-	3	0.2 %
2.24	-	1	0.1 %
2.25	-	6	0.4 %
2.27	-	1	0.1 %
2.28	-	2	0.1 %
2.29	-	3	0.2 %
2.31	-	2	0.1 %
2.33	-	5	0.4 %
2.36	-	1	0.1 %
2.38	-	5	0.4 %
2.39	-	1	0.1 %
2.40	-	3	0.2 %
2.41	-	1	0.1 %
2.43	-	2	0.1 %
2.44	-	2	0.1 %
2.45	-	1	0.1 %
2.47	-	1	0.1 %
2.50	-	27	2.0 %
2.54	-	1	0.1 %
2.56	-	1	0.1 %
2.57	-	2	0.1 %
2.58	-	1	0.1 %
2.60	-	9	0.7 %
2.61	-	2	0.1 %
2.64	-	1	0.1 %
2.65	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.67	-	9	0.7 %
2.69	-	4	0.3 %
2.70	-	4	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into section	310	22.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

Based upon 950 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1049-1055 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -400.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S2VARCST: S2 PainCost: Punishment Costs - Variety

Punishment costs - variety; Count of 18 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is comprised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {Others and You (e.g., "How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?")}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., "If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?"), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., "Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?")}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., "If I take things, other people my age will respect me more.")}, and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g., "How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	131	9.7 %
1	-	121	8.9 %
2	-	71	5.2 %
3	-	52	3.8 %
4	-	52	3.8 %
5	-	45	3.3 %
6	-	27	2.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
7	-	24	1.8 %
8	-	16	1.2 %
9	-	16	1.2 %
10	-	18	1.3 %
11	-	23	1.7 %
12	-	23	1.7 %
13	-	40	3.0 %
14	-	45	3.3 %
15	-	64	4.7 %
16	-	84	6.2 %
17	-	70	5.2 %
18	-	159	11.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100	Did not skip into section	179	13.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,081 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1056-1059 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2MATCST: S2 PainCost: Punishment Costs (13) - Material Issues

Punishment costs (13) - material issues; Sum of 13 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is compromised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {Others and You (e.g., "How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?")}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., "If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?"), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., "Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?")}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., "If I take things, other people my age will respect me more.")}, and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g., "How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	405	29.9 %
1	-	76	5.6 %
2	-	26	1.9 %
3	-	17	1.3 %
4	-	17	1.3 %
5	-	20	1.5 %
6	-	17	1.3 %
7	-	31	2.3 %
8	-	33	2.4 %
9	-	47	3.5 %
10	-	60	4.4 %
11	-	84	6.2 %
12	-	76	5.6 %
13	-	172	12.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100	Did not skip into section	179	13.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,081 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1060-1063 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2FRECST: S2 PainCost: Punishment Costs (5) - Freedom Issues

Punishment costs (5) - freedom issues; Sum of 5 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is compromised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {Others and You (e.g., "How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?")}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., "If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?"), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., "Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?")}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., "If I take things, other people my age will respect me more.")}, and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g., "How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	136	10.0 %
1	-	132	9.7 %
2	-	74	5.5 %
3	-	89	6.6 %
4	-	153	11.3 %
5	-	497	36.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100	Did not skip into section	179	13.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,081 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1064-1067 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2STLRWD: S2 PainCost: Social Rewards of Crime - Stealing

Social rewards of crime - stealing; Mean of 5 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is comprised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {Others and You (e.g., "How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?")}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., "If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?"), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., "Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?")}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., "If I take things, other people my age will respect me more.")}, and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g., "How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?").

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Somewhat disagree
- (3) Somewhat agree
- (4) Strongly agree

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly disagree	247	18.2 %
1.20	-	49	3.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.40	-	55	4.1 %
1.60	-	53	3.9 %
1.75	-	1	0.1 %
1.80	-	73	5.4 %
2.00	Somewhat disagree	415	30.6 %
2.20	-	181	13.4 %
2.25	-	1	0.1 %
2.40	-	93	6.9 %
2.60	-	51	3.8 %
2.80	-	25	1.8 %
3.00	Somewhat agree	8	0.6 %
3.20	-	3	0.2 %
3.40	-	3	0.2 %
4.00	Strongly agree	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-600.00	Missing for unknown reason	1	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,259 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1068-1074 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S2FGTRWD: S2 PainCost: Social Rewards of Crime - Fighting

Social rewards of crime - fighting; Mean of 5 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is compromised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment {Others and You (e.g., "How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?")}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., "If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?"), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., "Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?")}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., "If I take things, other people my age will respect me more.")}, and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g., "How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?").

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Somewhat disagree

- (3) Somewhat agree
 (4) Strongly agree

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly disagree	204	15.1 %
1.20	-	26	1.9 %
1.40	-	27	2.0 %
1.50	-	1	0.1 %
1.60	-	30	2.2 %
1.80	-	48	3.5 %
2.00	Somewhat disagree	319	23.6 %
2.20	-	158	11.7 %
2.25	-	1	0.1 %
2.40	-	157	11.6 %
2.60	-	131	9.7 %
2.75	-	1	0.1 %
2.80	-	82	6.1 %
3.00	Somewhat agree	44	3.2 %
3.20	-	15	1.1 %
3.40	-	11	0.8 %
3.60	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Strongly agree	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-600.00	Missing for unknown reason	1	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,259 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1075-1081 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -600.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S2ROBRWD: S2 PainCost: Social Rewards of Crime - Robbery

Social rewards of crime - robbery; Mean of 5 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is comprised of five dimensions: Certainty of Punishment (Others and You (e.g.,

"How likely is it that kids in your neighborhood would be caught and arrested for fighting?"}, Social Costs of Punishment (e.g., "If the police catch me doing something that breaks the law, how likely is it that I would be suspended from school?"), Personal Costs of Punishment {Variety and Weight (e.g., "Has your court sentence kept you from hanging out with your friends as much as you used to?")}, Social Rewards of Crime {Stealing, Fighting and Robbery (e.g., "If I take things, other people my age will respect me more."}), and Personal Rewards of Crime (e.g., "How much 'thrill' or 'rush' is it to break into a store or home?").

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Somewhat disagree
- (3) Somewhat agree
- (4) Strongly agree

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.0	Strongly disagree	294	21.7 %
1.2	-	22	1.6 %
1.4	-	36	2.7 %
1.6	-	37	2.7 %
1.8	-	66	4.9 %
2.0	Somewhat disagree	474	35.0 %
2.2	-	161	11.9 %
2.4	-	70	5.2 %
2.6	-	57	4.2 %
2.8	-	24	1.8 %
3.0	Somewhat agree	15	1.1 %
3.2	-	2	0.1 %
3.4	-	1	0.1 %
4.0	Strongly agree	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-600.0	Missing for unknown reason	1	0.1 %
-202.0	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,259 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1082-1088 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -600.0 , -300.0 , -202.0 , -201.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

S2PERRWD: S2 PainCost: Personal Rewards of Crime

Personal Rewards of crime; Mean of 7 items.

MEASURE: Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards

The Indices of Personal and Social Costs and Rewards were adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perceived likelihood of detection and punishment for any of several types of offenses (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). The 78-item measure is 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).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	No fun or kick at all	385	28.4 %
0.14	-	16	1.2 %
0.29	-	29	2.1 %
0.43	-	29	2.1 %
0.57	-	20	1.5 %
0.71	-	60	4.4 %
0.86	-	23	1.7 %
1.00	-	28	2.1 %
1.14	-	23	1.7 %
1.29	-	20	1.5 %
1.43	-	58	4.3 %
1.57	-	22	1.6 %
1.71	-	22	1.6 %
1.86	-	12	0.9 %
2.00	-	16	1.2 %
2.14	-	19	1.4 %
2.29	-	24	1.8 %
2.43	-	7	0.5 %
2.57	-	13	1.0 %
2.71	-	17	1.3 %
2.86	-	29	2.1 %
3.00	-	16	1.2 %
3.14	-	15	1.1 %
3.29	-	14	1.0 %
3.43	-	16	1.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.57	-	12	0.9 %
3.71	-	12	0.9 %
3.86	-	16	1.2 %
4.00	-	6	0.4 %
4.14	-	12	0.9 %
4.29	-	17	1.3 %
4.43	-	9	0.7 %
4.57	-	11	0.8 %
4.71	-	12	0.9 %
4.86	-	7	0.5 %
5.00	-	25	1.8 %
5.14	-	15	1.1 %
5.29	-	11	0.8 %
5.43	-	8	0.6 %
5.57	-	4	0.3 %
5.71	-	21	1.6 %
5.86	-	8	0.6 %
6.00	-	8	0.6 %
6.14	-	9	0.7 %
6.29	-	10	0.7 %
6.43	-	8	0.6 %
6.57	-	3	0.2 %
6.71	-	9	0.7 %
6.86	-	6	0.4 %
7.00	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1089-1095 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -99.00 , -98.00

S2DEMO_PRGNOW: S2 Pregnancy: Currently pregnant

Are you currently pregnant? (females only)

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	160	11.8 %
1	Yes	11	0.8 %
7	Suspected but not confirmed	4	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Subject is male	1087	80.3 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 175 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1096-1099 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_HOWPRG: S2 Pregnancy: Number of months along in current pregnancy

How many months pregnant are you? (females only)

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1-3 months	0	0.0 %
2	4-6 months	4	0.3 %
3	7-9 months	7	0.5 %
	Missing Data		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: Not currently pregnant	164	12.1 %
-101	Skipped: Subject is male	1087	80.3 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 11 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1100-1103 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEMO_PREGRP: S2 Pregnancy: Been pregnant during recall period (other than current pregnancy if currently pregnant)

Have you been pregnant during the recall period (other than current pregnancy if you are currently pregnant)? (females only)

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	156	11.5 %
1	Yes	19	1.4 %
	Missing Data		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Subject is male	1087	80.3 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 175 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1104-1107 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2DEMO_PRGENDRP: S2 Pregnancy: How did pregnancy end (refers to pregnancy from SS2Demo_PregRP)

How did this pregnancy end? (females only)

(refers to pregnancy from SS#Demo_PregRP)

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Live birth	9	0.7 %
2	Still birth, miscarriage or abortion	10	0.7 %
	Missing Data		
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-103	Skipped: Was not pregnant any other time during recall period	156	11.5 %
-101	Skipped: Subject is male	1087	80.3 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 19 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1108-1111 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -103 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2DEMO_GFPRG: S2 Pregnancy: Any girlfriends currently pregnant with your child

Do you have any girlfriends who are currently pregnant with your child? (males only)

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1020	75.3 %
1	Yes	59	4.4 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-104	Skipped: Subject is female	175	12.9 %
-9	Dont Know	7	0.5 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,079 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1112-1115 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2DEMO_GFPRN: S2 Pregnancy: Number of girlfriends currently pregnant with your child

How many girlfriends are currently pregnant with your child? (males only)

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	56	4.1 %
2	-	3	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-107	Skipped: Subject doesnt know if girlfriend is pregnant	7	0.5 %
-106	Skipped: Girlfriend is not pregnant	1020	75.3 %
-104	Skipped: Subject is female	175	12.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 59 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1116-1119 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -107 , -106 , -104 , -99 , -98

S2DEMO_GFHWFR: S2 Pregnancy: Number of months along wife/girlfriend is in current pregnancy

How many months pregant is she? (males only)

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	1-3 months	30	2.2 %
2	4-6 months	16	1.2 %
3	7-9 months	12	0.9 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-107	Skipped: Subject doesnt know if girlfriend is pregnant	7	0.5 %
-106	Skipped: Girlfriend is not pregnant	1020	75.3 %
-104	Skipped: Subject is female	175	12.9 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 58 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1120-1123 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -107 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2CHLD01_ALIVE: S2 Children: Child01 - Is this child alive

Child01 - Is this child alive.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	3	0.2 %
1	Yes	192	14.2 %
	Missing Data		
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	3	0.2 %
-650	No child reported	1064	78.6 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 195 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1124-1127 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S2CHLD01_AGE: S2 Children: Child01 - Age

Child01 - How old is this child.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	120	8.9 %
	Missing Data		
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	2	0.1 %
-650	No child reported	827	61.1 %
-526	Age unknown	26	1.9 %
-400	Not asked in this version	273	20.2 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	92	6.8 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	3	0.2 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

Location: 1128-1132 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -526, -400, -202, -201, -100, -99, -98

S2CHLD01_BIO: S2 Children: Child01 - Is this your biological child

Child01 - Is this your biological child.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	10	0.7 %
1	Yes	180	13.3 %
	Missing Data		
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	3	0.2 %
-650	No child reported	1064	78.6 %
-506	Biological relationship unknown	5	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 190 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1133-1136 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -506, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S2CHLD01_LIVWNW: S2 Children: Child01 - Does this child live with you

Child01 - Does this child live with you.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	22	1.6 %
1	Yes	13	1.0 %
	Missing Data		
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	3	0.2 %
-650	No child reported	1064	78.6 %
-400	Not asked in this version	160	11.8 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

Location: 1137-1140 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S2CHLD01_LIVWRP: S2 Children: Child01 - Has this child lived in the same household as you in the recall period

Child01 - Has this child lived in the same household as you in the recall period.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	113	8.3 %
1	Yes	41	3.0 %
6	Omit	0	0.0 %
7	Deceased	3	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	3	0.2 %
-650	No child reported	1064	78.6 %
-400	Not asked in this version	35	2.6 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	92	6.8 %
-9	Don't Know	3	0.2 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 157 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1141-1144 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S2CHLD01_CONTNW: S2 Children: Child01 - Frequency of contact with child now

Child01 - Frequency of contact with child now.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	19	1.4 %
2	3-6 times per week	0	0.0 %
3	2 times per week	3	0.2 %
4	1 time per week	2	0.1 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	1	0.1 %
6	1 time per month	2	0.1 %
7	Less than monthly	7	0.5 %
Missing Data			
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	3	0.2 %
-650	No child reported	1064	78.6 %
-400	Not asked in this version	160	11.8 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	92	6.8 %
-9	Don't Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 34 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1145-1148 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S2CHLD01_CONTRP: S2 Children: Child01 - Frequency of contact with child in the recall periods

Child01 - Frequency of contact with child in the recall periods.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	65	4.8 %
2	3-6 times per week	13	1.0 %
3	2 times per week	12	0.9 %
4	1 time per week	16	1.2 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	6	0.4 %
6	1 time per month	5	0.4 %
7	Less than monthly	34	2.5 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-750	Reported in previous RP but not here	3	0.2 %
-650	No child reported	1064	78.6 %
-400	Not asked in this version	35	2.6 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	92	6.8 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	3	0.2 %
-9	Don't Know	6	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 151 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1149-1152 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S2CHLD02_ALIVE: S2 Children: Child02 - Is this child alive

Child02 - Is this child alive.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1	0.1 %
1	Yes	27	2.0 %
Missing Data			
-650	No child reported	1234	91.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 1153-1156 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S2CHLD02_AGE: S2 Children: Child02 - Age

Child02 - How old is this child.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	18	1.3 %
Missing Data			
-650	No child reported	974	71.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-526	Age unknown	3	0.2 %
-400	Not asked in this version	266	19.6 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	92	6.8 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 18 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1157-1161 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -526 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -99 , -98

S2CHLD02_BIO: S2 Children: Child02 - Is this your biological child

Child02 - Is this your biological child.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1	0.1 %
1	Yes	26	1.9 %
	Missing Data		
-650	No child reported	1234	91.1 %
-506	Biological relationship unknown	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 1162-1165 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -506 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S2CHLD02_LIVWNW: S2 Children: Child02 - Does this child live with you

Child02 - Does this child live with you.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	5	0.4 %
1	Yes	1	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-650	No child reported	1234	91.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-400	Not asked in this version	22	1.6 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 1166-1169 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S2CHLD02_LIVWRP: S2 Children: Child02 - Has this child lived in the same household as you in the recall period

Child02 - Has this child lived in the same household as you in the recall period.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	13	1.0 %
1	Yes	8	0.6 %
6	Omit	0	0.0 %
7	Deceased	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-650	No child reported	1234	91.1 %
-400	Not asked in this version	6	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 1170-1173 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S2CHLD02_CONTNW: S2 Children: Child02 - Frequency of contact with child now

Child02 - Frequency of contact with child now.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	3	0.2 %
2	3-6 times per week	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	2 times per week	0	0.0 %
4	1 time per week	1	0.1 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	0	0.0 %
6	1 time per month	0	0.0 %
7	Less than monthly	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-650	No child reported	1234	91.1 %
-400	Not asked in this version	22	1.6 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 1174-1177 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S2CHLD02_CONTRP: S2 Children: Child02 - Frequency of contact with child in the recall periods

Child02 - Frequency of contact with child in the recall periods.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	9	0.7 %
2	3-6 times per week	3	0.2 %
3	2 times per week	4	0.3 %
4	1 time per week	1	0.1 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	0	0.0 %
6	1 time per month	0	0.0 %
7	Less than monthly	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-650	No child reported	1234	91.1 %
-400	Not asked in this version	6	0.4 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	92	6.8 %
-100	Didn't skip into question	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 1178-1181 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S2CHLD03_ALIVE: S2 Children: Child03 - Is this child alive

Child03 - Is this child alive.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	0	0.0 %
1	Yes	2	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-650	No child reported	1260	93.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

Location: 1182-1185 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -202, -201, -9, -8

S2CHLD03_AGE: S2 Children: Child03 - Age

Child03 - How old is this child.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-650	No child reported	995	73.5 %
-400	Not asked in this version	266	19.6 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

Location: 1186-1190 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -526, -400, -202, -201, -100, -99, -98

S2CHLD03_BIO: S2 Children: Child03 - Is this your biological child

Child03 - Is this your biological child.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	0	0.0 %
1	Yes	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-650	No child reported	1260	93.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 1191-1194 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -506 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S2CHLD03_LIVWNW: S2 Children: Child03 - Does this child live with you

Child03 - Does this child live with you.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1	0.1 %
1	Yes	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-650	No child reported	1260	93.1 %
-400	Not asked in this version	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 1195-1198 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S2CHLD03_LIVWRP: S2 Children: Child03 - Has this child lived in the same household as you in the recall period

Child03 - Has this child lived in the same household as you in the recall period.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Yes	0	0.0 %
6	Omit	0	0.0 %
7	Deceased	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-650	No child reported	1260	93.1 %
-400	Not asked in this version	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 1199-1202 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S2CHLD03_CONTNW: S2 Children: Child03 - Frequency of contact with child now

Child03 - Frequency of contact with child now.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	0	0.0 %
2	3-6 times per week	1	0.1 %
3	2 times per week	0	0.0 %
4	1 time per week	0	0.0 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	0	0.0 %
6	1 time per month	0	0.0 %
7	Less than monthly	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-650	No child reported	1260	93.1 %
-400	Not asked in this version	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 1203-1206 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811, -750, -700, -650, -601, -400, -202, -201, -100, -9, -8

S2CHLD03_CONTRP: S2 Children: Child03 - Frequency of contact with child in the recall periods

Child03 - Frequency of contact with child in the recall periods.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Daily	0	0.0 %
2	3-6 times per week	0	0.0 %
3	2 times per week	0	0.0 %
4	1 time per week	0	0.0 %
5	Less weekly, more than monthly	0	0.0 %
6	1 time per month	0	0.0 %
7	Less than monthly	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-650	No child reported	1260	93.1 %
-400	Not asked in this version	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat 4	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 1207-1210 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -811 , -750 , -700 , -650 , -601 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S2CHLD_COUNT: S2 Children: Count - Count of living, not omitted children reported in this recall period

Count - Count of living, not omitted children reported in this recall period.

MEASURE: Information related to pregnancy and/or subject's children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1069	79.0 %
1	-	167	12.3 %
2	-	24	1.8 %
3	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 1211-1214 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

S2MORDIS: S2 MorThk: Moral Disengagement Overall

Moral Disengagement Overall.

MEASURE: Moral Thinking

The Mechanisms of Moral Disengagement (Bandura, Barbarelli, Caprara, & Pastorelli, 1996) was used for this study to measure the adolescent's attitudes concerning the treatment of others. The self-report measure contains 32 items to which participants respond on a 3-point Likert scale ranging from "Disagree" to "Agree," with higher scores indicating a greater moral detachment. Items from the scale tap the following eight dimensions: moral justification (e.g., "It is alright to beat someone who bad mouths your family."), euphemistic language (e.g., "Slapping and shoving someone is just a way of joking."), advantageous comparison (e.g., "It is okay to insult a classmate because beating him/her is worse."), displacement of responsibility (e.g., "Kids cannot be blamed for using bad words when all their friends do it."), diffusion of responsibility (e.g., "A kid in a gang should not be blamed for the trouble the gang causes."), distorting consequences (e.g., "Teasing someone does not really hurt them."), attribution of blame (e.g., "If kids fight and misbehave in school it is their teacher's fault."), and dehumanization (e.g., "Some people deserve to be treated like animals.").

- (1) Disagree
- (2) Neither Agree nor Disagree
- (3) Agree

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Disagree	11	0.8 %
1.03	-	18	1.3 %
1.06	-	74	5.5 %
1.09	-	20	1.5 %
1.13	-	55	4.1 %
1.16	-	29	2.1 %
1.19	-	50	3.7 %
1.22	-	29	2.1 %
1.25	-	57	4.2 %
1.28	-	42	3.1 %
1.31	-	47	3.5 %
1.34	-	51	3.8 %
1.38	-	60	4.4 %
1.41	-	37	2.7 %
1.44	-	47	3.5 %
1.47	-	35	2.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.50	-	32	2.4 %
1.53	-	22	1.6 %
1.56	-	40	3.0 %
1.57	-	1	0.1 %
1.59	-	38	2.8 %
1.63	-	32	2.4 %
1.66	-	27	2.0 %
1.69	-	41	3.0 %
1.72	-	29	2.1 %
1.75	-	30	2.2 %
1.78	-	24	1.8 %
1.81	-	26	1.9 %
1.84	-	33	2.4 %
1.88	-	21	1.6 %
1.91	-	13	1.0 %
1.94	-	19	1.4 %
1.97	-	23	1.7 %
2.00	Neither Agree nor disagree	21	1.6 %
2.03	-	14	1.0 %
2.06	-	21	1.6 %
2.09	-	11	0.8 %
2.13	-	10	0.7 %
2.16	-	7	0.5 %
2.19	-	9	0.7 %
2.22	-	3	0.2 %
2.25	-	7	0.5 %
2.28	-	7	0.5 %
2.31	-	3	0.2 %
2.34	-	2	0.1 %
2.38	-	5	0.4 %
2.41	-	3	0.2 %
2.44	-	4	0.3 %
2.47	-	2	0.1 %
2.50	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1215-1221 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2MORAL: S2 MorThk: Moral Disengagement Count

Moral Disengagement - count (a count of all items for which the subject responded "agree"). This summary score can range from zero to 32.

MEASURE: Moral Thinking

The Mechanisms of Moral Disengagement (Bandura, Barbarelli, Caprara, & Pastorelli, 1996) was used for this study to measure the adolescent's attitudes concerning the treatment of others. The self-report measure contains 32 items to which participants respond on a 3-point Likert scale ranging from "Disagree" to "Agree," with higher scores indicating a greater moral detachment. Items from the scale tap the following eight dimensions: moral justification (e.g., "It is alright to beat someone who bad mouths your family."), euphemistic language (e.g., "Slapping and shoving someone is just a way of joking."), advantageous comparison (e.g., "It is okay to insult a classmate because beating him/her is worse."), displacement of responsibility (e.g., "Kids cannot be blamed for using bad words when all their friends do it."), diffusion of responsibility (e.g., "A kid in a gang should not be blamed for the trouble the gang causes."), distorting consequences (e.g., "Teasing someone does not really hurt them."), attribution of blame (e.g., "If kids fight and misbehave in school it is their teacher's fault."), and dehumanization (e.g., "Some people deserve to be treated like animals.").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	71	5.2 %
1	-	202	14.9 %
2	-	159	11.7 %
3	-	134	9.9 %
4	-	118	8.7 %
5	-	91	6.7 %
6	-	85	6.3 %
7	-	51	3.8 %
8	-	63	4.7 %
9	-	48	3.5 %
10	-	39	2.9 %
11	-	51	3.8 %
12	-	31	2.3 %
13	-	27	2.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
14	-	22	1.6 %
15	-	10	0.7 %
16	-	7	0.5 %
17	-	7	0.5 %
18	-	7	0.5 %
19	-	12	0.9 %
20	-	6	0.4 %
21	-	2	0.1 %
22	-	4	0.3 %
23	-	3	0.2 %
24	-	1	0.1 %
25	-	2	0.1 %
26	-	2	0.1 %
27	-	1	0.1 %
28	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	2	0.1 %
32	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1222-1225 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_SCH40: S2 Motivate: In my neighborhood easy for young person to get good job

In my neighborhood, it's pretty easy for a young person to get a good-paying, honest job.

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items are taken from Eccles et al. (1998). These six items tap the subject's assessment of the opportunities available in his/her neighborhood regarding schooling and work. At each follow-up interview, this measure reflects the perceived opportunities for the neighborhood where the adolescent lived the longest during the recall period. An additional two items are included regarding the adolescent's perceptions of how far they would like to go in school and how far they think they will go in school. These are treated as individual items.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	72	5.3 %
2	Disagree	277	20.5 %
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	294	21.7 %
4	Agree	559	41.3 %
5	Strongly Agree	54	4.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
-8	Refused	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 1226-1229 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_SCH41: S2 Motivate: Most of my friends will graduate from high school

Most of my friends will graduate from high school.

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items are taken from Eccles et al. (1998). These six items tap the subject's assessment of the opportunities available in his/her neighborhood regarding schooling and work. At each follow-up interview, this measure reflects the perceived opportunities for the neighborhood where the adolescent lived the longest during the recall period. An additional two items are included regarding the adolescent's perceptions of how far they would like to go in school and how far they think they will go in school. These are treated as individual items.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	59	4.4 %
2	Disagree	286	21.1 %
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	263	19.4 %
4	Agree	564	41.7 %
5	Strongly Agree	86	6.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,258 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1230-1233 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_SCH42: S2 Motivate: In my neighborhood hard to make money without doing something illegal

In my neighborhood, it's hard to make much money without doing something illegal.

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items are taken from Eccles et al. (1998). These six items tap the subject's assessment of the opportunities available in his/her neighborhood regarding schooling and work. At each follow-up interview, this measure reflects the perceived opportunities for the neighborhood where the adolescent lived the longest during the recall period. An additional two items are included regarding the adolescent's perceptions of how far they would like to go in school and how far they think they will go in school. These are treated as individual items.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	110	8.1 %
2	Disagree	499	36.9 %
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	266	19.6 %
4	Agree	338	25.0 %
5	Strongly Agree	44	3.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-9	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-8	Refused	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,257 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1234-1237 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_SCH43: S2 Motivate: College too expensive for most people in my neighborhood

College is too expensive for most of the people in my neighborhood.

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items are taken from Eccles et al. (1998). These six items tap the subject's assessment of the opportunities available in his/her neighborhood regarding schooling and work. At each follow-up interview, this measure reflects the perceived opportunities for the neighborhood where the adolescent lived the longest during the recall period. An additional two items are included regarding the adolescent's perceptions of how far they would like to go in school and how far they think they will go in school. These are treated as individual items.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	65	4.8 %
2	Disagree	423	31.2 %
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	300	22.2 %
4	Agree	388	28.7 %
5	Strongly Agree	74	5.5 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-9	Dont Know	9	0.7 %
-8	Refused	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,250 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1238-1241 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_SCH44: S2 Motivate: Not much opportunity to succeed as kids from other neighborhoods

I'll never have as much opportunity to succeed as kids from other neighborhoods.

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items are taken from Eccles et al. (1998). These six items tap the subject's assessment of the opportunities available in his/her neighborhood regarding schooling and work. At each follow-up interview, this measure reflects the perceived opportunities for the neighborhood where the adolescent lived the longest during the recall period. An additional two items are included regarding the adolescent's perceptions of how far they would like to go in school and how far they think they will go in school. These are treated as individual items.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	236	17.4 %
2	Disagree	683	50.4 %
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	181	13.4 %
4	Agree	141	10.4 %
5	Strongly Agree	17	1.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-9	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,258 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1242-1245 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_SCH45: S2 Motivate: Chances of getting ahead/being successful not very good

My chances of getting ahead and being successful are not very good.

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items are taken from Eccles et al. (1998). These six items tap the subject's assessment of the opportunities available in his/her neighborhood regarding schooling and work. At each follow-up interview, this measure reflects the perceived opportunities for the neighborhood where the adolescent lived the longest during the recall period. An additional two items are included regarding the adolescent's perceptions of how far they would like to go in school and how far they think they will go in school. These are treated as individual items.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Strongly Disagree	275	20.3 %
2	Disagree	729	53.8 %
3	Neither Agree nor disagree	143	10.6 %
4	Agree	103	7.6 %
5	Strongly Agree	9	0.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,259 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1246-1249 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_SCH46: S2 Motivate: How far would you LIKE to go in school

How far would you like to go in school?

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items are taken from Eccles et al. (1998). These six items tap the subject's assessment of the opportunities available in his/her neighborhood regarding schooling and work. At each follow-up interview, this measure reflects the perceived opportunities for the neighborhood where the adolescent lived the longest during the recall period. An additional two items are included regarding the adolescent's perceptions of how far they would like to go in school and how far they think they will go in school. These are treated as individual items.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Drop out before graduation	14	1.0 %
2	Graduate from high school	320	23.6 %
3	Go to a business, technical school or junior college	227	16.8 %
4	Graduate from college	556	41.1 %
5	Go to graduate or professional school	138	10.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-9	Dont Know	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,255 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1250-1253 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2SCH_SCH47: S2 Motivate: How far do you THINK you will go in school

How far do you think you will go in school?

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items are taken from Eccles et al. (1998). These six items tap the subject's assessment of the opportunities available in his/her neighborhood regarding schooling and work. At each follow-up interview, this measure reflects the perceived opportunities for the neighborhood where the adolescent lived the longest during the recall period. An additional two items are included regarding the adolescent's perceptions of how far they would like to go in school and how far they think they will go in school. These are treated as individual items.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Drop out before graduation	49	3.6 %
2	Graduate from high school	394	29.1 %
3	Go to a business, technical school or junior college	266	19.6 %
4	Graduate from college	432	31.9 %
5	Go to graduate or professional school	103	7.6 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-9	Dont Know	16	1.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,244 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1254-1257 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2MOTSUC: S2 Motivate: Motivation to Succeed

An overall "motivation to succeed" score is computed from the six items which represents the mean of the items. A higher score indicates more optimism regarding future success.

MEASURE: Motivation to Succeed

The motivation to succeed items are taken from Eccles et al. (1998). These six items tap the subject's assessment of the opportunities available in his/her neighborhood regarding schooling and work. At each follow-up interview, this measure reflects the perceived opportunities for the neighborhood where the adolescent lived the longest during the recall period. An additional two items are included regarding the adolescent's perceptions of how far they would like to go in school and how far they think they will go in school. These are treated as individual items.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree

- (4) Agree
 (5) Strongly Agree

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly disagree	0	0.0 %
1.17	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	2	0.1 %
1.67	-	3	0.2 %
1.83	-	7	0.5 %
2.00	Disagree	22	1.6 %
2.17	-	19	1.4 %
2.33	-	33	2.4 %
2.50	-	38	2.8 %
2.60	-	1	0.1 %
2.67	-	76	5.6 %
2.80	-	1	0.1 %
2.83	-	47	3.5 %
3.00	Neither agree nor disagree	126	9.3 %
3.17	-	95	7.0 %
3.20	-	2	0.1 %
3.33	-	156	11.5 %
3.40	-	1	0.1 %
3.50	-	88	6.5 %
3.67	-	146	10.8 %
3.80	-	1	0.1 %
3.83	-	116	8.6 %
4.00	Agree	152	11.2 %
4.17	-	46	3.4 %
4.33	-	28	2.1 %
4.50	-	15	1.1 %
4.67	-	19	1.4 %
4.83	-	10	0.7 %
5.00	Strongly agree	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-300.00	Too few values for computation	5	0.4 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 1258-1264 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2ETHAFF: S2 Phinney: Ethnic Identity - Affirmation and Belonging

Affirmation & Belonging; the mean of 7 items in this subscale.

MEASURE: Multigroup Measure of Ethnic Identity (Phinney)

Sections of the Multigroup Measure of Ethnic Identity are used to determine an individual's overall sense of ethnic identity (Phinney, 1992). Items from the measure assess feelings of Affirmation & Belonging (e.g., "I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to"), and Identity Achievement (e.g., "I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs"). For this scale, participants respond to 12 items using a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree," with higher scores indicating greater ethnic identity.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Agree
- (4) Strongly Agree

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Disagree	8	0.6 %
1.14	-	1	0.1 %
1.29	-	3	0.2 %
1.43	-	2	0.1 %
1.57	-	3	0.2 %
1.71	-	5	0.4 %
1.86	-	13	1.0 %
2.00	Disagree	35	2.6 %
2.14	-	24	1.8 %
2.29	-	26	1.9 %
2.33	-	1	0.1 %
2.43	-	41	3.0 %
2.57	-	73	5.4 %
2.67	-	2	0.1 %
2.71	-	102	7.5 %
2.83	-	1	0.1 %
2.86	-	172	12.7 %
3.00	Agree	362	26.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.14	-	63	4.7 %
3.29	-	47	3.5 %
3.43	-	41	3.0 %
3.57	-	47	3.5 %
3.71	-	31	2.3 %
3.83	-	1	0.1 %
3.86	-	58	4.3 %
4.00	Strongly Agree	98	7.2 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1265-1271 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2ETHACH: S2 Phinney: Ethnic Identity - Identity Achievement

Identity Achievement; the mean of 5 items in this subscale.

MEASURE: Multigroup Measure of Ethnic Identity (Phinney)

Sections of the Multigroup Measure of Ethnic Identity are used to determine an individual's overall sense of ethnic identity (Phinney, 1992). Items from the measure assess feelings of Affirmation & Belonging (e.g., "I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to"), and Identity Achievement (e.g., "I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs"). For this scale, participants respond to 12 items using a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree," with higher scores indicating greater ethnic identity.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Agree
- (4) Strongly Agree

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Disagree	42	3.1 %
1.20	-	14	1.0 %
1.40	-	28	2.1 %
1.60	-	41	3.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.80	-	35	2.6 %
2.00	Disagree	234	17.3 %
2.20	-	189	14.0 %
2.40	-	157	11.6 %
2.60	-	141	10.4 %
2.75	-	1	0.1 %
2.80	-	128	9.5 %
3.00	Agree	120	8.9 %
3.20	-	37	2.7 %
3.40	-	21	1.6 %
3.60	-	17	1.3 %
3.80	-	4	0.3 %
4.00	Strongly Agree	51	3.8 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1272-1278 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2ETHID: S2 Phinney: Ethnic Identity - Overall

Ethnic Identity - overall; the mean of the 12 items in the full scale.

MEASURE: Multigroup Measure of Ethnic Identity (Phinney)

Sections of the Multigroup Measure of Ethnic Identity are used to determine an individual's overall sense of ethnic identity (Phinney, 1992). Items from the measure assess feelings of Affirmation & Belonging (e.g., "I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to"), and Identity Achievement (e.g., "I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs"). For this scale, participants respond to 12 items using a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree," with higher scores indicating greater ethnic identity.

- (1) Strongly Disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Agree
- (4) Strongly Agree

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Disagree	8	0.6 %
1.08	-	1	0.1 %
1.17	-	2	0.1 %
1.25	-	3	0.2 %
1.33	-	2	0.1 %
1.42	-	2	0.1 %
1.50	-	7	0.5 %
1.58	-	5	0.4 %
1.67	-	3	0.2 %
1.75	-	7	0.5 %
1.83	-	8	0.6 %
1.92	-	8	0.6 %
2.00	Disagree	32	2.4 %
2.08	-	32	2.4 %
2.17	-	25	1.8 %
2.25	-	32	2.4 %
2.27	-	3	0.2 %
2.33	-	50	3.7 %
2.42	-	67	4.9 %
2.45	-	1	0.1 %
2.50	-	83	6.1 %
2.58	-	109	8.1 %
2.64	-	1	0.1 %
2.67	-	105	7.8 %
2.75	-	101	7.5 %
2.83	-	107	7.9 %
2.92	-	92	6.8 %
3.00	Agree	92	6.8 %
3.08	-	39	2.9 %
3.17	-	35	2.6 %
3.25	-	30	2.2 %
3.33	-	23	1.7 %
3.42	-	19	1.4 %
3.50	-	21	1.6 %
3.55	-	1	0.1 %
3.58	-	17	1.3 %
3.67	-	17	1.3 %
3.75	-	9	0.7 %
3.83	-	8	0.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.92	-	2	0.1 %
4.00	Strongly Agree	51	3.8 %
	Missing Data		
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1279-1285 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2HOOD: S2 NeiCon: Neighborhood Conditions Total

Total score; the mean of all 21 items in the scale.

MEASURE: Neighborhood Conditions

The Neighborhood Conditions Measure was adapted for this study to assess the environment surrounding the adolescent's home (Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999). Items from the self-report measure tap physical disorder of the neighborhood (e.g., "cigarettes on the street or in the gutters," "graffiti or tags"), as well as social disorder (e.g., "adults fighting or arguing loudly," "people using needles or syringes to take drugs"). The scale contains 21 items to which participants respond on a 4- point Likert scale ranging from "Never" to "Often," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of disorder within the community.

The neighborhood of focus for this measure is the neighborhood in which the youth spent the most time in the recall period. It is not necessarily the neighborhood that is most recent to the interview date.

- (1) Never
- (2) Rarely
- (3) Sometimes
- (4) Often

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	40	3.0 %
1.05	-	8	0.6 %
1.10	-	16	1.2 %
1.14	-	11	0.8 %
1.19	-	18	1.3 %
1.24	-	19	1.4 %
1.29	-	12	0.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.33	-	14	1.0 %
1.38	-	11	0.8 %
1.43	-	15	1.1 %
1.48	-	16	1.2 %
1.52	-	14	1.0 %
1.57	-	17	1.3 %
1.62	-	19	1.4 %
1.67	-	17	1.3 %
1.71	-	21	1.6 %
1.76	-	18	1.3 %
1.81	-	11	0.8 %
1.86	-	15	1.1 %
1.90	-	19	1.4 %
1.95	-	15	1.1 %
2.00	Rarely	7	0.5 %
2.05	-	7	0.5 %
2.10	-	19	1.4 %
2.14	-	14	1.0 %
2.19	-	20	1.5 %
2.24	-	14	1.0 %
2.29	-	15	1.1 %
2.32	-	1	0.1 %
2.33	-	14	1.0 %
2.38	-	12	0.9 %
2.43	-	27	2.0 %
2.48	-	11	0.8 %
2.50	-	1	0.1 %
2.52	-	23	1.7 %
2.55	-	1	0.1 %
2.57	-	24	1.8 %
2.62	-	12	0.9 %
2.67	-	15	1.1 %
2.71	-	21	1.6 %
2.75	-	1	0.1 %
2.76	-	15	1.1 %
2.81	-	17	1.3 %
2.86	-	18	1.3 %
2.90	-	16	1.2 %
2.95	-	18	1.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.00	Sometimes	15	1.1 %
3.05	-	10	0.7 %
3.10	-	17	1.3 %
3.14	-	14	1.0 %
	Missing Data		
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into NeiCon measure	366	27.0 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-8.00	Refusal	2	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

Based upon 892 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1286-1292 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800.00 , -666.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S2NEIPHY: S2 NeiCon: Physical Disorder

Physical disorder; the mean of the 12 physical disorder questions.

MEASURE: Neighborhood Conditions

The Neighborhood Conditions Measure was adapted for this study to assess the environment surrounding the adolescent's home (Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999). Items from the self-report measure tap physical disorder of the neighborhood (e.g., "cigarettes on the street or in the gutters," "graffiti or tags"), as well as social disorder (e.g., "adults fighting or arguing loudly," "people using needles or syringes to take drugs"). The scale contains 21 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Never" to "Often," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of disorder within the community.

The neighborhood of focus for this measure is the neighborhood in which the youth spent the most time in the recall period. It is not necessarily the neighborhood that is most recent to the interview date.

- (1) Never
- (2) Rarely
- (3) Sometimes
- (4) Often

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	57	4.2 %
1.08	-	11	0.8 %
1.17	-	20	1.5 %
1.25	-	25	1.8 %
1.33	-	17	1.3 %
1.42	-	32	2.4 %
1.50	-	32	2.4 %
1.58	-	19	1.4 %
1.67	-	22	1.6 %
1.75	-	34	2.5 %
1.83	-	27	2.0 %
1.91	-	1	0.1 %
1.92	-	18	1.3 %
2.00	Rarely	21	1.6 %
2.08	-	26	1.9 %
2.09	-	1	0.1 %
2.17	-	24	1.8 %
2.25	-	23	1.7 %
2.33	-	34	2.5 %
2.40	-	1	0.1 %
2.42	-	29	2.1 %
2.50	-	33	2.4 %
2.58	-	26	1.9 %
2.64	-	1	0.1 %
2.67	-	25	1.8 %
2.73	-	1	0.1 %
2.75	-	32	2.4 %
2.83	-	30	2.2 %
2.92	-	27	2.0 %
3.00	Sometimes	34	2.5 %
3.08	-	29	2.1 %
3.17	-	25	1.8 %
3.18	-	1	0.1 %
3.25	-	20	1.5 %
3.33	-	23	1.7 %
3.42	-	16	1.2 %
3.45	-	1	0.1 %
3.50	-	19	1.4 %
3.55	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.58	-	17	1.3 %
3.67	-	12	0.9 %
3.75	-	16	1.2 %
3.83	-	10	0.7 %
3.92	-	6	0.4 %
4.00	Often	13	1.0 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into NeiCon measure	366	27.0 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-8.00	Refusal	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Based upon 892 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1293-1299 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800.00 , -666.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S2NEISOC: S2 NeiCon: Social Disorder

Social disorder; the mean of the 9 social disorder questions.

MEASURE: Neighborhood Conditions

The Neighborhood Conditions Measure was adapted for this study to assess the environment surrounding the adolescent's home (Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999).

Items from the self-report measure tap physical disorder of the neighborhood

(e.g., "cigarettes on the street or in the gutters," "graffiti or tags"), as well as social disorder (e.g., "adults fighting or arguing loudly," "people using needles or syringes to take drugs"). The scale contains 21 items to which participants respond on a 4- point Likert scale ranging from "Never" to "Often," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of disorder within the community.

The neighborhood of focus for this measure is the neighborhood in which the youth spent the most time in the recall period. It is not necessarily the neighborhood that is most recent to the interview date.

- (1) Never
- (2) Rarely
- (3) Sometimes
- (4) Often

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	82	6.1 %
1.11	-	34	2.5 %
1.22	-	27	2.0 %
1.33	-	43	3.2 %
1.44	-	39	2.9 %
1.56	-	32	2.4 %
1.67	-	41	3.0 %
1.78	-	29	2.1 %
1.89	-	38	2.8 %
2.00	Rarely	39	2.9 %
2.11	-	25	1.8 %
2.22	-	39	2.9 %
2.33	-	51	3.8 %
2.38	-	1	0.1 %
2.44	-	23	1.7 %
2.56	-	45	3.3 %
2.67	-	38	2.8 %
2.78	-	26	1.9 %
2.89	-	38	2.8 %
3.00	Sometimes	22	1.6 %
3.11	-	23	1.7 %
3.22	-	31	2.3 %
3.33	-	30	2.2 %
3.44	-	19	1.4 %
3.56	-	20	1.5 %
3.63	-	1	0.1 %
3.67	-	19	1.4 %
3.78	-	14	1.0 %
3.89	-	8	0.6 %
4.00	Often	15	1.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into NeiCon measure	366	27.0 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-8.00	Refusal	2	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 892 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1300-1306 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800.00 , -666.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S2NSAFE: S2 NeiCon: Neighborhood Safety

Neighborhood safety.

MEASURE: Neighborhood Conditions

The Neighborhood Conditions Measure was adapted for this study to assess the environment surrounding the adolescent's home (Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999).

Items from the self-report measure tap physical disorder of the neighborhood (e.g., "cigarettes on the street or in the gutters," "graffiti or tags"), as well as social disorder (e.g., "adults fighting or arguing loudly," "people using needles or syringes to take drugs"). The scale contains 21 items to which participants respond on a 4- point Likert scale ranging from "Never" to "Often," with higher scores indicating a greater degree of disorder within the community.

The neighborhood of focus for this measure is the neighborhood in which the youth spent the most time in the recall period. It is not necessarily the neighborhood that is most recent to the interview date.

- (1) Strongly Disagree (1) In danger all of the time
- (2) Disagree (2) In danger most of the time
- (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree (3) In danger some of the time
- (4) Agree (4) In danger very little of the time
- (5) Strongly Agree (5) In danger none of the time (feel safe all of the time)

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Disagree / In danger all of the time	0	0.0 %
1.14	-	1	0.1 %
1.71	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	Disagree / In danger most of the time	0	0.0 %
2.14	-	2	0.1 %
2.29	-	4	0.3 %
2.43	-	4	0.3 %
2.57	-	5	0.4 %
2.71	-	6	0.4 %
2.86	-	7	0.5 %
3.00	Neither Agree nor Disagree / In danger some of the time	12	0.9 %
3.14	-	9	0.7 %
3.29	-	16	1.2 %
3.43	-	22	1.6 %
3.57	-	23	1.7 %
3.71	-	24	1.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.86	-	43	3.2 %
4.00	Agree / In danger very little of the time	46	3.4 %
4.14	-	58	4.3 %
4.29	-	47	3.5 %
4.43	-	134	9.9 %
4.57	-	52	3.8 %
4.71	-	53	3.9 %
4.86	-	33	2.4 %
5.00	Strongly Agree / In danger none of the time	98	7.2 %
Missing Data			
-400.00	Not asked in this version	265	19.6 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into NeiCon measure	292	21.6 %
-9.00	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
-8.00	Refusal	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 700 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1307-1313 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -800.00 , -666.00 , -400.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S2PAKNOW: S2 PMonit: Parental Knowledge

Parental knowledge; Mean of 5 items.

MEASURE: Parental Monitoring

The Parental Monitoring inventory (Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992) was adapted for this study to assess parenting practices related to supervision of the adolescent (i.e. study participant). Preliminary questions establish the presence of a single individual (X) who is primarily responsible for the youth. The respondent's answers to several items about their current living situation, specifically whether they live with the identified caretaker, establishes the skip pattern followed in the parental monitoring items. The scale is composed of 9 items. Five items assess parental knowledge (e.g. How much does X know about how you spend your free time) and are answered on a 4-point likert scale ranging from "doesn't know at all" to "knows everything". Even if a youth does not live with the person identified as their primary caretaker, they are asked these questions. If the youth lives with the primary caretaker, four additional items are asked to assess parental monitoring of the youth's behavior (e.g. How often do you have a set time to be home on weekend nights?). These are answered on a 4-point likert scale which ranges from "never" to "always".

- (1) Doesn't know at all
- (2) Knows a little bit
- (3) Knows a lot
- (4) Knows everything

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Doesn't know at all	36	2.7 %
1.20	-	14	1.0 %
1.40	-	13	1.0 %
1.60	-	27	2.0 %
1.80	-	32	2.4 %
2.00	Knows a little bit	60	4.4 %
2.20	-	60	4.4 %
2.25	-	1	0.1 %
2.40	-	55	4.1 %
2.60	-	62	4.6 %
2.75	-	1	0.1 %
2.80	-	59	4.4 %
3.00	Knows a lot	115	8.5 %
3.20	-	49	3.6 %
3.40	-	39	2.9 %
3.60	-	33	2.4 %
3.80	-	23	1.7 %
4.00	Knows everything	149	11.0 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into Parental Monitoring section	433	32.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 828 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1314-1320 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2PARMNT: S2 PMonit: Parental Monitoring

Parental monitoring; Mean of 4 items; only available if subject lives with supervising adult

MEASURE: Parental Monitoring

The Parental Monitoring inventory (Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992) was adapted for this study to assess parenting practices related to supervision of the adolescent (i.e. study participant). Preliminary questions establish the presence of a single individual (X) who is primarily responsible for the youth. The respondent's answers to several items about their current living situation,

specifically whether they live with the identified caretaker, establishes the skip pattern followed in the parental monitoring items. The scale is composed of 9 items. Five items assess parental knowledge (e.g. How much does X know about how you spend your free time) and are answered on a 4-point likert scale ranging from "doesn't know at all" to "knows everything". Even if a youth does not live with the person identified as their primary caretaker, they are asked these questions. If the youth lives with the primary caretaker, four additional items are asked to assess parental monitoring of the youth's behavior (e.g. How often do you have a set time to be home on weekend nights?). These are answered on a 4-point likert scale which ranges from "never" to "always".

- (1) Never
- (2) Sometimes
- (3) Usually
- (4) Always

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	24	1.8 %
1.25	-	25	1.8 %
1.50	-	33	2.4 %
1.75	-	26	1.9 %
2.00	Sometimes	52	3.8 %
2.25	-	40	3.0 %
2.50	-	67	4.9 %
2.67	-	1	0.1 %
2.75	-	35	2.6 %
3.00	Usually	37	2.7 %
3.25	-	36	2.7 %
3.50	-	20	1.5 %
3.75	-	37	2.7 %
4.00	Always	93	6.9 %
Missing Data			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	2	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into Parental Monitoring section	727	53.7 %
-97.00	NA	6	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 1321-1327 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -99.00 , -98.00 , -97.00

S2PORIENT_PTERM: S2 POrient: Has subject terminated parental rights

Subject has terminated parental rights.

MEASURE: Parent Orientation

The Youths Parenting Orientation scale was adapted for this study from Silverberg and Steinberg's (1990) subscale of Adult Role Orientation. The questions are asked only of youth who report having a child. The scale is used to assess the participant's view of his/her role as a parent (e.g., "Fathers/Mothers my age should devote most of their time and energy to rearing their child/children") and the degree to which this role is pervasive in his/her life. The inventory is a 6-item scale that asks participants to rank from 1 to 4 (1=Agree Strongly to 4=Disagree Strongly) the degree that each statement corresponds to their view of parenthood, with higher scores indicating greater parental orientation.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	26	1.9 %
1	Yes	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-400	Not asked in this version	1077	79.5 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Subject does not have any living children	158	11.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 1328-1331 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -102 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2PARENT: S2 POrient: Youths Parenting Orientation

Youth Parenting Orientation; the mean of six items in the scale.

MEASURE: Parent Orientation

The Youths Parenting Orientation scale was adapted for this study from Silverberg and Steinberg's (1990) subscale of Adult Role Orientation. The questions are asked only of youth who report having a child. The scale is used to assess the participant's view of his/her role as a parent (e.g., "Fathers/Mothers my age should devote most of their time and energy to rearing their child/children") and the degree to which this role is pervasive in his/her life. The inventory is a 6-item scale that asks participants to rank from 1 to 4 (1=Agree Strongly to 4=Disagree Strongly) the degree that each statement corresponds to their view of parenthood, with higher scores indicating greater parental orientation.

- (1) Disagree Strongly
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Agree

(4) Agree Strongly

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Disagree Strongly	0	0.0 %
1.50	-	2	0.1 %
2.00	Disagree	1	0.1 %
2.17	-	2	0.1 %
2.33	-	2	0.1 %
2.50	-	7	0.5 %
2.67	-	17	1.3 %
2.83	-	35	2.6 %
3.00	Agree	24	1.8 %
3.17	-	25	1.8 %
3.33	-	20	1.5 %
3.40	-	2	0.1 %
3.50	-	16	1.2 %
3.60	-	1	0.1 %
3.67	-	19	1.4 %
3.80	-	1	0.1 %
3.83	-	7	0.5 %
4.00	Agree Strongly	6	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-700.00	Data missing: Unknown reason	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into Parental Orientation section	1067	78.8 %
-9.00	Dont Know	5	0.4 %
-8.00	Refuse	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 187 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1332-1338 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -500.00 , -400.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S2RQUALPARENTS_MQUA_PVIS1: S2 PQual_Mom: How often did your primary female caregiver visit you in person in the recall period

How often did your primary female caregiver visit you in person in the recall period?

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Twice a day	0	0.0 %
2	Daily	0	0.0 %
3	More than once a week	11	0.8 %
4	Once a week	25	1.8 %
5	Once every two weeks	28	2.1 %
6	Once a month	28	2.1 %
7	Once every few months	60	4.4 %
8	Never	122	9.0 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: Subject spent majority of recall period in community	828	61.2 %
-101	Skipped: Did not live with mother figure responsible for raising them in recall period	158	11.7 %
-99	Don't Know	1	0.1 %
-97	Not Applicable	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 274 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1339-1342 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98 , -97

S2RQUALPARENTS_MQUA_PVIS2: S2 PQual_Mom: Had often did you talk to your primary female caregiver by phone in the recall period

Had often did you talk to your primary female caregiver by phone in the recall period?

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Twice a day	3	0.2 %
2	Daily	41	3.0 %
3	More than once a week	77	5.7 %
4	Once a week	82	6.1 %
5	Once every two weeks	20	1.5 %
6	Once a month	9	0.7 %
7	Once every few months	12	0.9 %
8	Never	31	2.3 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: Subject spent majority of recall period in community	828	61.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-101	Skipped: Did not live with mother figure responsible for raising them in recall period	158	11.7 %
-99	Don't Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 275 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1343-1346 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98 , -97

S2RQUALPARENTS_MQUA_PCTCT: S2 PQual_Mom: Have any contact with your primary female caregiver in the recall period

Did you have any contact with your primary female caregiver in the recall period?

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	3	0.2 %
1	Yes	99	7.3 %
	Missing Data		
-400	Not available in this version	1077	79.5 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-104	Skipped: Subject spent the majority of the recall period in an institution	40	3.0 %
-101	Skipped: Did not live with mother figure responsible for raising them in recall period	41	3.0 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 102 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1347-1350 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2RQUALPARENTS_FQUA_PVIS1: S2 PQual_Dad: How often did your primary male caregiver visit you in person in the recall period

How often did your primary male caregiver visit you in person in the recall period?

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Twice a day	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	Daily	0	0.0 %
3	More than once a week	4	0.3 %
4	Once a week	14	1.0 %
5	Once every two weeks	8	0.6 %
6	Once a month	17	1.3 %
7	Once every few months	27	2.0 %
8	Never	77	5.7 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: Subject spent majority of recall period in community	465	34.3 %
-101	Skipped: Did not live with father figure responsible for raising them in recall period	649	47.9 %
-99	Don't Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 1351-1354 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98 , -97

S2RQUALPARENTS_FQUA_PVIS2: S2 PQual_Dad: Had often did you talk to your primary male caregiver by phone in the recall period

Had often did you talk to your primary male caregiver by phone in the recall period?

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Twice a day	1	0.1 %
2	Daily	12	0.9 %
3	More than once a week	26	1.9 %
4	Once a week	37	2.7 %
5	Once every two weeks	9	0.7 %
6	Once a month	12	0.9 %
7	Once every few months	10	0.7 %
8	Never	40	3.0 %
Missing Data			
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: Subject spent majority of recall period in community	465	34.3 %
-101	Skipped: Did not live with father figure responsible for raising them in recall period	649	47.9 %
-99	Don't Know	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 1355-1358 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98 , -97

S2RQUALPARENTS_FQUA_PCTCT: S2 PQual_Dad: Have any contact with your primary male caregiver in the recall period

Did you have any contact with your primary male caregiver in the recall period?

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	12	0.9 %
1	Yes	46	3.4 %
	Missing Data		
-400	Not available in this version	1077	79.5 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-104	Skipped: Subject spent the majority of the recall period in an institution	25	1.8 %
-101	Skipped: Did not live with father figure responsible for raising them in recall period	100	7.4 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 58 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1359-1362 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2MAWARM: S2 PQual: Parent Warmth - Mother

Parent Warmth - Mother; Mean of 9 items, 7 must contain valid data.

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

The Quality of Parental Relationships Inventory (Conger, Ge, Elder, Lorenz, & Simons, 1994) was adapted for this study to assess the affective tone of the parental-adolescent relationship. Items from the measure tap parental warmth - mother (e.g., "How often does your mother let you know she really cares about you?"), parental hostility - mother (e.g., "How often does your mother get angry at you?"), parental warmth - father (e.g., "How often does your father tell you he loves you?"), and parental hostility - father (e.g., "How often does your father throw things at you?"). The scale contains 42 items (21 to assess the maternal relationship and 21 to assess the paternal relationship) to which participants respond on a 4- point

Likert scale ranging from "Always" to "Never," with higher scores indicating a more supportive and nurturing parental relationship.

- (1) Always
- (2) Often
- (3) Sometimes
- (4) Never

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	5	0.4 %
1.11	-	2	0.1 %
1.22	-	3	0.2 %
1.33	-	5	0.4 %
1.44	-	8	0.6 %
1.56	-	6	0.4 %
1.67	-	9	0.7 %
1.78	-	9	0.7 %
1.89	-	17	1.3 %
2.00	Sometimes	39	2.9 %
2.11	-	24	1.8 %
2.13	-	2	0.1 %
2.22	-	24	1.8 %
2.33	-	29	2.1 %
2.44	-	28	2.1 %
2.56	-	37	2.7 %
2.67	-	39	2.9 %
2.75	-	1	0.1 %
2.78	-	42	3.1 %
2.89	-	52	3.8 %
3.00	Often	60	4.4 %
3.11	-	53	3.9 %
3.22	-	48	3.5 %
3.33	-	55	4.1 %
3.44	-	55	4.1 %
3.56	-	48	3.5 %
3.67	-	60	4.4 %
3.78	-	76	5.6 %
3.89	-	67	4.9 %
4.00	Always	157	11.6 %
	Missing Data		

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into measure	202	14.9 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,060 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1363-1369 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2MAHOTL: S2 PQual: Parent Hostility - Mother

Parent Hostility - Mother; Mean of 12 items, 9 must contain valid data.

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

The Quality of Parental Relationships Inventory (Conger, Ge, Elder, Lorenz, & Simons, 1994) was adapted for this study to assess the affective tone of the parental-adolescent relationship. Items from the measure tap parental warmth - mother (e.g., "How often does your mother let you know she really cares about you?"), parental hostility - mother (e.g., "How often does your mother get angry at you?"), parental warmth - father (e.g., "How often does your father tell you he loves you?"), and parental hostility - father (e.g., "How often does your father throw things at you?"). The scale contains 42 items (21 to assess the maternal relationship and 21 to assess the paternal relationship) to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Always" to "Never," with higher scores indicating a more supportive and nurturing parental relationship.

- (1) Always
- (2) Often
- (3) Sometimes
- (4) Never

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	115	8.5 %
1.08	-	77	5.7 %
1.17	-	119	8.8 %
1.25	-	150	11.1 %
1.33	-	131	9.7 %
1.42	-	100	7.4 %
1.50	-	85	6.3 %
1.58	-	58	4.3 %
1.67	-	59	4.4 %
1.75	-	33	2.4 %
1.83	-	29	2.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.92	-	20	1.5 %
2.00	Sometimes	21	1.6 %
2.08	-	9	0.7 %
2.17	-	7	0.5 %
2.25	-	9	0.7 %
2.33	-	3	0.2 %
2.42	-	9	0.7 %
2.50	-	7	0.5 %
2.58	-	3	0.2 %
2.67	-	2	0.1 %
2.75	-	2	0.1 %
2.83	-	2	0.1 %
2.92	-	3	0.2 %
3.00	Often	4	0.3 %
3.08	-	2	0.1 %
3.67	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Always	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into measure	202	14.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,060 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1370-1376 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2PAWARM: S2 PQual: Parent Warmth - Father

Parent Warmth - Father; Mean of 9 items, 7 must contain valid data.

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

The Quality of Parental Relationships Inventory (Conger, Ge, Elder, Lorenz, & Simons, 1994) was adapted for this study to assess the affective tone of the parental-adolescent relationship. Items from the measure tap parental warmth - mother (e.g., "How often does your mother let you know she really cares about you?"), parental hostility - mother (e.g., "How often does your mother get angry at you?"), parental warmth - father (e.g., "How often does your father tell you he loves you?"), and parental hostility - father (e.g., "How often does your father throw things at you?"). The scale contains 42 items (21 to assess the maternal relationship and 21 to assess the paternal relationship) to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Always" to "Never," with higher scores indicating a more supportive and nurturing parental relationship.

- (1) Always
- (2) Often
- (3) Sometimes
- (4) Never

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	23	1.7 %
1.11	-	7	0.5 %
1.22	-	6	0.4 %
1.33	-	10	0.7 %
1.44	-	6	0.4 %
1.56	-	9	0.7 %
1.67	-	14	1.0 %
1.78	-	15	1.1 %
1.89	-	18	1.3 %
2.00	Sometimes	31	2.3 %
2.11	-	33	2.4 %
2.13	-	1	0.1 %
2.22	-	26	1.9 %
2.33	-	15	1.1 %
2.44	-	16	1.2 %
2.56	-	20	1.5 %
2.67	-	19	1.4 %
2.78	-	24	1.8 %
2.89	-	20	1.5 %
3.00	Often	31	2.3 %
3.11	-	19	1.4 %
3.22	-	25	1.8 %
3.33	-	17	1.3 %
3.44	-	17	1.3 %
3.56	-	9	0.7 %
3.67	-	19	1.4 %
3.78	-	21	1.6 %
3.89	-	18	1.3 %
4.00	Always	66	4.9 %
Missing Data			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into measure	706	52.1 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 555 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1377-1383 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2PAHOTL: S2 PQual: Parent Hostility - Father

Parent Hostility - Father; Mean of 12 items, 9 must contain valid data.

MEASURE: Parental Warmth and Hostility

The Quality of Parental Relationships Inventory (Conger, Ge, Elder, Lorenz, & Simons, 1994) was adapted for this study to assess the affective tone of the parental-adolescent relationship. Items from the measure tap parental warmth - mother (e.g., "How often does your mother let you know she really cares about you?"), parental hostility - mother (e.g., "How often does your mother get angry at you?"), parental warmth - father (e.g., "How often does your father tell you he loves you?"), and parental hostility - father (e.g., "How often does your father throw things at you?"). The scale contains 42 items (21 to assess the maternal relationship and 21 to assess the paternal relationship) to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Always" to "Never," with higher scores indicating a more supportive and nurturing parental relationship.

- (1) Always
- (2) Often
- (3) Sometimes
- (4) Never

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	116	8.6 %
1.08	-	60	4.4 %
1.17	-	69	5.1 %
1.25	-	65	4.8 %
1.33	-	48	3.5 %
1.42	-	49	3.6 %
1.50	-	30	2.2 %
1.58	-	23	1.7 %
1.67	-	16	1.2 %
1.75	-	15	1.1 %
1.83	-	18	1.3 %
1.92	-	10	0.7 %
2.00	Sometimes	4	0.3 %
2.08	-	13	1.0 %
2.17	-	4	0.3 %
2.25	-	5	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.33	-	1	0.1 %
2.50	-	3	0.2 %
2.67	-	1	0.1 %
2.75	-	2	0.1 %
2.83	-	1	0.1 %
2.92	-	1	0.1 %
3.00	Often	0	0.0 %
3.08	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Always	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into measure	706	52.1 %
-9.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 555 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1384-1390 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2PRBEHV: S2 PDel: Antisocial Behavior

Peer Delinquency - Antisocial behavior; the mean rating of the prevalence of friends who engage in the 12 behaviors listed in this section. Data must be contained in 9 of the 12 items in order to compute a valid mean.

MEASURE: Peer Delinquency

The Peer Delinquent Behavior items are a subset of those used by the Rochester Youth Study (Thornberry et al., 1994) to assess the degree of antisocial activity among the adolescent's peers. There are two dimensions to this scale: Antisocial Behavior (e.g., "How many of your friends have sold drugs?") and Antisocial Influence (e.g., "How many of your friends have suggested that you should sell drugs?"). The scale contains 19 items to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "None of them" to "All of them".

- (1) None of them
- (2) Very few of them
- (3) Some of them
- (4) Most of them
- (5) All of them

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	None of them	270	19.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.08	-	71	5.2 %
1.09	-	2	0.1 %
1.10	-	1	0.1 %
1.17	-	62	4.6 %
1.25	-	49	3.6 %
1.33	-	63	4.7 %
1.42	-	43	3.2 %
1.44	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	46	3.4 %
1.56	-	1	0.1 %
1.58	-	37	2.7 %
1.64	-	1	0.1 %
1.67	-	38	2.8 %
1.73	-	1	0.1 %
1.75	-	34	2.5 %
1.83	-	36	2.7 %
1.89	-	1	0.1 %
1.92	-	25	1.8 %
2.00	Very few of them	31	2.3 %
2.08	-	23	1.7 %
2.09	-	1	0.1 %
2.10	-	1	0.1 %
2.17	-	25	1.8 %
2.18	-	2	0.1 %
2.25	-	32	2.4 %
2.33	-	30	2.2 %
2.36	-	1	0.1 %
2.42	-	21	1.6 %
2.50	-	25	1.8 %
2.55	-	1	0.1 %
2.56	-	1	0.1 %
2.58	-	21	1.6 %
2.67	-	31	2.3 %
2.75	-	24	1.8 %
2.83	-	20	1.5 %
2.92	-	31	2.3 %
3.00	Some of them	26	1.9 %
3.08	-	17	1.3 %
3.17	-	12	0.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.25	-	13	1.0 %
3.33	-	6	0.4 %
3.40	-	1	0.1 %
3.42	-	7	0.5 %
3.45	-	1	0.1 %
3.50	-	9	0.7 %
3.58	-	6	0.4 %
3.67	-	6	0.4 %
3.75	-	6	0.4 %
3.83	-	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	5	0.4 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-9.00	Dont know	10	0.7 %
-8.00	Refuse	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Based upon 1,244 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1391-1397 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2PRINFL: S2 PDel: Antisocial Influence

Peer Delinquency - Antisocial influence; the mean rating of the prevalence of friends who encourage the youth to engage in the 7 items listed in this section. Data must be contained in 5 of the 7 items in order to compute a valid mean.

MEASURE: Peer Delinquency

The Peer Delinquent Behavior items are a subset of those used by the Rochester Youth Study (Thornberry et al., 1994) to assess the degree of antisocial activity among the adolescent's peers. There are two dimensions to this scale: Antisocial Behavior (e.g., "How many of your friends have sold drugs?") and Antisocial Influence (e.g., "How many of your friends have suggested that you should sell drugs?"). The scale contains 19 items to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "None of them" to "All of them".

- (1) None of them
- (2) Very few of them
- (3) Some of them
- (4) Most of them

(5) All of them

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	None of them	597	44.1 %
1.14	-	101	7.5 %
1.29	-	87	6.4 %
1.43	-	65	4.8 %
1.57	-	62	4.6 %
1.71	-	41	3.0 %
1.86	-	38	2.8 %
2.00	Very few of them	45	3.3 %
2.14	-	39	2.9 %
2.29	-	30	2.2 %
2.43	-	26	1.9 %
2.57	-	19	1.4 %
2.71	-	17	1.3 %
2.86	-	17	1.3 %
3.00	Some of them	19	1.4 %
3.14	-	12	0.9 %
3.29	-	12	0.9 %
3.43	-	6	0.4 %
3.57	-	3	0.2 %
3.71	-	5	0.4 %
3.86	-	2	0.1 %
4.00	Most of them	2	0.1 %
4.14	-	1	0.1 %
4.29	-	1	0.1 %
4.57	-	1	0.1 %
4.86	-	1	0.1 %
5.00	All of them	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-9.00	Dont know	5	0.4 %
-8.00	Refuse	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,254 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1398-1404 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S2OPP01A: S2 OppSucc: How important to have a good job or career

How important is it to you . . . to have a good job or career?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	19	1.4 %
2	Not too important	14	1.0 %
3	Somewhat important	87	6.4 %
4	Pretty important	268	19.8 %
5	Very important	871	64.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-97	NA - already achieved	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,259 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1405-1408 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S2OPP01B: S2 OppSucc: How likely to have a good job or career

What do you think your chances are . . . to have a good job or career?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Poor	29	2.1 %
2	Fair	149	11.0 %
3	Good	359	26.5 %
4	Very Good	407	30.1 %
5	Excellent	315	23.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-99	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,259 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1409-1412 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S2OPP02A: S2 OppSucc: How important to graduate from college

How important is it to you . . . to graduate from college?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?").

There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	104	7.7 %
2	Not too important	131	9.7 %
3	Somewhat important	208	15.4 %
4	Pretty important	258	19.1 %
5	Very important	558	41.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-99	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,259 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1413-1416 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S2OPP02B: S2 OppSucc: How likely to graduate from college

What do you think your chances are . . . to graduate from college?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Poor	165	12.2 %
2	Fair	271	20.0 %
3	Good	294	21.7 %
4	Very Good	279	20.6 %
5	Excellent	249	18.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-99	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,258 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1417-1420 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S2OPP03A: S2 OppSucc: How important to earn a good living

How important is it to you . . . to earn a good living?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	9	0.7 %
2	Not too important	8	0.6 %
3	Somewhat important	75	5.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	Pretty important	262	19.4 %
5	Very important	906	66.9 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1421-1424 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S2OPP03B: S2 OppSucc: How likely to earn a good living

What do you think your chances are . . . to earn a good living?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Poor	17	1.3 %
2	Fair	122	9.0 %
3	Good	359	26.5 %
4	Very Good	420	31.0 %
5	Excellent	341	25.2 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-99	Dont Know	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,259 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1425-1428 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S2OPP04A: S2 OppSucc: How important to provide a good home for your family

How important is it to you . . . to provide a good home for your family?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	2	0.1 %
2	Not too important	4	0.3 %
3	Somewhat important	47	3.5 %
4	Pretty important	218	16.1 %
5	Very important	988	73.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-99	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,259 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1429-1432 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S2OPP04B: S2 OppSucc: How likely to provide a good home for your family

What do you think your chances are . . . to provide a good home for your family?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Poor	10	0.7 %
2	Fair	76	5.6 %
3	Good	321	23.7 %
4	Very Good	421	31.1 %
5	Excellent	429	31.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-99	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,257 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1433-1436 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S2OPP05A: S2 OppSucc: How important to have a good marriage

How important is it to you . . . to have a good marriage?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess

the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	94	6.9 %
2	Not too important	68	5.0 %
3	Somewhat important	145	10.7 %
4	Pretty important	250	18.5 %
5	Very important	701	51.8 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-99	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,258 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1437-1440 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700, -202, -201, -99, -98, -97

S2OPP05B: S2 OppSucc: How likely to have a good marriage

What do you think your chances are . . . to have a good marriage?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Poor	91	6.7 %
2	Fair	166	12.3 %
3	Good	293	21.6 %
4	Very Good	359	26.5 %
5	Excellent	347	25.6 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-99	Dont Know	4	0.3 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 1441-1444 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S2OPP06A: S2 OppSucc: How important to have a good relationship with your children

How important is it to you . . . to have a good relationship with your children?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	11	0.8 %
2	Not too important	5	0.4 %
3	Somewhat important	28	2.1 %
4	Pretty important	134	9.9 %
5	Very important	1081	79.8 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-99	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,259 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1445-1448 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S2OPP06B: S2 OppSucc: How likely to have a good relationship with your children

What do you think your chances are . . . to have a good relationship with your children?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Poor	13	1.0 %
2	Fair	31	2.3 %
3	Good	141	10.4 %
4	Very Good	313	23.1 %
5	Excellent	759	56.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-99	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-97	NA - already achieved	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,257 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1449-1452 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S2OPP07A: S2 OppSucc: How important to stay out of trouble with the law

How important is it to you . . . to stay out of trouble with the law?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all important	13	1.0 %
2	Not too important	13	1.0 %
3	Somewhat important	72	5.3 %
4	Pretty important	157	11.6 %
5	Very important	1005	74.2 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1453-1456 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S2OPP07B: S2 OppSucc: How likely to stay out of trouble with the law

What do you think your chances are . . . to stay out of trouble with the law?

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Poor	46	3.4 %
2	Fair	169	12.5 %
3	Good	275	20.3 %
4	Very Good	306	22.6 %
5	Excellent	461	34.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-99	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-97	NA - already achieved	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,257 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1457-1460 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -99 , -98 , -97

S2OPPORT: S2 OppSucc: Aspirations for Work, Family, and Law

Aspirations for Work, Family, & Law; Mean of 6 items.

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

- (1) Not at all important
- (2) Not too important
- (3) Somewhat important
- (4) Pretty important
- (5) Very important

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Not at all important	0	0.0 %
1.33	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	1	0.1 %
1.67	-	1	0.1 %
1.83	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	Not too important	2	0.1 %
2.17	-	2	0.1 %
2.33	-	3	0.2 %
2.50	-	3	0.2 %
2.67	-	6	0.4 %
2.80	-	1	0.1 %
2.83	-	5	0.4 %
3.00	Somewhat important	15	1.1 %
3.17	-	19	1.4 %
3.33	-	28	2.1 %
3.50	-	25	1.8 %
3.67	-	48	3.5 %
3.83	-	72	5.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4.00	Pretty important	73	5.4 %
4.17	-	98	7.2 %
4.33	-	114	8.4 %
4.40	-	1	0.1 %
4.50	-	116	8.6 %
4.67	-	146	10.8 %
4.80	-	1	0.1 %
4.83	-	143	10.6 %
5.00	Very important	334	24.7 %
Missing Data			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,259 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1461-1467 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -99.00 , -98.00 , -97.00

S2EXPECT: S2 OppSucc: Expectations to have Work, Family, and Law

Expectations to have work, family, & law; Mean of 6 items.

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

- (1) Poor
- (2) Fair
- (3) Good
- (4) Very Good
- (5) Excellent

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Poor	2	0.1 %
1.33	-	4	0.3 %
1.50	-	2	0.1 %
1.67	-	5	0.4 %
1.83	-	11	0.8 %
2.00	Fair	22	1.6 %
2.17	-	22	1.6 %
2.33	-	36	2.7 %
2.40	-	1	0.1 %
2.50	-	48	3.5 %
2.60	-	1	0.1 %
2.67	-	66	4.9 %
2.83	-	57	4.2 %
3.00	Good	87	6.4 %
3.17	-	54	4.0 %
3.20	-	1	0.1 %
3.33	-	80	5.9 %
3.50	-	76	5.6 %
3.67	-	87	6.4 %
3.83	-	101	7.5 %
4.00	Very good	99	7.3 %
4.17	-	65	4.8 %
4.20	-	1	0.1 %
4.33	-	69	5.1 %
4.50	-	47	3.5 %
4.67	-	60	4.4 %
4.83	-	44	3.2 %
5.00	Excellent	110	8.1 %
Missing Data			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-99.00	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,258 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1468-1474 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -99.00 , -98.00 , -97.00

S2PESSIM: S2 OppSucc: Extent to which expectations fall short

Extent to which expectations fall short; Expectation score minus aspiration score.

MEASURE: Perceptions of Chances for Success

The Perceptions of Chances for Success measure (also called perceptions of opportunity) was adapted from the work of Menard & Elliott (1996) to assess the adolescent's prediction of his/her future adult success. Items from the measure tap the adolescent's investment in and perceived likelihood for achievement in several areas. Specifically, the scale taps Aspirations for Work, Family & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "How important is it to you to have a good job or career?"), and Expectations for Work, Family, & Law Abiding Behavior (e.g., "What do you think your chances are to earn a good living?"). There are a total of 14 questions asked (divided evenly between aspirations and expectations) to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not at all important/Poor" to "Very important/Excellent".

Higher scores for aspirations and expectations indicate greater optimism concerning future opportunities and/or success. Lower scores for "expectations fall short" indicate greater congruence between these perceptions.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-1.67	-	1	0.1 %
-1.17	-	1	0.1 %
-0.83	-	1	0.1 %
-0.67	-	5	0.4 %
-0.50	-	8	0.6 %
-0.33	-	13	1.0 %
-0.17	-	36	2.7 %
0.00	-	161	11.9 %
0.17	-	97	7.2 %
0.20	-	1	0.1 %
0.30	-	1	0.1 %
0.33	-	114	8.4 %
0.50	-	96	7.1 %
0.67	-	120	8.9 %
0.80	-	1	0.1 %
0.83	-	112	8.3 %
1.00	-	100	7.4 %
1.13	-	1	0.1 %
1.17	-	101	7.5 %
1.27	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.33	-	66	4.9 %
1.50	-	50	3.7 %
1.67	-	56	4.1 %
1.83	-	26	1.9 %
2.00	-	25	1.8 %
2.17	-	17	1.3 %
2.33	-	17	1.3 %
2.40	-	1	0.1 %
2.50	-	13	1.0 %
2.67	-	4	0.3 %
2.83	-	6	0.4 %
3.00	-	2	0.1 %
3.17	-	3	0.2 %
3.67	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	2	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,258 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1475-1481 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -99.00 , -98.00 , -97.00

S2PROJUS_PJPOLI: S2 ProJus: Police picked you up and accused you of something in the recall period

Police picked you up and accused you of something in the recall period.

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability, ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they treat most people my age."}), Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience

(e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly."}), Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1039	76.7 %
1	Yes	221	16.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1482-1485 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2PROJUS_PJPNUM: S2 ProJus: Number of times police picked you up and accused you of something in the recall period

Number of times police picked you up and accused you of something in the recall period.

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability, ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they treat most people my age."}), Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly."}), Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	188	13.9 %
2	-	25	1.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	-	4	0.3 %
4	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	2	0.1 %
20	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Not picked up by the police in the recall period	1039	76.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 1486-1489 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2PROJUS_PJCRT: S2 ProJus: Had a court appearance for something illegal you were accused of or up for review at placement in recall period

Have you had a court appearance for something illegal you were accused of doing or where you were up for review of your placement in the recall period?

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability, ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they treat most people my age.")}, Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly.")}, Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	779	57.5 %
1	Yes	480	35.5 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,259 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1490-1493 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2PROJUS_PJCNUM: S2 ProJus: Number of times had court appearance for something accused of/up for review at placement in recall period

Number of times had court appearance for something accused of doing or where you were up for review of your placement placement in the recall period.

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability, ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they treat most people my age.")}, Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly.")}, Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	246	18.2 %
2	-	112	8.3 %
3	-	44	3.2 %
4	-	26	1.9 %
5	-	25	1.8 %
6	-	9	0.7 %
7	-	6	0.4 %
8	-	6	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
10	-	2	0.1 %
11	-	1	0.1 %
22	-	1	0.1 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-102	Skipped: Did not have a court appearance in the recall period	780	57.6 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 479 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1494-1497 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2PJCOP: S2 ProJus: Procedural Justice - Police

Summary procedural justice indices for police; Mean of 19 items.

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability, ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they treat most people my age.")}, Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly.")}, Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.04	-	2	0.1 %
1.18	-	1	0.1 %
1.21	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.30	-	1	0.1 %
1.32	-	1	0.1 %
1.36	-	1	0.1 %
1.40	-	1	0.1 %
1.46	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	5	0.4 %
1.56	-	1	0.1 %
1.61	-	4	0.3 %
1.64	-	3	0.2 %
1.67	-	5	0.4 %
1.68	-	1	0.1 %
1.75	-	8	0.6 %
1.79	-	2	0.1 %
1.82	-	1	0.1 %
1.83	-	3	0.2 %
1.86	-	1	0.1 %
1.89	-	5	0.4 %
1.90	-	1	0.1 %
1.92	-	1	0.1 %
1.93	-	8	0.6 %
1.96	-	2	0.1 %
1.97	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	-	17	1.3 %
2.04	-	8	0.6 %
2.07	-	18	1.3 %
2.11	-	4	0.3 %
2.13	-	1	0.1 %
2.14	-	2	0.1 %
2.17	-	13	1.0 %
2.18	-	27	2.0 %
2.21	-	21	1.6 %
2.23	-	1	0.1 %
2.25	-	11	0.8 %
2.26	-	4	0.3 %
2.27	-	1	0.1 %
2.28	-	1	0.1 %
2.29	-	4	0.3 %
2.30	-	5	0.4 %
2.31	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.32	-	11	0.8 %
2.33	-	20	1.5 %
2.34	-	3	0.2 %
2.35	-	2	0.1 %
2.36	-	55	4.1 %
2.37	-	1	0.1 %
2.39	-	8	0.6 %
2.40	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1498-1504 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00 , -7.00

S2PJJUDG: S2 ProJus: Procedural Justice - Judge

Summary procedural justice indices for judges; Mean of 19 items.

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability, ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they treat most people my age.")}, Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly.")}, Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.21	-	1	0.1 %
1.26	-	1	0.1 %
1.32	-	1	0.1 %
1.45	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	2	0.1 %
1.60	-	2	0.1 %
1.61	-	2	0.1 %
1.67	-	2	0.1 %
1.71	-	1	0.1 %
1.75	-	5	0.4 %
1.79	-	2	0.1 %
1.82	-	1	0.1 %
1.83	-	1	0.1 %
1.89	-	3	0.2 %
1.92	-	1	0.1 %
1.93	-	4	0.3 %
2.00	-	14	1.0 %
2.01	-	1	0.1 %
2.04	-	2	0.1 %
2.07	-	7	0.5 %
2.17	-	4	0.3 %
2.18	-	11	0.8 %
2.19	-	1	0.1 %
2.20	-	1	0.1 %
2.21	-	5	0.4 %
2.25	-	9	0.7 %
2.28	-	1	0.1 %
2.29	-	1	0.1 %
2.30	-	1	0.1 %
2.31	-	1	0.1 %
2.32	-	4	0.3 %
2.33	-	13	1.0 %
2.34	-	2	0.1 %
2.35	-	2	0.1 %
2.36	-	20	1.5 %
2.39	-	4	0.3 %
2.40	-	1	0.1 %
2.42	-	1	0.1 %
2.43	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.44	-	2	0.1 %
2.45	-	2	0.1 %
2.46	-	9	0.7 %
2.49	-	2	0.1 %
2.50	-	33	2.4 %
2.51	-	1	0.1 %
2.52	-	2	0.1 %
2.54	-	8	0.6 %
2.55	-	2	0.1 %
2.56	-	3	0.2 %
2.57	-	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1505-1511 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00 , -7.00

S2PJCOPU: S2 ProJus: Procedural Justice - You - Police

Procedural justice scales for police - direct experience; Mean of 14 items.

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability, ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they treat most people my age.")}, Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly.")}, Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	-	13	1.0 %
1.50	-	22	1.6 %
1.65	-	1	0.1 %
1.73	-	1	0.1 %
1.80	-	1	0.1 %
1.87	-	2	0.1 %
1.94	-	2	0.1 %
2.00	-	80	5.9 %
2.01	-	2	0.1 %
2.08	-	3	0.2 %
2.15	-	5	0.4 %
2.16	-	1	0.1 %
2.19	-	2	0.1 %
2.20	-	1	0.1 %
2.23	-	4	0.3 %
2.24	-	4	0.3 %
2.26	-	2	0.1 %
2.30	-	6	0.4 %
2.32	-	1	0.1 %
2.36	-	1	0.1 %
2.37	-	2	0.1 %
2.38	-	1	0.1 %
2.39	-	4	0.3 %
2.40	-	1	0.1 %
2.42	-	1	0.1 %
2.43	-	1	0.1 %
2.44	-	6	0.4 %
2.46	-	1	0.1 %
2.49	-	1	0.1 %
2.50	-	68	5.0 %
2.51	-	4	0.3 %
2.52	-	1	0.1 %
2.53	-	3	0.2 %
2.56	-	2	0.1 %
2.58	-	5	0.4 %
2.60	-	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.61	-	1	0.1 %
2.63	-	1	0.1 %
2.65	-	7	0.5 %
2.67	-	5	0.4 %
2.68	-	4	0.3 %
2.69	-	1	0.1 %
2.71	-	2	0.1 %
2.72	-	2	0.1 %
2.73	-	1	0.1 %
2.74	-	1	0.1 %
2.76	-	2	0.1 %
2.77	-	1	0.1 %
2.78	-	2	0.1 %
2.79	-	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	49	3.6 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Based upon 1,211 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1512-1518 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00 , -7.00

S2PJCOP0: S2 ProJus: Procedural Justice - Others - Police

Procedural justice scales for police - others experience; Mean of 5 items.

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability, ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they

treat most people my age."}), Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly."}), Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	-	8	0.6 %
1.05	-	8	0.6 %
1.25	-	5	0.4 %
1.30	-	15	1.1 %
1.45	-	6	0.4 %
1.50	-	15	1.1 %
1.55	-	5	0.4 %
1.65	-	5	0.4 %
1.70	-	9	0.7 %
1.75	-	14	1.0 %
1.80	-	1	0.1 %
1.81	-	1	0.1 %
1.85	-	53	3.9 %
1.90	-	9	0.7 %
1.95	-	2	0.1 %
2.00	-	66	4.9 %
2.05	-	15	1.1 %
2.10	-	103	7.6 %
2.15	-	4	0.3 %
2.20	-	2	0.1 %
2.25	-	80	5.9 %
2.30	-	38	2.8 %
2.33	-	1	0.1 %
2.35	-	35	2.6 %
2.40	-	2	0.1 %
2.45	-	16	1.2 %
2.50	-	122	9.0 %
2.55	-	10	0.7 %
2.60	-	25	1.8 %
2.65	-	30	2.2 %
2.70	-	31	2.3 %
2.75	-	50	3.7 %
2.80	-	7	0.5 %
2.85	-	7	0.5 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.90	-	53	3.9 %
2.95	-	9	0.7 %
3.00	-	76	5.6 %
3.05	-	13	1.0 %
3.10	-	10	0.7 %
3.15	-	29	2.1 %
3.20	-	9	0.7 %
3.25	-	13	1.0 %
3.30	-	26	1.9 %
3.33	-	1	0.1 %
3.35	-	5	0.4 %
3.40	-	24	1.8 %
3.45	-	16	1.2 %
3.50	-	28	2.1 %
3.55	-	15	1.1 %
3.60	-	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1519-1525 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2PJJUDU: S2 ProJus: Procedural Justice - You - Court

Procedural justice scales for court - direct experience; Mean of 14 items.

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability, ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they treat most people my age.")}, Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly.")}, Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	-	22	1.6 %
1.24	-	1	0.1 %
1.30	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	13	1.0 %
1.56	-	1	0.1 %
1.70	-	1	0.1 %
1.74	-	1	0.1 %
1.80	-	1	0.1 %
1.85	-	1	0.1 %
1.87	-	2	0.1 %
2.00	-	115	8.5 %
2.06	-	1	0.1 %
2.08	-	2	0.1 %
2.15	-	1	0.1 %
2.17	-	1	0.1 %
2.19	-	1	0.1 %
2.22	-	1	0.1 %
2.23	-	3	0.2 %
2.25	-	1	0.1 %
2.26	-	1	0.1 %
2.27	-	1	0.1 %
2.29	-	1	0.1 %
2.30	-	4	0.3 %
2.32	-	1	0.1 %
2.36	-	1	0.1 %
2.37	-	1	0.1 %
2.39	-	1	0.1 %
2.40	-	1	0.1 %
2.42	-	1	0.1 %
2.43	-	2	0.1 %
2.45	-	1	0.1 %
2.46	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.48	-	1	0.1 %
2.49	-	1	0.1 %
2.50	-	59	4.4 %
2.51	-	1	0.1 %
2.52	-	2	0.1 %
2.53	-	1	0.1 %
2.54	-	2	0.1 %
2.56	-	3	0.2 %
2.57	-	1	0.1 %
2.58	-	2	0.1 %
2.60	-	3	0.2 %
2.61	-	1	0.1 %
2.62	-	1	0.1 %
2.63	-	1	0.1 %
2.64	-	3	0.2 %
2.65	-	2	0.1 %
2.66	-	1	0.1 %
2.67	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	45	3.3 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Based upon 1,215 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1526-1532 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00 , -7.00

S2PJJUDO: S2 ProJus: Procedural Justice - Others - Court

Procedural justice scales for court - others experience; Mean of 7 items.

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability,

ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they treat most people my age.")}, Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly.")}, Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	-	2	0.1 %
1.05	-	3	0.2 %
1.25	-	2	0.1 %
1.30	-	4	0.3 %
1.35	-	1	0.1 %
1.45	-	2	0.1 %
1.50	-	5	0.4 %
1.54	-	1	0.1 %
1.55	-	1	0.1 %
1.58	-	1	0.1 %
1.65	-	4	0.3 %
1.70	-	3	0.2 %
1.73	-	1	0.1 %
1.74	-	2	0.1 %
1.75	-	2	0.1 %
1.85	-	13	1.0 %
1.88	-	1	0.1 %
1.90	-	5	0.4 %
1.92	-	4	0.3 %
1.94	-	1	0.1 %
1.98	-	1	0.1 %
1.99	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	-	26	1.9 %
2.02	-	1	0.1 %
2.05	-	3	0.2 %
2.10	-	30	2.2 %
2.11	-	1	0.1 %
2.12	-	1	0.1 %
2.14	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.15	-	5	0.4 %
2.17	-	1	0.1 %
2.19	-	1	0.1 %
2.20	-	3	0.2 %
2.21	-	1	0.1 %
2.25	-	21	1.6 %
2.27	-	2	0.1 %
2.30	-	13	1.0 %
2.31	-	3	0.2 %
2.33	-	5	0.4 %
2.35	-	9	0.7 %
2.36	-	2	0.1 %
2.37	-	1	0.1 %
2.38	-	3	0.2 %
2.39	-	1	0.1 %
2.40	-	1	0.1 %
2.43	-	2	0.1 %
2.44	-	3	0.2 %
2.45	-	2	0.1 %
2.47	-	1	0.1 %
2.48	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1533-1539 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2LEGIT: S2 ProJus: Procedural Justice - Legitimacy

Legitimacy index; Mean of 11 items.

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential

basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability, ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they treat most people my age.")}, Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly.")}, Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Somewhat disagree
- (3) Somewhat agree
- (4) Strongly agree

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly disagree	15	1.1 %
1.09	-	8	0.6 %
1.18	-	6	0.4 %
1.20	-	2	0.1 %
1.22	-	1	0.1 %
1.25	-	2	0.1 %
1.27	-	34	2.5 %
1.30	-	1	0.1 %
1.36	-	18	1.3 %
1.38	-	1	0.1 %
1.40	-	2	0.1 %
1.43	-	1	0.1 %
1.44	-	1	0.1 %
1.45	-	24	1.8 %
1.50	-	3	0.2 %
1.55	-	34	2.5 %
1.56	-	1	0.1 %
1.60	-	2	0.1 %
1.63	-	1	0.1 %
1.64	-	24	1.8 %
1.67	-	2	0.1 %
1.70	-	1	0.1 %
1.73	-	35	2.6 %
1.75	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.78	-	2	0.1 %
1.80	-	3	0.2 %
1.82	-	46	3.4 %
1.83	-	2	0.1 %
1.88	-	2	0.1 %
1.89	-	2	0.1 %
1.90	-	3	0.2 %
1.91	-	45	3.3 %
2.00	Somewhat disagree	67	4.9 %
2.09	-	54	4.0 %
2.10	-	7	0.5 %
2.11	-	2	0.1 %
2.18	-	62	4.6 %
2.20	-	7	0.5 %
2.22	-	2	0.1 %
2.25	-	1	0.1 %
2.27	-	65	4.8 %
2.30	-	8	0.6 %
2.33	-	2	0.1 %
2.36	-	65	4.8 %
2.38	-	1	0.1 %
2.40	-	6	0.4 %
2.44	-	5	0.4 %
2.45	-	64	4.7 %
2.50	-	3	0.2 %
2.55	-	71	5.2 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1540-1546 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00 , -7.00

S2CYNIC: S2 ProJus: Procedural Justice - Legal Cynicism

Legal cynicism index; Mean of 5 items.

MEASURE: Procedural Justice

The Procedural Justice inventory was adapted for this study to measure the adolescent's perception of fairness and equity connected with arrest and court processing. The approach taken here was an adaptation of those taken by Tyler (1997). Conceptually, the idea is that there is an experiential basis for translating interactions with legal processes into perceptions and evaluations of the law and the legal actors that enforce it. This measure is designed to tap several dimensions of fair treatment: correctability, ethicality, representativeness and consistency (see Tyler and Huo, 2002). The outcomes of this process include evaluations of law and its underlying norms: legitimacy and legal cynicism.

The 55 items in this measure are divided into four sections: Police {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The police treat me the same way they treat most people my age.")}, Judge {Direct Experience & Others' Experience (e.g., "The court considered the evidence/viewpoints in this incident fairly.")}, Legitimacy (e.g., "I feel people should support the police."), and Legal Cynicism (e.g., "Laws are meant to be broken.").

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Somewhat disagree
- (3) Somewhat agree
- (4) Strongly agree

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly disagree	112	8.3 %
1.20	-	58	4.3 %
1.40	-	98	7.2 %
1.50	-	1	0.1 %
1.60	-	128	9.5 %
1.75	-	1	0.1 %
1.80	-	112	8.3 %
2.00	Somewhat disagree	169	12.5 %
2.20	-	179	13.2 %
2.25	-	2	0.1 %
2.40	-	136	10.0 %
2.60	-	90	6.6 %
2.80	-	76	5.6 %
3.00	Somewhat agree	39	2.9 %
3.20	-	25	1.8 %
3.25	-	1	0.1 %
3.40	-	19	1.4 %
3.60	-	7	0.5 %
3.80	-	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4.00	Strongly agree	3	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1547-1553 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00 , -7.00

S2PROPTIMEALLSETTINGS: S2 Recall Period - Proportion of time in all settings

Recall Period - Proportion of time in all settings.

MEASURE: Proportion of Time in Community and Facility and Probation Marker

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	489	36.1 %
0.01	-	14	1.0 %
0.02	-	6	0.4 %
0.03	-	7	0.5 %
0.04	-	4	0.3 %
0.05	-	6	0.4 %
0.06	-	3	0.2 %
0.07	-	6	0.4 %
0.08	-	1	0.1 %
0.09	-	2	0.1 %
0.10	-	4	0.3 %
0.11	-	8	0.6 %
0.12	-	4	0.3 %
0.13	-	10	0.7 %
0.14	-	2	0.1 %
0.15	-	6	0.4 %
0.16	-	7	0.5 %
0.17	-	2	0.1 %
0.18	-	7	0.5 %
0.19	-	8	0.6 %
0.20	-	2	0.1 %
0.21	-	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.22	-	3	0.2 %
0.23	-	2	0.1 %
0.24	-	2	0.1 %
0.25	-	4	0.3 %
0.26	-	6	0.4 %
0.27	-	4	0.3 %
0.28	-	3	0.2 %
0.29	-	8	0.6 %
0.30	-	7	0.5 %
0.31	-	5	0.4 %
0.32	-	5	0.4 %
0.33	-	5	0.4 %
0.34	-	5	0.4 %
0.35	-	1	0.1 %
0.36	-	3	0.2 %
0.37	-	5	0.4 %
0.38	-	4	0.3 %
0.39	-	4	0.3 %
0.40	-	6	0.4 %
0.41	-	1	0.1 %
0.42	-	4	0.3 %
0.43	-	7	0.5 %
0.44	-	5	0.4 %
0.45	-	4	0.3 %
0.46	-	1	0.1 %
0.47	-	4	0.3 %
0.48	-	3	0.2 %
0.49	-	7	0.5 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Based upon 1,261 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1554-1560 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202.00 , -201.00

S2PROPTIMESTREETS: S2 Recall Period - Proportion of time in streets using all settings

Recall Period - Proportion of time in streets using all settings.

MEASURE: Proportion of Time in Community and Facility and Probation Marker

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	208	15.4 %
0.01	-	58	4.3 %
0.02	-	39	2.9 %
0.03	-	19	1.4 %
0.04	-	8	0.6 %
0.05	-	4	0.3 %
0.06	-	4	0.3 %
0.07	-	9	0.7 %
0.08	-	8	0.6 %
0.09	-	5	0.4 %
0.10	-	6	0.4 %
0.11	-	3	0.2 %
0.12	-	8	0.6 %
0.13	-	9	0.7 %
0.14	-	8	0.6 %
0.15	-	7	0.5 %
0.16	-	5	0.4 %
0.17	-	7	0.5 %
0.18	-	2	0.1 %
0.19	-	2	0.1 %
0.20	-	4	0.3 %
0.21	-	7	0.5 %
0.22	-	4	0.3 %
0.23	-	3	0.2 %
0.24	-	4	0.3 %
0.25	-	6	0.4 %
0.26	-	2	0.1 %
0.27	-	10	0.7 %
0.28	-	3	0.2 %
0.29	-	4	0.3 %
0.30	-	5	0.4 %
0.31	-	5	0.4 %
0.32	-	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.33	-	4	0.3 %
0.34	-	2	0.1 %
0.35	-	4	0.3 %
0.36	-	1	0.1 %
0.37	-	2	0.1 %
0.38	-	5	0.4 %
0.39	-	6	0.4 %
0.40	-	2	0.1 %
0.41	-	6	0.4 %
0.42	-	5	0.4 %
0.43	-	2	0.1 %
0.44	-	4	0.3 %
0.45	-	3	0.2 %
0.46	-	6	0.4 %
0.47	-	3	0.2 %
0.48	-	2	0.1 %
0.49	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Based upon 1,261 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1561-1567 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202.00 , -201.00

S2PROPTIMESECURESETTINGS: S2 Recall Period - Proportion of time in settings with no community access

Recall Period - Proportion of time in settings with no community access.

MEASURE: Proportion of Time in Community and Facility and Probation Marker

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	493	36.4 %
0.01	-	14	1.0 %
0.02	-	6	0.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.03	-	7	0.5 %
0.04	-	4	0.3 %
0.05	-	6	0.4 %
0.06	-	3	0.2 %
0.07	-	6	0.4 %
0.08	-	1	0.1 %
0.09	-	2	0.1 %
0.10	-	4	0.3 %
0.11	-	8	0.6 %
0.12	-	4	0.3 %
0.13	-	10	0.7 %
0.14	-	2	0.1 %
0.15	-	6	0.4 %
0.16	-	7	0.5 %
0.17	-	2	0.1 %
0.18	-	7	0.5 %
0.19	-	8	0.6 %
0.20	-	2	0.1 %
0.21	-	3	0.2 %
0.22	-	3	0.2 %
0.23	-	2	0.1 %
0.24	-	2	0.1 %
0.25	-	4	0.3 %
0.26	-	6	0.4 %
0.27	-	4	0.3 %
0.28	-	3	0.2 %
0.29	-	8	0.6 %
0.30	-	7	0.5 %
0.31	-	6	0.4 %
0.32	-	5	0.4 %
0.33	-	4	0.3 %
0.34	-	5	0.4 %
0.35	-	1	0.1 %
0.36	-	3	0.2 %
0.37	-	4	0.3 %
0.38	-	4	0.3 %
0.39	-	4	0.3 %
0.40	-	6	0.4 %
0.41	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.42	-	4	0.3 %
0.43	-	7	0.5 %
0.44	-	5	0.4 %
0.45	-	5	0.4 %
0.46	-	1	0.1 %
0.47	-	4	0.3 %
0.48	-	3	0.2 %
0.49	-	7	0.5 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Based upon 1,261 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1568-1574 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202.00 , -201.00

S2PROPTIMESTREETS_SECURE: S2 Recall Period - Proportion of time in streets using settings with no community access

Recall Period - Proportion of time in streets using settings with no community access.

MEASURE: Proportion of Time in Community and Facility and Probation Marker

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	207	15.3 %
0.01	-	57	4.2 %
0.02	-	39	2.9 %
0.03	-	19	1.4 %
0.04	-	8	0.6 %
0.05	-	4	0.3 %
0.06	-	4	0.3 %
0.07	-	8	0.6 %
0.08	-	7	0.5 %
0.09	-	5	0.4 %
0.10	-	6	0.4 %
0.11	-	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.12	-	8	0.6 %
0.13	-	9	0.7 %
0.14	-	8	0.6 %
0.15	-	7	0.5 %
0.16	-	5	0.4 %
0.17	-	7	0.5 %
0.18	-	2	0.1 %
0.19	-	2	0.1 %
0.20	-	3	0.2 %
0.21	-	7	0.5 %
0.22	-	4	0.3 %
0.23	-	3	0.2 %
0.24	-	3	0.2 %
0.25	-	6	0.4 %
0.26	-	2	0.1 %
0.27	-	11	0.8 %
0.28	-	3	0.2 %
0.29	-	4	0.3 %
0.30	-	4	0.3 %
0.31	-	5	0.4 %
0.32	-	3	0.2 %
0.33	-	4	0.3 %
0.34	-	2	0.1 %
0.35	-	3	0.2 %
0.36	-	2	0.1 %
0.37	-	2	0.1 %
0.38	-	6	0.4 %
0.39	-	6	0.4 %
0.40	-	2	0.1 %
0.41	-	6	0.4 %
0.42	-	5	0.4 %
0.43	-	2	0.1 %
0.44	-	4	0.3 %
0.45	-	3	0.2 %
0.46	-	6	0.4 %
0.47	-	3	0.2 %
0.48	-	2	0.1 %
0.49	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

Based upon 1,261 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1575-1581 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202.00 , -201.00

S2PROBATION: S2 Recall Period - Been on probation/parole

Recall Period - Been on probation/parole.

MEASURE: Proportion of Time in Community and Facility and Probation Marker

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	417	30.8 %
1	Yes	843	62.3 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2; partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4; missed interview	92	6.8 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1582-1587 (width: 6; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -9999 , -9998 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S2PSMI: S2 PSMI: Overall

PSMI - overall; the mean of all 30 items in the inventory.

MEASURE: Psychosocial Maturity Inventory (PSMI)

The Psychosocial Maturity Inventory (PSMI Form D; Greenberger, Josselson, Knerr, & Knerr, 1974) has been used in previous research and shown excellent validity and psychometric properties (Greenberger & Bond, 1976). Items on the personal responsibility subscale tap self-reliance (i.e., feelings of internal control and the ability to make decisions without extreme reliance on others, e.g., "Luck decides most things that happen to me" {reverse coded}), identity (i.e., self-esteem, clarity of the self, and consideration of life goals, e.g., "I change the way I feel and act so often that I sometimes wonder who the 'real' me is" {reverse coded}), and work orientation (i.e., pride in the successful completion of tasks, e.g., "I hate

to admit it, but I give up on my work when things go wrong" {reverse coded}). The scale contains 30 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree". All items in the PSMI except one item are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more responsible behavior.

- (1) Strongly Agree
- (2) Slightly Agree
- (3) Slightly Disagree
- (4) Strongly Disagree

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Agree	0	0.0 %
1.10	-	1	0.1 %
1.30	-	1	0.1 %
1.43	-	1	0.1 %
1.60	-	1	0.1 %
1.70	-	3	0.2 %
1.77	-	1	0.1 %
1.80	-	1	0.1 %
1.87	-	1	0.1 %
1.90	-	2	0.1 %
1.93	-	3	0.2 %
1.97	-	5	0.4 %
2.00	Slightly Agree	1	0.1 %
2.03	-	4	0.3 %
2.07	-	2	0.1 %
2.10	-	2	0.1 %
2.13	-	3	0.2 %
2.17	-	3	0.2 %
2.20	-	3	0.2 %
2.22	-	1	0.1 %
2.23	-	3	0.2 %
2.27	-	4	0.3 %
2.30	-	7	0.5 %
2.33	-	6	0.4 %
2.37	-	5	0.4 %
2.40	-	8	0.6 %
2.43	-	10	0.7 %
2.46	-	1	0.1 %
2.47	-	12	0.9 %
2.50	-	10	0.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.53	-	19	1.4 %
2.57	-	22	1.6 %
2.60	-	25	1.8 %
2.62	-	1	0.1 %
2.63	-	20	1.5 %
2.67	-	23	1.7 %
2.70	-	26	1.9 %
2.72	-	2	0.1 %
2.73	-	36	2.7 %
2.77	-	38	2.8 %
2.80	-	33	2.4 %
2.83	-	28	2.1 %
2.87	-	29	2.1 %
2.90	-	34	2.5 %
2.93	-	42	3.1 %
2.97	-	40	3.0 %
3.00	Slightly Disagree	40	3.0 %
3.03	-	25	1.8 %
3.07	-	30	2.2 %
3.10	-	27	2.0 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1588-1594 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2PSMISR: S2 PSMI: Self Reliance

PSMI - self reliance; the mean of the 10 items in this subscale.

MEASURE: Psychosocial Maturity Inventory (PSMI)

The Psychosocial Maturity Inventory (PSMI Form D; Greenberger, Josselson, Knerr, & Knerr, 1974) has been used in previous research and shown excellent validity and psychometric properties (Greenberger & Bond, 1976). Items on the personal responsibility subscale tap self-reliance (i.e., feelings of internal control and the ability to make decisions without extreme reliance on others, e.g., "Luck

decides most things that happen to me" {reverse coded}), identity (i.e., self-esteem, clarity of the self, and consideration of life goals, e.g., "I change the way I feel and act so often that I sometimes wonder who the 'real' me is" {reverse coded}), and work orientation (i.e., pride in the successful completion of tasks, e.g., "I hate to admit it, but I give up on my work when things go wrong" {reverse coded}). The scale contains 30 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree". All items in the PSMI except one item are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more responsible behavior.

- (1) Strongly Agree
- (2) Slightly Agree
- (3) Slightly Disagree
- (4) Strongly Disagree

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Agree	1	0.1 %
1.10	-	1	0.1 %
1.30	-	1	0.1 %
1.40	-	3	0.2 %
1.60	-	3	0.2 %
1.80	-	4	0.3 %
1.90	-	3	0.2 %
2.00	Slightly Agree	11	0.8 %
2.10	-	10	0.7 %
2.20	-	14	1.0 %
2.30	-	20	1.5 %
2.40	-	26	1.9 %
2.44	-	1	0.1 %
2.50	-	38	2.8 %
2.60	-	48	3.5 %
2.67	-	1	0.1 %
2.70	-	66	4.9 %
2.80	-	83	6.1 %
2.90	-	84	6.2 %
3.00	Slightly Disagree	114	8.4 %
3.10	-	70	5.2 %
3.20	-	67	4.9 %
3.30	-	60	4.4 %
3.40	-	75	5.5 %
3.50	-	77	5.7 %
3.60	-	72	5.3 %
3.67	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.70	-	82	6.1 %
3.80	-	55	4.1 %
3.90	-	50	3.7 %
4.00	Strongly Disagree	118	8.7 %
	Missing Data		
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	1	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,259 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1595-1601 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2PSMIID: S2 PSMI: Identity

PSMI - identity; the mean of the 10 items in this subscale.

MEASURE: Psychosocial Maturity Inventory (PSMI)

The Psychosocial Maturity Inventory (PSMI Form D; Greenberger, Josselson, Knerr, & Knerr, 1974) has been used in previous research and shown excellent validity and psychometric properties (Greenberger & Bond, 1976). Items on the personal responsibility subscale tap self-reliance (i.e., feelings of internal control and the ability to make decisions without extreme reliance on others, e.g., "Luck decides most things that happen to me" {reverse coded}), identity (i.e., self-esteem, clarity of the self, and consideration of life goals, e.g., "I change the way I feel and act so often that I sometimes wonder who the 'real' me is" {reverse coded}), and work orientation (i.e., pride in the successful completion of tasks, e.g., "I hate to admit it, but I give up on my work when things go wrong" {reverse coded}). The scale contains 30 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree". All items in the PSMI except one item are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more responsible behavior.

- (1) Strongly Agree
- (2) Slightly Agree
- (3) Slightly Disagree
- (4) Strongly Disagree

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Agree	1	0.1 %
1.30	-	2	0.1 %
1.40	-	1	0.1 %
1.60	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.80	-	2	0.1 %
1.89	-	1	0.1 %
1.90	-	6	0.4 %
2.00	Slightly Agree	9	0.7 %
2.10	-	5	0.4 %
2.20	-	10	0.7 %
2.22	-	1	0.1 %
2.30	-	14	1.0 %
2.40	-	11	0.8 %
2.50	-	26	1.9 %
2.60	-	34	2.5 %
2.70	-	48	3.5 %
2.80	-	81	6.0 %
2.90	-	79	5.8 %
3.00	Slightly Disagree	113	8.3 %
3.10	-	87	6.4 %
3.20	-	78	5.8 %
3.30	-	68	5.0 %
3.40	-	79	5.8 %
3.50	-	62	4.6 %
3.60	-	78	5.8 %
3.70	-	70	5.2 %
3.78	-	2	0.1 %
3.80	-	73	5.4 %
3.90	-	56	4.1 %
4.00	Strongly Disagree	161	11.9 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1602-1608 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2PSMIWK: S2 PSMI: Work Orientation

PSMI - work orientation; the mean of the 10 items in this subscale.

MEASURE: Psychosocial Maturity Inventory (PSMI)

The Psychosocial Maturity Inventory (PSMI Form D; Greenberger, Josselson, Knerr, & Knerr, 1974) has been used in previous research and shown excellent validity and psychometric properties (Greenberger & Bond, 1976). Items on the personal responsibility subscale tap self-reliance (i.e., feelings of internal control and the ability to make decisions without extreme reliance on others, e.g., "Luck decides most things that happen to me" {reverse coded}), identity (i.e., self-esteem, clarity of the self, and consideration of life goals, e.g., "I change the way I feel and act so often that I sometimes wonder who the 'real' me is" {reverse coded}), and work orientation (i.e., pride in the successful completion of tasks, e.g., "I hate to admit it, but I give up on my work when things go wrong" {reverse coded}). The scale contains 30 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree". All items in the PSMI except one item are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more responsible behavior.

- (1) Strongly Agree
- (2) Slightly Agree
- (3) Slightly Disagree
- (4) Strongly Disagree

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Agree	1	0.1 %
1.10	-	2	0.1 %
1.30	-	6	0.4 %
1.40	-	1	0.1 %
1.50	-	5	0.4 %
1.60	-	6	0.4 %
1.70	-	8	0.6 %
1.80	-	11	0.8 %
1.90	-	13	1.0 %
2.00	Slightly Agree	22	1.6 %
2.10	-	33	2.4 %
2.20	-	33	2.4 %
2.30	-	44	3.2 %
2.40	-	61	4.5 %
2.50	-	77	5.7 %
2.56	-	3	0.2 %
2.60	-	80	5.9 %
2.67	-	1	0.1 %
2.70	-	103	7.6 %
2.80	-	83	6.1 %
2.90	-	99	7.3 %
3.00	Slightly Disagree	92	6.8 %
3.10	-	77	5.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.20	-	63	4.7 %
3.22	-	3	0.2 %
3.30	-	63	4.7 %
3.40	-	69	5.1 %
3.50	-	63	4.7 %
3.56	-	1	0.1 %
3.60	-	39	2.9 %
3.67	-	1	0.1 %
3.70	-	66	4.9 %
3.80	-	19	1.4 %
3.90	-	6	0.4 %
4.00	Strongly Disagree	6	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1609-1615 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2RELQLT: S2 RQual: Quality of Relationship - Quality

Romantic Relationship - Quality of Relationship; Mean of 7 items.

MEASURE: Quality of Romantic Relationships

The Quality of Romantic Relationships inventory was adapted for this study to evaluate the support, conflict, and depth of the adolescent's romantic relationships (Pierce, 1994; Pierce, Sarason, Sarason, Solky-Butzel, & Nagle, 1997). This scale assess the relationship along 5 dimensions: Quality of Relationship (e.g., "In general, how happy are you with your relationship?"), Knowledge of Behavior and Deviance (e.g., "How much does {Name} know who you spend time with?"), Tolerance of Deviance (e.g., "Would {Name} know if you have been using drugs?"), Antisocial Influence (e.g., "Has X suggested that you should sell drugs?"), and Antisocial Behavior (e.g., "Has X damaged/destroyed property?". The fourth and fifth subscales were derived from items mirroring the ones asked regarding peer delinquency; but using the romantic partner, not the peers, as the referent person. For the first three subscales, higher scores indicate a more symbiotic romantic relationship and for the last two subscales, more antisocial influence, antisocial behavior and more monitoring respectively.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	-	1	0.1 %
1.14	-	1	0.1 %
1.29	-	1	0.1 %
2.00	-	2	0.1 %
2.14	-	1	0.1 %
2.29	-	5	0.4 %
2.43	-	3	0.2 %
2.57	-	3	0.2 %
2.71	-	6	0.4 %
2.83	-	1	0.1 %
2.86	-	6	0.4 %
3.00	-	10	0.7 %
3.14	-	14	1.0 %
3.17	-	1	0.1 %
3.29	-	18	1.3 %
3.43	-	23	1.7 %
3.57	-	30	2.2 %
3.71	-	42	3.1 %
3.86	-	43	3.2 %
4.00	-	48	3.5 %
4.14	-	39	2.9 %
4.29	-	49	3.6 %
4.43	-	55	4.1 %
4.50	-	1	0.1 %
4.57	-	51	3.8 %
4.67	-	1	0.1 %
4.71	-	59	4.4 %
4.86	-	53	3.9 %
5.00	-	24	1.8 %
Missing Data			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into RQual measure	671	49.6 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 591 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1616-1622 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2RELDEV: S2 RQual: Quality of Relationship - Deviance

Romantic Relationship - Tolerance of Deviance; Mean of 2 items.

MEASURE: Quality of Romantic Relationships

The Quality of Romantic Relationships inventory was adapted for this study to evaluate the support, conflict, and depth of the adolescent's romantic relationships (Pierce, 1994; Pierce, Sarason, Sarason, Solky-Butzel, & Nagle, 1997). This scale assess the relationship along 5 dimensions: Quality of Relationship (e.g., "In general, how happy are you with your relationship?"), Knowledge of Behavior and Deviance (e.g., "How much does {Name} know who you spend time with?"), Tolerance of Deviance (e.g., "Would {Name} know if you have been using drugs?"), Antisocial Influence (e.g., "Has X suggested that you should sell drugs?"), and Antisocial Behavior (e.g., "Has X damaged/destroyed property?"). The fourth and fifth subscales were derived from items mirroring the ones asked regarding peer delinquency; but using the romantic partner, not the peers, as the referent person. For the first three subscales, higher scores indicate a more symbiotic romantic relationship and for the last two subscales, more antisocial influence, antisocial behavior and more monitoring respectively.

- (1) Would not care at all
- (2) Would be bothered, but would not say anything to me about it
- (3) Would be bothered and would talk to me about it
- (4) Would get very upset with me

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.0	Would not care at all	10	0.7 %
1.5	-	15	1.1 %
2.0	Would be bothered, but would not say anything to me about it	21	1.6 %
2.5	-	33	2.4 %
3.0	Would be bothered and would talk to me about it	117	8.6 %
3.5	-	81	6.0 %
4.0	Would get very upset with me	312	23.0 %
Missing Data			
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.0	Did not skip into RQual measure	671	49.6 %
-9.0	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 589 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1623-1629 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.0 , -202.0 , -201.0 , -100.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

S2RELCON: S2 RQual: Quality of Relationship - Monitoring

Romantic Relationship - Monitoring; Mean of 5 items.

MEASURE: Quality of Romantic Relationships

The Quality of Romantic Relationships inventory was adapted for this study to evaluate the support, conflict, and depth of the adolescent's romantic relationships (Pierce, 1994; Pierce, Sarason, Sarason, Solky-Butzel, & Nagle, 1997). This scale assess the relationship along 5 dimensions: Quality of Relationship (e.g., "In general, how happy are you with your relationship?"), Knowledge of Behavior and Deviance (e.g., "How much does {Name} know who you spend time with?"), Tolerance of Deviance (e.g., "Would {Name} know if you have been using drugs?"), Antisocial Influence (e.g., "Has X suggested that you should sell drugs?"), and Antisocial Behavior (e.g., "Has X damaged/destroyed property?". The fourth and fifth subscales were derived from items mirroring the ones asked regarding peer delinquency; but using the romantic partner, not the peers, as the referent person. For the first three subscales, higher scores indicate a more symbiotic romantic relationship and for the last two subscales, more antisocial influence, antisocial behavior and more monitoring respectively.

- (1) Doesn't know at all
- (2) Knows a little bit
- (3) Knows a lot
- (4) Knows everything

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Doesn't know at all	17	1.3 %
1.20	-	3	0.2 %
1.40	-	13	1.0 %
1.60	-	20	1.5 %
1.80	-	28	2.1 %
2.00	Knows a little bit	52	3.8 %
2.20	-	32	2.4 %
2.25	-	1	0.1 %
2.40	-	34	2.5 %
2.60	-	36	2.7 %
2.80	-	43	3.2 %
3.00	Knows a lot	64	4.7 %
3.20	-	37	2.7 %
3.40	-	33	2.4 %
3.60	-	30	2.2 %
3.80	-	33	2.4 %
4.00	Knows everything	115	8.5 %
Missing Data			
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into RQual measure	671	49.6 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 591 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1630-1636 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2DEL: S2 RQual: Antisocial Influence - Count of items endorsed

Romantic Relationship - Antisocial Influence, relies on items from the peer delinquency section to assess the antisocial influence from the romantic partner; Count of the 7 items endorsed..

MEASURE: Quality of Romantic Relationships

The Quality of Romantic Relationships inventory was adapted for this study to evaluate the support, conflict, and depth of the adolescent's romantic relationships (Pierce, 1994; Pierce, Sarason, Sarason, Solky-Butzel, & Nagle, 1997). This scale assess the relationship along 5 dimensions: Quality of Relationship (e.g., "In general, how happy are you with your relationship?"), Knowledge of Behavior and Deviance (e.g., "How much does {Name} know who you spend time with?"), Tolerance of Deviance (e.g., "Would {Name} know if you have been using drugs?"), Antisocial Influence (e.g., "Has X suggested that you should sell drugs?"), and Antisocial Behavior (e.g., "Has X damaged/destroyed property?". The fourth and fifth subscales were derived from items mirroring the ones asked regarding peer delinquency; but using the romantic partner, not the peers, as the referent person. For the first three subscales, higher scores indicate a more symbiotic romantic relationship and for the last two subscales, more antisocial influence, antisocial behavior and more monitoring respectively.

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	494	36.5 %
1	-	65	4.8 %
2	-	18	1.3 %
3	-	4	0.3 %
4	-	2	0.1 %
5	-	3	0.2 %
7	-	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100	Did not skip into RQual measure	671	49.6 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 590 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1637-1640 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S2PEERPR: S2 PEI: Resistance to Peer Influence

Resistance to peer influence; mean across 10 dimensions.

MEASURE: Resistance to Peer Influence

The Resistance to Peer Influence (Steinberg, 2000) measure was developed for this study to assess the degree to which adolescents act autonomously in interactions with their peer group. Participants are first presented with two conflicting scenarios (e.g., "Some people go along with their friends just to keep their friends happy" and "Other people refuse to go along with what their friends want to do, even though they know it will make their friends unhappy") and are then asked to choose the scenario which most closely reflects their behavior. Finally, the participant is asked to rate the degree to which the statement is accurate (i.e. "sort of true" or "really true"). Ten such sequences are presented to the participant, each exploring a different dimension of potential influence: go along with friends, fitting in with friends, changing their mind, knowingly do something wrong, hiding true opinion, breaking the law, changing the way you usually act, taking risks, saying things don't really believe, and going against the crowd.

- (1) It's really true I'm influenced by my peers
- (2) It's sort of true I'm influenced by my peers
- (3) It's sort of true I prefer to be an individual
- (4) It's really true I prefer to be an individual

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	It's really true I'm influenced by my peers	0	0.0 %
1.10	-	1	0.1 %
1.20	-	1	0.1 %
1.40	-	2	0.1 %
1.50	-	2	0.1 %
1.60	-	5	0.4 %
1.70	-	8	0.6 %
1.80	-	7	0.5 %
1.89	-	1	0.1 %
1.90	-	10	0.7 %
2.00	It's sort of true I'm influenced by my peers	14	1.0 %
2.10	-	18	1.3 %
2.11	-	1	0.1 %
2.20	-	24	1.8 %
2.30	-	32	2.4 %
2.40	-	35	2.6 %
2.50	-	64	4.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.56	-	1	0.1 %
2.60	-	64	4.7 %
2.63	-	1	0.1 %
2.70	-	52	3.8 %
2.80	-	55	4.1 %
2.89	-	1	0.1 %
2.90	-	54	4.0 %
3.00	It's sort of true I prefer to be an individual	69	5.1 %
3.10	-	94	6.9 %
3.13	-	2	0.1 %
3.20	-	71	5.2 %
3.22	-	1	0.1 %
3.30	-	64	4.7 %
3.40	-	75	5.5 %
3.44	-	1	0.1 %
3.50	-	75	5.5 %
3.60	-	70	5.2 %
3.70	-	90	6.6 %
3.75	-	1	0.1 %
3.78	-	1	0.1 %
3.80	-	52	3.8 %
3.90	-	42	3.1 %
4.00	It's really true I prefer to be an individual	97	7.2 %
Missing Data			
-300.00	Too few answers for computation	2	0.1 %
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,258 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1641-1647 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

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

S2ROUT: S2 Rout: Unsupervised Routine Activities

Unsupervised routine activities; the mean of all four questions.

MEASURE: Routine Activities

Items from the Routine Activities measure were drawn from the "Monitoring the Future Questionnaire" (Osgood, Wilson, O'Malley,

Bachman, and Johnston, 1996) and are used to assess the frequency of unstructured socializing. Items specifically tap activities that occur in the absence of an authority figure (e.g., "How often did you get together with friends informally?"). The scale contains 3 items to which participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Never" to "Almost every day". Higher scores indicate a greater involvement in unstructured activities. A fourth item is asked to specify the number of evenings in a typical week the participant spends on "fun" activities.

- | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------|
| (1) Never | (1) Less than one time |
| (2) A few times a year | (2) One |
| (3) Once or twice a month | (3) Two |
| (4) At least once a week | (4) Three |
| (5) Almost every day | (5) Four or More |

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Never	24	1.8 %
1.25	-	18	1.3 %
1.50	-	23	1.7 %
1.75	-	27	2.0 %
2.00	A few times a year	28	2.1 %
2.25	-	41	3.0 %
2.50	-	58	4.3 %
2.75	-	65	4.8 %
3.00	Once or twice a month	77	5.7 %
3.25	-	102	7.5 %
3.50	-	82	6.1 %
3.67	-	1	0.1 %
3.75	-	98	7.2 %
4.00	At least once a week	84	6.2 %
4.25	-	53	3.9 %
4.50	-	63	4.7 %
4.75	-	36	2.7 %
5.00	Almost every day	14	1.0 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into Routine Activities measure	366	27.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 894 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1648-1654 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -666.00 , -400.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S2SRO_DESTPROP: S2 SRO: Destroyed/damaged property - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [purposely destroyed or damaged property that did not belong to you] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1120	82.7 %
1	Yes	140	10.3 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1655-1658 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_DESTPROP_NUM: S2 SRO: Destroyed/damaged property - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [purposely destroyed or damaged property that did not belong to you] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1120	82.7 %
1	-	45	3.3 %
2	-	35	2.6 %
3	-	11	0.8 %
4	-	7	0.5 %
5	-	10	0.7 %
6	-	2	0.1 %
7	-	6	0.4 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
9	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	7	0.5 %
12	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	3	0.2 %
18	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	5	0.4 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	1	0.1 %
200	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1659-1662 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999, -998, -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101

S2SRO_DESTPROP_GROUP: S2 SRO: Destroyed/damaged property - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [purposely destroyed or damaged property that did not belong to you].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier

instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	50	3.7 %
1	Yes	90	6.6 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1120	82.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 140 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1663-1666 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_SETFIRE: S2 SRO: Set fire to house/building/car/vacant lot - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [purposely set fire to a house, building, car or vacant lot] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1252	92.5 %
1	Yes	8	0.6 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1667-1670 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_SETFIRE_NUM: S2 SRO: Set fire to house/building/car/vacant lot - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [purposely set fire to a house, building, car or vacant lot] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1252	92.5 %
1	-	6	0.4 %
2	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1671-1674 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S2SRO_SETFIRE_GROUP: S2 SRO: Set fire to house/building/car/vacant lot - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [purposely set fire to a house, building, car or vacant lot].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	4	0.3 %
1	Yes	4	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1252	92.5 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

Location: 1675-1678 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_ENTBLDSTEAL: S2 SRO: Entered building to steal - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [entered or broke into a building (home or business) to steal something] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1224	90.4 %
1	Yes	36	2.7 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1679-1682 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_ENTBLDSTEAL_NUM: S2 SRO: Entered building to steal - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [entered or broke into a building (home or business) to steal something] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1224	90.4 %
1	-	11	0.8 %
2	-	11	0.8 %
3	-	5	0.4 %
4	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	3	0.2 %
6	-	1	0.1 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
20	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1683-1686 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999, -998, -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101

S2SRO_ENTBLDSTEAL_GROUP: S2 SRO: Entered building to steal - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [entered or broke into a building (home or business) to steal something].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	8	0.6 %
1	Yes	28	2.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1224	90.4 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 36 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1687-1690 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101, -9, -8

S2SRO_SHOPLIFT: S2 SRO: Shoplifted - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [stole something from a store (shoplifted)] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1186	87.6 %
1	Yes	74	5.5 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1691-1694 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_SHOPLIFT_NUM: S2 SRO: Shoplift - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [stole something from a store (shoplifted)] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1186	87.6 %
1	-	16	1.2 %
2	-	13	1.0 %
3	-	6	0.4 %
4	-	7	0.5 %
5	-	5	0.4 %
7	-	2	0.1 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	3	0.2 %
12	-	1	0.1 %
13	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	2	0.1 %
20	-	5	0.4 %
25	-	2	0.1 %
50	-	5	0.4 %
75	-	1	0.1 %
80	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	3	0.2 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1695-1698 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S2SRO_SHOPLIFT_GROUP: S2 SRO: Shoplift - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [stole something from a store (shoplifted)].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	22	1.6 %
1	Yes	52	3.8 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1186	87.6 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 74 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1699-1702 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_BSTOLEN: S2 SRO: Bought/received/sold stolen property - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [bought, received, or sold something that you knew was stolen] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1084	80.1 %
1	Yes	176	13.0 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1703-1706 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_BSTOLEN_NUM: S2 SRO: Bought/received/sold stolen property - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [bought, received, or sold something that you knew was stolen] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1084	80.1 %
1	-	41	3.0 %
2	-	41	3.0 %
3	-	19	1.4 %
4	-	13	1.0 %
5	-	22	1.6 %
6	-	1	0.1 %
7	-	1	0.1 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	9	0.7 %
12	-	3	0.2 %
13	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	5	0.4 %
16	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	7	0.5 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	3	0.2 %
45	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	4	0.3 %
500	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-999	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,259 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1707-1710 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S2SRO_BSTOLEN_GROUP: S2 SRO: Bought/received/sold stolen property - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [bought, received, or sold something that you knew was stolen].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	78	5.8 %
1	Yes	98	7.2 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1084	80.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 176 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1711-1714 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_ILLCREDIT: S2 SRO: Used checks/credit cards illegally - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [used checks or credit cards illegally] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1243	91.8 %
1	Yes	17	1.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1715-1718 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_ILLCREDIT_NUM: S2 SRO: Used checks/credit cards illegally - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [used checks or credit cards illegally] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1243	91.8 %
1	-	6	0.4 %
2	-	3	0.2 %
4	-	5	0.4 %
9	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	2	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1719-1722 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S2SRO_ILLCREDIT_GROUP: S2 SRO: Used checks credit cards illegally - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [used checks or credit cards illegally].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	5	0.4 %
1	Yes	12	0.9 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1243	91.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 17 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1723-1726 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_STOLECAR: S2 SRO: Stolen car/motorcycle - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [stole a car or motorcycle to keep or sell] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1219	90.0 %
1	Yes	41	3.0 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1727-1730 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_STOLECAR_NUM: S2 SRO: Stole car/motorcycle - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [stole a car or motorcycle to keep or sell] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The

SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1219	90.0 %
1	-	13	1.0 %
2	-	10	0.7 %
3	-	2	0.1 %
4	-	5	0.4 %
5	-	2	0.1 %
6	-	1	0.1 %
9	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	1	0.1 %
12	-	1	0.1 %
13	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	1	0.1 %
200	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1731-1734 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S2SRO_STOLECAR_GROUP: S2 SRO: Stole car/motorcycle - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [stole a car or motorcycle to keep or sell].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure

the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	13	1.0 %
1	Yes	28	2.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1219	90.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

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

Location: 1735-1738 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_SOLDMAR: S2 SRO: Sold marijuana - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [sold marijuana] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1113	82.2 %
1	Yes	147	10.9 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1739-1742 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_SOLDMAR_NUM: S2 SRO: Sold marijuana - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [sold marijuana] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1113	82.2 %
1	-	13	1.0 %
2	-	9	0.7 %
3	-	7	0.5 %
4	-	5	0.4 %
5	-	7	0.5 %
6	-	4	0.3 %
7	-	2	0.1 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	9	0.7 %
13	-	1	0.1 %
14	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	4	0.3 %
18	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	1	0.1 %
21	-	1	0.1 %
24	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
25	-	3	0.2 %
28	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	5	0.4 %
35	-	2	0.1 %
40	-	6	0.4 %
48	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	8	0.6 %
57	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	3	0.2 %
70	-	1	0.1 %
75	-	1	0.1 %
80	-	2	0.1 %
90	-	4	0.3 %
100	-	7	0.5 %
120	-	1	0.1 %
180	-	3	0.2 %
200	-	5	0.4 %
210	-	1	0.1 %
300	-	2	0.1 %
400	-	1	0.1 %
500	-	1	0.1 %
600	-	1	0.1 %
700	-	1	0.1 %
800	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	6	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	10	0.7 %
-998	Refusal	2	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

Based upon 1,248 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1743-1746 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S2SRO_SOLDMAR_GROUP: S2 SRO: Sold marijuana - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [sold marijuana].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	68	5.0 %
1	Yes	77	5.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1113	82.2 %
-8	Refusal	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 145 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1747-1750 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_SOLDOTHDR: S2 SRO: Sold other illegal drugs - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [sold other illegal drugs (cocaine, crack, heroin)] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1127	83.2 %
1	Yes	133	9.8 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1751-1754 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_SOLDOTHDR_NUM: S2 SRO: Sold other illegal drugs - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [sold other illegal drugs (cocaine, crack, heroin)] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1127	83.2 %
1	-	7	0.5 %
2	-	11	0.8 %
3	-	2	0.1 %
4	-	4	0.3 %
5	-	2	0.1 %
6	-	3	0.2 %
7	-	6	0.4 %
8	-	3	0.2 %
10	-	13	1.0 %
14	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
15	-	2	0.1 %
20	-	4	0.3 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
28	-	2	0.1 %
30	-	6	0.4 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
48	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	3	0.2 %
57	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	5	0.4 %
61	-	1	0.1 %
80	-	2	0.1 %
85	-	1	0.1 %
90	-	4	0.3 %
100	-	11	0.8 %
112	-	1	0.1 %
120	-	2	0.1 %
150	-	1	0.1 %
180	-	3	0.2 %
200	-	2	0.1 %
225	-	1	0.1 %
300	-	4	0.3 %
400	-	1	0.1 %
500	-	1	0.1 %
600	-	2	0.1 %
800	-	1	0.1 %
970	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	9	0.7 %
-998	Refusal	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,250 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1755-1758 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S2SRO_SOLDOTHDR_GROUP: S2 SRO: Sold other illegal drugs - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [sold other illegal drugs (cocaine, crack, heroin)].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	53	3.9 %
1	Yes	79	5.8 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1127	83.2 %
-8	Refusal	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

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

Location: 1759-1762 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_CARJACK: S2 SRO: Carjacked someone - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [carjacked someone] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1248	92.2 %
1	Yes	12	0.9 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1763-1766 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_CARJACK_NUM: S2 SRO: Carjack someone - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [carjacked someone] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Measure: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1248	92.2 %
1	-	4	0.3 %
2	-	6	0.4 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1767-1770 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999, -998, -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101

S2SRO_CARJACK_GROUP: S2 SRO: Carjack someone - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [carjacked someone].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	5	0.4 %
1	Yes	7	0.5 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1248	92.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 12 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1771-1774 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101, -9, -8

S2SRO_CARJACK_GUN: S2 SRO: Carjack someone - Did you have a gun the last time

Whether the subject had a gun with them the last time they [carjacked someone].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up

questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	4	0.3 %
1	Yes	8	0.6 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1248	92.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 12 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1775-1778 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_DROVEDRUNK: S2 SRO: Drove drunk or high - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [driven while you were drunk or high] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1090	80.5 %
1	Yes	170	12.6 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1779-1782 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_DROVEDRUNK_NUM: S2 SRO: Drove drunk or high - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [driven while you were drunk or high] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1090	80.5 %
1	-	35	2.6 %
2	-	30	2.2 %
3	-	12	0.9 %
4	-	9	0.7 %
5	-	19	1.4 %
6	-	8	0.6 %
7	-	2	0.1 %
10	-	13	1.0 %
12	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	5	0.4 %
20	-	7	0.5 %
21	-	1	0.1 %
24	-	1	0.1 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	3	0.2 %
40	-	2	0.1 %
45	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	3	0.2 %
57	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	4	0.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
61	-	1	0.1 %
90	-	3	0.2 %
100	-	1	0.1 %
120	-	1	0.1 %
170	-	1	0.1 %
180	-	3	0.2 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	2	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,258 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1783-1786 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999, -998, -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101

S2SRO_DROVEDRUNK_GROUP: S2 SRO: Drove drunk or high - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [drove while you were drunk or high].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	45	3.3 %
1	Yes	124	9.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1090	80.5 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 169 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1787-1790 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_PAIDSEX: S2 SRO: Paid to have sexual relations - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [been paid by someone for having sexual relations with them] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1254	92.6 %
1	Yes	6	0.4 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1791-1794 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_PAIDSEX_NUM: S2 SRO: Paid to have sexual relations - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [been paid by someone for having sexual relations with them] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1254	92.6 %
1	-	3	0.2 %
3	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1795-1798 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999, -998, -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101

S2SRO_FORCEDEX: S2 SRO: Forced someone to have sex - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [forced someone to have sex with you] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

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

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

Location: 1799-1803 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

S2SRO_FORCEDSEX_NUM: S2 SRO: Forced sex - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [forced someone to have sex with you] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

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

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

Location: 1804-1808 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

S2SRO_FORCEDSEX_GROUP: S2 SRO: Forced sex - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [forced someone to have sex with you].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

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

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

Location: 1809-1813 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

S2SRO_FORCEDSEX_GUN: S2 SRO: Forced sex - Did you have a gun the last time

Whether the subject had a gun with them the last time they [forced someone to have sex with you].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

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

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

Location: 1814-1818 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

S2SRO_KILLED: S2 SRO: Killed someone - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [killed someone] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says

that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

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

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

Location: 1819-1823 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

S2SRO_KILLED_NUM: S2 SRO: Killed someone - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [killed someone] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

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

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

Location: 1824-1828 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

S2SRO_KILLED_GROUP: S2 SRO: Killed someone - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [killed someone].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier

instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

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

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1354	100.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,354 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1829-1833 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

S2SRO_KILLED_GUN: S2 SRO: Killed someone - Did you have a gun the last time

Whether the subject had a gun with them the last time they [killed someone].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
99999	Masked for Confidentiality	1354	100.0 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,354 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1834-1838 (width: 5; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

S2SRO_SHOT: S2 SRO: Shot someone (where bullet hit) - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [shot someone (where bullet hit the victim)] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1240	91.6 %
1	Yes	19	1.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-8	Refusal	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,259 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1839-1842 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_SHOT_NUM: S2 SRO: Shot someone (where bullet hit) - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [shot someone (where bullet hit the victim)] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1240	91.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	-	11	0.8 %
2	-	3	0.2 %
3	-	2	0.1 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
6	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,259 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1843-1846 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S2SRO_SHOT_GROUP: S2 SRO: Shot someone (where bullet hit) - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [shot someone (where bullet hit the victim)].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	8	0.6 %
1	Yes	11	0.8 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1241	91.7 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 19 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1847-1850 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_SHOTAT: S2 SRO: Shot at someone (pulled trigger) - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [shot AT someone (where you pulled the trigger)] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1210	89.4 %
1	Yes	50	3.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1851-1854 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_SHOTAT_NUM: S2 SRO: Shot at someone (pulled trigger) - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [shot AT someone (where you pulled the trigger)] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1210	89.4 %
1	-	18	1.3 %
2	-	10	0.7 %
3	-	9	0.7 %
4	-	2	0.1 %
5	-	3	0.2 %
6	-	2	0.1 %
10	-	3	0.2 %
16	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1855-1858 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S2SRO_SHOTAT_GROUP: S2 SRO: Shot at someone (pulled trigger) - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [shot AT someone (where you pulled the trigger)].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says

that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	12	0.9 %
1	Yes	38	2.8 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1210	89.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 50 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1859-1862 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_ROBWEAPON: S2 SRO: Robbery with weapon - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [took something from another person by force, using a weapon] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1209	89.3 %
1	Yes	51	3.8 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1863-1866 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_ROBWEAPON_NUM: S2 SRO: Robbery with weapon - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [took something from another person by force, using a weapon] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1209	89.3 %
1	-	17	1.3 %
2	-	13	1.0 %
3	-	7	0.5 %
4	-	2	0.1 %
5	-	1	0.1 %
6	-	1	0.1 %
7	-	2	0.1 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	3	0.2 %
20	-	2	0.1 %
60	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,259 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1867-1870 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S2SRO_ROBWEAPON_GROUP: S2 SRO: Robbery with weapon - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [took something from another person by force, using a weapon].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	8	0.6 %
1	Yes	43	3.2 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1209	89.3 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 51 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1871-1874 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_ROBWEAPON_GUN: S2 SRO: Robbery with weapon - Did you have a gun the last time

Whether the subject had a gun with them the last time they [took something from another person by force, using a weapon].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency,

and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	19	1.4 %
1	Yes	32	2.4 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1209	89.3 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 51 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1875-1878 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_ROBNOWEAPON: S2 SRO: Robbery no weapon - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [took something from another person by force, without a weapon] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1143	84.4 %
1	Yes	117	8.6 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1879-1882 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_ROBNOWEAPON_NUM: S2 SRO: Robbery no weapon - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [took something from another person by force, without a weapon] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1143	84.4 %
1	-	49	3.6 %
2	-	33	2.4 %
3	-	10	0.7 %
4	-	5	0.4 %
5	-	7	0.5 %
6	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	4	0.3 %
11	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	2	0.1 %
20	-	2	0.1 %
30	-	2	0.1 %
180	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1883-1886 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric
(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S2SRO_ROBNOWEAPON_GROUP: S2 SRO: Robbery no weapon - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [took something from another person by force, without a weapon].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	57	4.2 %
1	Yes	60	4.4 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1143	84.4 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 117 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1887-1890 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_BEATENUP: S2 SRO: Beaten up somebody badly needed doctor - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [beat up or physically attacked somebody so badly that they probably needed a doctor] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency,

and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1144	84.5 %
1	Yes	115	8.5 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-9	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,259 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1891-1894 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_BEATENUP_NUM: S2 SRO: Beaten up somebody badly needed doctor - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [beat up or physically attacked somebody so badly that they probably needed a doctor] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1144	84.5 %
1	-	86	6.4 %
2	-	9	0.7 %
3	-	11	0.8 %
4	-	4	0.3 %
5	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
7	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	1	0.1 %
12	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,259 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1895-1898 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S2SRO_BEATENUP_GROUP: S2 SRO: Beaten up somebody badly needed doctor - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [beat up or physically attacked somebody so badly that they probably needed a doctor].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	47	3.5 %
1	Yes	68	5.0 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1145	84.6 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 115 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1899-1902 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_INFIGHT: S2 SRO: Been in fight - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [been in a fight] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	763	56.4 %
1	Yes	497	36.7 %
-202	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1903-1906 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_INFIGHT_NUM: S2 SRO: Been in fight - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [been in a fight] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	763	56.4 %
1	-	216	16.0 %
2	-	103	7.6 %
3	-	61	4.5 %
4	-	30	2.2 %
5	-	32	2.4 %
6	-	16	1.2 %
7	-	4	0.3 %
8	-	11	0.8 %
9	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	7	0.5 %
12	-	2	0.1 %
15	-	4	0.3 %
20	-	1	0.1 %
25	-	4	0.3 %
30	-	1	0.1 %
31	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	1	0.1 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,259 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1907-1910 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999, -998, -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101

S2SRO_INFIGHT_GROUP: S2 SRO: Been in fight - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [were in a fight].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The

SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	218	16.1 %
1	Yes	279	20.6 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	763	56.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 497 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1911-1914 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_FIGHTGANG: S2 SRO: Fight part of gang - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [beat up, threatened, or physically attacked someone as part of a gang] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1179	87.1 %
1	Yes	81	6.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1915-1918 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_FIGHTGANG_NUM: S2 SRO: Fight part of gang - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [beat up, threatened, or physically attacked someone as part of a gang] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1179	87.1 %
1	-	23	1.7 %
2	-	19	1.4 %
3	-	13	1.0 %
4	-	6	0.4 %
5	-	7	0.5 %
6	-	2	0.1 %
7	-	2	0.1 %
10	-	3	0.2 %
12	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	1	0.1 %
25	-	1	0.1 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1919-1922 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999, -998, -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101

S2SRO_FIGHTGANG_GROUP: S2 SRO: Fight part of gang - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [beat up, threatened, or physically attacked someone as part of a gang].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	17	1.3 %
1	Yes	64	4.7 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1179	87.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 81 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1923-1926 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101, -9, -8

S2SRO_FIGHTGANG_GUN: S2 SRO: Fight part of gang - Did you have a gun the last time

Whether the subject had a gun with them the last time they [beat up, threatened,

or physically attacked someone as part of a gang].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	67	4.9 %
1	Yes	14	1.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1179	87.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 81 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1927-1930 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_CARRGUN: S2 SRO: Carried a gun - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [carried a gun] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1126	83.2 %
1	Yes	134	9.9 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1931-1934 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_CARRGUN_NUM: S2 SRO: Carried a gun - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [carried a gun] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1126	83.2 %
1	-	18	1.3 %
2	-	17	1.3 %
3	-	5	0.4 %
5	-	7	0.5 %
6	-	2	0.1 %
7	-	4	0.3 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	7	0.5 %
14	-	2	0.1 %
15	-	3	0.2 %
20	-	8	0.6 %
21	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
22	-	1	0.1 %
24	-	1	0.1 %
25	-	2	0.1 %
30	-	11	0.8 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	2	0.1 %
45	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	3	0.2 %
53	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	4	0.3 %
61	-	1	0.1 %
70	-	3	0.2 %
75	-	1	0.1 %
90	-	5	0.4 %
100	-	1	0.1 %
117	-	1	0.1 %
120	-	4	0.3 %
150	-	1	0.1 %
180	-	6	0.4 %
200	-	4	0.3 %
210	-	1	0.1 %
240	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-999	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,257 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1935-1938 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S2SRO_ENTCARSTEAL: S2 SRO: Broke into car to steal something - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [entered or broke into a car to steal something from it] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier

instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1194	88.2 %
1	Yes	66	4.9 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1939-1942 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_ENTCARSTEAL_NUM: S2 SRO: Broke into car to steal something - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [entered or broke into a car to steal something from it] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1194	88.2 %
1	-	20	1.5 %
2	-	13	1.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	-	4	0.3 %
4	-	3	0.2 %
5	-	6	0.4 %
6	-	2	0.1 %
7	-	2	0.1 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	6	0.4 %
12	-	1	0.1 %
15	-	2	0.1 %
20	-	3	0.2 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
100	-	1	0.1 %
500	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1943-1946 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S2SRO_ENTCARSTEAL_GROUP: S2 SRO: Broke into car to steal something - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [entered or broke into a car to steal something from it].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	17	1.3 %
1	Yes	49	3.6 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1194	88.2 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 66 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1947-1950 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_JOYRIDING: S2 SRO: Gone joy-riding (stole car to ride around) - recall period

Whether the subject engaged in [gone joy-riding (stole a car or motorcycle to ride around)] over the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1176	86.9 %
1	Yes	84	6.2 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1951-1954 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -9 , -8

S2SRO_JOYRIDING_NUM: S2 SRO: Gone joy riding - Number times in recall period

Frequency of [gone joy-riding (stole a car or motorcycle to ride around)] in the recall period.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1176	86.9 %
1	-	34	2.5 %
2	-	17	1.3 %
3	-	8	0.6 %
4	-	3	0.2 %
5	-	7	0.5 %
6	-	1	0.1 %
7	-	2	0.1 %
9	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	3	0.2 %
15	-	1	0.1 %
16	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	3	0.2 %
50	-	2	0.1 %
250	-	1	0.1 %
995	Maximum value permitted	0	0.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1955-1958 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -999 , -998 , -500 , -400 , -202 , -201 , -106 , -104 , -101

S2SRO_JOYRIDING_GROUP: S2 SRO: Gone joyriding - Was anyone with you the last time

Whether the subject was alone or if someone was with them the last time they [went joy-riding (stole a car or motorcycle to ride around)].

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	8	0.6 %
1	Yes	76	5.6 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-101	Skipped: Gate item is No	1176	86.9 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 84 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1959-1962 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500, -400, -202, -201, -106, -104, -101, -9, -8

S2SROPRV: S2 SRO: Total Offending Variety Proportion - Recall Period - recall period

Total Offending Variety Proportion Recall Period; A proportion score in which the numerator is the number of acts which were committed in the recall period and the denominator is the number of SRO questions answered.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added to the Pathways research battery after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. Every subject at the follow-up interviews will have responses for 'ever broke into a car to steal' while only some will have values for 'ever went joyriding'. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, it was decided that all SRO scores would be based on 22-items instead of the full, 24-item measure administered. Thus, although 24 items are administered for the vast proportion of the interviews, the calculation of the SRO score uses only 22 of these items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	613	45.3 %
0.05	-	271	20.0 %
0.09	-	115	8.5 %
0.14	-	58	4.3 %
0.18	-	55	4.1 %
0.23	-	37	2.7 %
0.27	-	27	2.0 %
0.32	-	25	1.8 %
0.36	-	19	1.4 %
0.38	-	1	0.1 %
0.41	-	8	0.6 %
0.45	-	13	1.0 %
0.50	-	5	0.4 %
0.55	-	2	0.1 %
0.59	-	3	0.2 %
0.68	-	3	0.2 %
0.73	-	1	0.1 %
0.76	-	1	0.1 %
0.77	-	2	0.1 %
0.82	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1963-1969 (*width:* 7; *decimal:* 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00

S2SRSEND: S2 SRO: Total Offending Variety Proportion - Recall Period - No Drug - recall period

Total Offending Variety Proportion No Drug-Recall Period; A proportion score calculated in the same way as the Total Offending Variety Proportion - Recall Period variable, except that the items included in the calculation exclude three drug-related offenses. The numerator is the number of acts endorsed and the denominator is the SRO items answered. Both numerator and denominator calculations are made using a set of items that excluded the three drug items.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added to the Pathways research battery after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. Every subject at the follow-up interviews will have responses for 'ever broke into a car to steal' while only some will have values for 'ever went joyriding'. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, it was decided that all SRO scores would be based on 22-items instead of the full, 24-item measure administered. Thus, although 24 items are administered for the vast proportion of the interviews, the calculation of the SRO score uses only 22 of these items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	651	48.1 %
0.05	-	286	21.1 %
0.11	-	115	8.5 %
0.16	-	66	4.9 %
0.21	-	51	3.8 %
0.26	-	23	1.7 %
0.32	-	24	1.8 %
0.37	-	12	0.9 %
0.39	-	1	0.1 %
0.42	-	13	1.0 %
0.47	-	6	0.4 %
0.53	-	3	0.2 %
0.58	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.63	-	1	0.1 %
0.68	-	2	0.1 %
0.72	-	1	0.1 %
0.74	-	2	0.1 %
0.79	-	2	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1970-1976 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00

S2SROFRQ: S2 SRO: Frequency of Offending - recall period - recall period

Frequency of Offending-Recall Period; Sum of the frequencies reported across 22 acts.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added to the Pathways research battery after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. Every subject at the follow-up interviews will have responses for 'ever broke into a car to steal' while only some will have values for 'ever went joyriding'. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, it was decided that all SRO scores would be based on 22-items instead of the full, 24-item measure administered. Thus, although 24 items are administered for the vast proportion of the interviews, the calculation of the SRO score uses only 22 of these items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	616	45.5 %
1	-	145	10.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2	-	83	6.1 %
3	-	38	2.8 %
4	-	30	2.2 %
5	-	36	2.7 %
6	-	15	1.1 %
7	-	15	1.1 %
8	-	15	1.1 %
9	-	14	1.0 %
10	-	9	0.7 %
11	-	12	0.9 %
12	-	2	0.1 %
13	-	4	0.3 %
14	-	10	0.7 %
15	-	6	0.4 %
16	-	8	0.6 %
17	-	3	0.2 %
18	-	4	0.3 %
19	-	2	0.1 %
20	-	7	0.5 %
21	-	4	0.3 %
22	-	3	0.2 %
23	-	2	0.1 %
24	-	3	0.2 %
25	-	2	0.1 %
26	-	2	0.1 %
27	-	2	0.1 %
28	-	4	0.3 %
29	-	2	0.1 %
30	-	5	0.4 %
31	-	4	0.3 %
32	-	4	0.3 %
33	-	5	0.4 %
35	-	1	0.1 %
36	-	2	0.1 %
39	-	2	0.1 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
41	-	1	0.1 %
42	-	2	0.1 %
44	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
45	-	1	0.1 %
46	-	1	0.1 %
47	-	2	0.1 %
48	-	2	0.1 %
49	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
51	-	1	0.1 %
52	-	1	0.1 %
53	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1977-1980 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

S2SROFRQND: S2 SRO: Frequency of Offending - recall - No Drug - recall period

Frequency of Offending-No Drug-Recall Period; Sum of the frequencies reported across 19 non-drug items.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added to the Pathways research battery after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. Every subject at the follow-up interviews will have responses for 'ever broke into a car to steal' while only some will have values for 'ever went joyriding'. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, it was decided that all SRO scores would be based on 22-items instead of the full, 24-item measure administered. Thus, although 24 items are administered for the vast proportion of the interviews, the calculation of the SRO score uses only 22 of these items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	652	48.2 %
1	-	153	11.3 %
2	-	92	6.8 %
3	-	43	3.2 %
4	-	36	2.7 %
5	-	37	2.7 %
6	-	24	1.8 %
7	-	15	1.1 %
8	-	16	1.2 %
9	-	12	0.9 %
10	-	13	1.0 %
11	-	5	0.4 %
12	-	4	0.3 %
13	-	4	0.3 %
14	-	8	0.6 %
15	-	4	0.3 %
16	-	7	0.5 %
17	-	6	0.4 %
18	-	4	0.3 %
19	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	5	0.4 %
21	-	3	0.2 %
22	-	3	0.2 %
23	-	3	0.2 %
24	-	6	0.4 %
25	-	3	0.2 %
26	-	5	0.4 %
27	-	1	0.1 %
28	-	2	0.1 %
29	-	2	0.1 %
30	-	2	0.1 %
31	-	6	0.4 %
32	-	2	0.1 %
33	-	2	0.1 %
34	-	3	0.2 %
35	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
36	-	1	0.1 %
37	-	2	0.1 %
38	-	1	0.1 %
39	-	3	0.2 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
41	-	4	0.3 %
43	-	2	0.1 %
44	-	1	0.1 %
52	-	2	0.1 %
54	-	1	0.1 %
55	-	2	0.1 %
57	-	1	0.1 %
61	-	1	0.1 %
63	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1981-1984 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

S2SROAGG: S2 SRO: Aggressive Offending Variety Proportion - Recall Period - recall period

Aggressive Offending Variety Proportion Recall Period; A proportion in which the numerator is the number of aggressive acts which were committed in the recall period and the denominator is the number of aggressive offense items which are not missing.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal")

were added to the Pathways research battery after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. Every subject at the follow-up interviews will have responses for 'ever broke into a car to steal' while only some will have values for 'ever went joyriding'. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, it was decided that all SRO scores would be based on 22-items instead of the full, 24-item measure administered. Thus, although 24 items are administered for the vast proportion of the interviews, the calculation of the SRO score uses only 22 of these items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	705	52.1 %
0.09	-	314	23.2 %
0.18	-	108	8.0 %
0.27	-	52	3.8 %
0.36	-	44	3.2 %
0.40	-	1	0.1 %
0.45	-	20	1.5 %
0.55	-	6	0.4 %
0.64	-	4	0.3 %
0.70	-	1	0.1 %
0.73	-	2	0.1 %
0.82	-	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	Partial Interview -data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1985-1991 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00

S2AGGFRQ: S2 SRO: Aggressive Offending Frequency - recall period - recall period

Aggressive Offending Frequency-Recall Period; Sum of the frequencies reported across the 11 aggressive offenses.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up

questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added to the Pathways research battery after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. Every subject at the follow-up interviews will have responses for 'ever broke into a car to steal' while only some will have values for 'ever went joyriding'. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, it was decided that all SRO scores would be based on 22-items instead of the full, 24-item measure administered. Thus, although 24 items are administered for the vast proportion of the interviews, the calculation of the SRO score uses only 22 of these items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	706	52.1 %
1	-	166	12.3 %
2	-	106	7.8 %
3	-	50	3.7 %
4	-	39	2.9 %
5	-	33	2.4 %
6	-	19	1.4 %
7	-	18	1.3 %
8	-	15	1.1 %
9	-	10	0.7 %
10	-	13	1.0 %
11	-	7	0.5 %
12	-	8	0.6 %
13	-	3	0.2 %
14	-	8	0.6 %
15	-	6	0.4 %
16	-	4	0.3 %
18	-	3	0.2 %
19	-	2	0.1 %
20	-	7	0.5 %
22	-	3	0.2 %
23	-	2	0.1 %
25	-	3	0.2 %
26	-	1	0.1 %
27	-	1	0.1 %
29	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
31	-	1	0.1 %
32	-	1	0.1 %
33	-	2	0.1 %
34	-	2	0.1 %
37	-	2	0.1 %
47	-	1	0.1 %
53	-	2	0.1 %
55	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	1	0.1 %
64	-	2	0.1 %
70	-	1	0.1 %
82	-	1	0.1 %
99	-	1	0.1 %
104	-	1	0.1 %
128	-	1	0.1 %
139	-	1	0.1 %
181	-	1	0.1 %
182	-	1	0.1 %
205	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1992-1995 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

S2SROINC: S2 SRO: Income Offending Variety Proportion - Recall Period - recall period

Income Offending Variety Proportion Recall Period; A proportion in which the numerator is the number of income offenses which were committed in the recall period and the denominator is the items which are considered income generating offenses that are not missing.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of

more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added to the Pathways research battery after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. Every subject at the follow-up interviews will have responses for 'ever broke into a car to steal' while only some will have values for 'ever went joyriding'. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, it was decided that all SRO scores would be based on 22-items instead of the full, 24-item measure administered. Thus, although 24 items are administered for the vast proportion of the interviews, the calculation of the SRO score uses only 22 of these items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.0	-	911	67.3 %
0.1	-	153	11.3 %
0.2	-	77	5.7 %
0.3	-	57	4.2 %
0.4	-	25	1.8 %
0.5	-	19	1.4 %
0.6	-	8	0.6 %
0.7	-	4	0.3 %
0.8	-	5	0.4 %
0.9	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.0	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 1996-2002 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500.0 , -300.0 , -202.0 , -201.0 , -100.0

S2SROIND: S2 SRO: Income Offending Variety Proportion - Recall Period - No Drug - recall period

Income Offending Variety Proportion No Drug-Recall Period; A proportion in which the numerator is the number of income offenses, exclusive of the 3 drug items, which were committed in the recall period and the denominator is the items which are non-drug related income generating offenses that are not missing.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added to the Pathways research battery after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. Every subject at the follow-up interviews will have responses for 'ever broke into a car to steal' while only some will have values for 'ever went joyriding'. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, it was decided that all SRO scores would be based on 22-items instead of the full, 24-item measure administered. Thus, although 24 items are administered for the vast proportion of the interviews, the calculation of the SRO score uses only 22 of these items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.00	-	985	72.7 %
0.13	-	150	11.1 %
0.25	-	62	4.6 %
0.38	-	32	2.4 %
0.50	-	17	1.3 %
0.63	-	5	0.4 %
0.75	-	8	0.6 %
0.88	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2003-2009 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00

S2INCFRQ: S2 SRO: Income Offending Frequency - recall period - recall period

Income Offending Frequency-Recall Period; Sum of the frequencies reported across the 10 income offenses.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added to the Pathways research battery after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. Every subject at the follow-up interviews will have responses for 'ever broke into a car to steal' while only some will have values for 'ever went joyriding'. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, it was decided that all SRO scores would be based on 22-items instead of the full, 24-item measure administered. Thus, although 24 items are administered for the vast proportion of the interviews, the calculation of the SRO score uses only 22 of these items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	919	67.9 %
1	-	57	4.2 %
2	-	31	2.3 %
3	-	20	1.5 %
4	-	8	0.6 %
5	-	18	1.3 %
6	-	11	0.8 %
7	-	12	0.9 %
8	-	8	0.6 %
9	-	6	0.4 %
10	-	10	0.7 %
11	-	3	0.2 %
12	-	2	0.1 %
13	-	3	0.2 %
14	-	3	0.2 %
15	-	4	0.3 %
16	-	3	0.2 %
17	-	2	0.1 %
18	-	3	0.2 %
20	-	5	0.4 %
21	-	3	0.2 %
22	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
23	-	1	0.1 %
24	-	3	0.2 %
25	-	3	0.2 %
26	-	2	0.1 %
28	-	2	0.1 %
30	-	6	0.4 %
31	-	3	0.2 %
33	-	2	0.1 %
34	-	1	0.1 %
38	-	1	0.1 %
39	-	1	0.1 %
40	-	1	0.1 %
44	-	1	0.1 %
45	-	1	0.1 %
46	-	1	0.1 %
47	-	2	0.1 %
49	-	1	0.1 %
50	-	4	0.3 %
52	-	2	0.1 %
53	-	1	0.1 %
54	-	2	0.1 %
55	-	1	0.1 %
56	-	1	0.1 %
57	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	2	0.1 %
64	-	1	0.1 %
67	-	1	0.1 %
68	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2010-2013 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

S2ICFQND: S2 SRO: Income Offending Frequency - recall - No Drug - recall period

Income Offending Frequency-No Drug-Recall Period; Sum of the frequencies reported across the 8 non-drug income offenses.

MEASURE: Self-Reported Offending (SRO)

The Self-Reported Offending (SRO) used in this study was an adaptation of earlier instruments of this sort (Huizinga, Esbensen, and Weihs, 1991) designed to measure the adolescent's account of involvement in antisocial and illegal activities. The SRO consists of 24-items which elicit subject involvement in different types of more serious criminal activity. When an item is endorsed (when the adolescent says that they engaged in that activity during the follow-up period), a set of follow-up questions are asked that collect more information regarding the frequency, recency, and situations surrounding the reported offense (e.g., "How many times have you done this in the [recall period]?").

Two of the 24 SRO-items ("ever went joyriding" and "ever broke into a car to steal") were added to the Pathways research battery after a large number of subjects had completed either baseline or six-month follow-up interviews. Every subject at the follow-up interviews will have responses for 'ever broke into a car to steal' while only some will have values for 'ever went joyriding'. The introduction of these items produced a large amount of missing data making the calculation of a consistently meaningful score difficult across all available time points. As a result, it was decided that all SRO scores would be based on 22-items instead of the full, 24-item measure administered. Thus, although 24 items are administered for the vast proportion of the interviews, the calculation of the SRO score uses only 22 of these items.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	985	72.7 %
1	-	59	4.4 %
2	-	43	3.2 %
3	-	28	2.1 %
4	-	11	0.8 %
5	-	25	1.8 %
6	-	14	1.0 %
7	-	12	0.9 %
8	-	7	0.5 %
9	-	3	0.2 %
10	-	10	0.7 %
11	-	2	0.1 %
13	-	3	0.2 %
14	-	2	0.1 %
15	-	5	0.4 %
16	-	2	0.1 %
17	-	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
18	-	4	0.3 %
19	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	5	0.4 %
22	-	1	0.1 %
23	-	2	0.1 %
24	-	3	0.2 %
25	-	2	0.1 %
26	-	1	0.1 %
29	-	1	0.1 %
30	-	2	0.1 %
31	-	1	0.1 %
34	-	1	0.1 %
37	-	1	0.1 %
47	-	2	0.1 %
50	-	1	0.1 %
51	-	2	0.1 %
52	-	2	0.1 %
53	-	1	0.1 %
61	-	1	0.1 %
74	-	1	0.1 %
76	-	1	0.1 %
79	-	1	0.1 %
89	-	1	0.1 %
91	-	1	0.1 %
101	-	1	0.1 %
105	-	1	0.1 %
108	-	1	0.1 %
121	-	1	0.1 %
180	-	1	0.1 %
190	-	1	0.1 %
205	-	1	0.1 %
857	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2014-2017 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -500 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -100

S2SCCLINT: S2 SocCap: Closure and Integration

Social Capital - Closure + Integration; mean of 8 items.

MEASURE: Social Capital

The Social Capital Inventory measures the connectedness an adolescent feels to his/her community (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). This concept is explored along three dimensions: intergenerational closure (e.g., "How many of the parents of your friends know your parents?"), social integration (e.g., "How many of your teachers do your parents know by name?"), and perceived opportunity for work (e.g. "Employers around here often hire young people from this neighborhood?"). The measure contains 19 items; however, only 13 are considered in scoring. Higher scores indicate greater degree of community connectedness.

- (1) None
- (2) A few
- (3) Many
- (4) Most

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information(www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	None	6	0.4 %
1.13	-	4	0.3 %
1.14	-	1	0.1 %
1.25	-	4	0.3 %
1.38	-	11	0.8 %
1.43	-	5	0.4 %
1.50	-	21	1.6 %
1.57	-	5	0.4 %
1.63	-	22	1.6 %
1.67	-	1	0.1 %
1.71	-	5	0.4 %
1.75	-	32	2.4 %
1.80	-	2	0.1 %
1.86	-	11	0.8 %
1.88	-	36	2.7 %
2.00	A Few	73	5.4 %
2.13	-	46	3.4 %
2.14	-	11	0.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.17	-	1	0.1 %
2.20	-	4	0.3 %
2.25	-	57	4.2 %
2.29	-	10	0.7 %
2.33	-	3	0.2 %
2.38	-	62	4.6 %
2.43	-	19	1.4 %
2.50	-	61	4.5 %
2.57	-	18	1.3 %
2.60	-	2	0.1 %
2.63	-	63	4.7 %
2.67	-	2	0.1 %
2.71	-	14	1.0 %
2.75	-	49	3.6 %
2.80	-	1	0.1 %
2.83	-	4	0.3 %
2.86	-	15	1.1 %
2.88	-	49	3.6 %
3.00	Many	54	4.0 %
3.13	-	27	2.0 %
3.14	-	9	0.7 %
3.17	-	3	0.2 %
3.25	-	20	1.5 %
3.29	-	5	0.4 %
3.33	-	2	0.1 %
3.38	-	11	0.8 %
3.43	-	3	0.2 %
3.50	-	10	0.7 %
3.57	-	1	0.1 %
3.60	-	1	0.1 %
3.63	-	6	0.4 %
3.71	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into SocCap measure	366	27.0 %
-97.00	NA	1	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 894 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2018-2024 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800.00 , -666.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -99.00 , -98.00 , -97.00

S2SOCAP2: S2 SocCap: Social Integration

Social Capital - Social integration; mean of 5 items.

MEASURE: Social Capital

The Social Capital Inventory measures the connectedness an adolescent feels to his/her community (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). This concept is explored along three dimensions: intergenerational closure (e.g., "How many of the parents of your friends know your parents?"), social integration (e.g., "How many of your teachers do your parents know by name?"), and perceived opportunity for work (e.g. "Employers around here often hire young people from this neighborhood?"). The measure contains 19 items; however, only 13 are considered in scoring. Higher scores indicate greater degree of community connectedness.

- (1) None/Never
- (2) A few/Rarely
- (3) Many/Sometimes
- (4) Most/Often

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information(www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	None	34	2.5 %
1.20	-	29	2.1 %
1.25	-	15	1.1 %
1.33	-	2	0.1 %
1.40	-	54	4.0 %
1.50	-	23	1.7 %
1.60	-	77	5.7 %
1.67	-	4	0.3 %
1.75	-	23	1.7 %
1.80	-	100	7.4 %
2.00	A Few	132	9.7 %
2.20	-	109	8.1 %
2.25	-	20	1.5 %
2.33	-	5	0.4 %
2.40	-	80	5.9 %
2.50	-	19	1.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
2.60	-	50	3.7 %
2.67	-	3	0.2 %
2.75	-	13	1.0 %
2.80	-	33	2.4 %
3.00	Many	26	1.9 %
3.20	-	16	1.2 %
3.25	-	1	0.1 %
3.33	-	1	0.1 %
3.40	-	10	0.7 %
3.50	-	2	0.1 %
3.60	-	2	0.1 %
3.75	-	1	0.1 %
3.80	-	1	0.1 %
4.00	Most	8	0.6 %
	Missing Data		
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into SocCap measure	366	27.0 %
-97.00	NA	2	0.1 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 893 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2025-2031 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800.00 , -666.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -99.00 , -98.00 , -97.00

S2SOCAP3: S2 SocCap: Perceived Opportunity for Work

Social Capital - Perceived opportunity for work; mean of 5 items.

MEASURE: Social Capital

The Social Capital Inventory measures the connectedness an adolescent feels to his/her community (Nagin and Paternoster, 1994). This concept is explored along three dimensions: intergenerational closure (e.g., "How many of the parents of your friends know your parents?"), social integration (e.g., "How many of your teachers do your parents know by name?"), and perceived opportunity for work (e.g. "Employers around here often hire young people from this neighborhood?"). The measure contains 19 items; however, only 13 are considered in scoring. Higher scores indicate greater degree of community connectedness.

- (1) Strongly Agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
- (4) Disagree

(5) Strongly Disagree

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information(www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	Strongly Disagree	9	0.7 %
1.20	-	4	0.3 %
1.40	-	4	0.3 %
1.60	-	4	0.3 %
1.80	-	5	0.4 %
2.00	Disagree	24	1.8 %
2.20	-	19	1.4 %
2.33	-	1	0.1 %
2.40	-	23	1.7 %
2.60	-	19	1.4 %
2.75	-	1	0.1 %
2.80	-	30	2.2 %
3.00	Neither Agree nor Disagree	79	5.8 %
3.20	-	63	4.7 %
3.33	-	2	0.1 %
3.40	-	62	4.6 %
3.50	-	1	0.1 %
3.60	-	114	8.4 %
3.75	-	2	0.1 %
3.80	-	98	7.2 %
4.00	Agree	238	17.6 %
4.20	-	30	2.2 %
4.25	-	1	0.1 %
4.33	-	1	0.1 %
4.40	-	15	1.1 %
4.60	-	12	0.9 %
4.80	-	11	0.8 %
5.00	Strongly Agree	18	1.3 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	1	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-100.00	Did not skip into SocCap measure	366	27.0 %
-9.00	Dont Know	3	0.2 %
-8.00	Refusal	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 890 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2032-2038 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800.00 , -666.00 , -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -100.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S2SUBUSE1: S2 SubUse: How often had alcohol to drink in recall period

How often have you had alcohol to drink in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	737	54.4 %
2	1-2 times	157	11.6 %
3	3-5 times	97	7.2 %
4	1X per month	47	3.5 %
5	2-3X per month	76	5.6 %
6	1X per week	47	3.5 %
7	2-3X per week	67	4.9 %
8	4-5X per week	23	1.7 %
9	Every day	9	0.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2039-2042 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S2SUBUSE2: S2 SubUse: Num alcoholic drinks usually consumed

When you drink, about how many drinks do you usually have (as defined as a 12 oz. Can of beer, glass of wine, shot of hard liquor either alone or in a mixed drink)?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	737	54.4 %
1	-	64	4.7 %
2	-	88	6.5 %
3	-	66	4.9 %
4	-	46	3.4 %
5	-	45	3.3 %
6	-	54	4.0 %
7	-	27	2.0 %
8	-	19	1.4 %
9	-	9	0.7 %
10	-	20	1.5 %
11	-	1	0.1 %
12	-	33	2.4 %
13	-	3	0.2 %
15	-	14	1.0 %
16	-	4	0.3 %
17	-	1	0.1 %
18	-	5	0.4 %
20	-	11	0.8 %
24	-	4	0.3 %
30	-	2	0.1 %
36	-	1	0.1 %
60	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-99	Dont know	5	0.4 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,255 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2043-2046 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -101 , -99 , -98

S2SUBUSE3: S2 SubUse: How often had 5+ drinks at one time in recall period

How often did you have five or more drinks at one time in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	928	68.5 %
2	1-2 times	111	8.2 %
3	3-5 times	46	3.4 %
4	1X per month	30	2.2 %
5	2-3X per month	44	3.2 %
6	1X per week	35	2.6 %
7	2-3X per week	39	2.9 %
8	4-5X per week	21	1.6 %
9	Every day	6	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2047-2050 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S2SUBUSE4: S2 SubUse: Num times been drunk on alcohol during recall period

How many times have you been drunk in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	901	66.5 %
2	1-2 times	133	9.8 %
3	3-5 times	87	6.4 %
4	1X per month	30	2.2 %
5	2-3X per month	38	2.8 %
6	1X per week	26	1.9 %
7	2-3X per week	32	2.4 %
8	4-5X per week	11	0.8 %
9	Every day	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2051-2054 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S2SUBUSE6: S2 SubUse: Num times used marijuana/hashish during recall period

How many times did you use marijuana or hashish in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	848	62.6 %
2	1-2 times	86	6.4 %
3	3-5 times	49	3.6 %
4	1X per month	26	1.9 %
5	2-3X per month	37	2.7 %
6	1X per week	26	1.9 %
7	2-3X per week	49	3.6 %
8	4-5X per week	37	2.7 %
9	Every day	100	7.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-99	Dont know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,258 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2055-2058 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S2SUBUSE8: S2 SubUse: Num times used sedative/tranquilizers during recall period

How many times have you used sedatives or tranquilizers in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of

illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1193	88.1 %
2	1-2 times	23	1.7 %
3	3-5 times	10	0.7 %
4	1X per month	9	0.7 %
5	2-3X per month	6	0.4 %
6	1X per week	5	0.4 %
7	2-3X per week	9	0.7 %
8	4-5X per week	2	0.1 %
9	Every day	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2059-2062 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S2SUBUSE10: S2 SubUse: Num times used stimulants/amphetamines during recall period

How many times have you used stimulants or amphetamines in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1189	87.8 %
2	1-2 times	19	1.4 %
3	3-5 times	9	0.7 %
4	1X per month	6	0.4 %
5	2-3X per month	8	0.6 %
6	1X per week	1	0.1 %
7	2-3X per week	8	0.6 %
8	4-5X per week	11	0.8 %
9	Every day	9	0.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2063-2066 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S2SUBUSE12: S2 SubUse: Num times used cocaine during recall period

How many times have you used cocaine (including powder, crack, free base, cocoa leaves, or paste) in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1202	88.8 %
2	1-2 times	23	1.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3	3-5 times	7	0.5 %
4	1X per month	4	0.3 %
5	2-3X per month	6	0.4 %
6	1X per week	5	0.4 %
7	2-3X per week	7	0.5 %
8	4-5X per week	2	0.1 %
9	Every day	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2067-2070 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S2SUBUSE14: S2 SubUse: Num times used opiates during recall period

How many times have you used opiates in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1238	91.4 %
2	1-2 times	7	0.5 %
3	3-5 times	4	0.3 %
4	1X per month	1	0.1 %
5	2-3X per month	2	0.1 %
6	1X per week	0	0.0 %
7	2-3X per week	3	0.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
8	4-5X per week	3	0.2 %
9	Every day	2	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2071-2074 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S2SUBUSE16: S2 SubUse: Num times used ecstasy during recall period

How many times have you used ecstasy in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1228	90.7 %
2	1-2 times	15	1.1 %
3	3-5 times	6	0.4 %
4	1X per month	5	0.4 %
5	2-3X per month	3	0.2 %
6	1X per week	0	0.0 %
7	2-3X per week	0	0.0 %
8	4-5X per week	1	0.1 %
9	Every day	2	0.1 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2075-2078 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S2SUBUSE18: S2 SubUse: Num times used hallucinogens during recall period

How many times have you used hallucinogens to get high in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1196	88.3 %
2	1-2 times	32	2.4 %
3	3-5 times	15	1.1 %
4	1X per month	4	0.3 %
5	2-3X per month	7	0.5 %
6	1X per week	2	0.1 %
7	2-3X per week	1	0.1 %
8	4-5X per week	1	0.1 %
9	Every day	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2079-2082 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S2SUBUSE20: S2 SubUse: Num times used inhalants during recall period

How many times have you used inhalants to get high in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1239	91.5 %
2	1-2 times	8	0.6 %
3	3-5 times	4	0.3 %
4	1X per month	2	0.1 %
5	2-3X per month	4	0.3 %
6	1X per week	0	0.0 %
7	2-3X per week	1	0.1 %
8	4-5X per week	0	0.0 %
9	Every day	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2083-2086 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S2SUBUSE22: S2 SubUse: Num times used amyl nitrate/odorizers/rush during recall period

How many times have you used amyl nitrate, odorizers, or rush to get high in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance

use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1249	92.2 %
2	1-2 times	3	0.2 %
3	3-5 times	1	0.1 %
4	1X per month	1	0.1 %
5	2-3X per month	4	0.3 %
6	1X per week	0	0.0 %
7	2-3X per week	0	0.0 %
8	4-5X per week	0	0.0 %
9	Every day	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2087-2090 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S2SUBUSE24: S2 SubUse: Used other drugs during recall period [Y/N]

Have you used any other drugs in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your

mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?"") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1256	92.8 %
1	Yes	4	0.3 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2091-2094 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -108 , -107 , -106 , -104 , -103 , -9 , -8

S2SUBUSE26: S2 SubUse: Num times used other drugs during recall period

How many times did you use these other drugs in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	1256	92.8 %
2	1-2 times	1	0.1 %
3	3-5 times	2	0.1 %
4	1X per month	0	0.0 %
5	2-3X per month	1	0.1 %
6	1X per week	0	0.0 %
7	2-3X per week	0	0.0 %
8	4-5X per week	0	0.0 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
9	Every day	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2095-2098 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S2SUBUSE28: S2 SubUse: Num times abused prescribed medications (own or someone else) during recall period

How many times have you abused prescribed medications (own or someone else) in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	0	0.0 %
2	1-2 times	3	0.2 %
3	3-5 times	1	0.1 %
4	1X per month	0	0.0 %
5	2-3X per month	0	0.0 %
6	1X per week	0	0.0 %
7	2-3X per week	0	0.0 %
8	4-5X per week	0	0.0 %
9	Every day	0	0.0 %
	Missing Data		
-800	Question not asked for this subject	1256	92.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 4 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2099-2102 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S2SUBUSE30: S2 SubUse: Num times smoked cigarettes during recall period

How often have you smoked cigarettes in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not at all	650	48.0 %
2	1-2 times	56	4.1 %
3	3-5 times	45	3.3 %
4	1X per month	19	1.4 %
5	2-3X per month	36	2.7 %
6	1X per week	19	1.4 %
7	2-3X per week	46	3.4 %
8	4-5X per week	44	3.2 %
9	Every day	342	25.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-99	Dont know	3	0.2 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,257 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2103-2106 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -800 , -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -102 , -101 , -99 , -98

S2SUBUSE31: S2 SubUse: Num cigarettes smoke per day during recall period

How many cigarettes did you smoke in a typical day in the recall period?

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	0 cigarettes	668	49.3 %
2	1-4 cigarettes	261	19.3 %
3	5-9 cigarettes	127	9.4 %
4	10-15 cigarettes	98	7.2 %
5	16-20 cigarettes	76	5.6 %
6	More than a pack a day cigarettes	28	2.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
-9	Dont know	2	0.1 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,258 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2107-2110 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201 , -110 , -109 , -105 , -9 , -8

S2QFBRMO: S2 SubUse: Quant/freq used beer/wine/liquor - recall period

Quantity/Frequency of alcohol use - recall period; Frequency times quantity.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	737	54.4 %
1	-	45	3.3 %
2	-	46	3.4 %
3	-	21	1.6 %
4	-	31	2.3 %
5	-	9	0.7 %
6	-	38	2.8 %
7	-	5	0.4 %
8	-	26	1.9 %
9	-	9	0.7 %
10	-	20	1.5 %
12	-	35	2.6 %
13	-	2	0.1 %
14	-	3	0.2 %
15	-	13	1.0 %
16	-	9	0.7 %
18	-	16	1.2 %
20	-	21	1.6 %
21	-	3	0.2 %
22	-	1	0.1 %
24	-	23	1.7 %
25	-	6	0.4 %
28	-	5	0.4 %
30	-	11	0.8 %
32	-	4	0.3 %
35	-	7	0.5 %
36	-	13	1.0 %
40	-	12	0.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
42	-	9	0.7 %
45	-	3	0.2 %
48	-	15	1.1 %
54	-	4	0.3 %
56	-	2	0.1 %
60	-	11	0.8 %
63	-	1	0.1 %
68	-	1	0.1 %
72	-	7	0.5 %
75	-	3	0.2 %
78	-	1	0.1 %
80	-	2	0.1 %
84	-	6	0.4 %
90	-	2	0.1 %
96	-	2	0.1 %
105	-	1	0.1 %
112	-	1	0.1 %
120	-	1	0.1 %
140	-	4	0.3 %
144	-	1	0.1 %
150	-	1	0.1 %
160	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-300	Too few answers for computation	5	0.4 %
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,255 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2111-2114 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S26MOUSE: S2 SubUse: Number drugs used - recall period

Number of drugs used in the recall period; Count of endorsed items.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance

use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	816	60.3 %
1	-	290	21.4 %
2	-	77	5.7 %
3	-	39	2.9 %
4	-	16	1.2 %
5	-	12	0.9 %
6	-	3	0.2 %
7	-	3	0.2 %
9	-	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2115-2118 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300 , -202 , -201 , -100 , -9 , -8

S2QFSMK6: S2 SubUse: Quant/freq used cigarettes - recall period

Quantity/Frequency of cigarette use in the recall period.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your

mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?"") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0.0	-	668	49.3 %
2.5	-	37	2.7 %
5.0	-	30	2.2 %
7.0	-	2	0.1 %
7.5	-	16	1.2 %
10.0	-	20	1.5 %
12.5	-	16	1.2 %
14.0	-	6	0.4 %
15.0	-	34	2.5 %
17.5	-	24	1.8 %
18.0	-	4	0.3 %
20.0	-	87	6.4 %
21.0	-	1	0.1 %
25.0	-	3	0.2 %
28.0	-	6	0.4 %
35.0	-	2	0.1 %
36.0	-	1	0.1 %
40.0	-	2	0.1 %
42.0	-	7	0.5 %
49.0	-	6	0.4 %
50.0	-	4	0.3 %
54.0	-	1	0.1 %
56.0	-	97	7.2 %
62.5	-	1	0.1 %
72.0	-	3	0.2 %
75.0	-	1	0.1 %
80.0	-	2	0.1 %
87.5	-	9	0.7 %
90.0	-	1	0.1 %
100.0	-	78	5.8 %
108.0	-	2	0.1 %
126.0	-	3	0.2 %
140.0	-	1	0.1 %
144.0	-	60	4.4 %
160.0	-	21	1.6 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-300.0	Too few answers for computation	4	0.3 %
-202.0	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.0	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,256 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2119-2125 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.0 , -202.0 , -201.0 , -100.0 , -9.0 , -8.0

S2A6SC2: S2 SubUse: Recall period alcohol consequences

Recall period Alcohol Consequences; Count of social consequences in the recall period attributed to alcohol.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1030	76.1 %
1	-	79	5.8 %
2	-	44	3.2 %
3	-	31	2.3 %
4	-	27	2.0 %
5	-	17	1.3 %
6	-	16	1.2 %
7	-	8	0.6 %
8	-	3	0.2 %
9	-	2	0.1 %
10	-	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2126-2129 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -202 , -201

S2D6SC2: S2 SubUse: Recall period drug consequences

Recall period Drug Consequences; Count of social consequences in the recall period and attributed to drugs.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1030	76.1 %
1	-	58	4.3 %
2	-	46	3.4 %
3	-	32	2.4 %
4	-	21	1.6 %
5	-	21	1.6 %
6	-	18	1.3 %
7	-	10	0.7 %
8	-	6	0.4 %
9	-	4	0.3 %
10	-	4	0.3 %
11	-	3	0.2 %
12	-	3	0.2 %
13	-	3	0.2 %
15	-	1	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2130-2133 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201

S2A6DP2: S2 SubUse: Recall period alcohol dependence symptoms

Recall period Alcohol Dependence Symptoms; Count of symptoms in the recall period attributed to alcohol use.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1127	83.2 %
1	-	62	4.6 %
2	-	34	2.5 %
3	-	17	1.3 %
4	-	6	0.4 %
5	-	6	0.4 %
6	-	3	0.2 %
8	-	1	0.1 %
9	-	1	0.1 %
10	-	3	0.2 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2134-2137 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201

S2D6DP2: S2 SubUse: Recall period drug dependence symptoms

Recall period Drug Dependence Symptoms; Count of symptoms in the recall period attributed to drug use.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1073	79.2 %
1	-	71	5.2 %
2	-	27	2.0 %
3	-	28	2.1 %
4	-	15	1.1 %
5	-	13	1.0 %
6	-	8	0.6 %
7	-	4	0.3 %
8	-	7	0.5 %
9	-	10	0.7 %
10	-	4	0.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2138-2141 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201

S2TOTSC6: S2 SubUse: Recall period total substance use consequences

Recall period Total Substance Use Consequences; Count of consequences in the recall period attributed to either drugs or alcohol.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	925	68.3 %
1	-	92	6.8 %
2	-	64	4.7 %
3	-	42	3.1 %
4	-	34	2.5 %
5	-	25	1.8 %
6	-	23	1.7 %
7	-	18	1.3 %
8	-	11	0.8 %
9	-	6	0.4 %
10	-	6	0.4 %
11	-	6	0.4 %
12	-	4	0.3 %
13	-	3	0.2 %
15	-	1	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2142-2145 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201

S2TOTDS6: S2 SubUse: Recall period total substance use dependency symp

Recall period Total Substance Use Dependency Symptoms; Count of dependency symptoms attributed to drugs or alcohol that have occurred in the recall period.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	1022	75.5 %
1	-	83	6.1 %
2	-	48	3.5 %
3	-	32	2.4 %
4	-	21	1.6 %
5	-	16	1.2 %
6	-	11	0.8 %
7	-	4	0.3 %
8	-	6	0.4 %
9	-	10	0.7 %
10	-	7	0.5 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2146-2149 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201

S2ALTRTM: S2 SubUse: Recall period alcohol treatment

Recall period Alcohol Treatment.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1216	89.8 %
1	Yes	44	3.2 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2150-2153 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201

S2DGTRTM: S2 SubUse: Recall period drug treatment

Recall period Drug Treatment.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1194	88.2 %
1	Yes	66	4.9 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2154-2157 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201

S2TRTM: S2 SubUse: Recall period alcohol or drug treatment

Recall period Alcohol or Drug Treatment.

MEASURE: Substance Abuse

The Substance Use/Abuse Inventory is a modified version of a substance use measure developed by Chassin et al., 1991 for use in a study of children of alcoholics. This measure considers the adolescent's use of illegal drugs and alcohol over the recall period. The self-report measure is comprised of the following subscales: Substance Use (e.g., "How often have you had alcohol to drink?") and Social Consequences, Dependency and Treatment (e.g., "Have you had problems or arguments with family or friends before because of your alcohol or drug use?" / "Have you wanted a drink or drugs so badly that you could not think of about anything else?"). In addition, Parental Substance Use (e.g., "Has your mother gotten into trouble at work because of drinking?") is assessed.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	1175	86.8 %
1	Yes	85	6.3 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
	Total	1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2158-2161 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -202 , -201

S2TCO1: S2 TCO: Past 7 days mind dominated by forces beyond control

During the past seven days (including today) . . . how often have you felt that your mind was dominated by forces beyond your control?

MEASURE: Threat Control Override (TCO)

The Threat/Control Override Psychotic Symptoms Scale (TCO; Link, Stueve, and Phelan, 1998) is used to measure the presence of three specific psychotic-like symptoms that have been found to have an association with violence in prior research of the link between mental illness and violence. Items from the measure assess the belief that others are seeking to do the adolescent harm, or that outside forces are in control of the adolescent's mind. The adolescent responds to these three items on a 5-point likert scale ranging from "Never" to "Very Often," with higher scores indicating greater delusional symptoms.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	1174	86.7 %
2	Almost never	36	2.7 %
3	Sometimes	37	2.7 %
4	Often	8	0.6 %
5	Very often	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2162-2165 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S2TCO2: S2 TCO: Past 7 days how often thoughts in head not own

During the past seven days (including today) . . . how often have you felt that thoughts were put into your head that were not your own?

MEASURE: Threat Control Override (TCO)

The Threat/Control Override Psychotic Symptoms Scale (TCO; Link, Stueve, and Phelan, 1998) is used to measure the presence of three specific psychotic-like symptoms that have been found to have an association with violence in prior research of the link between mental illness and violence. Items from the measure assess the belief that others are seeking to do the adolescent harm, or that outside forces are in control of the adolescent's mind. The adolescent responds to these three items on a 5-point likert scale ranging from "Never" to "Very Often," with

higher scores indicating greater delusional symptoms.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	1170	86.4 %
2	Almost never	43	3.2 %
3	Sometimes	29	2.1 %
4	Often	11	0.8 %
5	Very often	7	0.5 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2166-2169 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S2TCO3: S2 TCO: Past 7 days how often people wished you to do harm

During the past seven days (including today) . . . how often have you felt that there were people who wished to do you harm?

MEASURE: Threat Control Override (TCO)

The Threat/Control Override Psychotic Symptoms Scale (TCO; Link, Stueve, and Phelan, 1998) is used to measure the presence of three specific psychotic-like symptoms that have been found to have an association with violence in prior research of the link between mental illness and violence. Items from the measure assess the belief that others are seeking to do the adolescent harm, or that outside forces are in control of the adolescent's mind. The adolescent responds to these three items on a 5-point likert scale ranging from "Never" to "Very Often," with higher scores indicating greater delusional symptoms.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Never	998	73.7 %
2	Almost never	77	5.7 %
3	Sometimes	111	8.2 %
4	Often	44	3.2 %
5	Very often	30	2.2 %
Missing Data			

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2170-2173 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S2TCOCNT: S2 TCO: Count based on 3 variables

Count of the number of items endorsed at a level higher than "never"..

MEASURE: Threat Control Override (TCO)

The Threat/Control Override Psychotic Symptoms Scale (TCO; Link, Stueve, and Phelan, 1998) is used to measure the presence of three specific psychotic-like symptoms that have been found to have an association with violence in prior research of the link between mental illness and violence. Items from the measure assess the belief that others are seeking to do the adolescent harm, or that outside forces are in control of the adolescent's mind. The adolescent responds to these three items on a 5-point likert scale ranging from "Never" to "Very Often," with higher scores indicating greater delusional symptoms.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	-	957	70.7 %
1	-	217	16.0 %
2	-	37	2.7 %
3	-	49	3.6 %
	Missing Data		
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2174-2177 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S2IMPULS: S2 WAI: Impulse Control

Impulse control; the mean of 8 items which comprise the scale. Seven of the eight items are reverse coded.

MEASURE: Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI)

The Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI; Weinberger and Schwartz, 1990) is an assessment of an individual's social-emotional adjustment within the context of external constraints. There are 4 subscales: Impulse control (e.g., "I say the first thing that comes into my mind without thinking enough about it".), suppression of aggression (e.g. "People who get me angry better watch out")., consideration of others (e.g., "Doing things to help other people is more important to me than almost anything else".) and temperance. The measure asks participants to rank how much (1=False to 5=True) their behavior in the past six months matches a series of statements. Higher scores on each of the subscales delineated below indicate more positive behavior (i.e. more impulse control, greater temperance and greater consideration for others).

- (1) False
- (2) Somewhat False
- (3) Not Sure
- (4) Somewhat True
- (5) True

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	False	7	0.5 %
1.13	-	8	0.6 %
1.25	-	8	0.6 %
1.38	-	13	1.0 %
1.50	-	22	1.6 %
1.63	-	15	1.1 %
1.75	-	19	1.4 %
1.88	-	17	1.3 %
2.00	Somewhat False	52	3.8 %
2.13	-	43	3.2 %
2.25	-	44	3.2 %
2.38	-	41	3.0 %
2.50	-	53	3.9 %
2.63	-	56	4.1 %
2.75	-	51	3.8 %
2.86	-	1	0.1 %
2.88	-	52	3.8 %
3.00	Not sure	70	5.2 %
3.13	-	53	3.9 %
3.25	-	53	3.9 %
3.38	-	60	4.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.50	-	70	5.2 %
3.63	-	40	3.0 %
3.75	-	46	3.4 %
3.88	-	50	3.7 %
4.00	Somewhat True	64	4.7 %
4.13	-	42	3.1 %
4.25	-	23	1.7 %
4.38	-	29	2.1 %
4.50	-	40	3.0 %
4.63	-	28	2.1 %
4.75	-	18	1.3 %
4.88	-	25	1.8 %
5.00	True	47	3.5 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2178-2184 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S2SUPAGG: S2 WAI: Suppression of Aggression

Suppression of aggression; the mean of 7 items which comprise the score.
Each item is reverse scored.

MEASURE: Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI)

The Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI; Weinberger and Schwartz, 1990) is an assessment of an individual's social-emotional adjustment within the context of external constraints. There are 4 subscales: Impulse control (e.g., "I say the first thing that comes into my mind without thinking enough about it".), suppression of aggression (e.g. "People who get me angry better watch out".), consideration of others (e.g., "Doing things to help other people is more important to me than almost anything else".) and temperance. The measure asks participants to rank how much (1=False to 5=True) their behavior in the past six months matches a series of statements. Higher scores on each of the subscales delineated below indicate more positive behavior (i.e. more impulse control, greater temperance and greater consideration for others).

- (1) False
- (2) Somewhat False
- (3) Not Sure

(4) Somewhat True

(5) True

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	False	23	1.7 %
1.14	-	20	1.5 %
1.29	-	12	0.9 %
1.43	-	21	1.6 %
1.57	-	36	2.7 %
1.71	-	39	2.9 %
1.86	-	44	3.2 %
2.00	Somewhat False	53	3.9 %
2.14	-	68	5.0 %
2.29	-	66	4.9 %
2.43	-	78	5.8 %
2.57	-	63	4.7 %
2.71	-	79	5.8 %
2.86	-	74	5.5 %
3.00	Not sure	56	4.1 %
3.14	-	57	4.2 %
3.29	-	76	5.6 %
3.43	-	50	3.7 %
3.57	-	54	4.0 %
3.71	-	44	3.2 %
3.86	-	55	4.1 %
4.00	Somewhat True	27	2.0 %
4.14	-	35	2.6 %
4.29	-	15	1.1 %
4.43	-	54	4.0 %
4.57	-	18	1.3 %
4.71	-	9	0.7 %
4.86	-	8	0.6 %
5.00	True	26	1.9 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2185-2191 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S2CONSID: S2 WAI: Consideration of Others

Consideration of others; the mean of 7 items which comprise the score.

MEASURE: Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI)

The Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI; Weinberger and Schwartz, 1990) is an assessment of an individual's social-emotional adjustment within the context of external constraints. There are 4 subscales: Impulse control (e.g., "I say the first thing that comes into my mind without thinking enough about it".), suppression of aggression (e.g. "People who get me angry better watch out".), consideration of others (e.g., "Doing things to help other people is more important to me than almost anything else".) and temperance. The measure asks participants to rank how much (1=False to 5=True) their behavior in the past six months matches a series of statements. Higher scores on each of the subscales delineated below indicate more positive behavior (i.e. more impulse control, greater temperance and greater consideration for others).

- (1) False
- (2) Somewhat False
- (3) Not Sure
- (4) Somewhat True
- (5) True

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	False	4	0.3 %
1.14	-	5	0.4 %
1.29	-	4	0.3 %
1.43	-	4	0.3 %
1.57	-	9	0.7 %
1.71	-	6	0.4 %
1.86	-	10	0.7 %
2.00	Somewhat False	15	1.1 %
2.14	-	30	2.2 %
2.29	-	20	1.5 %
2.43	-	35	2.6 %
2.57	-	35	2.6 %
2.71	-	52	3.8 %
2.86	-	43	3.2 %
3.00	Not sure	62	4.6 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.14	-	79	5.8 %
3.29	-	87	6.4 %
3.43	-	82	6.1 %
3.57	-	59	4.4 %
3.71	-	86	6.4 %
3.86	-	84	6.2 %
4.00	Somewhat True	103	7.6 %
4.14	-	66	4.9 %
4.29	-	63	4.7 %
4.43	-	81	6.0 %
4.57	-	37	2.7 %
4.71	-	36	2.7 %
4.86	-	26	1.9 %
5.00	True	37	2.7 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2192-2198 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S2TEMPER: S2 WAI: Temperance

Temperance score; calculated by combining the 15 items from the impulse control and suppression of aggression subscales. The score represents the mean of these 15 items.

MEASURE: Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI)

The Weinberger Adjustment Inventory (WAI; Weinberger and Schwartz, 1990) is an assessment of an individual's social-emotional adjustment within the context of external constraints. There are 4 subscales: Impulse control (e.g., "I say the first thing that comes into my mind without thinking enough about it".), suppression of aggression (e.g. "People who get me angry better watch out".), consideration of others (e.g., "Doing things to help other people is more important to me than almost anything else".) and temperance. The measure asks participants to rank how much (1=False to 5=True) their behavior in the past six months matches a series of statements. Higher scores on each of the subscales delineated below indicate more positive behavior (i.e. more impulse control, greater temperance and greater consideration for others).

(1) False

- (2) Somewhat False
- (3) Not Sure
- (4) Somewhat True
- (5) True

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1.00	False	0	0.0 %
1.07	-	2	0.1 %
1.13	-	6	0.4 %
1.27	-	7	0.5 %
1.33	-	6	0.4 %
1.40	-	2	0.1 %
1.47	-	8	0.6 %
1.53	-	11	0.8 %
1.60	-	9	0.7 %
1.67	-	8	0.6 %
1.73	-	12	0.9 %
1.80	-	22	1.6 %
1.87	-	18	1.3 %
1.93	-	24	1.8 %
2.00	Somewhat False	10	0.7 %
2.07	-	20	1.5 %
2.13	-	23	1.7 %
2.20	-	22	1.6 %
2.27	-	20	1.5 %
2.33	-	39	2.9 %
2.40	-	28	2.1 %
2.47	-	37	2.7 %
2.53	-	28	2.1 %
2.60	-	44	3.2 %
2.67	-	35	2.6 %
2.73	-	28	2.1 %
2.80	-	38	2.8 %
2.86	-	1	0.1 %
2.87	-	44	3.2 %
2.93	-	33	2.4 %
3.00	Not sure	41	3.0 %
3.07	-	27	2.0 %
3.13	-	39	2.9 %
3.20	-	42	3.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
3.27	-	34	2.5 %
3.33	-	36	2.7 %
3.40	-	43	3.2 %
3.47	-	28	2.1 %
3.53	-	32	2.4 %
3.60	-	22	1.6 %
3.67	-	36	2.7 %
3.73	-	27	2.0 %
3.80	-	13	1.0 %
3.87	-	21	1.6 %
3.93	-	36	2.7 %
4.00	Somewhat True	24	1.8 %
4.07	-	22	1.6 %
4.13	-	18	1.3 %
4.20	-	27	2.0 %
4.27	-	9	0.7 %
Missing Data			
-202.00	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201.00	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2199-2205 (width: 7; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -300.00 , -202.00 , -201.00 , -9.00 , -8.00

S2CHARM: S2 YPI: Dishonest Charm

The sum of the 5 items contained in the dishonest charm subscale.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking

(e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	177	13.1 %
6	-	83	6.1 %
7	-	93	6.9 %
8	-	101	7.5 %
9	-	89	6.6 %
10	-	168	12.4 %
11	-	134	9.9 %
12	-	97	7.2 %
13	-	87	6.4 %
14	-	73	5.4 %
15	-	55	4.1 %
16	-	31	2.3 %
17	-	27	2.0 %
18	-	10	0.7 %
19	-	13	1.0 %
20	-	21	1.6 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2206-2209 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S2GRAND: S2 YPI: Grandiosity

The sum of the 5 items contained in the grandiosity subscale.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	-	3	0.2 %
5	-	54	4.0 %
6	-	40	3.0 %
7	-	97	7.2 %
8	-	117	8.6 %
9	-	121	8.9 %
10	-	157	11.6 %
11	-	186	13.7 %
12	-	141	10.4 %
13	-	105	7.8 %
14	-	88	6.5 %
15	-	64	4.7 %
16	-	31	2.3 %
17	-	26	1.9 %
18	-	12	0.9 %
19	-	6	0.4 %
20	-	12	0.9 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2210-2213 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S2LYING: S2 YPI: Lying

The sum of the 5 items contained in the lying

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	332	24.5 %
6	-	123	9.1 %
7	-	127	9.4 %
8	-	112	8.3 %
9	-	109	8.1 %
10	-	139	10.3 %
11	-	101	7.5 %
12	-	70	5.2 %
13	-	53	3.9 %
14	-	31	2.3 %
15	-	24	1.8 %
16	-	10	0.7 %
17	-	11	0.8 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
18	-	6	0.4 %
19	-	2	0.1 %
20	-	10	0.7 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2214-2217 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S2MANIP: S2 YPI: Manipulation

The sum of the 5 items contained in the manipulation subscale.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	269	19.9 %
6	-	84	6.2 %
7	-	80	5.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
8	-	97	7.2 %
9	-	100	7.4 %
10	-	175	12.9 %
11	-	121	8.9 %
12	-	82	6.1 %
13	-	60	4.4 %
14	-	56	4.1 %
15	-	49	3.6 %
16	-	19	1.4 %
17	-	22	1.6 %
18	-	11	0.8 %
19	-	13	1.0 %
20	-	21	1.6 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2218-2221 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S2REMOR: S2 YPI: Remorselessness

The sum of the 5 items contained in the remorselessness subscale.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants

respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	-	2	0.1 %
5	-	173	12.8 %
6	-	79	5.8 %
7	-	102	7.5 %
8	-	117	8.6 %
9	-	121	8.9 %
10	-	172	12.7 %
11	-	154	11.4 %
12	-	123	9.1 %
13	-	85	6.3 %
14	-	52	3.8 %
15	-	32	2.4 %
16	-	20	1.5 %
17	-	8	0.6 %
18	-	9	0.7 %
20	-	11	0.8 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2222-2225 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S2UNEMO: S2 YPI: Unemotionality

The sum of the 5 items contained in the unemotionality subscale.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost

anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	52	3.8 %
6	-	32	2.4 %
7	-	68	5.0 %
8	-	115	8.5 %
9	-	99	7.3 %
10	-	155	11.4 %
11	-	183	13.5 %
12	-	155	11.4 %
13	-	149	11.0 %
14	-	106	7.8 %
15	-	55	4.1 %
16	-	37	2.7 %
17	-	26	1.9 %
18	-	9	0.7 %
19	-	7	0.5 %
20	-	11	0.8 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2226-2229 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S2CALLOS: S2 YPI: Callousness

The sum of the 5 items contained in the callousness subscale.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	22	1.6 %
6	-	18	1.3 %
7	-	35	2.6 %
8	-	87	6.4 %
9	-	69	5.1 %
10	-	133	9.8 %
11	-	200	14.8 %
12	-	193	14.3 %
13	-	161	11.9 %
14	-	162	12.0 %
15	-	87	6.4 %
16	-	51	3.8 %
17	-	25	1.8 %
18	-	8	0.6 %
19	-	7	0.5 %
20	-	2	0.1 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2230-2233 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S2THRILL: S2 YPI: Thrill Seeking

The sum of the 5 items contained in the thrill seeking subscale.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	13	1.0 %
6	-	7	0.5 %
7	-	35	2.6 %
8	-	60	4.4 %
9	-	58	4.3 %
10	-	90	6.6 %
11	-	121	8.9 %
12	-	120	8.9 %
13	-	140	10.3 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
14	-	176	13.0 %
15	-	135	10.0 %
16	-	100	7.4 %
17	-	90	6.6 %
18	-	50	3.7 %
19	-	24	1.8 %
20	-	41	3.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2234-2237 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S2YPIIMP: S2 YPI: Impulsiveness

The sum of the 5 items contained in the impulsiveness subscale.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
4	-	1	0.1 %
5	-	77	5.7 %
6	-	40	3.0 %
7	-	62	4.6 %
8	-	112	8.3 %
9	-	86	6.4 %
10	-	122	9.0 %
11	-	147	10.9 %
12	-	138	10.2 %
13	-	145	10.7 %
14	-	99	7.3 %
15	-	85	6.3 %
16	-	46	3.4 %
17	-	47	3.5 %
18	-	20	1.5 %
19	-	14	1.0 %
20	-	19	1.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2238-2241 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S2IRRESP: S2 YPI: Irresponsibility

The sum of the 5 items contained in the irresponsibility subscale.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g.,

"I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
5	-	130	9.6 %
6	-	63	4.7 %
7	-	96	7.1 %
8	-	140	10.3 %
9	-	147	10.9 %
10	-	123	9.1 %
11	-	143	10.6 %
12	-	120	8.9 %
13	-	88	6.5 %
14	-	75	5.5 %
15	-	48	3.5 %
16	-	34	2.5 %
17	-	24	1.8 %
18	-	10	0.7 %
19	-	6	0.4 %
20	-	13	1.0 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2242-2245 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S2GRANMA: S2 YPI: Grandiose-Manipulative Dimension

Grandiose-Manipulative Dimension; Sum of 20 items in this dimension.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin

and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
19	-	1	0.1 %
20	-	28	2.1 %
21	-	14	1.0 %
22	-	25	1.8 %
23	-	31	2.3 %
24	-	25	1.8 %
25	-	31	2.3 %
26	-	44	3.2 %
27	-	29	2.1 %
28	-	47	3.5 %
29	-	40	3.0 %
30	-	28	2.1 %
31	-	37	2.7 %
32	-	34	2.5 %
33	-	36	2.7 %
34	-	29	2.1 %
35	-	33	2.4 %
36	-	36	2.7 %
37	-	33	2.4 %
38	-	34	2.5 %
39	-	36	2.7 %
40	-	43	3.2 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
41	-	43	3.2 %
42	-	65	4.8 %
43	-	48	3.5 %
44	-	51	3.8 %
45	-	31	2.3 %
46	-	30	2.2 %
47	-	26	1.9 %
48	-	36	2.7 %
49	-	19	1.4 %
50	-	29	2.1 %
51	-	25	1.8 %
52	-	20	1.5 %
53	-	12	0.9 %
54	-	21	1.6 %
55	-	20	1.5 %
56	-	12	0.9 %
57	-	9	0.7 %
58	-	6	0.4 %
59	-	6	0.4 %
60	-	5	0.4 %
61	-	7	0.5 %
62	-	6	0.4 %
63	-	5	0.4 %
64	-	4	0.3 %
65	-	3	0.2 %
66	-	4	0.3 %
67	-	1	0.1 %
68	-	6	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2246-2249 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S2CALUNE: S2 YPI: Callous-Unemotional Dimension

Callous-Unemotional Dimension; Sum of 15 items in this dimension.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
15	-	1	0.1 %
16	-	2	0.1 %
17	-	3	0.2 %
18	-	7	0.5 %
19	-	6	0.4 %
20	-	13	1.0 %
21	-	19	1.4 %
22	-	28	2.1 %
23	-	33	2.4 %
24	-	60	4.4 %
25	-	31	2.3 %
26	-	41	3.0 %
27	-	52	3.8 %
28	-	64	4.7 %
29	-	56	4.1 %
30	-	78	5.8 %
31	-	53	3.9 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
32	-	71	5.2 %
33	-	89	6.6 %
34	-	76	5.6 %
35	-	75	5.5 %
36	-	72	5.3 %
37	-	59	4.4 %
38	-	60	4.4 %
39	-	39	2.9 %
40	-	37	2.7 %
41	-	33	2.4 %
42	-	25	1.8 %
43	-	16	1.2 %
44	-	15	1.1 %
45	-	7	0.5 %
46	-	7	0.5 %
47	-	3	0.2 %
48	-	6	0.4 %
49	-	3	0.2 %
50	-	3	0.2 %
51	-	7	0.5 %
52	-	2	0.1 %
53	-	2	0.1 %
54	-	3	0.2 %
55	-	3	0.2 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2250-2253 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S2IMPIRR: S2 YPI: Impulsive-Irresponsible Dimension

Impulsive-Irresponsible Dimension; Sum of 15 items in this dimension.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy

among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
15	-	3	0.2 %
16	-	3	0.2 %
17	-	7	0.5 %
18	-	5	0.4 %
19	-	16	1.2 %
20	-	15	1.1 %
21	-	29	2.1 %
22	-	24	1.8 %
23	-	22	1.6 %
24	-	35	2.6 %
25	-	33	2.4 %
26	-	23	1.7 %
27	-	53	3.9 %
28	-	32	2.4 %
29	-	36	2.7 %
30	-	53	3.9 %
31	-	46	3.4 %
32	-	56	4.1 %
33	-	60	4.4 %
34	-	63	4.7 %
35	-	55	4.1 %
36	-	66	4.9 %
37	-	59	4.4 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
38	-	77	5.7 %
39	-	47	3.5 %
40	-	41	3.0 %
41	-	41	3.0 %
42	-	51	3.8 %
43	-	34	2.5 %
44	-	20	1.5 %
45	-	32	2.4 %
46	-	17	1.3 %
47	-	15	1.1 %
48	-	25	1.8 %
49	-	14	1.0 %
50	-	10	0.7 %
51	-	11	0.8 %
52	-	5	0.4 %
53	-	3	0.2 %
54	-	5	0.4 %
55	-	4	0.3 %
56	-	3	0.2 %
57	-	3	0.2 %
58	-	1	0.1 %
59	-	2	0.1 %
60	-	5	0.4 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2254-2257 (width: 4; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8

S2YPI: S2 YPI: Total Score

YPI Total score; Sum of all 50 items in the measure.

MEASURE: Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI)

The Youth Psychopathic Traits Inventory (YPI; Andershed, Kerr, Sattin

and Levander, 2002) is a self-report measure that assesses psychopathy among youth. Items from the measure make up the following ten subscales: dishonest charm (e.g., "I have the ability to con people by using my charm and smile"), grandiosity (e.g., "I'm better than everyone on almost everything"), lying (e.g., "Sometimes I lie for no reason, other than because it's fun"), manipulation (e.g., "I can make people believe almost anything"), remorselessness (e.g., "To feel guilt and regret when you have done something wrong is a waste of time"), unemotionality (e.g., "I usually feel calm when other people are scared"), callousness (e.g., "I think that crying is a sign of weakness, even if no one sees you"), thrill seeking (e.g., "I like to be where exciting things happen"), impulsiveness (e.g., "I consider myself as a pretty impulsive person"), and irresponsibility (e.g., "I have often been late to work or classes in school").

Additionally, the measure taps three dimensions of psychopathy: Grandiose Manipulative Dimension, Callous Unemotional Dimension, and Impulsive Irresponsible Dimension. The scale contains 50 items to which participants respond on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from "Does not apply at all" to "Applies very well". Several items in the scale are reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more psychopathic characteristics.

Consult the Pathways Study codebook for more information (www.pathwaysstudy.pitt.edu).

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
58	-	3	0.2 %
59	-	4	0.3 %
60	-	3	0.2 %
61	-	2	0.1 %
62	-	2	0.1 %
63	-	7	0.5 %
64	-	3	0.2 %
65	-	7	0.5 %
66	-	6	0.4 %
67	-	8	0.6 %
68	-	12	0.9 %
69	-	10	0.7 %
70	-	8	0.6 %
71	-	13	1.0 %
72	-	8	0.6 %
73	-	7	0.5 %
74	-	13	1.0 %
75	-	11	0.8 %
76	-	5	0.4 %
77	-	17	1.3 %
78	-	11	0.8 %
79	-	10	0.7 %

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
80	-	19	1.4 %
81	-	17	1.3 %
82	-	16	1.2 %
83	-	11	0.8 %
84	-	12	0.9 %
85	-	14	1.0 %
86	-	13	1.0 %
87	-	18	1.3 %
88	-	14	1.0 %
89	-	20	1.5 %
90	-	8	0.6 %
91	-	16	1.2 %
92	-	18	1.3 %
93	-	17	1.3 %
94	-	14	1.0 %
95	-	18	1.3 %
96	-	13	1.0 %
97	-	19	1.4 %
98	-	25	1.8 %
99	-	12	0.9 %
100	-	11	0.8 %
101	-	25	1.8 %
102	-	19	1.4 %
103	-	17	1.3 %
104	-	24	1.8 %
105	-	23	1.7 %
106	-	26	1.9 %
107	-	18	1.3 %
Missing Data			
-202	IntCompStat = 2 partial interview, data missing	2	0.1 %
-201	IntCompStat = 4 missed interview	92	6.8 %
Total		1,354	100%

Please note that only the first 50 response categories are displayed in the PDF codebook. To view all response categories, please analyze the data file in the statistical package of your choice (SAS, SPSS, Stata, R).

Based upon 1,260 valid cases out of 1,354 total cases.

Location: 2258-2261 (*width:* 4; *decimal:* 0)

Variable Type: numeric

(Range of) Missing Values: -700 , -600 , -400 , -300 , -202 , -201 , -9 , -8