

Scales Documentation and Question Sources for the Nine-Year Wave of the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study

April 2013

***Bendheim-Thoman
Center for Research on Child Wellbeing***
Wallace Hall
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ 08544
<http://crcw.princeton.edu>

Columbia Population Research Center
1255 Amsterdam Avenue, Room 715
Columbia University
New York, NY 10027
<http://cupop.columbia.edu/>

Prepared by the staff at the Bendheim-Thoman Center for Research on Child Wellbeing (CRCW), Princeton University. For more information about Fragile Families, please visit our web site at <http://www.fragilefamilies.princeton.edu/> or email ffdata@princeton.edu.

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	3
II.	Abbreviations	3
III.	Description of Scales/Concepts	4
	1. Alcohol Use	4
	2. Drug Use	5
	3. Mental Health Scale for Depression	7
	4. Aggravation in Parenting	11
	5. Caregiver Child Relationship	13
	6. Conflict Tactics Scale	14
	7. Couple Relationship Quality	20
	8. Economic Hardship	21
	9. Child/ Mother Height and Weight Measurements	24
	10. Pubertal Development Scale	28
	11. Child Behavior Problems	29
	12. Connectedness at School	32
	13. Conner's Teacher Rating Scale –Revised Short Form	33
	14. Self Description Questionnaire	35
	15. Task Completion and Behavior	37
	16. Delinquent Behavior	38
	17. Peer Bullying	41
	18. Social Skills	42
	19. WISC-IV Forward and Backward Digit Span	45
	20. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test	47
	21. Woodcock Johnson Passage Comprehension And Applied Problems	48
	22. Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment	50
IV.	Bibliography	51

I. INTRODUCTION

This document provides the sources of questions in the Fragile Families Nine-Year Survey instrument that were derived from other surveys. We describe any established scales that were used, any modifications to them, and suggested scoring. We also describe measures we gathered from different sources that are not established scales, but measure similar concepts.

II. ABBREVIATIONS

The following is a list of abbreviations used throughout this documentation:

Abbreviation	
ADHD	Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder
BMI	Body Mass Index
CIDI[-SF]	Composite International Diagnostic Interview [- Short Form]
CBCL	Child Behavior Checklist
CDC	Center for Disease Control
CTRS- R:S	Conner's Teacher Rating Scale –Revised Short Form
CTSPC	Parent Child Conflict Tactics Scale
DSM-IV	Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4 th Edition
HOME	Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment
IOWA	Study of Work, Welfare, & Family Well-Being of Iowa families on FIP
JOBS	Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program
MD	Major Depression
MDE	Major Depressive Episode
NEWWS	National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies
NICHD-	National Institute of Child Health and Development: Study of Early
SECCYD	Child Care and Youth Development
NSCH	National Survey of Children's Health
NSFH	National Survey of Families and Households
PSID	Panel Study of Income Dynamics
PSID-CDS-III	Panel Study of Income Dynamics –Child Development Supplement--II
SIPP	Survey on Income and Program Participation
SDQ	Self Description Questionnaire
SIS	New York City Social Indicators Survey
SSRS	Social Skills Rating System
WISC-IV	Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children

III. DESCRIPTION OF SCALES/CONCEPTS

CONCEPT

ALCOHOL USE

WAVE – NINE-YEAR

Mother questions: m5g19, m5g19a, m5g20

Father questions: f5g19, f5g19a, f5g20

The Nine-Year Survey does not contain the full CIDI-SF Alcohol and Drug Dependence Scales and only includes a subset of three questions indicating alcohol use.

MODIFICATIONS

The Fragile Families Nine-Year Survey is comparable to the Five-Year Survey in its measurements of alcohol use. It is not comparable to the One-Year and Three-Year surveys in measurement of alcohol and drug dependence. Though the Nine and Five-Year surveys draw on the same interview form as the Three-Year survey (the Composite International Diagnostic Interview - Short Form (CIDI-SF)), they ask only a subset of three questions about alcohol dependence. The Nine-Year Survey only includes questions regarding the frequency of alcohol use in the last twelve months and one of the seven symptoms (role interference as a result of use). Consequently, alcohol dependence caseness cannot be determined from the Nine-Year survey.

TABLES

Table 1 reports how many mothers and fathers report having at least four drinks in one day in the last twelve months at the Nine-Year Survey.

Table 1: Alcohol Use in the Nine-Year Survey

Alcohol User	Nine-Year FF Mothers	Nine-Year FF Fathers
Yes (1)	554	983
No (0)	2954	1660
Totals	3508	2643

REFERENCES

Kessler, R.C., Andrews, G., Mroczek, D., Ustun, T.B., & Wittchen, H.U. (1998). The world health organization composite international diagnostic interview short-form (CIDI-SF). *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 7, 171-185.

Walters, E.E., Kessler, R.C., Nelson, R.C., & Mroczek, D. (2002). *Scoring the World Health Organization's Composite International Diagnostic Interview Short Form (CIDI-SF; Dec 2002)*. For a copy of this memo please contact ffdata@princeton.edu.

CONCEPT

DRUG USE

WAVE: NINE-YEAR

Mother questions: m5g21a, m5g21b, m5g21c, m5g21d, m5g21e, m5g21f, m5g21g, m5g21h, m5g21i, m5g21k, m5g22k

Father questions: f5g21a, f5g21b, f5g21c, f5g21d, f5g21e, f5g21f, f5g21g, f5g21h, f5g21i, f5g21k, f5g22

The Nine-Year Survey does not contain the full CIDI-SF Alcohol and Drug Dependence Scales and only includes a subset of eleven questions indicating drug use.

MODIFICATIONS

The Fragile Families Nine-Year Survey only includes questions regarding the use of the nine drugs and one of the seven symptoms (role interference as a result of use). Consequently, drug dependence caseness cannot be determined. The survey includes an additional question regarding how often each parent used any of the drugs in the past 12 months.

Table 2, below, reports how many mothers and fathers report using any drugs in the last twelve months at the Nine-Year Survey. Table 3 reports the average number of drugs used by drug users.

TABLES

Table 2: Drug Use among Fragile Families Mothers and Fathers at Nine-Year

Drug User	Nine-Year FF Mothers	Nine-Year FF Fathers
Yes (1)	318	416
No (0)	3185	2228
Totals	3503	2644

Table 3: Average Number of Drugs Used Among Drug Users

	Nine-Year FF Mothers	Nine-Year FF Fathers
Average Number of Drugs Used (standard deviation)	1.28 (0.64)	1.35 (0.89)
Total Users	318	2416

REFERENCES

Kessler, R.C., Andrews, G., Mroczek, D., Ustun, T.B., & Wittchen, H.U. (1998). The world health organization composite international diagnostic interview short-form (CIDI-SF). *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 7, 171-185.

Walters, E.E., Kessler, R.C., Nelson, R.C., & Mroczek, D. (2002). *Scoring the World Health Organization's Composite International Diagnostic Interview Short Form (CIDI-SF; Dec 2002)*. For a copy of this memo please contact ffdata@princeton.edu.

CONCEPT

MENTAL HEALTH SCALE FOR DEPRESSION

WAVE: NINE-YEAR

Mother questions: m5g3, m5g4, m5g5, m5g6, m5g7, m5g8, m5g9, m5g10, m5g11, m5g11a, m5g12, m5g12a, m5g13, m5g14, m5g15 (15 items)

Father questions: f5g3, f5g4, f5g5, f5g6, f5g7, f5g8, f5g9, f5g10, f5g11, f5g11a, f5g12, f5g12a, f5g3, f5g14, f5g15 (15 items)

Non-parental caregiver questions: n5g3, n5g4, n5g5, n5g6, n5g7, n5g8, n5g9, n5g10, n5g11, nf5g11a, n5g12, n5g12a, n5g3, n5g14, n5g15 (15 items)

The Major Depressive Episode (MDE) Nine-Year questions are derived from the Composite International Diagnostic Interview - Short Form (CIDI-SF), Section A (Kessler et al. 1998). The short form of the CIDI interview takes a portion of the full set of CIDI questions and generates the probability that the respondent would be a “case” (i.e., a positively diagnosed respondent) if given a full CIDI interview.

The CIDI questions are consistent with the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders – Fourth Edition (DSM-IV; APA, 1994). The CIDI is a standardized instrument for assessment of mental disorders intended for use in epidemiological, cross-cultural, and other research studies.

Respondents are asked whether they have had feelings of dysphoria (depression) or anhedonia (inability to enjoy what is usually pleasurable) in the past year that lasted for two weeks or more and, if so, whether the symptoms lasted most of the day and occurred every day of the two week period. If so, they were asked more specific questions about 1) losing interest, 2) feeling tired, 3) change in weight, 4) trouble sleeping, 5) trouble concentrating, 6) feeling worthless, and 7) thinking about death.

MODIFICATIONS

All of the essential CIDI-SF questions to score a MDE are included in the Nine-Year survey. A few questions are omitted. These omitted questions deal with persistence, recency, and impairments associated with major depression and the subject's contact with a health care provider or other professional. The omitted questions play no part in generating predicted probabilities for the presence of disorders (See Walters et al., 2002).

SCORING INFORMATION

Section A of the CIDI-SF is used to classify respondents according to the criteria for a DSM-IV major depressive episode. No distinction is made between respondents with major depressive disorder, major depressive episodes that occur as part of a bipolar disorder, or major depressive episodes that occur in the course of psychotic disorders.

There are two ways to meet the diagnostic stem requirement for MDE:

- endorse all questions about having two weeks of dysphoric mood (g3-g4-g5); or

- endorse all questions about having two weeks of anhedonia (g7-g8-g9).

Consistent with the procedures described by Kessler and Mroczek in 1994 and 1997, each series requires the respondent to report two weeks of symptoms lasting at least about half of the day (g4, g8) and almost every day (g5, g9).

When the respondent denied the existence of the symptom or denied persistence, they skipped-out, and the respondent received a probability of caseness equal to zero. If the respondent endorsed the dysphoric stem, they were not asked the anhedonia stem questions. Note that the scoring instructions issued by Walters et al. (2002) created more stringent conditions for endorsing the stem; respondents must report two weeks of symptoms last at least “most of the day” in questions g4 and g8. As a consequence, the approach used here results in more respondents endorsing the stem than would endorse if the 2002 revisions were employed.

If the respondent endorsed the diagnostic stem series, an additional seven symptom questions were asked: losing interest (g6=1, only if the stem involves dysphoria; the anhedonia stem question g7=1 should be counted when the anhedonia stem is endorsed), feeling tired (g10=1), change in weight greater than or equal to 10 pounds (g11=1, 2, or 3 and g11a>=10), trouble with sleep (g12=1 and g12a=1 or 2), trouble concentrating (g13=1), feeling down (g14=1), and thoughts about death (g15=1). The respondent's MD score (range 0-8) is then calculated as the sum of positive responses to each of these seven symptom questions and the first dysphoric stem question (g3). Note that the scoring scheme proposed by Walters et al. (2002) excludes g3 from the symptom count, leading to an MD score range of 0-7.

The files contain both a conservative (**cm5md_case_con** **cf5md_case_con**, **cn5md_case_con**) and liberal (**cm5md_case_lib** **cf5md_case_lib**, **cn5md_case_lib**) version of diagnoses for major depression and probabilities. The liberal scale follows Kessler and Mroczek’s criteria, requiring the respondent report two-week depressive symptoms over at least half the day and including the first stem question (g3) in the MD score. The conservative scale uses the adjustments advocated by Walters et al. (2002), requiring depressive symptoms be present “most of the day” to be counted and omitting the first stem question when calculating MD score.

There are two scoring alternatives for the CIDI-SF MD section. The first is to create a dichotomous score, classifying respondents as either probable cases or probable non-cases based on whether or not they have a MD score of three or more. The second is to assign respondents the probability of caseness score. Note that respondents who denied the MD stem questions or otherwise skipped out of the section prior to assessing the symptoms in the MD score receive a probability of caseness equal to zero.

A Memo Edit issued by Kessler in December 2002 indicates that subjects that volunteer they are taking medication for depression (g3 or g7=-14) should be counted as depressed. Note that while they receive a positive score for caseness, they are not asked any of the seven symptom questions. Note that participants indicate in g2b1d whether they are taking medication for depression. These questions are not an official part of the CIDI scales for depression, so are not included in MD caseness.

KNOWN ISSUES

A small number of moms (n=45) are missing information on three variables in the CIDI scale for depression due to an error in the Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing program. Moms affected are coded as “-3, missing” for the variables listed below. When coding the binary caseness variables for conservative and liberal estimates of depression, moms affected by this error who already met criteria for depression are left as depressed cases (coded as 1). Moms affected by this error who did not yet meet the criteria for depression are coded to missing on the caseness variables, as they might have met the criteria for depression if these data were collected (coded to -3). Five of the mothers affected by this error meet the criteria for a conservative case of depression and 40 are coded to missing. 33 moms affected by this error meet the criteria for a liberal case of depression and 12 are coded to missing.

- m5g13: During those two weeks, did you have a lot more trouble concentrating than usual?
- m5g14: People sometimes feel down on themselves, no good, or worthless. During that two week period did you feel this way?
- m5g15: Did you think a lot about death –either your own, someone else’s or death in general during those two weeks?

TABLES

Table 4: Major Depression Caseness (Conservative)

MD Caseness	Nine-Year FF Mothers	Nine-Year FF Fathers	Nine-Year FF non-parental caregivers
Yes (1)	430	271	12
No (0)	3044	2376	118
Totals	3474	2647	130

Table 5: Major Depression Caseness (Liberal)

MD Caseness	Nine-Year FF Mothers	Nine-Year FF Fathers	Nine-Year FF non-parental caregivers
Yes (1)	613	381	17
No (0)	2889	2266	113
Totals	3502	2647	130

REFERENCES

American Psychiatric Association (1994). *Diagnostic And Statistical Manual Of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.

- Kendler, K.S., Davis, C.G., Kessler, R.C. (1997). The familial aggregation of common psychiatric and substance use disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey: A family history study. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 170, 541-548.
- Kessler, R.C., Andrews, G., Mroczek, D., Ustun, T.B., & Wittchen, H.U. (1998). The world health organization composite international diagnostic interview short-form (CIDI-SF). *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 7, 171-185.
- Walters, E.E., Kessler, R.C., Nelson, R.C., & Mroczek, D. (2002). *Scoring the World Health Organization's Composite International Diagnostic Interview Short Form (CIDI-SF; Dec 2002)*. For a copy of this memo please contact ffdata@princeton.edu.

CONCEPT

AGGRAVATION IN PARENTING

These items are taken from the JOBS¹ (Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program) Child Outcomes Study, and also are found in the Child Development Supplement of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (*Primary Caregiver of Target Child Household Questionnaire for the Child Development Supplement to the Family Economics Study, 1997*).

WAVE: NINE-YEAR

Primary caregiver questions: **p5k1a, p5k1b, p5k1c, p5k1d**

Mother questions: **m5k2a, m5k2b, m5k2c, m5k2d²**

Father questions: **f5k2a, f5k2b, f5k2c, k2d**

The aggravation in parenting questions are derived from the Child Development Supplement of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID). The scale measures the amount of parenting stress brought on by changes in employment, income or other factors in the parent's life. It was developed for the JOBS child outcome survey by Child Trends, Inc. and several items come from the Parent Stress Inventory (Abidin 1995). Items Q2A29a-d are from the primary caregiver/household questionnaire. The items used in the JOBS study are marked with an asterisk in table 6. Their 5-question scale had an alpha of 0.69. Research has shown that high levels of aggravation in parenting are related to mothers' employment status and to child behavior problems (Hofferth, Davis-Kean, Davis, & Finkelstein. 1997).

MODIFICATIONS

The Fragile Families study does not use all 9 of the items mentioned above. Instead, the four questions from Q2A29a-d are used (see table 6 for complete listing). The FF questions are also scored on a 4-point scale, where 1 = "strongly agree," 2 = "somewhat agree," 3 = "somewhat disagree," and 4 = "strongly disagree," whereas the original questions used a 5-point Likert scale that ranged from "not at all true" to "completely true."

SCORING INFORMATION

Given that Fragile Families did not implement the full scale, we suggest summing the items and dividing by the top value of the Likert scale.

¹ Now known as the National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies (NEWWS).

² Mom answers these questions in the Biomom survey only when she is not the PCG; otherwise she answers them in the PCG survey

TABLES

Table 6: Aggravation in Parenting FF Items PSID-CDS

	Items in FF?	Source Items
Q2A29a	M: K2A F: K2A P: K1A	Being a parent is harder than I thought it would be
Q2A29b	M: K2B F: K2B P: K1B	I feel trapped by my responsibilities as a parent
Q2A29c	M: K2C F: K2C P: K1C	I find that taking care of my child(ren) is much more work than pleasure
Q2A29d	M: K2D F: K2D P: K1D	I often feel tired, worn out, or exhausted from raising a family

Table 7: Basic scale statistics for aggravation in parenting (FF Scale)

	α	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Range	Skew	Kurtosis
PCG aggravation in parenting	0.66	3614	8.12 (0.05)	4-16	0.42	2.66
Mothers' aggravation	0.62	110	8.07 (0.25)	4-15	0.51	2.82
Fathers' aggravation	0.67	2286	7.46 (0.06)	4-16	0.72	3.04

Note. Statistics (including the range) are based on the Nine-Year Fragile Families survey data; they do not represent scale norms. Cronbach's alpha is quite sensitive to the number of items in the scale. Pallant (2007) suggests alphas of greater than or equal to 0.5 can be considered acceptable if the number of items in the scale is less than ten.

REFERENCES

- Abidin, R. (1995). *Parent Stress Inventory, 3rd Edition*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Hofferth, S., Davis-Kean, P.E., Avis, J., & Finkelstein, J. *The Child Development Supplement to the Panel Study of Income Dynamics: 1997 User Guide*. Survey Research Center, The University of Michigan Institute for Social Research. Retrieved March 27, 2003, from <http://www.isr.umich.edu/src/child-development/usergd.html>
- Pallant, J. F. (2007). *SPSS Survival Manual: A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis using SPSS for Windows (3rd ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Primary Caregiver of Target Child Household Questionnaire for the Child Development Supplement to the Family Economics Study, 1997.* (1997). Retrieved March 27, 2003, from <ftp://ftp.isr.umich.edu/pub/src/psid/questionnaires/97child/PCGhhld.pdf>

CONCEPT

CAREGIVER-CHILD RELATIONSHIP

These items are taken from the Family Functioning and the Middle Childhood and Adolescent sections of the National Survey of Child Health (NSCH), 2003.

WAVE: NINE-YEAR

Primary Caregiver Questions: **p5k1g, p5k1f, p5i23**

Child Questions: **k5a2e, k5a2f**

These items assess the caregiver-child relationship with respect to closeness between caregiver/child, degree to which caregiver/child talk and share ideas, and number of friends of the child the caregiver can identify. Closeness between child and caregiver is measured on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (*extremely close*) to 4 (*not very close*). The extent to which the child/caregiver talk and exchange ideas was measured on a similar Likert scale ranging from 1 (*extremely well*) to 4 (*not very well*). The number of friends of child the caregiver can identify is measured on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (*none of them*) to 5 (*all of them*); an additional point 6 (*child has no friends*) was also included.

REFERENCES

National Survey of Children's Health. (2003). Family Functioning Section
<http://nschdata.org/Content/Guide.aspx#S8>

National Survey of Children's Health. (2003). Middle Childhood and Adolescence Section
<http://nschdata.org/Content/Guide.aspx#S7>

CONCEPT

CONFLICT TACTICS SCALE

WAVE: NINE-YEAR

Primary Caregiver Questions: p5q1a, p5q1b, p5q1c, p5q1d, p5q1e, p5q1f, p5q1g, p5q1h, p5q1i, p5q1j, p5q1k, p5q1l, p5q1m, p5q1n, p5q2a, p5q2b, p5q2c, p5q2d, p5q2e

The Primary Care Giver Self Administered Questionnaire uses 15 of the 22 items on the Parent Child Conflict Tactics Scales (CTSPC). The original Conflict Tactic Scales (1979) was designed for use with partners in a marital, cohabiting, or dating relationship. The CTSPC was created in 1996 in response to limitations of the original scale as a measure of child maltreatment (Straus, et al., 1998).

MODIFICATIONS

Our survey eliminates seven questions from the CTSPC that ask about severe physical maltreatment. However, we include the CTSPC's supplemental scale on Neglect (5 questions). Questions asked in the scale are listed in tables 9 and 10. Prevalence and chronicity statistics from the pioneer Gallup survey conducted in 1995 may be found in table 10.

SCORING INFORMATION

It should be noted that scale scores are only calculated for participants with responses to each item in the scale. When a participant responds with don't know, refuse, or missing to any item on a given scale, their scale score will be missing (see tables below for individual scales).

Yearly Frequency (Y): This score may be extremely skewed for community samples; however, it may be appropriate for the Non-Violent Discipline Scale and Psychological Aggression scale of the CTSPC. First create recoded versions of all violence items by recoding 7 to 0, and values of 3 through 6 to be the midpoints as follows: 3 = 4, 4 = 8, 5 = 15, 6 = 25. Then sum the items in the scale.

Yearly Prevalence (P): The most frequently used type of score for the Physical Assault scale. The prevalence score indicates whether one or more of the acts in the scale were used during the referent period. Create dichotomous versions of each item in which a score of 1 indicates one or more acts of violence in the past year. Score each item as 1 if there is a response of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 to an item. Category 7 (not in the past year, but happened before), and category 8 (never happened) are recoded to zero. Do NOT sum the dichotomous items. This method assigns a score of 1 (or 100 if you want the mean to be expressed as a percentage) for any subject who reported one or more instances of any of the acts in the scale.

Ever Prevalence (E): Create dichotomous versions of each item in which a score of one indicates whether an item was ever performed. Participants with responses ranging from 1 to 7 receive a score of one; participants indicating they never completed an act (response of 7) are coded to zero.

Yearly Chronicity (C): The chronicity score is the SUM of the number of times each act in a scale was used by those who used at least one of the acts in a scale. This measures how often each act was done in the previous 12 months, among those parents who did it at least once in the previous 12 months. Categories 7 (not this year but happened before) and 8 (never happened) should be recoded to -3 and flagged as missing.

Alternative scoring options for chronicity:

1. Give responses a value between 0 and 6 and sum the total for each subscale. Be sure to recode 7 (never happened) to zero using this method.
2. Assign weights to values in accordance with the frequencies indicated by the response categories. In our case these would be: 0, 1, 2, 4, 8, 15, and 25 or (7=0, 1=0, 2=2, 3=4, 5=8, 6=25).³
3. Each of the scales can be standardized on a 0 to 100 scale indicating the percentage of the possible total score. First, weight items in accordance with the frequency of occurrence (7=0, 1=0, 2=2, 3=4, 5=8, 6=25). Next divide the score by the maximum possible score for each item, multiply by 100, and round the integer. Example: respondent indicates they engaged in a behavior 3-6 times in the past year (response=3). Weight the response of 3-6 times to 4 (see weighting in criteria above). Divide 4 by 25, which is the maximum possible score ($4/25=0.16$). Multiple by 100 ($0.16*100=16\%$). The advantage of the percentage standardization is that it expresses all scales in the same units and uses units that have meaning to the general public: i.e., percentage of the maximum possible score. However, there is no statistical advantage (Straus, 1990).
4. Use the Gallup data in table 10 as a benchmark for new data. Categorical measures for CTSPC responses are employed chiefly for assault data, and utilize questions not administered in the Fragile Families Study. Straus suggests that it may be useful to set threshold criteria for “low” and “high” rates of incidence for the various subscales,⁴ though there are currently no established norms for such categories. Summing responses for the entire scale or constructing categories would be problematic since for several items high frequencies may represent socially desirable conflict management tactics. Even for undesirable tactics, there is a lack of agreement over how to measure the severity of physical and psychological maltreatment. With applicable standards, however, measures combining severity and chronicity would be possible.⁵

³ 25 is an assumed mid-point for the “more than 20 times” category. See Murray A. Straus’ “Scoring and Norms for the CTS2 and CTSPC” at <http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2/CTS28.pdf>

⁴ Also see Straus, <http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2/CTS28.pdf> section on “Cutting Points For ... Scales”

⁵ Such measures are available for assault data. For one such measure, see the Frequency Times Severity Weighted (FS) Scale in Kantor, G.K. and Jasinski, J.L. *Out of the Darkness*, pp. 123-124.

Table 8: Conflict Tactics Scale Modifications

Original CTSPC	FF PCG Self Administered Questionnaire.
A. Explained why something was wrong	A. Explained why something was wrong
B. Put him/her in “time out” (or sent to his/her room)	B. Put him/her in “time out” (or sent to his/her room)
C. Shook him/her	C. Shook him/her
D. Hit him/her on the bottom with something like a belt, hairbrush, a stick or some other hard object	D. Hit him/her on the bottom with something like a belt, hairbrush, a stick or some other hard object
E. Gave him/her something else to do instead of what he/she was doing wrong	E. Gave him/her something else to do instead of what he/she was doing wrong
F. Shouted, yelled, or screamed at him/her	F. Shouted, yelled, or screamed at him/her
G. Hit him/her with a fist or kicked him/her hard	G. Hit him/her with a fist or kicked him/her hard
H. Spanked him/her on the bottom with your bare hand	H. Spanked him/her on the bottom with your bare hand
I. Grabbed him/her around the neck and choked him/her	I. Grabbed him/her around the neck and choked him/her
J. Swore or cursed at him/her	J. Swore or cursed at him/her
K. Beat him/her up, that is you hit him/her over and over as hard as you could	K. Beat him/her up, that is you hit him/her over and over as hard as you could
L. Said you would send him/her away or kick him/her out of the house	L. Said you would send him/her away or kick him/her out of the house
M. Burned or scalded him/her on purpose	M. Burned or scalded him/her on purpose
N. Threatened to spank or hit him/her but did not actually do it	N. Threatened to spank or hit him/her but did not actually do it
O. Hit him/her on some other part of the body besides the bottom with something like a belt, hairbrush, a stick or some other hard object	O. Hit him/her on some other part of the body besides the bottom with something like a belt, hairbrush, a stick or some other hard object
P. Slapped him/her on the hand, arm or leg	P. Slapped him/her on the hand, arm or leg
Q. Took away privileges or grounded him/her	Q. Took away privileges or grounded him/her
R. Pinched him/her	R. Pinched him/her
S. Threatened him/her with a knife or gun	S. Threatened him/her with a knife or gun
T. Threw or knocked him/her down	T. Threw or knocked him/her down
U. Called him/her dumb or lazy or some other name like that	U. Called him/her dumb or lazy or some other name like that
V. Slapped him/her on the face or head or ears	V. Slapped him/her on the face or head or ears

Table 9: Neglect Items

A. Had to leave your child home alone, even when you thought some adult should be with him/her
B. Were so caught up with your own problems that you were not able to show or tell your child that you loved him/her
C. Were not able to make sure your child got the food he/she needed
D. Were not able to make sure your child got to a doctor or hospital when he/she needed it
E. Were so drunk or high that you had a problem taking care of your child

Table 10: Prevalence Rates from Gallup

	Year	Ever	Year Chronicity ¹
Non-violent discipline	97.7	99.9	46.0
Explained why something was wrong	94.3	94.5	18.31
Gave him/her something else to do instead of what he/she was doing wrong	77.0	83.1	12.2
Took away privileges or grounded him/her	86.0	78.5	10.8
Put him/her in “time out” (or sent to his/her room)	75.5	81.3	13.0
Psychological Aggression	85.6	89.9	21.7
Shouted, yelled, or screamed at him/her	84.7	86.7	12.8
Threatened to spank or hit him/her but did not actually do it	53.6	61.8	10.6
Swore or cursed at him/her	24.3	26.0	6.5
Called him/her dumb or lazy or some other name like that	16.3	17.5	5.7
Said you would send him/her away or kick him/her out of the house	6.0	7.0	3.9
Physical Assault	n/a	n/a	n/a
Spanked him/her on the bottom with your bare hand	46.9	63.6	7.5
Hit him/her on the bottom with something like a belt, hairbrush, a stick or some other hard object	20.7	29.4	5.5
Slapped him/her on the hand, arm or leg	36.9	51.2	7.3
Pinched him/her	4.3	5.9	6.4
Shook him/her	9.0	15.0	2.8
Neglect	27.0	30.6	6.9
Had to leave your child home alone, even when you thought some adult should be with him/her	19.5	21.3	6.0
Were so caught up with your own problems that you were not able to show or tell your child that you loved him/her	0.2	1.1	4.6
Were not able to make sure your child got the food he/she needed	11.0	13.7	5.5
Were not able to make sure your child got to a doctor or hospital when he/she needed it	0.4	1.2	2.0
Were so drunk or high that you had a problem taking care of your child	2.3	3.3	5.9

Note. These rates represent Gallup, not Fragile Families, data. Rates and means weighted to correct for sampling deviation from the census distribution.

¹ Mean number of times each act was reported among subset of parents reporting at least one occurrence.

Table 11: Non-Violent Discipline Subscale for Nine Year Fragile Families Data

	N	Item
Explained why something was wrong	3302	p5q1a
Gave him/her something else to do instead of what he/she was doing wrong	3255	p5q1e
Took away privileges or grounded him/her	3274	p5q1l
Put him/her in “time out” (or sent to his/her room)	3291	p5q1b

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.83 ($N=3150$).

Table 12: Psychological Aggression Subscale for Nine Year Fragile Families Data

	N	Item
Shouted, yelled, or screamed at him/her	3277	p5q1f
Threatened to spank or hit him/her but did not actually do it	3300	p5q1j
Swore or cursed at him/her	3285	p5q1h
Called him/her dumb or lazy or some other name like that	3319	p5q1n
Said you would send him/her away or kick him/her out of the house	3306	p5q1i

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.62 ($N=3180$). There are 62 missing scale scores for this scale; these missings occur because of participants responding don’t know, refuse, or missing to any given item within the scale.

Table 13: Physical Assault Subscale for Nine Year Fragile Families Data

	N	Item
Spanked him/her on the bottom with your bare hand	3289	p5q1g
Hit him/her on the bottom with something like a belt, hairbrush, a stick or some other hard object	3291	p5q1d
Slapped him/her on the hand, arm or leg	3296	p5q1k
Pinched him/her	3277	p5q1m
Shook him/her	3140	p5q1c

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.70 ($N=3007$).

Table 14: Neglect Subscale for Nine Year Fragile Families Data

	N	Item
Had to leave your child home alone, even when you thought some adult should be with him/her	3319	p5q2a
Were so caught up with your own problems that you were not able to show or tell your child that you loved him/her	3315	p5q2b
Were not able to make sure your child got the food he/she needed	3308	p5q2c
Were not able to make sure your child got to a doctor or hospital when he/she needed it	3317	p5q2d
Were so drunk or high that you had a problem taking care of your child	3322	p5q2e

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.57($N=3289$)

Table 15: Subscale Statistics for Nine Year Fragile Families Data

	α	N	$M (SD)$	Range	Skew	Kurtosis
Non-violent discipline	0.83	3150	RAW: 38.56 (28.04) AVG: 9.64 (7.01)	0-100 0-25	0.63	2.32
Psychological Aggression	0.62	3180	RAW: 17.30 (0.33) AVG: 3.46 (0.07)	0-125 0-25	1.50	5.26
Physical Assault	0.70	3007	RAW: 5.98 (0.20) AVG: 1.20 (0.04)	0-101 0-20.2	3.81	22.30
Neglect	0.57	3289	RAW: 1.24 (0.87) AVG: 0.25 (0.02)	0-100 0-20	8.95	114.02

REFERENCES

Straus, M.A. (1990). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: the conflict tactics (ct) scales. In M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families*, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Straus, M.A. (2001). Scoring and norms for the cts2 and ctspc family research laboratory, University of New Hampshire. <http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2>

Straus, M.A., Hamby, S.L., Finkelhor, D., Moore, D.W., & Runyan, D. (1998). Identification of child maltreatment with the parent-child conflict tactics scales: Development and psychometric data for a national sample of american parents. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 22, 249 – 270.

CONCEPT

COUPLE RELATIONSHIP QUALITY

These items include questions on whether their relationship is in trouble and the frequency with which they discuss breaking up.

WAVE: NINE-YEAR

Mother questions: m5c5a, m5c5b, m5c5c

Father questions: f5c5a, f5c5b, f5c5c

Three questions about whether the relationship might be in trouble and consideration of breaking up (c5a-c) are modifications of NSFH questions (Sweet and Bumpass 1996), which were originally developed by Booth, Johnson, and Edwards as part of the Marital Instability Index (Booth, Johnson, and Edwards 1983).

Items are coded on a 3-point scale (1=often, 2=sometimes, 3=never).

REFERENCES

Booth, A., Johnson, D., & Edwards, J. N. (1983). Measuring marital instability. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 45: 387-394.

Sweet, J.A. and Bumpass, L. (1996). *The National Survey of Families and Households - Waves 1 and 2: Data Description and Documentation*. Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison (<http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/nsfh/home.htm>).

CONCEPT

ECONOMIC HARDSHIP

These items are taken from the “Basic Needs – Ability to Meet Expenses” section of the survey on Income and Program Participation (SIPP) 1996 Panel Wave 8 Adult Well-Being Topical Module Questionnaire (*Survey on Income and Program Participation*, 1998), the 1997 & 1999 New York City Social Indicators Survey (SIS) (Social Indicators Survey Center, 1997 & 1999), and the 1999 Study of Work, Welfare, and Family Well-Being of Iowa families on FIP (Iowa’s assistance program) (Mathematica Policy Research).

WAVE: NINE-YEAR

Mother questions: **m5f23a, m5f23b, m5f23c, m5f23d, m5f23e, m5f23f, m5f23g, m5f23h, m5f23i** (not sep. child question), **m5f23j**

Father questions: **f5f23a, f5f23b, f5f23c, f5f23d, f5f23e, f5f23f, f5f23g, f5f23h, f5f23i, f5f23j**

Non-parental caregiver questions: **n5g1a, n5g1b, n5g1c, n5g1d, n5g1e, n5g1f, n5g1g, n5g1h, n5g1i, n5g1j**

The Fragile Families Nine-Year Survey includes several material hardship measures that are taken from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP, 1991 and 1992) (Bauman, 1998). These questions are also similar to Mayer and Jencks (1989) Chicago study of hardship and poverty (Bauman, 1999).

Some of the hardship questions are also derived from the 1997 and 1999 Social Indicators Survey (SIS). This study looks at families and individuals in New York City and monitors changes over time. Some of the material hardship questions found in the SIS are similar to those found in the SIPP, such as items referring to not paying bills on time and loss of utilities. Other questions concern the respondent or his/her child going hungry, access to free food, and places he/she has lived, all within the past 12 months and all due to financial difficulties (Social Indicators Survey Center, 1999).

MODIFICATIONS

These “YES/NO” questions are similar to the original questions taken from other surveys, with a few exceptions. In the SIPP, respondents are asked whether “you/anyone in your household” had encountered the specified hardship. In the SIS, questions refer to “you [or your partner].” In W164 of the 1997 SIS, the question is asked of “you [or your spouse/partner] [or your child] [or your children].” The corresponding Fragile Families survey questions refer only to the respondent and not to his/her partner or children.

Note: The Fragile Families Nine-Year Survey includes only a subset of the hardship questions used in the SIPP, SIS and IOWA studies. The Nine-Year Survey does not contain separate questions on hunger (ever hungry but didn’t eat because you couldn’t afford enough food) for self and child/ children, as in the Five-Year Survey.

SCORING

The economic hardship questions do not constitute a “scale”. There is no established consensus on the validity of a constructed measure.

TABLES

Table 16: Economic Hardships Source and FF Item Numbers

SIPP	SIS 1997	SIS 1999	IOWA	Item in FF?	Items
AW35_NEED 1				m5f23c f5f23c	Was there any time in the past 12 months when you did not pay the full amount of the rent or mortgage?
AW38_NEED 2				m5f23d f5f23d	In the past 12 months were you evicted from your home or apartment for not paying the rent or mortgage?
AW41_NEED 3				m5f23e f5f23e	In the past 12 months, did you not pay the full amount of the gas, oil, or electricity bill?
AW50_NEED 6				m5f23j f5f23j	In the past 12 months, was there anyone in your household who needed to see a doctor or go to the hospital but couldn't go because of the cost?
	W164			m5f23a f5f23a	In the past 12 months, did you receive free food or meals?
		HAR10		m5f23h f5f23h	In the past 12 months, did you move in with other people even for a little while because of financial problems?
		HAR12		m5f23i f5f23i	In the past 12 months, did you ever stay at a shelter, in an abandoned building, an automobile or any other place not meant for regular housing even for one night?
				m5f23g f5f23g	In the past 12 months, did you borrow money from friends or family to help pay bills?
				m5f23b f5f23b	In the past 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?
				m5f23f f5f23f	Was your gas or electric service ever turned off or the heating oil company did not deliver oil because there wasn't enough money to pay the bills?

REFERENCES

Bauman, K. J. (1999). Shifting family definitions: The effect of cohabitation and other nonfamily household relationships on measures of poverty. *Demography* 36(3):315-325.

Bauman, K. (1998). Direct measures of poverty as indicators of economic need: Evidence from the survey income and program participation. *U.S. Census Bureau Poverty Measurement Papers*. Retrieved March 27, 2003, from <http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0030/twps0030.html>

Mayer, S.E., & Jencks, C. (1989). Poverty and the distribution of material hardship. *Journal of Human Resources*, 24 (1): 88-114.

Social Indicators Survey Center, Columbia University School of Social Work. (1999). *1999 New York City Social Indicators Survey: Documentation and Codebook, Revised Version*. Retrieved March 27, 2003, from <http://www.siscenter.org/>

Survey on Income and Program Participation: 1996 Panel Wave 8 Adult Well-Being Topical Module Questionnaire. (1998). Retrieved March 27, 2003, from http://www.sipp.census.gov/sipp/top_mod/1996/quests/wave8/awbook.html

CONCEPT

CHILD/MOTHER HEIGHT AND WEIGHT MEASUREMENTS

These items were measured during the Nine-Year In-Home Assessment.

WAVE: NINE-YEAR

Mother Variables: hv5_mwtlb hv5_mwtkg hv5_mbmi hv5_ovscale hv5_mflag
hv5_mbmiz hv5_mbmizdiff hv5_mhtcm hv5_mmis_ht hv5_selfht hv5_8 hv5_8a1
hv5_8a2 hv5_8a3 hv5_8b hv5_selfwt hv5_mmis_wt
Child Variables: hv5_agem hv5_chtcm hv5_cwtlb hv5_cwtkg hv5_cbmi
hv5_flag_cm hv5_cflag hv5_haz hv5_hap hv5_waz hv5_wap hv5_bmiz
hv5_bmip hv5_bmidiff hv5_bmizdiff hv5_bmipdiff hv5_11 hv5_11a1 hv5_11a2
hv5_11a3 hv5_11b hv5_9 hv5_9a1 hv5_9a2
hv5_9a3 hv5_9b

Height measurements, in centimeters, (using a large plastic standing ruler called a “stadiometer”) of focal children and weight measurements, in pounds, of biological mothers and focal children were taken during the Home Visit. In constructing Body Mass Index (BMI), mothers’ height was taken from the Home Visit in Year 3 or from the Home Visit in Year 5 when Year 3 information was not available. Self reported height from Year 3 was used when measurement of height was not available at both Years 3 and 5.

When taking height measurements of the focal child, the interviewer took two measurements. A third measurement was taken if the first two measurements deviated by 2 or more centimeters. For weight measurements, the interviewer took a third measurement of the mother or focal child if the difference in weight was greater than or equal to 2 pounds.

SCORING INFORMATION

Child BMI and BMI Z-Score Variables: Child’s BMI was calculated by dividing the weight in kilograms by the height in meters. The Z-score and Percentile variables contain the standardized measurements which were generated based on the Center for Disease Control’s (CDC) SAS programs. These programs generate a dataset that contain indices of the anthropometric status of children from birth to 20 years of age based on the 2000 CDC growth charts (<http://www.cdc.gov/growthcharts/>).

The following variables were used for the Z-score computations for focal children in the Nine-Year In-Home survey: age of child in months (hv5_agem), child’s gender (cm1bsex), child’s constructed height in centimeters (hv5_chtcm), and child’s constructed weight in kilograms (hv5_cwtkg). The CDC code also includes a variable, which indicates whether a child’s height was measured recumbent or standing; in our conversion, we coded everyone to standing as we did not measure recumbent height. The CDC further includes a variable for head circumference, which was set to missing in our calculation per CDC instruction.

Mother Constructed BMI and BMI Z-Score Variables: Mother’s Body Mass Index was calculated by dividing the weight in kilograms (hv5_mwtkg) by the height in centimeters

(hv5_mhtcm). Mother's BMI Z-score was calculated by assuming a normal distribution of hv5_mbmi with a mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1.

KNOWN ISSUES

The file contains a constructed variable, hv5_flag_cm, which flags cases where, due to considerably higher and lower values, we believe a value for inches (not centimeters) for the height may have been erroneously recorded by the interviewer or that the pieces of the stadiometer may have been inserted incorrectly when the height measurement was taken. This would have yielded a value 50 centimeters shorter or taller than the true height value. For the 71 cases where hv5_flag_cm equals 1, we have recoded the height based on these assumptions. Heights of fewer than 60 centimeters were presumed to be in inches and have been multiplied by 2.54 to yield centimeters. Heights between 60 centimeters and 110 centimeters were assumed to result from incorrect stadiometer construction and 50 centimeters were added to the height measurement. Heights equal to or greater than 174 centimeters were assumed to also result from incorrect stadiometer construction but in the opposite manner, and 50 centimeters were subtracted from the height. The resulting range of heights in centimeters for these 71 cases was 120-158 centimeters.

The variable, hv5_cflag (similar in format to the Year 5 In-Home variable), flags missing cases and inconsistencies with the measurement data; values of 1 through 7 denote specific, potential problems with the measurement for each record. There is a parallel variable, hv5_mflag, that notes problems with records for the mothers.

Interviewers should have taken a third measurement for focal child's height when the first two measurements differed by 2 or more centimeters; however, this didn't happen in 57 cases. In 55 of the 57 cases the difference between the first and second height measurements was equal to or less than 3 centimeters. The remaining 2 cases had differences of 9 and 24 centimeters. In all 57 cases, we used the second measurement for the composite height measure.

Interviewers should have taken a third measurement for focal child's or mother's weight when the first two measurements differed by 2 or more pounds. In 7 cases for focal children, the third measurement was not taken. In 3 of the 7 focal child cases the difference between the first and second weight measurements was equal to or less than 3 pounds. The remaining 4 cases had differences of 6 to 7 pounds. In 8 cases for mothers, the third measurement was not taken. In 6 of the 8 mother cases the difference between the first and second weight measurements was between 4 and 6 pounds. The remaining 2 cases had differences of 30 and 100 pounds. In all cases, the second measurement was used for the composite weight measure.

There are currently 260 cases where the Home Visit was conducted at least in part with the family but height and/or weight data are missing for the mother and 51 cases where the height and/or weight data are missing for the child. Additionally, mothers not present during the home visit resulted in 265 additional cases in which the mother's information is not available.

Due to a programming error, -1 and -2 values in **hv5_cbmiz**, **hv5_mbmiz**, **hv5_haz**, and **hv5_waz** are incorrectly labeled as missing but are actually valid z-scores.

TABLES

Table 17: Child Measurement Source Variables

	N	Item
Child age in months at date of home interview	3391	hv5_agem
Constructed, combined child height in centimeters	3352	hv5_chtcm
Constructed, combined child weight in pounds	3361	hv5_cwtlb
Constructed, combined child weight in kilograms	3361	hv5_cwtkg
Constructed, child's Body Mass Index (BMI)	3349	hv5_cbmi
Flag for altered child height measurements (see description)	3369	hv5_flag_cm
Flag for any issue with child's measures	3400	hv5_cflag
Child Body Mass Index (BMI)		
Child's z-score for height-for-age	3335	hv5_haz
Child's percentile for height-for-age	3349	hv5_hap
Child's z-score for weight-for-age	3344	hv5_waz
Child's percentile for weight-for-age	3349	hv5_wap
Child's z-score for BMI	3345	hv5_bmiz
Child's percentile for BMI	3349	hv5_bmip
Child Height		
Indicator for participation in child height measurements	3371	hv5_11
First height measurement taken (cms)	3345	hv5_11a1
Second height measurement taken (cms)	3345	hv5_11a2
Third height measurement (cms)	250	hv5_11a3
Height of child if self-reported instead of measured	7	hv5_11b
Child Weight		
Indicator for participation in child weight measurements	3374	hv5_9
First weight measurement taken (lbs)	3327	hv5_9a1
Second weight measurement taken (lbs)	3327	hv5_9a2
Third weight measurement taken (lbs)	20	hv5_9a3
Weight of child if self-reported instead of measured	34	hv5_9b

Table 18: Mother Measurement Source Variables

	N	Item
Constructed, combined mother weight in pounds	3016	hv5_mwtlb
Constructed, combined mother weight in kilograms	3016	hv5_mwtkg
Constructed, mother's Body Mass Index (BMI)	2875	hv5_mbmi
Flag indicating mother was too heavy for scale for weight	3019	hv5_ovscale
Flag for any issue with mother's measures	3400	hv5_mflag
Mother Body Mass Index (BMI)		
Mother's z-score for BMI	2875	hv5_mbmiz
Mother Height ^a		
Mother's height in centimeters	3738	hv5_mhtcm
Flag indicating mother's height is missing	3400	hv5_mmis_ht
Flag indicating source of mother's height	3223	hv5_selfht
Mother Weight		
Indicator for participation in mother weight measurements	3372	hv5_8
First weight measurement taken (lbs)	2704	hv5_8a1

Second weight measurement taken (lbs)	2704	hv5_8a2
Third weight measurement taken (lbs)	6	hv5_8a3
Weight of mother if self-reported instead of measured	312	hv5_8b
Flag indicating mother's weight was self-reported	3016	hv5_selfwt
Flag indicating mother's weight is missing	3400	hv5_mmis_wt

Note. ^a Mother's height was not measured in the Nine-Year wave of data collection. These variables represent height measures from Year 5 or Year 3

REFERENCES

Kuczmariski, R. J., Ogden, C. L., Guo, S. S. (2002). 2000 CDC growth charts for the united states: Methods and development. National Center for Health Statistics, 11(246).

CONCEPT

PUBERTAL DEVELOPMENT SCALE

These items are taken from the Mother questionnaire of the Phase IV NICHD Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development Survey.

WAVE: NINE-YEAR

Primary Caregiver Questions: p5h17, p5h17a, p5h17b, p5h23

Primary Caregiver Male-Specific Questions: p5h19, p5h19a

Primary Caregiver Female-Specific Questions: p5h21, p5h22, p5h22a, p5h22b

The Pubertal Development Scale was developed by Anne Peterson (Petersen et al., 1988) to provide an instrument for self-assessment of pubertal development by adolescents that could be used in school. It consists of a series of questions about physical development that ask the respondent to evaluate the degree to which a specific physical change (such as pimply skin, growth spurt, breast development, or facial hair) has occurred. Development is related on a scale with the following values 1 (*No*), 2 (*Yes, barely*), 3 (*Yes, Definitely*), and 4 (*Development completed*). This measure has been widely used for assessment of pubertal development by parents and other observers. There are separate questions for girls and boys.

MODIFICATIONS

The scale was completed by the primary caregiver rather than the child. The procedure in the Fragile Families Nine-Year Survey is equivalent to that used in the NICHD Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development Survey.

SCORING INFORMATION

Girls' Pubertal Developmental Scale: For scoring p5h22 is recoded so 1=4 and 2=1. That is, 1 (*yes, menstruation started*) becomes 4 (*Development completed*) and 2 (*No, menstruation not started*) becomes 1 (*No*). The Pubertal development scale for girls is then computed as the mean of items with complete data.

Boys' Pubertal Development Scale is computed as the mean of items for cases with complete data.

REFERENCES

National Institute of Child Health and Development Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development: *Phase IV Mother Questionnaire: Pubertal Development Scale*.
<https://secc.rti.org/Phase4InstrumentDoc.pdf>

Petersen, A.C., Crockett, L., Richards, M., & Boxer, A. (1988). A self-report measure of pubertal status: Reliability, validity, and initial norms. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, 17(2): 117-133.

CONCEPT

CHILD BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS

Data about child’s behavior were collected using questions taken from the behavioral, emotional and social problems scales of the CBCL/6-18 (See Child Behavior Checklist/6-18, (CBCL/6-18: Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001).

WAVE: NINE-YEAR

Primary Caregiver Questions: p5q3a -p5q3do

The Nine-Year Primary Care Giver Self Administered Questionnaire contains 111 items and scales of the CBCL/6-18 on which a parent, or surrogate parent, is asked to rate their child’s behavior from 1 (*Not true*) to 3 (*Very true or often true*).

Relatively few well-standardized behavioral measures are available for young children. Achenbach’s *Child Behavior Checklists* are the most widely used scales for assessing problematic behavior, with versions available for preschoolers as well as older children, and for teacher- as well as parent-report. They provide subscales for different subtypes of problems and are supported with extensive normative data.

MODIFICATIONS

Several items from the other problems scale were excluded. These items include the following questions: child has bowel movements outside of the toilet, child does not eat well, child bites fingernails, child sleeps more than most children, child sucks thumb, child wets self during the day, child wets the bet, and child wishes to be opposite sex.

SCORING INFORMATION

Selected items in the CBCL comprise the following eight constructs or syndromes: aggressive behavior, withdrawn/ depressed, anxious/ depressed, attention problems, social problems, rule-breaking behavior, somatic complaints, and thought problems. Variables should be recoded in the following manner prior to scoring (1=0, 2=1, 3=2). Scores for subscales can be calculated either by adding scores for each item or by averaging item scores. It should be noted that scale scores are only calculated for participants with responses to each item in the scale. When a participant responds with don’t know, refuse, or missing, to any item on a given scale, their scale score will be missing. See tables below for examples of items from individual scales.

TABLES

Table 19: CBCL: Examples from the Aggressive Subscale

	N	Item
Child is cruel, bullies, or shows meanness to others	3320	p5q3o
Child physically attacks people	3316	p5q3bc
Child has temper tantrums or a hot temper	3331	p5q3co

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.89 (N=3177).

Table 20: CBCL: Examples from the Withdrawn/ Depressed Subscale

	N	Item
Child enjoys very little	3307	p5q3e
Child is unhappy, sad, or depressed	3331	p5q3cv
Child is withdrawn, doesn't get involved with others	3318	p5q3da

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.70 ($N=3246$).

Table 21: CBCL: Examples from the Anxious/ Depressed Subscale

	N	Item
Child cries a lot	3322	p5q3m
Child fears certain animals, situations, or places, other than school	3318	p5q3ab
Child fears going to school	3324	p5q3ac

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.78 ($N=3205$).

Table 22: Examples from the CBCL: Attention Problems Subscale

	N	Item
Child fails to finish things he or she starts.	3297	p5q3d
Child can't concentrate, can't pay attention for long	3319	p5q3g
Child can't sit still, is restless, or hyperactive	3319	p5q3i

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.85 ($N=3238$).

Table 23: CBCL: Examples from the Social Problems Subscale

	N	Item
Child is easily jealous	3317	p5q3y
Child gets hurt a lot or is accident-prone	3324	p5q3ai
Child prefers being with younger kids	3320	p5q3bj

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.73 ($N=3213$).

Table 24: CBCL: Examples from the Rule Breaking Behavior Subscale

	N	Item
Child drinks alcohol without parents' approval	3313	p5q3b
Child doesn't seem to feel guilty after misbehaving	3318	p5q3x
Child breaks rules at home, school or elsewhere	3324	p5q3aa

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.77 ($N=3226$).

Table 25: CBCL: Examples from the Somatic Complaints Subscale

	N	Item
Child has nightmares	3326	p5q3as
Child is constipated, doesn't have bowel movements	3321	p5q3au
Child feels dizzy or lightheaded	3331	p5q3aw

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.76 ($N=3209$).

Table 26: CBCL: Examples from the Thought Problems Subscale

	N	Item
Child can't get his or her mind off certain thoughts	3318	p5q3h
Child hears sounds or voices that aren't there	3326	p5q3am
Child exhibits strange behavior	3321	p5q3cd

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.77 ($N=3213$).

Table 27: CBCL: Subscale Statistics

CBCL 6/18 Scale	α	N	$M (SD)$	Range	Skew	Kurtosis
Aggressive Behavior	0.89	3177	RAW: 4.39 (4.92) AVG: 0.24 (0.27)	0-36 0-2	1.90	7.83
Withdrawn/ Depressed	0.70	3246	RAW: 1.39 (1.83) AVG: 0.17 (0.23)	0-16 0-2	2.39	12.47
Anxious/ Depressed	0.78	3205	RAW: 2.38 (2.80) AVG: 0.18 (0.22)	0-26 0-2	2.62	15.32
Attention Problems	0.85	3238	RAW: 3.64 (3.59) AVG: 0.36 (0.36)	0-20 0-2	1.18	4.20
Social Problems	0.73	3213	RAW: 2.30 (2.56) AVG: 0.21 (0.23)	0-22 0-2	2.08	10.48
Rule Breaking Behavior	0.77	3226	RAW: 1.87 (2.44) AVG: 0.11 (0.14)	0-34 0-2	5.04	54.46
Somatic Complaints	0.76	3209	RAW: 1.29 (2.11) AVG: 0.12 (0.19)	0-22 0-2	3.68	26.17
Thought Problems	0.77	3213	RAW: 1.88 (2.62) AVG: 0.13 (0.17)	0-30 0-2	3.74	29.20
Total Internalizing ¹	0.88	3043	RAW: 5.03 (5.70) AVG: 0.16 (0.18)	0-64 0-2	3.49	26.62
Total Externalizing ²	0.91	3108	RAW: 6.22 (6.92) AVG: 0.18 (0.20)	0-70 0-2	2.64	16.16
Total CBCL ³	0.95	2602	RAW: 40.07 (19.48) AVG: 0.33 (0.16)	0-248 0-2	2.72	22.11

Note. Statistics (including the range) are based on the Nine-Year Fragile Families survey data; they do not represent scale norms. ¹Total internalizing includes all items from the anxious/depressed scale, all items from the somatic complaints scale and all items from the withdrawn/depressed scale. See previous CBCL tables above for a full list of scale items. ²Total externalizing includes all items from the aggressive behavior scale and all items from the rule-breaking behavior scale. See previous CBCL tables above for a full list of scale items. ³Total CBCL includes most items from the CBCL. It does not include the following questions: child has bowel movements outside of toilet, child does not eat well, child bites fingernails, child sleeps more than most children, child sucks thumb, child wets self during day, child wets bed, child wishes to be the opposite sex. Total CBCL includes the following items, which are not contained in any other subscale: child brags or boasts, child is cruel to animals, child overeats, child is overweight, child shows off or clowns, child talks too much, child whines. See previous CBCL tables above for a full list of items.

REFERENCES

Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. Al. (2001). *Manual for the ASEBA School-Age Forms & Profiles*: Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth & Families.

CONCEPT

CONNECTEDNESS AT SCHOOL

WAVE: NINE-YEAR

Child Questions: **k5e1a, k5e1b k5e1c, k5e1d**

These items were compiled by Jacquelyn Eccles for the PSID-CDS-III to measure the degree of inclusiveness, closeness, happiness, and safety the child experiences at school. Each question is rated on a 5-point Likert Scale ranging from 0 (*not once in past month*) to 4 (*everyday*).

SCORING INFORMATION

Items can be averaged to create a scale for school connectedness. Basic scale statistics may be found in table 29.

TABLES

Table 28: Connectedness at School

	<i>N</i>	Item
How often did you feel like you were part of your school?	3288	k5ea1a
How often did you feel close to people at your school?	3306	k5ea1b
How often did you feel happy to be at your school?	3326	k5ea1c
How often did you feel safe at your school?	3313	k5ea1d

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.70 ($N=3257$).

Table 29: Connectedness at School: Scale Statistics

Scale	α	<i>N</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	Range	Skew	Kurtosis
Connectedness at School	0.70	3257	3.09 (0.97)	0-4	-1.22	3.97

Note. Statistics (including the range) are based on the Nine-Year Fragile Families survey data; they do not represent scale norms.

REFERENCES

- Child Development Supplement: Panel Study of Income Dynamics.* (2007). Retrieved February 17, 2010, from <http://psidonline.isr.umich.edu/CDS/questionnaires/cds-iii/child.pdf>
- The Panel Study of Income Dynamics Child Development Supplement: User Guide for CDS-III.* (2010). Retrieved February 17, 2010, from <http://psidonline.isr.umich.edu/CDS/questionnaires/cds-iii/child.pdf>

CONCEPT

CONNER'S TEACHER RATING SCALE –REVISED SHORT FORM

WAVE: NINE-YEAR

Teacher Questions: t5b4a - t5b4ab

Data about child's behavior were collected via report by the child's teacher using items from the oppositional, cognitive problems/ inattention, hyperactivity, and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) subscales of the Conner's Teacher Rating Scale—Revised Short form (CTRS-R:S: Conners, K., 2001).

The Nine-Year Teacher survey contains 28 items and scales of the CTRS-R:S on which a teacher is asked to rate the child's behavior from 0 (*Not true at all, never, seldom*) to 3 (*Very much true, very often, very frequently*).

SCORING INFORMATION

It should be noted that scale scores are only calculated for participants with responses to each item in the scale. When a participant responds with don't know, refuse, or missing, to any item on a given scale, their scale score will be missing (see tables below for individual scales).

Selected items in the CTRS-R:S comprise the following four constructs: oppositional, cognitive problems/ inattention, hyperactivity, and ADHD. Scores for subscales can be calculated by adding scores for each item.

TABLES

Table 30: Examples from the Oppositional Subscale

	<i>N</i>	Item
Defiant	2246	t5b4b
Actively defies or refuses to comply with adults' request	2246	t5b4f
Spiteful or vindictive	2241	t5b4j

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.94 (*N*=2216).

Table 31: Examples from the Cognitive Problems/ Inattention Subscale

	<i>N</i>	Item
Forgets things he or she has already learned	2242	t5b4d
Poor in spelling	2240	t5b4h
Not reading up to par	2242	t5b4m

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.88 (*N*=2207).

Table 32: Examples from the Hyperactivity subscale

	<i>N</i>	Item
Is always "on the go" or acts as if driven by a motor	2246	t5b4g
Has difficulty playing or engaging in leisure activities	2247	t5b4x
Excitable, impulsive	2250	t5b4aa

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.92 (*N*=2228).

Table 33: Examples from the ADHD Subscale

	<i>N</i>	Item
Inattentive, easily distracted	2243	t5b4a
Disturbs other children	2245	t5b4e
Cannot remain still	2250	t5b4i

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.95 (*N*=2200).

Table 34: Subscale Statistics Conner's Teacher Rating Scale –Revised short form

	α	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Range	Skew	Kurtosis
Opposition scale	0.94	2216	2.09 (3.44)	0-15	1.91	6.07
Cognitive problems/ Inattention	0.88	2207	4.62 (4.22)	0-15	0.69	2.39
Hyperactivity scale	0.92	2228	3.72 (4.71)	0-21	1.53	4.70
ADHD scale	0.95	2200	9.44 (8.87)	0-36	0.93	3.04

REFERENCES

Conners, K. (2001). *Conners' Rating Scales-Revised: Technical Manual*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.

CONCEPT

SELF DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

WAVE: NINE-YEAR

Child Questions: **k5g2b k5g2d k5g2f k5g2h k5g2m k5g2n k5g2a k5g2c k5g2e k5g2g k5g2i k5g2j k5g2k k5g2l**

Data about child’s behaviors and emotions were collected via self interview using items from the internalizing and externalizing subscales of the Self Description Questionnaire (SDQ) (Marsh, 1990).

The Nine-Year child interview contains 14 of the SDQ items, on which the child is asked to rate their frequency of emotions and behaviors from 0 (*Not at all true*) to 3 (*Very true*).

SCORING INFORMATION

The scale for externalizing was only calculated for children with valid data for at least four of the six items. For internalizing the scale was calculated for children with valid data for six of the eight items. When a participant responds with don’t know, refuse, or missing, to any item on a given scale, their scale score will be missing (see tables below for individual scales).

Selected items in the SDQ comprise the following constructs: internalizing and externalizing. Scores for subscales can be calculated by taking the mean of the items in each subscale.

TABLES

Table 35: SDQ Externalizing

	<i>N</i>	Item
I often argue with other kids	3330	k5g2b
It's hard for me to pay attention	3331	k5g2d
I get distracted easily	3329	k5g2f
It's hard for me to finish my school work	3327	k5g2h
I get in trouble for talking and disturbing others	3328	k5g2m
I get in trouble for fighting with other kids	3326	k5g2n

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.76 (*N*=3334). The subscale is calculated when participants have valid data points for at least two items.

Table 36: SDQ Internalizing

	<i>N</i>	Item
I feel angry when I have trouble learning	3318	k5g2a
I worry about taking tests	3332	k5g2c
I often feel lonely	3331	k5g2e
I feel sad a lot of the time	3326	k5g2g
I worry about doing well in school	3326	k5g2i
I worry about finishing my work	3327	k5g2j
I worry about having someone to play with at school	3332	k5g2k
I feel ashamed when I make mistakes at school	3324	k5g2l

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.78 ($N=3329$). The subscale is calculated when participants have valid data points for at least two items.

Table 37: Self Description Scale: Subscale Statistics

Scale	α	<i>N</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	Range	Skew	Kurtosis
Externalizing	0.76	3334	0.92 (0.72)	0-3	0.71	2.78
Internalizing	0.78	3329	1.15 (0.70)	0-3	0.37	2.37

Statistics (including the range) are based on the Nine-Year Fragile Families survey data; they do not represent scale norms.

REFERENCES

Marsh, H. W. (1990). *Self-Description Questionnaire Manual*. Campbelltown N. S. W. Australia: University of Western Sydney, Macarthur.

CONCEPT

TASK COMPLETION AND BEHAVIOR

WAVE: NINE-YEAR

Child Questions: k5g1a, k5g1b k5g1c, k5g1d, k5g1e

These items are modeled after the perseverance scale from the PSID-CDS-II and III.

SCORING INFORMATION

Cases can be scored by taking the mean of all four items for cases without missing data. Basic scale statistics may be found in table 39.

TABLES

Table 38: Task Completion and Behavior Scale

	<i>N</i>	Item
I stay with a task until I solve it.	3292	k5g1a
Even when I task is difficult, I want to solve it anyway.	3308	k5g1b
I keep my things orderly.	3323	k5g1c
I try to do my best on all my work.	3333	k5g1d
When I start something, I follow it through to the end.	3313	k5g1e

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.59 (*N*=3262). There are 115 missing responses for the Task Completion and Behavior scale; these missings occur because of participants responding don't know, refuse, or missing to any given item within the scale.

Table 39: Task Completion and Behavior: Scale Statistics

Scale	α	<i>N</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	Range	Skew	Kurtosis
Peer Bullying	0.59	3262	2.41 (0.48)	0-3	-0.97	4.10

Statistics (including the range) are based on the Nine-Year Fragile Families survey data; they do not represent scale norms.

REFERENCES

Furstenberg, F. F., Jr., Cook, T. D., Eccles, J., Elder, G. H., & Sameroff, A. (1999). *Managing to Make it: Urban Families and Adolescent Success*. University of Chicago Press.

CONCEPT

DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR

WAVE: NINE-YEAR

Child Questions: **k5f1a, k5f1b, k5f1c, k5f1d, k5f1e, k5f1f, k5f1g, k5f1h, k5f1i, k5f1j, k5f1k, k5f1l, k5f1m, k5f1n, k5f1o, k5f1p, k5f1q**

These items are modeled after the Things That You Have Done scale (Maumary-Gremaud). Similar items were included in the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (1997).

MODIFICATIONS

Fragile Families Nine-Year Survey posed these questions in a “YES/ NO” format as opposed to employing a Likert scale for frequency of behaviors. Several scales were modified from the Things That You Have Done Scale (see tables below for scale descriptions in the Fragile Families data).⁶

SCORING INFORMATION

Items can be summed to yield a total delinquent behavior score or summed to create individual subscales for crimes against people, theft, vandalism, alcohol use, and drug use.

TABLES

Table 40: Child Self-Reported Delinquency Questions

	N	Item
Purposely damaged or destroyed property that wasn't yours	3333	k5f1a
Taken or stolen something from another person or from a store	3333	k5f1b
Taken money at home, like from your mother's purse/ dresser	3334	k5f1c
Cheated on a school test	3336	k5f1d
Had a fist fight with another person	3339	k5f1e
Hurt an animal on purpose	3338	k5f1f
Trespassed into somebody's garden, backyard, house, or garage	3339	k5f1g
Ran away from home	3343	k5f1h
Skipped school without an excuse	3341	k5f1i
Secretly taken a sip of wine, beer, or liquor	3339	k5f1j
Smoked marijuana, grass, pot, weed	3338	k5f1k
Smoked a cigarette or used tobacco	3339	k5f1l
Been suspended or expelled from school	3341	k5f1m
Written things or spray painted on walls or sidewalks or cars	3343	k5f1n
Purposely set fire to a building, a car, or other property or tried to do so	3341	k5f1o
Avoided paying for movies, bus or subway rides or food	3328	k5f1p
Thrown rocks or bottles at people or cars	3339	k5f1q

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.70 (N=3281)

⁶The following document also has comparisons of subscales:
<http://www.fasttrackproject.org/techrept/t/tyd/tyd5tech.pdf>

Table 41: Crimes against people subscale

	N	Item
Had a fist fight with another person	3339	k5f1e
Thrown rocks or bottles at people or cars	3339	k5f1q

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.29 ($N=3335$).

Table 42: Theft people subscale

	N	Item
Taken or stolen something from another person or from a store	3333	k5f1b
Taken money at home, like from your mother's purse/ dresser	3334	k5f1c
Trespassed into somebody's garden, backyard, house, or garage	3339	k5f1g
Avoided paying for movies, bus or subway rides or food	3328	k5f1p

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.42 ($N=3312$).

Table 43: Vandalism subscale

	N	Item
Purposely damaged or destroyed property that wasn't yours	3333	k5f1a
Written things or sprayed paint on walls or sidewalks or cars	3341	k5f1n
Purposely set fire to a building, a car, or other property or tried	3343	k5f1o

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.29 ($N=3330$).

Table 44: School delinquency subscale

	N	Item
Cheated on a school test	3336	k5f1d
Skipped school without an excuse	3341	k5f1i
Been suspended or expelled from school	3341	k5f1m

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.22 ($N=3331$).

Table 45: Alcohol subscale

	N	Item
Secretly taken a sip of wine, beer, or liquor	3339	k5f1j

Table 46: Drug use subscale

	N	Item
Smoked marijuana, grass, pot, weed	3338	k5f1k
Smoked a cigarette or used tobacco	3339	k5f1l

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.21 ($N=3337$).

Table 47: Child Self-Reported Delinquency Scale Statistics

Scale	α	<i>N</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	Range	Skew	Kurtosis
Total child delinquency	0.70	3281	1.24 (1.77)	0-17	2.30	10.75
Crimes against people	0.29	3335	0.36 (0.55)	0-2	1.26	3.60
Theft	0.42	3312	0.61 (0.64)	0-4	2.38	9.13
Vandalism	0.29	3330	0.19 (0.46)	0-3	2.63	10.80
School delinquency	0.22	3331	0.27 (0.52)	0-3	1.90	6.17
Alcohol use		3339	0.04 (0.20)	0-1	4.63	22.42
Drug use	0.21	3337	0.01 (0.10)	0-2	11.64	152.79

Note. Statistics (including the range) are based on the Nine-Year Fragile Families survey data; they do not represent scale norms.

REFERENCES

Maumary-Gremaud, A. (2000). Things that you have done. (Technical Report)
<http://www.fasttrackproject.org/techrept/t/tyd/tyd5tech.pdf>

CONCEPT

PEER BULLYING

WAVE: NINE-YEAR

Child Questions: **k5e2a, k5e2b k5e2c, k5e2d**

These items are modeled after the peer bullying assessment from the PSID-CDS-III. The questions were confirmed for use in the PSID confirmatory factor analysis, which loaded onto one factor.

SCORING INFORMATION

Cases can be scored by taking the mean of all four items for cases without missing data. Basic scale statistics may be found in table 49.

TABLES

Table 48: Peer Bullying Scale

	N	Item
How often have you kids in your school or neighborhood picked on you or said mean things to you?	3322	k5e2a
How often have you kids in your school or neighborhood hit you?	3327	k5e2b
How often have you kids in your school or neighborhood taken your things, like your money or lunch, without asking?	3327	k5e2c
How often have you kids in your school or neighborhood purposely left you out of activities?	3316	k5e2d

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.67 (N=3299). There are 78 missing responses for the Peer Bullying scale; these missings occur because of participants responding don't know, refuse, or missing to any given item within the scale.

Table 49: Peer Bullying: Scale Statistics

Scale	α	N	M (SD)	Range	Skew	Kurtosis
Peer Bullying	0.67	3299	0.60 (0.76)	0-4	1.63	5.76

Statistics (including the range) are based on the Nine-Year Fragile Families survey data; they do not represent scale norms.

REFERENCES

Ladd, G. W., Kochenderfer, B. J., & Coleman, C. C. (1996). Friendship quality as a predictor of young children's early school adjustment. *Child Development, 67*: 1103-1118.

Child Development Supplement: Panel Study of Income Dynamics. (2007). Retrieved February 17, 2010, from <http://psidonline.isr.umich.edu/CDS/questionnaires/cds-iii/child.pdf>

The Panel Study of Income Dynamics Child Development Supplement: User Guide for CDS-III. (2010). Retrieved February 17, 2010, from <http://psidonline.isr.umich.edu/CDS/questionnaires/cds-iii/child.pdf>

CONCEPT

SOCIAL SKILLS

WAVE: NINE-YEAR

Teacher Questions: **t5b1a, t5b1b, t5b1c, t5b1d, t5b1e, t5b1f, t5b1g, t5b1h, t5b1i, t5b1j, t5b1k, t5b1l, t5b1m, t5b1n, t5b1o t5b1p, t5b1q, t5b1r, t5b1s, t5b1t, t5b1u, t5b1v, t5b1w, t5b1x t5b1y, t5b3a, t5b3b, t5b3c, t5b3d, t5b3e, t5b3f, t5b3g, t5b3h, t5b3i, t5b3j, t5b3k, t5b3l**

These items were modeled after the social rating scale used in the ECLS-K.

Data about child's social skills were collected via report by the child's teacher using items from the cooperation, assertion, self control, and social problems subscales of the Social Skills Rating System (SSRS: Gresheam & Elliott, 1990). The Nine-Year Teacher survey contains 37 items and scales of the SSRS on which a teacher is asked to rate the child's behavior from 1 (*Never*) to 4 (*Very Often*).

MODIFICATIONS

The SSRS uses a 3 point Likert scale in which never is equal to zero, sometimes is equal to 1, and very often is equal to 2. Following the ECLS-K, we included an additional point on the scale so that never is equal to 1, sometimes is equal to 2, often is equal to 3, and very often is equal to 4. The modified scale was provided by the US Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics with permission from the copyright owner.

Several items from the instrument were excluded. These items include the following questions: introduces herself or himself to new people without being told, appropriately questions rules that may be unfair, initiates conversations with peers, appropriately tells you when he or she thinks you have treated him or her unfairly, and volunteers to help peers with classroom tasks. It should be noted that scale scores are only calculated for participants with responses to each item in the scale. When a participant responds with don't know, refuse, or missing to any item on a given scale, their scale score will be missing (see tables below for examples from individual scales).

Several items from the hyperactivity subscale were also excluded. These items include the following questions: is easily distracted, interrupts conversations of others, disturbs ongoing activities, doesn't listen to what others say, acts impulsively, and fidgets or moves excessively.

SCORING INFORMATION

Selected items in the SSRS comprise the following constructs: cooperation, assertion, self control, internalizing, and externalizing. Scores for subscales can be calculated by rescaling the data as follows: never (1=0), sometimes (2=1), often (3=2), and very often (4=3), then by summing scores for each scale. For a full list of items comprising each subscale please email ffdata@princeton.edu

TABLES

Table 50: Examples from the Social Skills Cooperation Subscale

	<i>N</i>	Item
Follows your directions	2249	t5b1p
Puts work materials or school property away	2252	t5b1q
Keeps desk clean and neat without being reminded	2239	t5b1v

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.95 ($N=2200$).

Table 51: Examples from the Social Skills Assertion Subscale

	<i>N</i>	Item
Invites others to join in activities	2245	t5b1e
Makes friends easily	2248	t5b1h
Gives compliments to peers	2242	t5b1o

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.89 ($N=2218$).

Table 52: Examples from the Social Skills Self-Control Subscale

	<i>N</i>	Item
Controls temper in conflict situations with peers	2248	t5b1a
Receives criticism well	2240	t5b1k
Accepts peers' ideas for group activities	2245	t5b1n

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.95 ($N=2138$).

Table 53: Examples from the Social Problems: Externalizing Subscale

	<i>N</i>	Item
Fights with others	2238	t5b3a
Threatens or bullies others	2244	t5b3c
Argues with others	2243	t5b3g

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.93 ($N=2218$).

Table 54: Examples from the Social Problems: Internalizing Subscale

	<i>N</i>	Item
Has low self-esteem	2239	t5b3b
Appears lonely	2246	t5b3d
Shows anxiety about being with a group of children	2239	t5b3e

Note. Alpha based on full sample: 0.85 ($N=2211$).

Table 55: Examples from the Social Skills Subscale Statistics

	α	N	$M (SD)$	Range	Skew	Kurtosis
Cooperation Scale	0.95	2200	18.71 (7.34)	0-30	-0.09	1.98
Assertion Scale	0.89	2218	9.39 (3.56)	0-15	-0.12	2.18
Self-Control Scale	0.95	2138	19.12 (7.20)	0-30	-0.33	2.23
Total Social Skills Scale	0.97	2091	47.26 (16.63)	0-75	-0.15	2.17

Table 56: Examples from the Social Problems Subscale Statistics

	α	N	$M (SD)$	Range	Skew	Kurtosis
Externalizing	0.93	2218	3.35 (4.07)	0-18	1.55	4.98
Internalizing	0.85	2211	3.63 (3.25)	0-17	1.16	4.23
Problem Behaviors Total	0.89	2189	6.97 (6.08)	0-33	1.21	4.24

REFERENCES

Gresham, F. M., & Elliott, S. N. (2007). *Social Skills Rating System*. Toronto: Pearson Publishing.

CONCEPT

WISC –IV FORWARD AND BACKWARD DIGIT SPAN

WAVE: NINE-YEAR

Assessment Variables: **hv5_dspr hv5_dsss hv5_dsraw hv5_dsae**

Data about child’s auditory short term memory, sequencing skills, attention, and concentration were measured using the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, Digit Span subtest (WISC-IV Digit Span: (Wechsler, D., 2003).

The Nine-Year In-Home Assessment contains 16 items in two sections from the WISC-IV Digit Span forward and backward tests. Each item contains two trials, or chances for a child to repeat the span correctly. Each trial is different, but trials for each individual item are equivalent (see table 57 for examples). Interviewers read a number and asked the child to repeat the number, forward or backward, dependent on the section. Interviewers score 1(*correct*) or 0 (*incorrect*). Children who do not respond receive a rating of 0: incorrect. The interviewers follow a discontinue rule for each section, if a score of 0 is achieved on both trials.

Individual items for the PPVT are not available for release. Variables included on the file are listed in table 57.

TABLES

Table 57: WISC-IV Digit Span Variables

	<i>N</i>	Item
Digit span raw score	3369	hv5_dsraw
Digit span standard score	3367	hv5_dsss
Digit span age equivalency	3368	hv5_dsae
Digit span percentile rank	3366	hv5_dspr

Table 58: WISC-IV Digit Span Items

Digit Span Forward and Backward Examples

Item 1.1: 2 – 9

Item 4.2: 5 – 2 – 1 – 8 – 6

Item 8.2: 4 – 2 – 6 – 9 – 1 – 7 – 8 – 3 – 5

Table 59: WISC-IV Digit Span Scale Statistics

	<i>α</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	Range	Skew	Kurtosis
Digit Span	0.87. ¹	3369	Raw: 13.85 (3.12)	0-32	0.20	4.96
			Standardized: 9.35 (2.81)	1-19		

Note. ¹The reported alpha represents the subtest alpha, which resulted when the WISC – IV was normed. It does not reflect the alpha for this sample.

REFERENCES

Wechsler, D. (2003). *Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children: WISC-IV®*, (4th Ed)
San Antonio, TX: Harcourt Assessment.

CONCEPT

PEABODY PICTURE VOCABULARY TEST-III

WAVE: NINE-YEAR

Assessment Variables: **hv5_ppvtae hv5_ppvtpr hv5_ppvtraw hv5_ppvtss**

The Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT-III) test measures receptive vocabulary and screens for verbal ability. Like the Woodcock Johnson III tests, it is administered with an “easel” or activity book. The interviewer reads a word and asks the child to identify the picture in the easel (among a set of four pictures) that corresponds to that word.

TABLES

Table 60: PPVT Variables

	<i>N</i>	Item
PPVT raw score	3346	hv5_ppvtraw
PPVT standard score	3346	hv5_ppvtss
PPVT age equivalency	3346	hv5_ppvtae
PPVT percentile rank	3346	hv5_ppvtpr

Table 61: PPVT Scale Statistics

	α	<i>N</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	Range	Skew	Kurtosis
PPVT	0.95. ¹	3346	Raw: 111.11 (20.38)	41-185	0.42	3.12
			Standardized: 92.72 (14.95)	37-159		

Note. ¹The reported alpha represents the median alpha for the population on which the PPVT was normed. It does not reflect the alpha for this sample.

REFERENCES

Dunn, L. M., & Dunn, L. M. (1997). *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test*, (3rd Ed.). Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.

CONCEPT

WOODCOCK JOHNSON PASSAGE COMPREHENSION AND APPLIED PROBLEMS

WAVE: NINE-YEAR

Assessment Variables: **hv5_wj9raw hv5_wj9ss hv5_wj9pr hv5_wj9ae
hv5_wj10ss hv5_wj10pr hv5_wj10ae hv5_wj10raw**

The initial Passage Comprehension (WJ Subtest 9) items involve symbolic learning, or the ability to match a rebus (pictograph representation of a word) with an actual picture of the object. The next items are presented in a multiple-choice format and require the individual to point to the picture represented by a phrase. The remaining items require the person to read a short passage and identify a missing key word that makes sense in the context of that passage. The items become increasingly difficult by removing pictorial stimuli and by increasing passage length, level of vocabulary, and complexity of syntactic and semantic cues.

Applied Problems (WJ Subtest 10) requires the focal child to analyze and solve math problems. To solve the problems, the focal child must listen to the problem, recognize the procedure to be followed, and then perform relatively simple calculations. Because many of the problems include extraneous information, the focal child must decide not only the appropriate mathematical operations to use but also which numbers to include in the calculation. Item difficulty increases with complex calculations.

TABLES

Table 62: Woodcock Johnson Variables

	<i>N</i>	Item
WJ passage comprehension raw score	3333	hvj5_wj9raw
WJ passage comprehension standard score	3333	hv5_wj9ss
WJ passage comprehension age equivalency	3332	hv5_wj9ae
WJ passage comprehension percentile rank	3332	hv5_wj9pr
WJ applied problems raw score	3343	hv5_wj10raw
WJ applied problems standard score	3343	hv5_wj10ss
WJ applied problems age equivalency	3342	hv5_wj10ae
WJ applied problems percentile rank	3342	hv5_wj10pr

Table 63: Woodcock-Johnson Scale Statistics

	α	N		Range	Skew	Kurtosis
WJ Test 9		3333	Raw: 25.53 (5.71)	0-40	-1.03	8.18
			Standardized: 92.63 (14.23)	1-136		
WJ Test 10	0.81-.94. ¹	3343	Raw: 32.13 (6.14)	0-54	-1.08	7.58
			Standardized: 97.92 (16.16)	1-152		

Note. ¹The reported alpha represents the median range of alphas for the entire battery. It does not reflect the alpha for this sample.

REFERENCES

Woodcock, R. W., McGrew, K. S., & Mather, N. (2001). *Woodcock-Johnson III Tests of Achievement*. Itasca, IL: Riverside Publishing.

CONCEPT

Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment

WAVE: NINE-YEAR

The Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment (HOME) provides a means to examine and assess the caring environment in which the child is being reared. A number of items from the HOME were assessed during the in-home interview portion of the Nine-Year survey. These items were derived from several versions of the HOME for different age groups including the early childhood HOME, middle childhood HOME and early adolescent HOME. Subscale scoring is not provided because of the use of items from all three versions of the HOME.

REFERENCES

Caldwell, M. & Bradley, R H. (1984). *The Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment*. Little Rock: University of Arkansas.

IV. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abidin, R. (1995). *Parent Stress Inventory, 3rd Edition*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A. (2001). *Manual for the ASEBA School-Age Forms & Profiles*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth & Families.
- American Psychiatric Association (1994). *Diagnostic And Statistical Manual Of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- Bauman, K. J. (1999). Shifting family definitions: The effect of cohabitation and other nonfamily household relationships on measures of poverty. *Demography* 36(3):315-325.
- Bauman, K. (1998). Direct measures of poverty as indicators of economic need: Evidence from the survey income and program participation. *U.S. Census Bureau Poverty Measurement Papers*. Retrieved March 27, 2003, from <http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0030/twps0030.html>
- Booth, A., Johnson, D., & Edwards, J. N. (1983). Measuring marital instability. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 45: 387-394.
- Caldwell, M. & Bradley, R H. (1984). *The Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment*. Little Rock: University of Arkansas.
- Child Development Supplement: Panel Study of Income Dynamics*. (2007). Retrieved February 17, 2010, from <http://psidonline.isr.umich.edu/CDS/questionnaires/cds-iii/child.pdf>
- Conners, K. (2001). *Conners' Rating Scales-Revised: Technical Manual*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
- Dunn, L. M., & Dunn, L. M. (1997). *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, (3rd Ed.)*. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.
- Gresham, F. M., & Elliott, S. N. (2007). *Social Skills Rating System*. Toronto: Pearson Publishing.
- Hofferth, S., Davis-Kean, P.E., Avis, J., & Finkelstein, J. *The Child Development Supplement to the Panel Study of Income Dynamics: 1997 User Guide*. Survey Research Center, The University of Michigan Institute for Social Research. Retrieved March 27, 2003, from <http://www.isr.umich.edu/src/child-development/usergd.html>
- Kendler, K.S., Davis, C.G., Kessler, R.C. (1997). The familial aggregation of common psychiatric and substance use disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey: A family history study. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 170, 541-548.

- Kessler, R.C., Andrews, G., Mroczek, D., Ustun, T.B., & Wittchen, H.U. (1998). The world health organization composite international diagnostic interview short-form (CIDI-SF). *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 7, 171-185.
- Kuczarski, R. J., Ogden, C. L., Guo, S. S. (2002). 2000 CDC growth charts for the united states: Methods and development. National Center for Health Statistics, 11 (246).
- Ladd, G. W., Kochenderfer, B. J., & Coleman, C. C. (1996). Friendship quality as a predictor of young children's early school adjustment. *Child Development*, 67: 1103-1118.
- Maumary-Gremaud, A. (2000). Things that you have done. (Technical Report)
<http://www.fastrackproject.org/techrept/t/tyd/tyd5tech.pdf>
- Marsh, H. W. (1990). *Self-Description Questionnaire* Manual. Campbelltown N. S. W. Australia: University of Western Sydney, Macarthur.
- Mayer, S.E., & Jencks, C. (1989). Poverty and the distribution of material hardship. *Journal of Human Resources*, 24 (1): 88-114.
- National Institute of Child Health and Development Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development: *Phase IV Mother Questionnaire: Pubertal Development Scale*.
<https://secc.rti.org/Phase4InstrumentDoc.pdf>
- National Survey of Children's Health*. (2003). Family Functioning Section
<http://nschdata.org/Content/Guide.aspx#S8>
- National Survey of Children's Health*. (2003). Middle Childhood and Adolescence Section
<http://nschdata.org/Content/Guide.aspx#S7>
- Pallant, J. F. (2007). *SPSS Survival Manual: A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis using SPSS for Windows* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- The Panel Study of Income Dynamics Child Development Supplement: User Guide for CDS-III*. (2010). Retrieved February 17, 2010, from
<http://psidonline.isr.umich.edu/CDS/questionnaires/cds-iii/child.pdf>
- Petersen, A.C., Crockett, L., Richards, M., & Boxer, A. (1988). A self-report measure of pubertal status: Reliability, validity, and initial norms. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, 17(2): 117-133.
- Primary Caregiver of Target Child Household Questionnaire for the Child Development Supplement to the Family Economics Study, 1997*. (1997). Retrieved March 27, 2003, from
<ftp://ftp.isr.umich.edu/pub/src/psid/questionnaires/97child/PCGhhld.pdf>
- Straus, M.A. (1990). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: the conflict tactics (ct)

- scales. In M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families*, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Straus, M.A. (2001). Scoring and norms for the cts2 and ctspc family research laboratory, University of New Hampshire. <http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2>
- Straus, M.A., Hamby, S.L., Finkelhor, D., Moore, D.W., & Runyan, D. (1998). Identification of child maltreatment with the parent-child conflict tactics scales: Development and psychometric data for a national sample of american parents. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 22, 249 – 270.
- Social Indicators Survey Center*, Columbia University School of Social Work. (1999). *1999 New York City Social Indicators Survey: Documentation and Codebook, Revised Version*. Retrieved March 27, 2003, from <http://www.siscenter.org/>
- Survey on Income and Program Participation: 1996 Panel Wave 8 Adult Well-Being Topical Module Questionnaire*. (1998). Retrieved March 27, 2003, from http://www.sipp.census.gov/sipp/top_mod/1996/quests/wave8/awbook.html
- Sweet, J.A. and Bumpass, L. (1996). *The National Survey of Families and Households - Waves 1 and 2: Data Description and Documentation*. Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison (<http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/nsfh/home.htm>).
- Walters, E.E., Kessler, R.C., Nelson, R.C., & Mroczek, D. (2002). *Scoring the World Health Organization's Composite International Diagnostic Interview Short Form (CIDI-SF; Dec 2002)*.
- Wechsler, D. (2003). *Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children: WISC-IV®*, (4th Ed) San Antonio, TX: Harcourt Assessment.
- Woodcock, R. W., McGrew, K. S., & Mather, N. (2001). *Woodcock-Johnson III Tests of Achievement*. Itasca, IL: Riverside Publishing.