

LATINO FAMILIES AND YOUTH:

A Compendium of Assessment Tools



**Pan American
Health
Organization**

*Regional Office of the
World Health Organization*



1902 - 2012

LATINO FAMILIES AND YOUTH:

A Compendium of Assessment Tools



Also published in Spanish (2013) with the title:
Familias latinas y jóvenes: un compendio de herramientas de evaluación
ISBN 978-92-75-07447-3

PAHO HQ Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

Pan American Health Organization.

Latino Families and Youth: A Compendium of Assessment Tools = Familias latinas y jóvenes: un compendio de herramientas de evaluación = Washington,DC : PAHO , 2013.

1. Program Evaluation. 2. Health Services Evaluation. 3. Damage Assessment in the Social Sector. 4. Evaluation Studies. 5. Family. 6. Youth. 7. Latin America. I. Title.

ISBN 978-92-75-07447-3

(NLM Classification: W84.4 DA15)

The Pan American Health Organization welcomes requests for permission to reproduce or translate its publications, in part or in full. Applications and inquiries should be addressed to Editorial Services, Entity of Knowledge Management and Communications (KMC), Pan American Health Organization, Washington, D.C., U.S.A. (pubrights@paho.org). The department of Family, Gender and Life Course will be glad to provide the latest information on any changes made to the text, plans for new editions, and reprints and translations already available.

© Pan American Health Organization, 2013. All rights reserved.

Publications of the Pan American Health Organization enjoy copyright protection in accordance with the provisions of Protocol 2 of the Universal Copyright Convention. All rights are reserved.

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the Pan American Health Organization concerning the status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

The mention of specific companies or of certain manufacturers' products does not imply that they are endorsed or recommended by the Pan American Health Organization in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned. Errors and omissions excepted, the names of proprietary products are distinguished by initial capital letters.

All reasonable precautions have been taken by the Pan American Health Organization to verify the information contained in this publication. However, the published material is being distributed without warranty of any kind, either expressed or implied. The responsibility for the interpretation and use of the material lies with the reader. In no event shall the Pan American Health Organization be liable for damages arising from its use.

Authors: Pamela Orpinas, Adriana Rico and Lourdes Martinez
Editors: Matilde Maddaleno, Ashley Rowe and Lauren Vulcanovic

CONTENTS

PREFACE	06
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	09
INTRODUCTION	10
SECTION I: PARENT-CHILD COMMUNICATION AND RELATIONSHIP	12
Alabama Parenting Questionnaire (APQ)	13
Family APGAR	16
Behavioral Affect Rating Scale (BARS)	18
How is your Family? – Brief Scale for Parents	21
How is your Family? - Brief Scale for Adolescents	23
How is your Family? – Difficult Situations for Adults and Adolescents	25
Argentine Questionnaire on Coping for Children 8-12 Years of Age	26
Argentine Scale of Perception of the Relationship with Parents for Children 13-17 Years of Age, 2005	29
Argentine Scale of Perception of the Relationship with Parents for Children 8-12 Years of Age, 2007	35
Maternal Resilience Scale	40
Scale of Subdimensions of Family Relations	46
Family Cohesion Scale from FACES II	54
Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA)	56
Maternal Expertise, Trustworthiness, and Accessibility Scale	59
McMaster Family Assessment Device (FAD)	61
Parent-Adolescent Communication	66
Parent-Adolescent Communication Scale (PACS)	67
Parental Knowledge	70
Parental Monitoring Assessment (PMA)	71
Parental Support for Fighting	73
Parenting Practices	75
Parental Monitoring (Students for Peace)	78
Parental Monitoring-Curfew (H/L ATS)	79
Parent-Child Communication about Smoking (H/L ATS)	80
Relationship with Parents (Students for Peace)	82
Social Influences on Smoking (H/L ATS)	83
SECTION II: PEER AND SCHOOL INFLUENCES	86
Academic Achievement	87
Engagement vs. Disaffection with Learning: Student Report	88

CONTENTS

Continued

Parent Involvement in School	90
Parent Report on Child's Close Friends	93
Peer Deviancy	94
Personal Value on Achievement Scale	96
School Safety Problems	97
SECTION III: COMMUNITY COHESION	100
Collective Efficacy	102
SECTION IV: INDIVIDUAL LEVEL CONSTRUCTS	104
Argentine Loneliness Scale for Adolescents	106
Beliefs about Aggression and Alternatives	108
Questionnaire on Optimal Experience	109
Scale for Beliefs on the Role of the Father after a Divorce (ECRP-D)	113
SECTION V: HIGH-RISK BEHAVIORS	116
Alcohol Screening	118
Aggression Scale	120
Gang Membership	121
Reduced Aggression and Victimization Scales (RAVS)	122
Self-Efficacy for Alternatives to Aggression	124
Victimization Scale	125
SECTION VI: MODERATORS: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS	128
Alcohol and Tobacco for Adults (BRFSS)	130
Health-Related Quality of Life: Symptoms of Healthy Days	132
Food Security Status – Short form	134
SECTION VII: LATINO ETHNIC PRIDE, ACCULTURATION, AND IMMIGRATION	138
Bicultural Involvement Questionnaire (BIQ)	140
Brief Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire-Community Version (Brief PEDQ-CV)	142
Immigration Risk Index	146
Familial Ethnic Socialization (FES)	147
Revised Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM-R)	148
APPENDIX A: CONTACT INFORMATION	152

PREFACE

In 2008, the Pan American Health Organization/World Health Organization (PAHO/WHO) Member States approved the Adolescent and Youth Regional Strategy and Plan of Action and the Resolution CD49.R14

[http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2009/CD49.R14%20\(Eng.\).pdf](http://www2.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2009/CD49.R14%20(Eng.).pdf)

This resolution encouraged PAHO/WHO member states to engage adolescents and youth, their families, communities, schools, and other appropriate institutions and organizations in the provision of culturally sensitive and age-appropriate promotion and prevention programs as part of the comprehensive approach to improving the health and well-being of adolescents.

The strengthening of families is important in resource-limited countries where poverty increases the risk that adolescents engage in unhealthy behaviors. The adolescent population, 10 to 19 years, currently represents 20% of the population in Latin America, and an estimated two-thirds of premature deaths and a third of all adult problems are attributable to behaviors that are initiated during adolescence. Parents have a critical role in promoting healthy behaviors in adolescents, and PAHO/WHO has identified interventions for families and communities as an important line of action in its Strategy and Plan of Action for Improving Adolescent Health.

Health service providers and other groups, including schoolteachers and community health promoters, are instrumental in improving the health of adolescents. As behavior change in adolescents is influenced by the environment in which they live, study and work, community-based interventions that strengthen families, include schools and encourage broad-based participation are essential.

The Familias Fuertes program, adapted from Iowa State University's Iowa Strengthening Families Program (ISFP), is a community-based parenting and family strengthening program designed to reduce risk behaviors among adolescents. The main objective of the program is to promote parenting skills and better communication among families to ultimately reduce problem behaviors and alcohol and drug abuse among adolescents and to improve social competencies and school performance. Familias Fuertes has been adapted to the social and cultural realities of Latin America, has been implemented in 13 countries in the Region and is continually expanding.

Proper evaluation of the Familias Fuertes program is integral to the improvement of the program and achievement of the program objectives, and, as outlined in the Strategy and Plan of Action for Improving Adolescent Health, the development and dissemination of evaluation tools in the development, monitoring and evaluation of comprehensive programs is important. This publication provides instruments to evaluate the Familias Fuertes program among Latino families, and can be used by program facilitators, researchers and staff. This document provides easily accessible evaluation tools and scales to ensure the consistent evaluation of outcome mediators as the program expands, and is central to the advancement of the Familias Fuertes program.

Matilde Maddaleno

Regional Advisor for Adolescent Health
Pan American Health Organization /
World Health Organization

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the authors of this document: Dr. Pamela Orpinas, Professor in the Department of Health Promotion and Behavior at the University of Georgia's College of Public Health, as well as Adriana Rico and Lourdes Martinez, graduate students at the University of Georgia, for their extensive identification, organization, and summary of measurement scales. We also wish to acknowledge and thank all the researchers (see Appendix A) who have contributed their measures to this compendium as well as the following persons who contributed to the document with revisions and approval: Ashley Rowe, Family and Community Health Consultant at the Pan American Health Organization, Lauren Vulcanovic, Knowledge Management and Communications Specialist at the Pan American Health Organization and Dr. Matilde Maddaleno, Senior Advisor for Adolescent Health at the Pan American Health Organization.

The Pan American Health Organization also wishes to express thanks to PRADICAN and the Andean Community for their technical support in the development and revision of this document, as well as the European Union and the Royal Norwegian Embassy for their financial contributions.

INTRODUCTION

This compendium is intended to help researchers and others who work with Latino families evaluate programs to prevent problems of risky behaviors in adolescents.

The Pan American Health Organization originally financed this compendium in order to identify assessment tools that are appropriate for evaluating the Strong Families (“Familias Fuertes”) program. The intense support and interest of researchers led us to expand the manual to include additional scales relevant to the area of family and adolescence.

This compendium summarizes more than 50 scales that have been evaluated in different countries of Latin America or in the United States for use with Latino families. It is important, therefore, that researchers adapt the language to local usage. Moreover, given the diversity of cultures in Latin America, it is important to examine the relevance of the constructs, and of the items that measure these constructs, in terms of their relationship to the local context.

The compendium is divided into seven sections. Section 1, the longest, summa-

rizes scales that evaluate communication between parents and adolescents and the quality of family relationships. Section 2 measures influences of the school and of other adolescents, including academic qualifications, safety problems in schools, value of education of education, and characteristics of friends. Section 3 has only one scale, on the influence of the community; it is clear that more scales are needed to evaluate this construct. Section 4 includes four scales at the individual level that measure feelings of loneliness in adolescents, beliefs about the use of aggression, optimal experience, and beliefs of fathers about their roles after a divorce. Section 5 provides scales that measure risky behaviors by adolescents, including alcohol use, aggression, and victimization. Section 6 provides scales to evaluate three factors that can influence the impact of a prevention program: use of alcohol and

tobacco by parents, physical illness of parents, and food insecurity. Section 7 includes scales that measure ethnic pride, acculturation, and immigration. The scales in Section 7 have been used to evaluate characteristics of Latinos who live in the United States. However, some of these scales could be used to evaluate feelings of discrimination of ethnic minorities in Latin America.

All the assessment tools in this compendium are free. Researchers may use them without requesting permission from the authors, unless otherwise indicated in the section entitled "Copyright." Authors will appreciate receiving a copy of publications that have used their scales.



Section I:

PARENT-CHILD COMMUNICATION
AND RELATIONSHIP

Alabama Parenting Questionnaire (APQ)

DESCRIPTION	<p>The original Alabama Parenting Questionnaire (APQ) consists of 35 items and five subscales: Involvement, Positive Parenting, Poor Monitoring/Supervision, Inconsistent Discipline, and Corporal Punishment. The APQ includes seven additional items that measures specific discipline practices. The scale was used with a clinical sample of elementary school-aged children between 6 to 13 years old and their parents (Shelton, Frick & Wootton, 1996). The five subscales are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Involvement (10 items) (2) Positive Parenting (6 items) (3) Poor Monitoring/Supervision (10 items) (4) Inconsistent Discipline (6 items) (5) Corporal Punishment (3 items) 												
RESPONSE FORMAT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 = Never 2 = Almost Never 3 = Sometimes 4 = Often 5 = Always 												
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Parents												
SCORING AND DIRECTION	Scale scores were derived by taking the average frequencies of behaviors in a 3-day interval on 4 interviews.												
RELIABILITY	<p>The internal consistency of the scores, measured by Cronbach's alpha, are listed below for the full sample (Shelton et al., 1996).</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: right;">Alpha</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Involvement</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Positive Parenting</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poor Monitoring/Supervision</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Inconsistent Discipline</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Corporal Punishment</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.46</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Alpha	Involvement	0.80	Positive Parenting	0.80	Poor Monitoring/Supervision	0.67	Inconsistent Discipline	0.67	Corporal Punishment	0.46
	Alpha												
Involvement	0.80												
Positive Parenting	0.80												
Poor Monitoring/Supervision	0.67												
Inconsistent Discipline	0.67												
Corporal Punishment	0.46												
MISSING VALUES	Interviews were not used unless the participant completed at least 3 of the 4 interviews.												

Alabama Parenting Questionnaire (APQ)

REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Shelton, K. K., Frick, P. J., & Wootton, J. (1996). Assessment of parenting practices in families of elementary school-age children. <i>Journal of Clinical Child Psychology</i> , 25(3), 317-329. http://psyc.uno.edu/Frick%20Lab/APQ.html Servera, M. (2007). <i>Versión en español del Alabama Parenting Questionnaire (APQ). Versión para padres y para niños</i> . Documento no publicado. http://devpsy.wordpress.com/2008/
OTHER REFERENCES	Frick, P.J., Christian, R.E., & Wootton, J.M. (1999). Age trends in the association between parenting practices and conduct problems. <i>Behavior Modification</i> , 23(1), 106-128.
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

ITEMS

Parent Version:

Involvement

01. You have a friendly talk with your child.
04. You volunteer to help with special activities that your child is involved in (e.g., sports, Boy/Girl Scouts, church youth groups).
07. You play games or do other fun things with your child.
09. You ask your child about his/her day in school.
11. You help your child with his/her homework.
14. You ask your child what his/her plans are for the coming day.
15. You drive your child to a special activity.
20. You talk to your child about his/her friends.
23. Your child helps plan family activities.
26. You attend PTA meetings, parent/teacher conferences, or other meetings at your child's school.

Positive Parenting

02. You let your child know when he/she is doing a good job with something.
05. You reward or give something extra to your child for obeying you or behaving well.
13. You compliment your child when he/she does something well.
16. You praise your child if he/she behaves well.
18. You hug or kiss your child when he/she has done something well.
27. You tell your child that you like it when he/she helps around the house.

Poor Monitoring/Supervision

06. Your child fails to leave a note or to let you know where he/she is going.
10. Your child stays out in the evening past the time he/she is supposed to be home.
17. Your child is out with friends you do not know.
19. Your child goes out without a set time to be home.

- 21. Your child is out after dark without an adult with him/her.
- 24. You get so busy that you forget where your child is and what he/she is doing.
- 28. You don't check that your child comes home from school when he/she is supposed to.
- 29. You don't tell your child where you are going.
- 30. Your child comes home from school more than an hour past the time you expect him/her.
- 32. Your child is at home without adult supervision.

Inconsistent Discipline

- 03. You threatened to punish your child and then do not actually punish him/her.
- 08. Your child talks you out of being punished after he/she has done something wrong.
- 12. You feel that getting your child to obey you is more trouble than it's worth.
- 22. You let your child out of a punishment early (e.g., lift restrictions earlier than you originally said).
- 25. Your child is not punished when he/she has done something wrong.
- 31. The punishment you give your child depends on your mood.

Child Version:

- 01. You have a friendly talk with your mom. How about your dad?
- 02. Your parents tell you that you are doing a good job.
- 03. Your parents threaten to punish you and then do not do it.
- 04. Your mom helps with some of your special activities (such as sports, boy/girls scouts, church youth groups). How about your dad?
- 05. Your parents reward or give something extra to you for behaving well.
- 06. You fail to leave a note or let your parents know where you are going.
- 07. You play games or do other fun things with your mom. How about your dad?

Corporal Punishment

- 33. You spank your child with your hand when he/she has done something wrong.
- 35. You slap your child when he/she has done something wrong.
- 38. You hit your child with a belt, switch, or other object when he/she has done something wrong.

Other Discipline Practices

- 34. You ignore your child when he/she is misbehaving.
- 36. You take away privileges or money from your child as punishment.
- 37. You send your child to his/her room as punishment.
- 39. You yell or scream at your child when he/she has done something wrong.
- 40. You calmly explain to your child why his/her behavior was wrong when he/she misbehaves.
- 41. You use time out (make him/her sit or stand in corner) as a punishment.
- 42. You give your child extra chores as a punishment.

- 08. You talk your parents out of punishing you after you have done something wrong.
- 09. Your mom asks you about your day in school. How about your dad?
- 10. You stay out in the evening past the time you are supposed to be home.
- 11. Your mom helps you with your homework. How about your dad?
- 12. Your parents give up trying to get you to obey them because it's too much trouble.
- 13. Your parents compliment you when you have done something well.
- 14. Your mom asks you what your plans are for the coming day. How about your dad?
- 15. Your mom drives you to a special activity. How about your dad?

Items

16. Your parents praise you for behaving well.
17. Your parents do not know the friends you are with.
18. Your parents hug or kiss you when you have done something well.
19. You go out without a set time to be home.
20. Your mom talks to you about your friends. How about your dad?
21. You go out after dark without an adult with you.
22. Your parents let you out of a punishment early (like lift restrictions earlier than they originally said).
23. You help plan family activities.
24. Your parents get so busy that they forget where you are and what you are doing.
25. Your parents do not punish you when you have done something wrong.
26. Your mom goes to a meeting at school, like a PTA meeting or parent/teacher conference. How about your dad?
27. Your parents tell you that they like it when you help around the house.
28. You stay out later than you are supposed to and your parents don't know it.
29. Your parents leave the house and don't tell you where they are going.
30. You come home from school more than an hour past the time your parents expect you to be home.
31. The punishment your parents give depends on their mood.
32. You are at home without an adult being with you.
33. Your parents spank you with their hand when you have done something wrong.
34. Your parents ignore you when you are misbehaving.
35. Your parents slap you when you have done something wrong.
36. Your parents take away a privilege or money from you as a punishment.
37. Your parents send you to your room as a punishment.
38. Your parents hit you with a belt, switch, or other object when you have done something wrong.
39. Your parents yell or scream at you when you have done something wrong.
40. Your parents calmly explain to you why your behavior was wrong when you misbehave.
41. Your parents use time out (make you sit or stand in a corner) as a punishment.
42. Your parents give you extra chores as a punishment.

Family APGAR

DESCRIPTION

The Family APGAR scale developed by Smilkstein (1975) has been used in many research projects. As a result, several similar versions exist; this manual presents two of them. The scale was translated into Spanish and adapted for Chilean adolescents (Maddaleno et al., 1987); it has also been used with adolescents in Puerto Rico (Goodman et al., 1998). The scale contains five questions that measure the adolescent's perception of family satisfaction. It also uses five criteria to measure the functioning of the family: adaptability, partnership, growth, affection, and resolve.

DESCRIPTION	<p>(1) Adaptability: The capacity to use family/community resources for problem solving in a crisis.</p> <p>(2) Partnership: The capacity to share and resolve problems.</p> <p>(3) Growth: The capacity to pass through the different stages of the family cycle while allowing the individual maturation and self-fulfillment of family members.</p> <p>(4) Affection: The capacity to demonstrate caring and concern for other family members. The capacity to express various emotions: fear, affection, love, grief, and anger.</p> <p>(5) Resolve: The capacity to apply the foregoing while sharing time and resources with each member of the family.</p>
RESPONSE FORMAT	<p>0 = Hardly ever</p> <p>1 = Some of the time</p> <p>2 = Almost always</p>
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Adolescents
SCORING AND DIRECTION	<p>The scores of the items are added; the total score for the scale ranges between 0 and 10 points. Higher scores indicate greater satisfaction or family functionality.</p> <p>0–3 Points: Severely Dysfunctional Family</p> <p>4–6 Points: Moderately Dysfunctional Family</p> <p>7–10 Points: Functional Family</p>
RELIABILITY	<p>The correlation between the individual score and the total scale ranged from 0.52 to 0.88 (Maddaleno et al., 1987). Reliability, measured by Cronbach’s alpha coefficient, ranged from 0.82 to 0.86 using four adolescent samples; the coefficient was 0.86 in one sample of adolescents in Puerto Rico between 9 and 17 years of age (Goodman et al., 1998).</p>
MISSING VALUES	Respondents should answer all questions.
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	<p>Goodman, S. H., Hoven, C. W., Narrow, W. E., Cohen, P., Fielding, B., Alegria, M., et al. (1998). Measurement of risk for mental disorders and competence in a psychiatric epidemiologic community survey: The National Institute of Mental Health Methods for the Epidemiology of Child and Adolescent Mental Disorders (MECA) study. <i>Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology</i>, 33(4), 162-173.</p>

Family APGAR *Continued*

REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	<p>Maddaleno, M., Horwitz, N., Jara, C., Florenzano, R., & Salazar, D. (1987). Aplicación de un instrumento para calificar el funcionamiento familiar en la atención de adolescentes. <i>Revista Chilena de Pediatría</i>, 58(3), 246-249.</p> <p>Smilkstein, G. (1978). The family APGAR: A proposal for a family function test and its use by physicians. <i>Journal of Family Practice</i>, 6(6), 1231-1239.</p>
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

Original version of Smilkstein (1975)

01. I am satisfied with the help that I receive from my family when something is troubling me.
02. I am satisfied with the way my family discusses items of common interest and shares problem solving with me.
03. I find that my family accepts my wishes to take on new activities or make changes in my life-style.
04. I am satisfied with the way my family expresses affection and responds to my feelings such as anger, sorrow, and love.
05. I am satisfied with the amount of time my family and I spend together.

Behavioral Affect Rating Scale (BARS)

DESCRIPTION	<p>The Behavioral Affect Rating Scale assesses warmth and hostility in the parent-child relationships. The BARS has two versions: one of 22 items and one of 12 items. The BARS has been used across family relationships from various ethnic groups. Taylor et al. (2012) used the BARS (22 items) with a sample of Mexican-origin families. The original BARS 7-point response format was modified to a 4-point response format. The BARS uses a multi-informant measurement strategy where each participant responds to the items on how they feel about another family member's behavior. The BARS has three versions, one for each respondent: "focal" is the person who initiates the behavior, "recipient" is the person who receives the behavior, and "reporter" is the person who completes the questionnaire. The 22-item version has three subscales: Warmth (W), Moderate Hostility (MH), and Extreme Hostility (EH). The 12-item version has two subscales: Warmth (W) and Hostility (H).</p>
--------------------	---

RESPONSE FORMAT	<p>Conger, 1989 22-item version</p> <p>1 = Always 2 = Almost always 3 = Fairly often 4 = About half the time 5 = Not too often 6 = Almost never 7 = Never</p> <p>Conger, 1989 12-item version</p> <p>1 = Never 2 = Sometimes 3 = Most of the time</p> <p>Taylor, 2002 version: Four-point scale with only endpoints labeled.</p> <p>1 = Almost never or never 4 = Almost always or always</p>														
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Parents and adolescents (ages 12-18 years old)														
SCORING AND DIRECTION	Calculate the scores by averaging the items of the subscales. Higher scores indicate higher levels of the construct.														
RELIABILITY	The internal consistency scores, measured by Cronbach's alpha, are listed below (Taylor et al., 2012).														
	<table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Alpha</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mother report of father hostility</td> <td>0.88</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mother report of father warmth</td> <td>0.94</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Father report of mother hostility</td> <td>0.81</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Father report of mother warmth</td> <td>0.91</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Child report of mother warmth</td> <td>0.82</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Child report of father warmth</td> <td>0.87</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Alpha	Mother report of father hostility	0.88	Mother report of father warmth	0.94	Father report of mother hostility	0.81	Father report of mother warmth	0.91	Child report of mother warmth	0.82	Child report of father warmth	0.87
	Alpha														
Mother report of father hostility	0.88														
Mother report of father warmth	0.94														
Father report of mother hostility	0.81														
Father report of mother warmth	0.91														
Child report of mother warmth	0.82														
Child report of father warmth	0.87														
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	<p>Conger, R. D. (1989). Behavioral Affect Rating Scale (BARS). Developed from diverse sources for the Iowa Youth & Family Project. Ames, IA: Iowa State University.</p> <p>Taylor, Z. E., Larsen-Rife, D., Conger, R. D., & Widaman, K. F. (2012). Familism, interparental conflict, and parenting in Mexican-origin families: A cultural-contextual framework. <i>Journal of Marriage and Family</i>, 74(2), 312-327.</p>														
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.														

12-Item version:

INSTRUCTIONS

How often does your [dad/mom]...

ITEM		SUBSCALE
2	Let you know he/she really care about you?	W
5	Act lovingly and affectionate toward you?	W
6	Let you know that he/she appreciate you, your ideas or the things you do?	W
7	Help you do something that was important to you?	W
11	Tell you that he/she loves you?	W
1	Get mad (angry) at you?	H
3	Criticize you or your ideas?	H
4	Shout or yell at you because he/she was mad at you?	H
8	Argue with you whenever you disagreed about something?	H
9	Threaten you, or tell you that you're going to get in trouble if you do something wrong?	H
10	Hit, push, grab or shove you?	H
12	Ignore you when you tried to talk to him/her?	H

W = Warmth; H = Hostility

22-item version:

INSTRUCTIONS

[The wording of the items presented here is for the respondent's report of others' behavior toward him/her. Pronouns are changed depending on the version.]

During the past 12 months when you and specific person have spent time talking or doing things together, how often did she/he...

ITEM		SUBSCALE
2	Ask you for your opinion about an important matter?	W
3	Listen carefully to your point of view?	W
4	Let you know she/he really cares about you?	W
7	Act loving and affectionate toward you?	W
10	Let you know that she/he appreciates you, your ideas or the things you do?	W
11	Help you do something that was important to you?	W
13	Have a good laugh with you about something that was funny?	W
17	Act supportive and understanding toward you?	W

ITEM		SUBSCALE
22	Tell you she/he loves you?	W
1	Get angry at you?	MH
5	Criticize you or your ideas?	MH
6	Shout or yell at you because she/he was mad at you?	MH
8	Ignore you when you tried to talk to him/her?	MH
9	Give you a lecture about how you should behave?	MH
12	Boss you around a lot?	MH
15	Not listen to you but do all of the talking himself/herself?	MH
16	Argue with you whenever you disagreed about something?	MH
19	Tell you she/he is right and you are wrong about things?	MH
14	Hit, push, grab or shove you?	EH
18	Insult or swear at you?	EH
20	Call you bad names?	EH
21	Threaten to hurt you by hitting you with his/her fist, an object, or something else?	EH

W = Warmth; MH = Moderate Hostility; EH = Extreme Hostility

How is your Family?—Brief scale for parents

DESCRIPTION	<p>The objective of the "How is your Family?" brief scale for parents is to investigate, from the perspective of the parents, characteristics of family functioning that protect an adolescent from risky behaviors. This summary presents two subscales that evaluate communication and connection between spouses and among members of the nuclear family.</p> <p>Communication and connection between spouses refers to the "level of openness, confidence, and satisfaction in the interaction between spouses, which enables them to openly share their ideas and feelings with each other" (Fundación Kellogg, 1996, p. 21).</p> <p>Communication and connection with the nuclear family refers to the degree of interaction between members of the nuclear family and their satisfaction with that interaction.</p>
RESPONSE FORMAT	<p>0 = Never 0 = Very rarely 1 = Sometimes 2 = Frequently 2 = Almost always</p>

How is your Family?—Brief scale for parents

INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Parents of adolescents between 10 and 19 years of age
SCORING AND DIRECTION	The score of each subscale is calculated by adding the items in the scale. Higher values indicate better family communication.
RELIABILITY	The scale has a total reliability of 0.84. The document does not specify reliability of the subscales. However, these two subscales explain 88% of the variation in perceptions that parents have of the family.
MISSING VALUES	All the questions should be answered.
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	<p>Fundación W. K. Kellogg. 1996. <i>Familia y adolescencia: Indicadores de salud. Manual de Aplicación de Instrumentos</i>. Washington, D.C. http://www.paho.org/Spanish/HPP/HPF/ADOL/Family.pdf</p> <p>Organización Pan Americana de la Salud [OPS]. (1999). <i>Familia y Adolescencia. Indicadores de Salud</i>. Manual de aplicación de instrumentos e instrumento abreviado. Washington, D.C.</p>
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

INSTRUCTIONS

Think about how things are in YOUR family at present. Circle each number that corresponds to a response you agree with.

COMMUNICATION-CONNECTION BETWEEN SPOUSES

In our family:

1. The father spends time every day talking with the children.
2. I am satisfied with the way my spouse/partner and I talk with each other.
3. It is easy to express my feelings to my spouse/partner.
4. My spouse/partner understands me.
5. If I am in a difficult situation, I talk about it with my spouse/partner.

COMMUNICATION-CONNECTION WITHIN THE NUCLEAR FAMILY

In our family:

6. We share household tasks and responsibilities.
7. Each member of the family expresses what he/she desires or thinks.
8. We like to spend our free time together.
9. The mother spends time every day talking with the children.
10. We share some meals every day.
11. We get together at some point during the day to converse and/or do some shared activity.

How is your Family?—Brief scale for adolescents

DESCRIPTION	<p>The objective of the “How is your Family” brief scale for adolescents is to investigate, from the perspective of the adolescents, characteristics of family functioning that protect an adolescent from risky behaviors. This summary presents three subscales that evaluate communication and connection between the adolescent and his/her father, mother, and nuclear family.</p> <p>Communication and connection refers to the “level of openness, confidence, and satisfaction in the interaction between parents and children, which enables them to openly share their ideas and feelings with each other” (Fundación Kellogg, 1996, p. 20). It is defined as “form, space and opportunity for family interaction and the level of satisfaction that this generates in family members, including interaction between the parents and between the parents and children” (PAHO, 1999, p. 57).</p>
RESPONSE FORMAT	<p>0 = Never 0 = Very rarely 1 = Sometimes 2 = Frequently 2 = Almost always</p>
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Adolescents between 10 and 19 years of age
SCORING AND DIRECTION	The score of the subscales is calculated by adding the items in each subscale. Higher values indicate better communication with the family.
RELIABILITY	The scale has an internal consistency of 0.80. The document does not specify reliability of the subscales. However, these three subscales explain 79% of the variation in the perceptions that adolescents have of their families.

How is your Family?—Brief scale for adolescents

MISSING VALUES	All the questions should be answered.
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Fundación W.K. Kellogg. 1996. <i>Familia y adolescencia: Indicadores de salud. Manual de Aplicación de Instrumentos</i> . Washington, D.C. http://www.paho.org/Spanish/HPP/HPF/ADOL/Family.pdf Organización Pan Americana de la Salud [OPS]. (1999). <i>Familia y Adolescencia. Indicadores de Salud</i> . Manual de aplicación de instrumentos e instrumento abreviado. Washington, D.C.
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

INSTRUCTIONS

Think about how things are in YOUR family at present. Circle each number that corresponds to a response you agree with.

Communication-Connection with the father

1. My father spends time every day talking with the children.
2. I am satisfied with the way my father and I talk with each other.
3. It is easy to express my feelings to my father.
4. My father understands me.
5. If I am in a difficult situation, I can tell my father.

Communication-Connection with the mother

6. My mother spends time every day talking with the children.
7. I am satisfied with the way my mother and I talk with each other.
8. It is easy to express my feelings to my mother.
9. My mother understands me.
10. If I am in a difficult situation, I can tell my mother.

Communication-Connection with the nuclear family

11. We share a meal every day.
12. We do something together as a family at least once a week.
13. We like to spend our free time together.
14. We share household tasks and responsibilities.

How is your Family?—Difficult situations for adults and adolescents

DESCRIPTION	<p>The objective of the “How is your Family?” questionnaire is to investigate, from the perspectives of parents and adolescents, characteristics of family functioning that protect an adolescent from risky behaviors (Fundación Kellogg, 1996).</p> <p>“Difficult situations for adults and adolescents” is a subscale of the questionnaire. It evaluates the accumulation of tensions due to health problems (physical, mental, emotional) and events in the family (divorce, change of housing, conflicts). The accumulation of stressful events is a risk factor for parents and adolescents.</p>
RESPONSE FORMAT	<p>0 = Did not occur 1 = Occurred but did NOT affect my family 2 = Occurred and affected my family SOMEWHAT 3 = Occurred and affected my family A GREAT DEAL</p>
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Adolescents between 10 and 19 years of age and their parents
SCORING AND DIRECTION	The score on this subscale is calculated by adding all the items. Higher values indicate greater tension.
RELIABILITY	The reliability of this subscale is not reported.
MISSING VALUES	All the questions should be answered.
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	<p>Fundación W.K. Kellogg. (1996). <i>Familia y adolescencia: Indicadores de salud. Manual de Aplicación de Instrumentos</i>. Washington, D.C.</p> <p>http://www.paho.org/Spanish/HPP/HPF/ADOL/Family.pdf</p>
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items:

INSTRUCTIONS

If your family experienced any of the following situations during the past year, indicate how much they affected you (see response format above).

Health

1. One of us, or a close relative, became physically disabled, developed a severe or chronic disease, or was placed in a care facility or nursing home.
2. One of us had emotional or psychological problems.
3. A member of the family, a relative, or a close friend died.

Items

Events

4. [One of us/one of the children] had difficulties at school or university with academic performance or behavior.
5. One of us had significant changes at work (positive or negative).
6. There were serious family conflicts or problems.
7. [My spouse and I/my parents] were separated or divorced.
8. The household had money problems.
9. There was violence between members of the family.
10. The family changed residence (house or apartment).
11. One or both parents acquired a new partner or remarried.
12. The family or a member of the family gave birth to or adopted a child.
13. The family went for days without food for lack of money.
14. The family had no housing (house or apartment).
15. A member of the family did not visit a doctor when needed, for lack of money.
16. One or more children ran away from home.
17. One of the parents abandoned the family.

Argentinean Questionnaire on Coping for Children 8–12 Years of Age

DESCRIPTION

The Argentinean Questionnaire on Coping for Children 8–12 of Age contains 27 items and evaluates nine coping strategies divided into three main dimensions:

- Evaluation-centered (logical analysis, cognitive restructuring, cognitive avoidance)
- Problem-centered (action on the problem, search for emotional support, search for alternative forms of gratification)
- Emotion-centered (emotional control, paralysis, lack of emotional control)

These nine strategies are combined to produce two overall styles or factors: functional coping and dysfunctional coping.

The questionnaire was administered to a sample of 890 children 8 to 12 years old, of average socioeconomic level, who attended public and private schools in Argentina (Richaud de Minzi, 2006). Ghiglione and Richaud de Minzi (2009) used an abbreviated version of this instrument with a sample of 864 children 6 and 7 years old. This abbreviated version has 18 items and conserves the psychometric properties of the original. The two questionnaires, both the complete and the abbreviated, provide information on the two factors mentioned, namely functional and dysfunctional styles of coping. These two alternatives are based on combinations of the nine strategies listed above:

DESCRIPTION	<p>1) Functional style of coping with conflict: (a) logical analysis, (b) cognitive restructuring, (c) search for support, (d) action on the problem, and (e) emotional control.</p> <p>2) Dysfunctional style of coping with conflict: (f) cognitive avoidance, (g) search for alternative forms of gratification, (h) paralysis, and (i) lack of emotional control.</p>
RESPONSE FORMAT	<p>1 = No 2 = Sometimes 3 = Yes</p>
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Children from 6 to 12 years of age
SCORING AND DIRECTION	<p>The values in each strategy are calculated by adding the corresponding items:</p> <p>Logical analysis: items 1, 11, and 22 Cognitive restructuring: items 2, 5, and 12 Cognitive avoidance: items 3, 6, and 13 Search for support: items 18, 21, and 26 Action on the problem: items 7, 15, and 20 Search for alternative forms of gratification: items 8, 14, and 23 Emotional control: items 9, 16, and 27 Paralysis: items 4, 19, and 25 Lack of emotional control: items 10, 17, and 24</p> <p>Each strategy ranges, in the complete version, from 3 to 9, and in the abbreviated version, from 2 to 6, with the lower value corresponding to the least utilization of the strategy.</p>
RELIABILITY	<p>Reliability, measured by Cronbach's alpha coefficient, was 0.71 for the functional strategies factor and 0.74 for the dysfunctional strategies factor in the sample of children 8–12 years old (Richaud de Minzi, 2006). The internal consistency of the questionnaire in the sample of children 6 and 7 years old was 0.71 for the functional strategies factor and 0.74 for the dysfunctional strategies factor (Ghiglione & Richaud de Minzi, 2009).</p>
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	<p>Richaud de Minzi, M.C. (2006). Evaluación del afrontamiento en niños de 8 a 12 años [Assessment of coping in children age 8 to 12 years]. <i>Revista Mexicana de Psicología</i>, 23(2), 196-201.</p> <p>Ghiglione, M. & Richaud de Minzi, M.C. (2009) Estudio psicométrico de una versión abreviada del Cuestionario Argentino de Afrontamiento para niños de 8 a 12 años. <i>Psiquiátrica y Psicológica de América Latina</i>, 55(4), 239-248.</p>
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

Factor	Order	Item	Dimension
Functional	1	I think a lot about the problem to understand better what is happening.	Logical analysis*
	11	I think about different ways of solving the problem.	Logical analysis*
	22	I decide on the next step to take.	Logical analysis
	2	I try to find something good in all the bad things that are happening to me.	Cognitive restructuring
	5	I try to see the positive side of the problem.	Cognitive restructuring*
	12	I try to look at things in a different way in order to find solutions.	Cognitive restructuring*
	7	I try hard to solve the problem.	Action on the problem*
	15	I focus on resolving the cause of the problem.	Action on the problem*
	20	I plan what I will do.	Action on the problem
	9	I feel bad but I hide it.	Emotional control*
	16	I keep to myself how bad I am feeling.	Emotional control
	27	I refrain from crying or showing that I am angry.	Emotional control*
	18	I talk with someone who knows how to solve the problem.	Search for support*
	21	I tell a friend what is happening to see if he/she can help me.	Search for support
	26	I ask my parents (or another family member such as uncle, grandfather, brother) to advise me on how to solve the problem.	Search for support*
Disfunctional	3	I try to forget the problem by playing, reading, or watching television.	Cognitive avoidance
	6	I pretend that nothing is happening.	Cognitive avoidance*
	13	I try to forget everything.	Cognitive avoidance*
	4	I am paralyzed, I don't know what to do.	Paralysis
	19	I hope for a miracle.	Paralysis*
	25	I hope that the problem solves itself.	Paralysis*
	8	I put off the problem for later and start doing something I enjoy.	Alternative gratification*
	14	I look for something good to eat (ice cream, candy, etc.).	Alternative gratification*

	23	I watch my favorite television program.	Alternative gratification
	10	I hit things or throw things around.	Lack of emotional control
	17	I act crazy.	Lack of emotional control*
	24	I shout or insult people.	Lack of emotional control*

* Items with an asterisk are included in the 18-item abbreviated version of the questionnaire used by Ghiglione & Richaud de Minzi (2009).

Argentinean Scale for Perceptions of Relationships with Parents for Children 13–17 Years of Age

DESCRIPTION	<p>The original scale, Child’s Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI; Schaefer, 1965), has 26 scales with 10 items in each that measure adolescents’ perceptions of the parenting styles of their parents and relationships with their father and mother. Klimkiewicz (1996) adapted a version of Schaefer’s scale to Spanish for the population of Argentina, resulting in an instrument with 72 items. Richaud de Minzi (2005) administered this version to 853 adolescents of both sexes, from 13 to 17 years of age, who were high school students in the city of Buenos Aires. The result, reported in this summary, was an abbreviated version of 32 that evaluate the relationship with the father and 32 items that evaluate the relationship with the mother. These items measure three factors: Acceptance, Pathological Control, and Extreme Autonomy.</p> <p>Definition of the three factors:</p> <p>Acceptance: Family relations are characterized by positive evaluation, sharing, expression of affection, and emotional support. Sociability and independent thinking are promoted.</p> <p>Pathological Control: This includes several forms of excessive control: being intrusive, exerting control by blaming, applying overly strict standards, using punishment and threats, negatively evaluating the child, and alienating the child through rejection.</p> <p>Extreme Autonomy: This refers to extreme permissiveness, that is, lax parental control in which total freedom is given to the child without imposing rules or limits. Children generally perceive this parental behavior as reflecting ignorance and negligence in meeting their needs.</p>
RESPONSE FORMAT	<p>1 = No 2 = Somewhat 3 = Yes</p>
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Adolescents from 13 to 17 years of age

Argentinean Scale for Perceptions of Relationships with Parents for Children 13–17 Years of Age, 2005

<p>SCORING AND DIRECTION</p>	<p>The score of the scales is calculated by averaging the items for each factor. Higher values reflect greater strength of the construct.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="483 464 1378 653"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th># of items Father</th> <th># of items Mother</th> <th>Possible range</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Acceptance</td> <td>8</td> <td>8</td> <td>1 to 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pathological Control</td> <td>16</td> <td>16</td> <td>1 to 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Extreme Autonomy</td> <td>8</td> <td>8</td> <td>1 to 3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Items</p> <p>Acceptance: 1, 2, 6, 11, 15, 17, 18, 23</p> <p>Pathological Control: 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 29, 32</p> <p>Extreme Autonomy: 4, 8, 12, 21, 25, 27, 30, 31</p> <p>When one wants to be more precise (for example, in looking at the components of Pathological Control), partial scores can be calculated, for example in Possessiveness or Hostile Control, averaging the items as indicated in the publication.</p>		# of items Father	# of items Mother	Possible range	Acceptance	8	8	1 to 3	Pathological Control	16	16	1 to 3	Extreme Autonomy	8	8	1 to 3
	# of items Father	# of items Mother	Possible range														
Acceptance	8	8	1 to 3														
Pathological Control	16	16	1 to 3														
Extreme Autonomy	8	8	1 to 3														
<p>RELIABILITY</p>	<p>Reliability, measured by Cronbach’s alpha coefficient, in the sample of adolescents in Buenos Aires, Argentina, ranged from 0.73 to 0.84 (Richaud de Minzi, 2005).</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="483 1241 1101 1388"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mother</th> <th>Father</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Acceptance</td> <td>0.81</td> <td>0.82</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pathological Control</td> <td>0.83</td> <td>0.84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Extreme Autonomy</td> <td>0.75</td> <td>0.73</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Mother	Father	Acceptance	0.81	0.82	Pathological Control	0.83	0.84	Extreme Autonomy	0.75	0.73				
	Mother	Father															
Acceptance	0.81	0.82															
Pathological Control	0.83	0.84															
Extreme Autonomy	0.75	0.73															
<p>REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE</p>	<p>Richaud de Minzi, M. C. (2005). Versión abreviada del inventario de la percepción de los hijos acerca de las relaciones con sus padres para adolescentes. <i>Psicodiagnosticar</i>, 15, 99-106.</p>																
<p>OTHER REFERENCES</p>	<p>Klimkiewicz, A. (1996). Percepción del comportamiento parental en adolescentes: Adaptación Argentina del CRPBI <i>Interdisciplinaria</i>, 13(1), 67.</p> <p>Schaefer, E. S. (1965). Children’s reports of parental behavior: An inventory. <i>Child Development</i>, 36(2), 413-424.</p>																
<p>COPYRIGHT</p>	<p>The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.</p>																

Items

INSTRUCTIONS (FATHER):

Each of the following statements describes an attitude that your father could have toward you. Read each phrase carefully and mark an "X" in the column corresponding to the attitude he shows.

- If his attitude IS LIKE the one in the statement, place an "X" in the YES column.
- If his attitude IS SOMEWHAT LIKE the one in the statement, place an "X" in the SOMEWHAT column.
- If his attitude IS NOT LIKE the one in the statement, place a "X" in the NO column.

INSTRUCTIONS (MOTHER):

Each of the following statements describes an attitude that your mother could have toward you. Read each phrase carefully and mark an "X" in the column corresponding to the attitude she shows.

- If her attitude IS LIKE the one in the statement, place an "X" in the YES column.
- If her attitude IS SOMEWHAT LIKE the one in the statement, place an "X" in the SOMEWHAT column.
- If her attitude IS NOT LIKE the one in the statement, place a "X" in the NO column.

Items on the questionnaires related to the father (F) and mother (M) by factor, order of appearance in the survey, and original factor to which the item is linked.

Factor	Order Father	Order Mother	Item	Father, Mother	Original Factor
Acceptance	2	2	He/she likes to talk with me and be with me.	F, M	Child-centeredness
	15	15	He/she comforts me when I am afraid.	F, M	Positive involvement
	17	17	He/she makes me feel that I am the most important person.	F, M	Child-centeredness
	18	18	He/she always listens to my ideas and opinions.	F, M	Acceptance of individuality
	23	23	He/she tries to understand my point of view.	F, M	Acceptance of individuality

Items

Factor	Order Father	Order Mother	Item	Father, Mother	Original Factor
Acceptance	1		Talking with him makes me feel better.	F	Acceptance
	6		He asks my opinion on how to do things.	F	Acceptance of individuality
			He sincerely wants me to tell him what I feel.	F	Positive involvement
		1	She tells me how much she loves me.	M	Child-centeredness
		6	She almost always speaks to me lovingly and kindly.	M	Acceptance
		11	She often has long talks with me.	M	Positive involvement
Pathological Control	3	3	He/she wants me to stay at home in order to control me.	F, M	Possessiveness
	5	5	He/she tries to change the way I am.	F, M	Intrusiveness
	7	7	He/she monitors my friends closely.	F, M	Intrusiveness
	10	10 J	He/she does not leave me in peace until I do what he/she has asked.	F, M	Hostile control
	13	13	He/she thinks that I don't know how to take care of myself.	F, M	Possessiveness
	16	16	When I disappoint him/her, he/she does not want to have anything to do with me.	F, M	Relation withdrawal
	19	19	He/she wants to control all my actions.	F, M	Intrusiveness
	20	20	I have to do exactly what he/she tells me.	F, M	Extreme control

Factor	Order Father	Order Mother	Item	Father, Mother	Original Factor
Pathological Control	26	26	He/she tells me that if I loved him/her, I wouldn't cause him/her so much worry.	F, M	Blame
	28	28	He/she believes that punishing me will correct my behavior.	F, M	Hostile control
	29	29	He/she is always finding fault with me.	F, M	Rejection
	32	32	He/she decides which friends I can have.	F, M	Intrusiveness
	9		He is quite impatient with me.	F	Hostile control
	14		He meddles in my life.	F	Intrusiveness
	22		If I complain, he stops speaking to me.	F	Relationship withdrawal
	24		He wants to know who called me and what they said.	F	Intrusiveness
		9	She is very strict with me.	M	Extreme control
		14	She always wants to know what I am doing.	M	Possessiveness
		22	If I get close to someone else she is cold and distant.	M	Relationship withdrawal
		24	She always wants to know exactly where I am.	M	Possessiveness
Extreme Autonomy	4	4	He/she allows me to go out as often as I want.	F, M	Extreme autonomy
	8	8	If I insist, he/she allows me to stay out late.	F, M	Extreme autonomy
	12	12	He/she gives me the freedom that I want.	F, M	Extreme autonomy

Items

Factor	Order Father	Order Mother	Item	Father, Mother	Original Factor
Extreme Autonomy	21	21	He/she doesn't make me obey orders.	F, M	Lax discipline
	25	25	He/she allows me to go out at night whenever I want.	F, M	Extreme autonomy
	27	27	He/she allows me to go wherever I want without asking where I'm going.	F, M	Lax discipline
	30	30	He/she doesn't worry that I may do things I shouldn't do.	F, M	Lax discipline
	31	31	He/she sometimes lets me do things that are not good.	F, M	Lax discipline

Argentinean Scale on Perceptions of Relationships with Parents for Children 8–12 Years of Age

DESCRIPTION	<p>Taking as a basis the Schaefer (1965) model, Richaud de Minzi (2007) constructed a brief self-administered questionnaire for children from 8 to 12 years of age. On the basis of interviews with children, parents, and teachers, and a literature review, 32 items were developed in two versions, one for the mother and the other for the father. Using a sample of 1,421 children 8 to 12 years old, of both sexes, of average socioeconomic level, the study analyzed the underlying structure of perceptions of the behavior of fathers and mothers. It found that there were three factors in the relationships: acceptance versus strict control; pathological control; and extreme autonomy or permissiveness.</p> <p>Definitions of the three factors:</p> <p>Acceptance versus Strict Control: Includes three alternative types of relationships:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) Acceptance: This refers to acceptance of the child as a clear expression of affection and emotional support, acceptance of individuation with promotion of open exchange and communication, freedom to express oneself and think independently, and positive involvement such as being sensitive to the needs of the child.(b) Accepted control: This includes setting limits and standards that are perceived by the child as showing that the parent cares.(c) Strict control: This includes setting limits and norms with overly close parental supervision that is perceived by the child as an imposition. <p>Pathological Control: This includes several forms of excessive control: being intrusive, exerting control by blaming, applying overly strict standards, using punishment and threats, negatively evaluating the child, and alienating the child through rejection.</p> <p>Extreme Autonomy: This refers to extreme permissiveness, that is, lax parental control in which total freedom is given to the child without imposing rules or limits. Children generally perceive this parental behavior as ignorance and as negligence in meeting their needs.</p>
RESPONSE FORMAT	1 = No 2 = Somewhat 3 = Yes

Argentinean Scale on Perceptions of Relationships with Parents for Children 8–12 Years of Age, 2007

INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Children from 8 to 12 years of age			
SCORING AND DIRECTION	The score of the scales is calculated by averaging the items for each factor. Higher values reflect greater strength of the construct.			
	# of items Father	# of items Mother	Possible Range	
	Acceptance versus			
	Strict Control:	17	18	1 to 3
	Pathological Control:	10	9	1 to 3
	Extreme Autonomy:	5	5	1 to 3
	Items			
	Acceptance:	8 items for mother and father: 1, 3, 8, 11, 17, 20, 26, 29		
	Accepted control:	6 items for father and 7 items for mother: 1, 4, 12, 18, 21 (only mother), 24, 32		
	Strict control:	3 items for father and mother: 15, 22, 28		
	Pathological Control:	9 items for mother and 10 items for father: 5, 9, 10, 13, 14, 19, 21 (only father), 25, 27, 30		
	Extreme Autonomy:	5 items for mother and father: 6, 7, 16, 23, 31		
RELIABILITY	Reliability, measured by Cronbach's alpha coefficient, in the sample of adolescents in Buenos Aires, Argentina, ranged from 0.60 to 0.92 (Richaud de Minzi, 2007).			
		Mother	Father	
	Acceptance	0.92	0.89	
	Strict Control	0.81	0.75	
	Accepted Control	0.75	0.75	
	Pathological Control	0.72	0.81	
	Extreme Autonomy	0.60	0.60	
MISSING VALUES	The score for each factor can be calculated with a minimum of 75% of the items.			
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Richaud de Minzi, M. C. (2007). La percepción de estilos de relación con su padre y madre en niños y niñas de 8 a 12 años. <i>Revista Iberoamericana de Diagnóstico y Evaluación Psicológica</i> , 1(23), 63-81.			
OTHER REFERENCES	Schaefer, E. S. (1965). Children's reports of parental behavior: An inventory. <i>Child Development</i> , 36(2), 413-424.			
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.			

Items

INSTRUCTIONS (FATHER)

Each of the following statements describes an attitude that your father could have toward you. Read each phrase carefully and mark an "X" in the column corresponding to the attitude he shows.

- If his attitude IS LIKE the one in the statement, place an "X" in the YES column.
- If his attitude IS SOMEWHAT LIKE the one in the statement, place an "X" in the SOMEWHAT column.
- If his attitude IS NOT LIKE the one in the statement, place a "X" in the NO column.

INSTRUCTIONS (MOTHER)

Each of the following statements describes an attitude that your mother could have toward you. Read each phrase carefully and mark an "X" in the column corresponding to the attitude she shows.

- If her attitude IS LIKE the one in the statement, place an "X" in the YES column.
- If her attitude IS SOMEWHAT LIKE the one in the statement, place an "X" in the SOMEWHAT column.
- If her attitude IS NOT LIKE the one in the statement, place a "X" in the NO column.

Items on the questionnaires related to the father (F) and mother (M) by factor, order of appearance in the survey, and original factor to which the item is linked.

Factor	Order	Item	Father, Mother	Original Factor
Acceptance versus Strict Control	1	My father/mother likes to talk with me and be with me most of the time.	F, M	Child-centeredness
	2	My father/mother makes sure I get home on time.	F, M	Accepted control
	3	My father/mother tells me that he/she loves me a great deal.	F, M	Acceptance
	4	My father/mother wants to know at all times where I am and what I am doing.	F, M	Accepted control
	8	My father/mother makes me feel that I am the most important person in their life.	F, M	Child-centeredness
	11	My father/mother always listens to what I say and think.	F, M	Acceptance of individuality
	12	My father/mother always wants to know what I do at school and in my free time.	F, M	Accepted control

Items

Factor	Order	Item	Father, Mother	Original Factor
Acceptance versus Strict Control	15	My father/mother cares when I do something that I shouldn't do.	F, M	Strict control
	17	My father/mother protects me when I am afraid.	F, M	Positive involvement
	18	My father/mother insists that I have to do everything he/she tells me.	F, M	Accepted control
	20	My father/mother often has long talks with me to explain the reasons for things.	F, M	Positive involvement
	22	My father/mother insists that I do my chores.	F, M	Strict control
	24	My father/mother says that misbehaving is very serious and that I might have problems when I grow up.	F, M	Accepted control
	26	My father/mother shows that he/she is proud of what I do.	F, M	Acceptance
	28	My father/mother makes me do what he/she tells me to do.	F, M	Strict control
	29	My father/mother is interested in what I do.	F, M	Acceptance of individuality
	32	My father/mother worries when I misbehave because I will suffer the consequences when I grow up.	F, M	Accepted control
	21	My mother says that if I really love her, I should behave well so as not to make her life miserable.	M	Accepted control
	5	My father/mother decides which friends I can have.	F, M	Intrusiveness (F) / Control (M)
	9	My father/mother gets into my things.	F, M	Intrusiveness
	10	My father/mother believes that punishing me is going to correct my poor behavior.	F, M	Control through hostility

Factor	Order	Item	Father, Mother	Original Factor
Acceptance versus Strict Control	13	My father/mother always talks about the things they do for me and blames me because they have to do so much.	F, M	Control through blame
	14	My father/mother wants to control everything that I do.	F, M	Intrusiveness
	19	My father/mother punishes me when I haven't done anything wrong.	F, M	Control through hostility
	25	My father/mother, if I do something he/she is upset about, stops speaking to me until I apologize.	F, M	Blame through relationship withdrawal
	27	My father/mother wants me to stay home so that they know what I am doing.	F, M	Possessiveness
	30	My father/mother, when I make a mistake, refuses to have anything to do with me until I find a way to reconcile with him/her.	F, M	Control through relationship withdrawal
	21	My father says that if I really love him, I should behave well so as not to make his life miserable.	F	Control through blame
	6	My father/mother does not much care if I misbehave.	F, M	Lax discipline
	7	My father/mother allows me to go out whenever I want.	F, M	Extreme autonomy
	16	My father/mother allows me to do whatever I want.	F, M	Extreme autonomy
	23	If I insist, my father/mother gives in and says I can stay out later on weeknights.	F, M	Lax discipline
	31	My father/mother allows me to go out to play whenever I want.	F, M	Extreme autonomy

Maternal Resilience Scale (ERESMA)

DESCRIPTION

From an ecosystem point of view, resilience has two elements: 1) the presence of significant personal adversity, and 2) positive adaptation to this situation. To study resilience, one needs to identify the characteristics of resilience in specific situations of adversity, as well as the personal and environmental mediating factors that alleviate or aggravate the impact of the adversity. One situation in which parents are highly vulnerable is when they have an exceptional child, that is, a child with a disability or a gifted child with learning problems. The resilience of parents—and especially of the mother in charge of an exceptional child—is an important resource in the care and rehabilitation of the child.

The Maternal Resilience Scale, using an ecosystem approach, evaluates the resilience of mothers or caregivers of exceptional children. The scale was developed based on an exploratory study, using focus groups of mothers and caregivers of children with special needs. The items defining the scale were selected based on pilot studies with individuals and groups, including potential participants and expert judges.

The scale was validated with 500 mothers in four states of Mexico (Distrito Federal, Puebla, México, and Tlaxcala). Participants in the validation study were women between 19 and 63 years old (average age = 37, SD = 7.9) who had children between 3 and 30 years old, attending regular or special schools from preschool through secondary (Roque, Aclé, and García, 2009).

The scale has 45 items measuring six factors. The first factor identifies self-determination as a characteristic of resilience, while the other five concern related mediators at the personal level (hopelessness, spiritual faith, rejection of personal responsibility) and the environmental level (lack of support from the partner, limited resources for meeting needs). These factors alleviate (favor positive adaptation) or aggravate the impact of children's exceptionality.

DESCRIPTION

Definition of the construct:

Maternal resilience. This refers to the interaction between the self-determination of the mother caring for an exceptional child and the personal mediating factors (hopelessness, spiritual faith, rejection of personal responsibility) and environmental mediating factors (lack of support from the partner, limited resources for meeting needs). These factors alleviate or aggravate the impact of the child's exceptionality on the mother and either favor or hinder her positive adaptation to the situation.

Definition of the six factors:

Self-determination (characteristic of resilience). Ability of the mother to make decisions by herself, set goals, strive to achieve them, evaluate their achievement, and make necessary adjustments based on what has been achieved, in order to obtain appropriate care for her child with special needs.

Hopelessness. This refers to the thoughts, feelings, and actions of the mother about herself and her situation, reflecting the belief that no matter how much she does, it is difficult to achieve results for her exceptional child, even though she sees these results as desirable and important.

Spiritual faith. This focuses on the dedication and devoutness of the mother with respect to her religious beliefs and obligations, which help her nurture, raise, and educate her exceptional child and also give her interior peace, calm, and strength to carry on.

Rejection of personal responsibility. This means that the mother does not accept responsibility for her own actions or for attending to the problems of her exceptional child (including cases where the mother's own health prevents her from taking care of her children).

Lack of support from the partner. This refers to problems perceived by the mother in her relationship with her partner, characterized by limited material and emotional support from the partner. This hinders care of the exceptional child as well as creating problems in the mother's own life.

Limited resources for meeting needs. This refers to the mother's perception and feelings regarding the limited support available from her family and from outside sources. This makes it difficult for her to meet the economic, health, and education needs of all members of her family, particularly the exceptional child.

Maternal Resilience Scale (ERESMA)

RESPONSE FORMAT	<p>1 = Never 2 = Almost never 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Always</p> <p>The items marked as “inverse code” should be re-coded in the inverse order (1=always, 2=frequently, 3=sometimes, 4=almost never, 5=never).</p>														
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	<p>Mothers or caregivers in charge of an exceptional child</p>														
SCORING AND DIRECTION	<p>The scale contains 45 items (14 positive and 31 negative, which need to be recoded in inverse order). The score for the scale is calculated by adding the values of the items for each factor. Higher values indicate greater maternal resilience.</p> <p>Items:</p> <table data-bbox="500 1016 1385 1276"> <tr> <td>Self-determination</td> <td>11, 24, 1, 44, 17, 30, 42, 33, 14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hopelessness</td> <td>2, 8, 23, 12, 28, 20, 36, 43, 40, 45, 15, 32, 4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Spiritual faith</td> <td>5, 22, 26, 35, 29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rejection of personal responsibility</td> <td>3, 19, 27, 38, 9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lack of support from the partner</td> <td>10, 21, 6, 39, 16, 34, 41</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Limited resources for meeting needs</td> <td>18, 25, 31, 7, 37, 13</td> </tr> </table>	Self-determination	11, 24, 1, 44, 17, 30, 42, 33, 14	Hopelessness	2, 8, 23, 12, 28, 20, 36, 43, 40, 45, 15, 32, 4	Spiritual faith	5, 22, 26, 35, 29	Rejection of personal responsibility	3, 19, 27, 38, 9	Lack of support from the partner	10, 21, 6, 39, 16, 34, 41	Limited resources for meeting needs	18, 25, 31, 7, 37, 13		
Self-determination	11, 24, 1, 44, 17, 30, 42, 33, 14														
Hopelessness	2, 8, 23, 12, 28, 20, 36, 43, 40, 45, 15, 32, 4														
Spiritual faith	5, 22, 26, 35, 29														
Rejection of personal responsibility	3, 19, 27, 38, 9														
Lack of support from the partner	10, 21, 6, 39, 16, 34, 41														
Limited resources for meeting needs	18, 25, 31, 7, 37, 13														
RELIABILITY	<p>Based on a factorial analysis of principal components with orthogonal rotation, six factors that explain 50.2% of the total variance were obtained. The alpha values for the total scale and for each of the six factors were:</p> <table data-bbox="500 1493 1060 1753"> <tr> <td>Total scale</td> <td>0.92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Self-determination (resilience)</td> <td>0.84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hopelessness</td> <td>0.89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Spiritual faith</td> <td>0.78</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rejection of personal responsibility</td> <td>0.71</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lack of support from the partner</td> <td>0.84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Limited resources for meeting needs</td> <td>0.80</td> </tr> </table>	Total scale	0.92	Self-determination (resilience)	0.84	Hopelessness	0.89	Spiritual faith	0.78	Rejection of personal responsibility	0.71	Lack of support from the partner	0.84	Limited resources for meeting needs	0.80
Total scale	0.92														
Self-determination (resilience)	0.84														
Hopelessness	0.89														
Spiritual faith	0.78														
Rejection of personal responsibility	0.71														
Lack of support from the partner	0.84														
Limited resources for meeting needs	0.80														
MISSING VALUES	<p>If the mother or caregiver does not have a partner, the scale can be calculated with 38 items (eliminating “lack of support from the partner”).</p>														

REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Roque, M. P., Acle, G. y García, M. (2009). Escala de resiliencia materna: Un estudio de validación en una muestra de madres con niños especiales [Maternal resilience scale: A validation study in a sample of mothers with exceptional children]. <i>Revista Iberoamericana de Diagnóstico y Evaluación Psicológica</i> , 1 (27), 107–132. Artículo publicado también en versión electrónica: http://www.aidep.org/03_ridep/2_volumen27.html
OTHER REFERENCES	Roque, H. M. P. (2012). Evaluación de las características de resiliencia materna y mediadores ante la excepcionalidad. En G. Acle (Coord.). <i>Resiliencia en educación especial. Una experiencia en la escuela regular</i> (pp. 105 -135). Barcelona, España: Gedisa. ISBN: 978-84-9784-706-3.
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

INSTRUCTIONS

To better understand the different issues for mothers or caregivers of children with special problems, I am asking for your valuable collaboration. Please respond to the statements below to indicate how closely they fit your situation. Read each statement carefully and note that each one has five possible responses ranging from NEVER to ALWAYS.

1 = Never; 2 = Almost never; 3 = Sometimes; 4 = Frequently; 5 = Always

For each statement, mark with an “X” the response that best describes your situation. Remember to choose only one of the five options. There are NO correct or incorrect responses; please answer each one based on your honest opinion. Your responses are confidential. We thank you in advance for your participation.

Items on the questionnaire organized by factor. The second column indicates the order of appearance in the instrument, and the last column indicates whether or not the items should be recoded with an inverse code.

Factor	Order	Item	Inverse code
Self-determination	1	I try to make sure that my child with problems is happy.	
	11	What I do for my child with problems helps him/her advance.	
	14	I believe that my child with problems will be better off in the future.	

Items

Factor	Order	Item	Inverse code
Self-determination	17	I give advice to my child with problems so that he/she becomes a respectful person.	
	24	I encourage my child with difficulties when he/she is discouraged at the effort it takes to do something.	
	30	I learn from the problems my child has.	
	33	In order to improve the health of my child with problems, I seek out information that helps me decide what to do.	
	42	In my family, all of us make an effort to improve the well-being of my child who has problems.	
	44	When I encounter difficulties in obtaining medical care for my child with problems, I keep trying until I get it.	
Hopelessness	2	I lose faith when my child who has difficulties stops making progress in his/her learning.	[R]
	4	I feel that I am failing in the task of educating my child with problems.	[R]
	8	It distresses me to realize that each day it becomes more difficult to raise my child with problems.	[R]
	12	It is difficult to achieve the goals set for my child who has problems.	[R]
	15	In my family it is difficult for us to agree on what to do so that my child with problems can advance.	[R]
	20	I find it difficult to resolve situations that have to do with my child who is not doing well at school.	[R]
	23	The most difficult situations I have faced are related to my child who has difficulties.	[R]
	28	I lament the fact that I have a child with problems.	[R]
	32	It takes a lot of work to improve the behavior of my child with problems.	[R]
	36	Health problems of my child who is not doing well in school make me feel tense.	[R]

Factor	Order	Item	Inverse code
Hopelessness	40	Feeling afraid keeps me from finding out how to help my child with problems.	[R]
	43	It is hard for me to be proud of my child.	[R]
	45	In order to take care of my child with problems, I neglect my other children.	[R]
Spiritual faith	5	God helps me so that my child who has problems gets the education he/she needs.	
	22	I get strength from God to continue raising my child with problems.	
	26	I ask God to guide me on how to help my child with problems advance.	
	29	Having faith that my child will improve helps set my mind at rest.	
	35	Prayer gives me interior peace.	
Rejection of personal responsibility	3	Whether I succeed in what I do is mainly up to others.	[R]
	9	If I make a mistake, I look for someone to blame.	[R]
	19	I blame other people for the educational problems that my child has.	[R]
	27	My health keeps me from taking care of my child.	[R]
	38	When I have problems with my child, I need someone to help me stay in a good mood.	[R]
Lack of support from the partner	6	It annoys me that my partner avoids making decisions concerning my child.	[R]
	10	My partner ignores me when I ask for help to understand what is happening with my child who has problems.	[R]
	16	My partner gets annoyed with me for spending time on my child with problems.	[R]
	21	I argue with my partner over what to do about the education of my child with problems.	[R]
	34	It is difficult for me to feel accepted by my partner.	[R]
	39	My partner discourages me from continuing to care for my child with problems.	[R]

Items

Factor	Order	Item	Inverse code
Lack of support from the partner	41	My life is filled with problems.	[R]
Limited resources for meeting needs	7	Lack of money limits the education that my child with problems receives.	[R]
	13	I feel discouraged because no one helps me care for my children when they are sick.	[R]
	18	When I need to take my children to the doctor, lack of money keeps me from doing so.	[R]
	25	I can't count on support from anyone else when I am in trouble.	[R]
	31	It's impossible to turn to my relatives for help when there are economic needs at home.	[R]
	37	When my child with problems needs care, it is hard for me to access medical services.	[R]

[R] Invert the values in the coding as indicated in the instructions.

Scale for Sub-dimensions of Family Relations

DESCRIPTION

The objective of the Sub-dimensions of Family Relations scale is to evaluate different dimensions of family functioning. Melgarejo (2008) created the 60 items based on the dimensions of the GARF (Global Assessment of Relational Functioning; Yingling et al., 1998) and interviews with families. The Melgarejo study, based on analysis of two samples (n=40 and n=45) of mothers in Cuernavaca, Mexico, identified five factors:

- (1) Problem solving and responsibility: the family's capacity to solve its problems and act in a responsible way.
- (2) Parental teamwork and expressions of affection: the parents' capacity to work together as a cohesive team, and the way in which members of the family express their affection.
- (3) Negotiating rules and routines and the quality of sexual relations: family members' capacity to negotiate family rules and routines, as well as the extent to which the parents have a satisfying sexual life.
- (4) Communication, empathy, values, and principles: family members' capacity to communicate and express empathy, and whether they are clear about their values and principles.
- (5) Maintenance of hierarchies: parents' capacity to maintain hierarchies among the different subsystems that make up the family.

RESPONSE FORMAT	<p>The score for each item ranges between 0 (most dysfunctional) and 2 (most functional). Most of the 60 items offer the following response options:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>a. Always</td> <td>[2]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b. Sometimes</td> <td>[1]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c. Rarely</td> <td>[1]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d. Never</td> <td>[0]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>e. Does not apply</td> <td>[.]</td> </tr> </table> <p>The values in brackets indicate how the item is coded. [.] = missing value. This is only used for questions that refer to either the father or the mother, or in cases where the family has a single parent or an only child (this must be taken into account since the scale is designed for two-parent families with more than one child).</p> <p>The table below shows all the items and includes the response options for items with different responses.</p>	a. Always	[2]	b. Sometimes	[1]	c. Rarely	[1]	d. Never	[0]	e. Does not apply	[.]		
a. Always	[2]												
b. Sometimes	[1]												
c. Rarely	[1]												
d. Never	[0]												
e. Does not apply	[.]												
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	<p>Father, mother, or adolescent child (except for the questions on sexuality)</p>												
SCORING AND DIRECTION	<p>Scores on the five subscales are calculated by averaging the items in the subscale. The possible scores thus range from 0 (most dysfunctional) to 2 (most functional). Based on percentiles of response from the 85 Mexican families, the author proposes a schema for levels of functionality.</p>												
RELIABILITY	<p>Reliability, measured by Cronbach's alpha coefficient, in the sample of families in Cuernavaca, Mexico, ranged from 0.74 to 0.95 (Melgarejo, 2008).</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Factors</th> <th style="text-align: right;">Cronbach's Alpha</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>(1) Problem solving and responsibility</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.95</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(2) Parental teamwork and expressing affection</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.96</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(3) Negotiating rules and routines and quality of sexual relations</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.94</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Communication, empathy, values, and principles</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.92</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(5) Maintenance of hierarchies</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0.74</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Factors	Cronbach's Alpha	(1) Problem solving and responsibility	0.95	(2) Parental teamwork and expressing affection	0.96	(3) Negotiating rules and routines and quality of sexual relations	0.94	(4) Communication, empathy, values, and principles	0.92	(5) Maintenance of hierarchies	0.74
Factors	Cronbach's Alpha												
(1) Problem solving and responsibility	0.95												
(2) Parental teamwork and expressing affection	0.96												
(3) Negotiating rules and routines and quality of sexual relations	0.94												
(4) Communication, empathy, values, and principles	0.92												
(5) Maintenance of hierarchies	0.74												

Scale for Sub-dimensions of Family Relations

REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	GARF (Global Assessment of Relational Functioning), Yingling, L., et al. (1998). Melgarejo, M. C. (2008). <i>Construcción y validación de una escala que mide funcionamiento familiar</i> . Tesis de Maestría. Crisol, Centro de Posgrado en Terapia Familiar. Cuernavaca, Morelos, México.
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

INSTRUCTIONS

Below you will find a series of questions with several possible responses. Circle the letter of the response you agree with most. Questions in the section on Quality of Sexual Relations will only be answered by the parents. Resolution of problems

Items in the questionnaire by original factor, order of appearance, and factor to which each is linked based on the factorial analysis

Original Factor	Order	Item	Factor based on factorial analysis
Skills in negotiating family goals, rules, and routines	1	Who makes the rules in the house? a. We all come to an agreement [2] b. Father [1] c. Mother [1] d. There are no rules [0]	1
	2	When father makes a rule, can it be broken? a. Never [2] b. Sometimes [1] c. Rarely [1] d. Always [0] e. Does not apply [.]	3
	3	Are the rules made by mother more important than the rules made by father?	3
	4	When there is disagreement about a rule, can it be negotiated?	1

Original Factor	Order	Item	Factor based on factorial analysis
Skills in negotiating family goals, rules, and routines	5	Are household tasks distributed fairly among all family members, considering the ages of the children?	3
Adaptability to stress	6	When father arrives home from work, is he willing to talk with everyone in the family?	5
	7	When mother is very busy with household tasks, does she allow the children to come to her if they have a problem?	5
	8	When everyone in the family is at home, is it possible to converse calmly?	
	9	Is there a harmonious climate in the home?	1
	10	Is there tension in the home?	
Communication skills	11	To what extent do family members communicate empathetically?	
	12	When mother is at home, does she communicate in the same way with each of her children?	4
	13	When father arrives home from work, does he communicate with mother?	3
	14	Does father communicate in the same way with all the children?	1
	15	How much communication is there between siblings in the family?	

Original Factor	Order	Item	Factor based on factorial analysis
Ability to resolve conflict	16	When there is a problem in the family, what do father and mother do? a. Seek solutions together [2] b. Remain indifferent [0] c. Allow shouting and hitting [0] d. Allow shouting [0]	1
	17	How often do conflicts occur in the family?	1
	18	What does father do when there is a conflict between the children? a. Proposes a solution [2] b. Remains indifferent [0] c. Hits them and shouts at them [0] d. Shouts at them [0] e. Does not apply [0]	1
	19	What does mother do when there is a conflict between the children? a. Tries to reach an agreement [2] b. Remains indifferent [0] c. Hits them and shouts at them [0] d. Shouts at them [0] e. Does not apply [0]	5
	20	How do father and mother discuss issues? a. Peacefully [2] b. Violently, in front of the children [0] c. Violently, in their bedroom [0] d. Does not apply [0]	1
Family organization and structure	21	Do the parents have their own space in the house, separate from the children?	2
Maintenance of hierarchies and subsystem boundaries	22	Do father and mother engage in activities outside the home in which the children are not involved?	3
	23	Can father engage in activities other than work in which mother and the children are not involved?	5
	24	Can mother engage in activities outside the home in which father and the children are not involved?	5
	25	Can the children engage in activities that do not involve father and mother?	5

Original Factor	Order	Item	Factor based on factorial analysis
Parental teamwork to lead family effectively	26	Does father respect and enforce the disciplinary limits that mother establishes?	2
	27	Does mother respect and enforce the disciplinary limits that father establishes?	2
	28	On whom can mother rely for support when there are problems? a. On father [2] b. On one of the children [1] c. On some other family member or friend [0]	2
	29	On whom can father rely for support when there are problems? a. On mother [2] b. On one of the children [1] c. On some other family member or friend [0]	2
	30	When there are conflicts between siblings, do they rely on themselves to find a solution?	4
Appropriate distribution of power, control, and responsibility	31	Do mother and father have the same level of authority in the household?	1
	32	Do mother's and father's opinions have the same influence in decision-making?	1
	33	Are mother's decisions more important than those of father?	3
	34	When a conflict occurs, are the consequences the responsibility of mother and father equally?	1
	35	Does any child in the family have the same level of authority as father and mother?	4
Emotional climate	36	Can mother openly express her feelings?	1
Feeling free to express feelings	37	Can father openly express his feelings?	3
	38	Can every child express his/her feelings, whether positive or negative?	4

Original Factor	Order	Item	Factor based on factorial analysis
Feeling free to express feelings	39	Are feelings expressed openly within the family?	1
	40	When there is a conflict in the family, can every member express his/her feelings openly?	1
Level of commitment, caring, and empathy for each other	41	If mother is ill, does she receive care and support from father?	2
	42	If father is ill, does he receive care and support from mother?	2
	43	Do the children support father and mother when the parents have a problem?	4
	44	When the siblings have problems, do they support each other?	4
	45	Do all members of the family feel equally supported?	1
Sharing of values and principles	46	Do mother and father agree on the principles that govern this family?	1
	47	Do the children understand the values that govern this family? a. Very well [2] b. A little [1] c. Not at all [0]	4
	48	Are the important values and principles for this family explained clearly, with examples?	1
	49	Do all members of this family feel committed to its values and principles?	4
	50	Is important in this family to have values and principles? a. Very much [2] b. A little [1] c. Not at all [0]	5
Showing affection, respect, and regard	51	Does mother feel loved and supported by father?	2
	52	Does father feel loved and supported by mother?	2

Original Factor	Order	Item	Factor based on factorial analysis
Showing affection, respect, and regard	53	Do the children feel loved, accepted, and respected in this family?	1
	54	Does mother feel respected by father?	2
	55	Does father feel respected by mother?	2
Quality of sexual relations (This part will be answered only by the parents of the family)	56	Does mother feel free to express to father what pleases her sexually?	3
	57	Does father feel satisfied sexually?	3
	58	Can father and mother communicate about sex without fear of being judged by the other?	3
	59	Does mother feel satisfied sexually?	3
	60	Does anyone in the family speak freely with the children about sexuality ?	3

Items without specified response options use the following: a. Always [2] b. Sometimes [1] c. Rarely [1] d. Never [0] e. Does not apply [.] [.] = missing value (only used for questions that refer to the father or the mother).

Levels of functionality by factor*

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5
Chaotic functionality	0–1	0–1.18	0–0.96	0–1.05	0–1.16
Rarely satisfactory functionality	1.10–1.41	1.19–1.42	0.97–1.37	1.06–1.33	1.17–1.33
Moderately satisfactory functionality	1.42–1.59	1.43–1.72	1.98–1.60	1.34–1.50	1.34–1.63
Predominantly satisfactory functionality	1.60–1.81	1.73–1.81	1.61–1.76	1.51–1.72	1.64–1.81
Totally satisfactory functionality	1.82–2	1.82–2	1.77–2	1.73–2	1.82–2

* Note: These levels were calculated based on percentiles of responses from 85 families in Mexico.

Factor 1—Problem solving and responsibility

Factor 2—Parental teamwork and expressing affection

Factor 3—Negotiating rules and routines and quality of sexual relations

Factor 4—Communication, empathy, values, and principles

Factor 5—Maintenance of hierarchies

Family Cohesion Scale from FACES II

DESCRIPTION	The Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales II (FACES II) measures two constructs of perceived family function: family cohesion (16 items) and adaptability (14 items). This manual only presents the family cohesion scale, which evaluates eight concepts (2 items each): emotional bonding, family boundaries, coalitions, time, space, friends, decision-making, and interest and recreation. Gonzales et al. (2012) translated FACES II into Spanish and truncated the 16-item scale into a shorter version consisting of only 8 items, which was used with a sample of Mexican American adolescents.
RESPONSE FORMAT	1 = Almost never or never 2 = Once in a while 3 = Sometimes 4 = A lot of the time (frequently) 5 = Almost always or always
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Individual family members including adolescents 12 years or older.

SCORING AND DIRECTION	A higher score indicates high family cohesion.
RELIABILITY	The internal consistency, measured by Cronbach's alpha, was 0.87 for the family cohesion scale (Olson et al., 1982). The internal consistency for Gonzales et al.'s brief version ranged from 0.81 to 0.87 with different samples.
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Olson, D. H., Portner, J., & Bell R. Q. (1982). <i>FACES II: Family adaptability and cohesion evaluation scales</i> . Family Social Science, University of Minnesota, St Paul, Minnesota. Gonzales, N. A., Dumka, L. E., Millsap, R. E., Gottschall, A. McClain, D. B., Wong, J. J. Germán, M., Mauricio, A. M., Wheeler, L., Carpentier, F. D., & Kim, S. Y. (2012). Randomized trial of a broad preventive intervention for Mexican American adolescents. <i>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 80</i> (1), 1–16.
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should email cs@facesiv.com for permission for the 16-item scale and information about scoring. Past research and updates are available at www.facesiv.com

Items

16-item Family Cohesion Scale

1. Family members are supportive of each other during difficult times.
2. It was easier to discuss problems with people outside the family than with other family members. [R]
3. Our family gathers together in the same room.
4. Our family does things together.
5. In our family, everyone goes his/her own way. [R]
6. Family members know each other's close friends.
7. Family members consult other family members on their decisions.
8. We have difficulty thinking of things to do as a family. [R]
9. Family members feel very close to each other.
10. Family members feel closer to people outside the family than to other family members. [R]
11. Family members go along with what the family decides to do.
12. Family members like to spend their free time with each other.
13. Family members avoid each other at home. [R]
14. Family members approve of each other's friends.
15. Family members pair up rather than do things as a total family. [R]
16. Family members share interests and hobbies with each other.

[R] = Reverse coding

Items

8-item Family Cohesion Scale

1. In the past month, family members were supportive of each other during difficult times. [1]
2. Our family did things together. [4]
3. Family members consulted other family members on their decisions. [7]
4. Family members felt very close to each other. [9]
5. Family members went along with what the family decided to do. [11]
6. Family members liked to spend their free time with each other. [12]
7. We approved of each other's friends. [14]
8. Family members shared interests and hobbies with each other. [16]

Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA)

DESCRIPTION	<p>The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA) measures positive and negative dimensions of the parent-child relationship and of the adolescent-peer relationship. The revised IPPA consists of three self-reported questionnaires that measures attachment with the Mother, Father, and Peers using a five-point scale. Each questionnaire consists of 25 items. The IPPA measures three dimensions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Degree of mutual trust (Confianza): The ability of attachment figures to understand and respect adolescents (felt security), and the perception that attachment figures are responding to adolescent needs. 2) Quality of communication (Comunicación): Extent of communication 3) Extent of anger and alienation (Alienación): Responses to disruption of insecure attachment <p>The IPPA is available in Spanish. Sonia Carrillo translated the IPPA scale to use in Colombia using a sample of adolescents from various SES.</p>
RESPONSE FORMAT	<p>1 = Almost Never or Never True 2 = Not Very Often True 3 = Sometimes True 4 = Often True 5 = Almost Always or Always True</p>
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	<p>Adolescents and parents (mother and father)</p>

SCORING AND DIRECTION	<p>To calculate the subscale scores, reverse score the negative items and then add the items of each subscale. To calculate an overall Mother, Father, and Peer Attachment score, all items of the alienation subscales must also be reverse scored.</p> <p>Items of parent subscales</p> <p>Parent Trust: 1, 2, 4, 12, 13, 20, 21, 22, reverse score: 3, 9</p> <p>Parent Communication: 5, 7, 15, 16, 19, 24, 25, reverse score: 6, 14</p> <p>Parent Alienation: 8, 10, 11, 17, 18, 23</p> <p>Items of peer subscales</p> <p>Peer Trust: 6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, reverse score: 5</p> <p>Peer Communication: 1, 2, 3, 7, 16, 17, 24, 25</p> <p>Peer Alienation: 4, 9, 10, 11, 18, 22, 23</p>												
RELIABILITY	<p>The internal consistency, measured by Cronbach's alpha, for the revised IPPA were:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="592 1031 1141 1178"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Armsden</th> <th>Colombia</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mother</td> <td>0.87</td> <td>0.90*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Father</td> <td>0.89</td> <td>0.93*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Peer</td> <td>0.92</td> <td>0.90*</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*Item 9 was excluded</p>		Armsden	Colombia	Mother	0.87	0.90*	Father	0.89	0.93*	Peer	0.92	0.90*
	Armsden	Colombia											
Mother	0.87	0.90*											
Father	0.89	0.93*											
Peer	0.92	0.90*											
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	<p>Armsden, G. C., & Greenberg, M. T. (1987). The inventory of parent and peer attachment: Individual differences and their relationship to psychological well-being in adolescence. <i>Journal of Youth and Adolescence</i>, 16, 427–454.</p> <p>Pardo, M. E., Pineda, S., Carrillo, S., & Castro, S. (2006). Análisis psicométrico del inventario de apego con padres y pares en una muestra de adolescentes colombianos. <i>Interamerican Journal of Psychology</i>, 40(3), 289-302.</p>												
COPYRIGHT	<p>The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.</p>												

Items

MOTHER'S VERSION:

(For the father's version, replace 'mother' with 'father')

Items

INSTRUCTIONS:

The following statements ask about your feelings about your mother or the person who has acted as your mother. If you have more than one person acting as your mother (e.g. a natural mother and a step-mother) answer the questions for the one you feel has most influenced you.

1. My mother respects my feeling.
2. I feel my mother does a good job as a mother.
3. I wish I had a different mother.
4. My mother accepts me as I am.
5. I like to get my mother's point of view on things I'm concerned about.
6. I feel it's no use letting my feelings show around my mother.
7. My mother can tell when I'm upset about something.
8. Talking over my problems with my mother makes me feel ashamed or foolish.
9. My mother expects too much from me.
10. I get upset easily around my mother.
11. I get upset a lot more than my mother knows about.
12. When we discuss things, my mother cares about my point of view.
13. My mother trusts my judgment.
14. My mother has her own problems, so I don't bother her with mine.
15. My mother helps me to understand myself better.
16. I tell my mother about my problems and troubles.
17. I feel angry with my mother.
18. I don't get much attention from my mother.
19. My mother helps me to talk about my difficulties.
20. My mother understands me.
21. When I am angry about something, my mother tries to be understanding.
22. I trust my mother.
23. My mother doesn't understand what I'm going through these days.
24. I can count on my mother when I need to get something off my chest.
25. If my mother knows something is bothering me, she asks me about it.

PEER VERSION:

1. I like to get my friend's point of view on things I'm concerned about.
2. My friends can tell when I'm upset about something.
3. When we discuss things, my friends care about my point of view.
4. Talking over my problems with friends makes me feel ashamed or foolish.
5. I wish I had different friends.
6. My friends understand me.
7. My friends encourage me to talk about my difficulties.
8. My friends accept me as I am.
9. I feel the need to be in touch with my friends more often.
10. My friends don't understand what I'm going through these days.
11. I feel alone or apart when I am with my friends.

12. My friends listen to what I have to say.
13. I feel my friends are good friends.
14. My friends are fairly easy to talk to.
15. When I am angry about something, my friends try to be understanding.
16. My friends help me understand myself better.
17. My friends care about how I am feeling.
18. I feel angry with my friends.
19. I can count on my friends when I need to get something off my chest.
20. I trust my friends.
21. My friends respect my feelings.
22. I get upset a lot more than my friends know about.
23. It seems as if my friends are irritated with me for no reason.
24. I can tell my friends about my problems and troubles.
25. If my friends know something is bothering me, they ask me about it.



Maternal Expertise, Trustworthiness, and Accessibility Scale

DESCRIPTION	The Maternal, Expertise and Accessibility Scale assesses both adolescent and mother perceived maternal expertise, trustworthiness and accessibility (Guilamo-Ramos et al., 2006).
RESPONSE FORMAT	1 = Strongly agree 2 = Moderately agree 3 = Neither agree nor disagree 4 = Moderately disagree 5 = Strongly disagree
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Early adolescents (ages 11 to 14) and their mothers. Fathers may be included if the referent is modified.
SCORING AND DIRECTION	All items are added. The higher score reflects a higher degree of maternal expertise, trustworthiness, and accessibility.
RELIABILITY	The internal consistency scores, measured by Cronbach's alpha for the expertise, trustworthiness, and accessibility scale domains for adolescents were 0.72, 0.82 and 0.73, respectively. For mothers they were 0.70, 0.68, and 0.70, respectively.
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Guilamo-Ramos, V., Jaccard, J., Dittus, P., & Bouris, A. (2006). Paternal expertise, trustworthiness, and accessibility: Parent-adolescent communication and adolescent risk behavior. <i>Journal of Marriage and Family</i> , 69(5), 12-29.

Maternal Expertise, Trustworthiness, and Accessibility Scale

OTHER REFERENCES	Guilamo-Ramos, V., Jaccard, J., Dittus, P., Bouris, A., Gonzalez, B., Casillas, E., & Banspach, S. (2011). A comparative study of interventions for delaying the initiation of sexual intercourse among Latino and black youth. <i>Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health</i> , 43(4), 247-254.
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

ADOLESCENTS	MOTHERS
<p>Expertise</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My mother gives me good advice. 2. The advice my mother gives me is helpful when we talk about important topics. 3. When I need good advice about something important, I go to my mother for help. 	<p>Expertise</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My daughter thinks I give good advice to her. 2. My daughter finds my advice helpful when we talk about important topics. 3. When my daughter needs good advice about something important, she comes to me for help.
<p>Trustworthiness</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I can trust my mother when we talk. 2. My mother keeps her promises to me. 3. My mother is honest with me. 	<p>Trustworthiness</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My daughter trusts me when we talk. 2. My daughter knows that I will keep my promises to her. 3. My daughter knows I am honest with her.
<p>Accessibility</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is difficult for my mother and me to find a time to talk. 2. My mother is too busy when I want to talk to her about things. 3. My mother has trouble finding time to talk with me. 	<p>Accessibility</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is difficult for my daughter and me to find a time to talk. 2. I find I am too busy when my daughter wants to talk with me about things. 3. I have trouble finding time to talk with my daughter.

McMaster Family Assessment Device (FAD)

<p>DESCRIPTION</p>	<p>The McMaster Family Assessment Device (FAD), originally developed by Epstein et al. (1983), measures different aspects of family functioning. It is composed of seven subscales (total of 60 items):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Problem Solving (6 items): family’s ability to solve problems, 2) Communication (9 items): effectiveness of exchanging information, 3) Roles (11 items): extent to which the family has established behavior patterns when handling family tasks, 4) Affective Responsiveness (6 items): family’s ability to respond with appropriate emotions, 5) Affective Involvement (7 items): quality of family members’ involvement with one another, 6) Behavior Control (9 items): expected standards and limits of behavior, 7) General Functioning (12 items). This subscale can be used independently and has shown good psychometric properties in Latino samples. <p>The subscale about Roles was eliminated from this manual as its reliability scores were low.</p> <p>Aarons et al. (2007) used the FAD with a Hispanic sample living in the United States. Barroilhet et al. (2009) translated and adapted the FAD for a sample from Spain.</p>
<p>RESPONSE FORMAT</p>	<p>1 = Strongly agree 2 = Agree 3 = Disagree 4 = Strongly disagree</p>
<p>SCORING AND DIRECTION</p>	<p>The subscales are calculated by averaging the items for each subscale. To obtain a family score, average all subscale scores of each family member. Lower scores reflect a better family functioning.</p>
<p>INTENDED RESPONDENTS</p>	<p>The scale was developed for family members 12 years or older.</p>

McMaster Family Assessment Device (FAD)

RELIABILITY	<p>The internal consistency, measured by Cronbach's alpha, from Epstein for each subscale range from 0.72 to 0.92, using a community sample. The internal consistency scores obtained by Aarons et al. using a Hispanic sample in the United States and those from Barroilhet using a non-clinical sample in Spain are listed below.</p> <table><thead><tr><th></th><th>Aarons</th><th>Barroilhet</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Problem Solving</td><td>0.72</td><td>0.69</td></tr><tr><td>Communication</td><td>0.68</td><td>0.76</td></tr><tr><td>Affective Responsiveness</td><td>0.68</td><td>0.75</td></tr><tr><td>Affective Involvement</td><td>0.70</td><td>0.80</td></tr><tr><td>Behavioral Control</td><td>0.75</td><td>0.78</td></tr><tr><td>General Functioning</td><td>0.82</td><td>0.85</td></tr><tr><td>Overall</td><td>0.93</td><td>0.93</td></tr></tbody></table>		Aarons	Barroilhet	Problem Solving	0.72	0.69	Communication	0.68	0.76	Affective Responsiveness	0.68	0.75	Affective Involvement	0.70	0.80	Behavioral Control	0.75	0.78	General Functioning	0.82	0.85	Overall	0.93	0.93
	Aarons	Barroilhet																							
Problem Solving	0.72	0.69																							
Communication	0.68	0.76																							
Affective Responsiveness	0.68	0.75																							
Affective Involvement	0.70	0.80																							
Behavioral Control	0.75	0.78																							
General Functioning	0.82	0.85																							
Overall	0.93	0.93																							
REFERENCES	<p>Aarons, G. A., McDonald, E. J., Connelly, C. D., & Newton, R. R. (2007). Assessment of family functioning in Caucasian and Hispanic Americans: Reliability, validity, and factor structure of the <i>Family Assessment Device</i>. <i>Family Process, 46</i>(4), 557-569.</p> <p>Barroilhet, S., Cano-Prous, A., Cervera-Enguix, S., Forjaz, M. J., & Guillén-Grima, F. (2009). A Spanish version of the Family Assessment Device. <i>Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology, 44</i>(12), 1051-1065.</p> <p>Epstein, N. B., Baldwin, L. M., & Bishop, D. S. (1983). The McMaster Family Assessment Device. <i>Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 9</i>(2), 171-180.</p>																								
COPYRIGHT	<p>The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.</p>																								

Items

INSTRUCTIONS:

"State whether you agree with the following statements thinking of your family."

PROBLEM SOLVING

1. We resolve most everyday problems around the house.
2. We usually act on our decisions regarding problems.
3. After our family tries to solve a problem, we usually discuss whether it worked or not.
4. We resolve most emotional upsets that come up.
5. We confront problems involving feelings.
6. We try to think of different ways to solve problems.

COMMUNICATION

7. When someone is upset the others know why.
8. You can't tell how a person is feeling from what they are saying.*
9. People come right out and say things instead of hinting at them.
10. It is difficult to talk to each other about tender feelings.*
11. We talk to people directly rather than through go-betweens.
12. We often don't say what we mean.*
13. We are frank with each other.
14. We don't talk to each other when we are angry.*
15. When we don't like what someone has done, we tell them.

AFFECTIVE RESPONSIVENESS

16. We are reluctant to show our affection for each other.*
17. Some of us just don't respond emotionally.*
18. We do not show our love for each other.*
19. Tenderness takes second place to other things in our family.*
20. We express tenderness.
21. We cry openly.

AFFECTIVE INVOLVEMENT

33. If someone is in trouble, the others become too involved.*
34. You only get the interest of others when something is important to them.*
35. We are too self-centered.*
36. We get involved with each other only when something interests us.*
37. We show interest in each other when we can get something out of it personally.
38. Our family shows interest in each other only when they can get something out of it.
39. Even though we mean well, we intrude too much into each other's lives.

BEHAVIORAL CONTROL

40. We don't know what to do when an emergency comes up.
41. You can easily get away with breaking the rules.*
42. We know what to do in an emergency.
43. We have no clear expectations about toilet habits.
44. We have rules about hitting people.
45. We don't hold to any rules or standards.
46. If the rules are broken, we don't know what to expect.
47. Anything goes in our family.*
48. There are rules about dangerous situations.

GENERAL FUNCTIONING

49. Planning family activities is difficult because we misunderstand each other.
50. In times of crisis we can turn to each other for support.
51. We cannot talk to each other about the sadness we feel.
52. Individuals are accepted for what they are.
53. We avoid discussing our fears and concerns.
54. We can express feelings to each other.

Items

- 55. There are lots of bad feelings in the family.
- 56. We feel accepted for what we are.
- 57. Making decisions is a problem for our family.
- 58. We are able to make decisions about how to solve problems.
- 59. We don't get along well together.
- 60. We confide in each other.

Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS)

DESCRIPTION	The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS) was developed to assess perceived social support among youth from three different sources: family, friends, and significant other. The MSPSS is a 12-item scale originally used with a sample of college undergraduate students 17 to 21 years old (Zimet et al., 1988). Edwards (2004) used the MSPSS to assess social support among English-speaking Mexican American youth. The participants were middle and high school students aged between 11 to 18 years old.																
RESPONSE FORMAT	1 = Very strongly disagree 2 = Strongly disagree 3 = Mildly disagree 4 = Neutral 5 = Mildly agree 6 = Strongly agree 7 = Very strongly agree																
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Adolescents																
SCORING AND DIRECTION	The subscales are computed by averaging the scores of all items. Higher scores indicate greater perceived social support.																
RELIABILITY	The internal consistencies of the scores, measured by Cronbach's alpha, are listed below. <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Zimet et al., 1988</th> <th>Edwards, 2004</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Family</td> <td>0.87</td> <td>0.88</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Friends</td> <td>0.85</td> <td>0.90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Significant Other</td> <td>0.91</td> <td>0.61</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Scale</td> <td>0.88</td> <td>0.86</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Zimet et al., 1988	Edwards, 2004	Family	0.87	0.88	Friends	0.85	0.90	Significant Other	0.91	0.61	Total Scale	0.88	0.86
	Zimet et al., 1988	Edwards, 2004															
Family	0.87	0.88															
Friends	0.85	0.90															
Significant Other	0.91	0.61															
Total Scale	0.88	0.86															

REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	<p>Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. (1988). The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support. <i>Journal of Personality Assessment</i>, 52(1), 30-41.</p> <p>Edwards, L. M. (2004). Measuring perceived social support in Mexican American youth: Psychometric properties of the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support. <i>Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences</i>, 26(2), 187-194.</p>
OTHER REFERENCES	<p>Levin, S. K., Metlay, J. P., Maselli, J. H., Kersey, A. S., Camargo, C. A., Gonzales, R., & Investigators, I. P. (2009). Perceived social support among adults seeking care for acute respiratory tract infections in US EDs. <i>American Journal of Emergency Medicine</i>, 27(5), 582-587.</p>
COPYRIGHT	<p>The scale is free. Researchers use proper citation.</p>

Items

INSTRUCTIONS:

We are interested in how you feel about the following statements. Read each statement carefully. Indicate how you feel about each statement.

FACTOR	ORDER	ITEM
Family	3	My family really tries to help me.
	4	I get the emotional help and support that I need from my family.
	8	I can talk about my problems with my family.
	11	My family is willing to help me make decisions.
Friends	6	My friends really try to help me.
	7	I can count on my friends when things go wrong.
	9	I have friends with whom I can share my joys and sorrows.
	12	I can talk about my problems with my friends.
Significant Other	1	There is a special person who is around when I am in need.
	2	There is a special person with whom I can share joys and sorrows.
	5	I have a special person who is a real source of comfort to me.
	10	There is a special person in my life who cares about my feelings.

Parent-Adolescent Communication

DESCRIPTION	The Parent-Adolescent Communication assesses three domains of parent-adolescent communication: 1) health risks associated with sexual behavior, 2) social consequences of having sexual intercourse, and 3) moral consequences of having sexual intercourse (Guilamo-Ramos et al., 2006).
RESPONSE FORMAT	1 = Not at all 2 = Somewhat 3 = A moderate amount 4 = A great deal
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Adolescents (aged 11 to 14) and Parents (mother/father)
SCORING AND DIRECTION	All items are added. The higher the score the more parent-adolescent communication.
RELIABILITY	The internal consistency scores, measured by Cronbach's alpha, for the three domains among adolescents were 0.88, 0.85, and 0.89, respectively. The internal consistency scores for the three domains among mothers were 0.88, 0.86, and 0.89, respectively. These scores were obtained with a sample of Latino and African American adolescents and mothers. The majority of the Latino population was Dominican and Puerto Rican.
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Guilamo-Ramos, V., Jaccard, J., Dittus, P., & Bouris, A. M. (2006). Parental expertise, trustworthiness, and accessibility: Parent-adolescent communication and adolescent risk behavior. <i>Journal of Marriage and Family</i> , 68(5), 1229.
OTHER REFERENCES	Guilamo-Ramos, V., Jaccard, J., Dittus, P., Bouris, A., Holloway, I., & Casillas, E. (2007). Adolescent expectancies, parent-adolescent communication and intentions to have sexual intercourse among inner-city, middle school youth. <i>Annals of Behavioral Medicine</i> , 34(1), 56-66. Guilamo-Ramos, V., Jaccard, J., Dittus, P., Collins, S. (2008). Parent-adolescent communication about sexual intercourse: An analysis of maternal reluctance to communicate. <i>Health Psychology</i> , 27(6), 780-769.
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

Domain 1: Health risks associated with sexual behavior

1. My mother and I have talked about what might happen to me if I were to get pregnant.
2. My mother and I have talked about how if I had sexual intercourse at this time in my life, I might get a sexually transmitted disease (STD).
3. My mother and I have talked about how if I had sexual intercourse at this time in my life, I might get HIV/AIDS.

Domain 2: Social consequences of engaging in sexual intercourse

1. My mother and I have talked about how I might get a bad reputation if I had sexual intercourse at this time in my life.
2. My mother and I have talked about how embarrassing it would be for me if I got pregnant now.
3. My mother and I have talked about how my boyfriend might lose respect for me if we had had sexual intercourse at this time in my life.

Domain 3: Moral consequences of engaging in sexual intercourse

1. My mother and I have talked about how having sexual intercourse at this time in my life would be morally wrong.
2. My mother and I have talked about how if I had sexual intercourse at this time in my life I might regret not waiting until I was married.
3. My mother and I have talked about how I would feel guilty if I had sexual intercourse at this time in my life.

*For father version, replace 'mother' with 'father.'

Parent-Adolescent Communication Scale (PACS)

DESCRIPTION	The Parent-Adolescent Communication Scale (PACS) consists of two subscales that measure 1) the degree of openness in family communication (10 items) and 2) the extent of problems with family communication (10 items). The measure comprises 20 items for adolescents and 20 for parents.
RESPONSE FORMAT	1 = Strongly disagree 2 = Moderately disagree 3 = Neither agree nor disagree 4 = Moderately agree 5 = Strongly agree
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Adolescents and parents (mother and father)

Parent-Adolescent Communication Scale (PACS)

SCORING AND DIRECTION	<p>The subscales are calculated by adding the 10 items. For degree of openness, a higher score indicates better communication between parent and adolescent. For extent of problems, a higher score indicates more problems in the parent-child communication.</p> <p>Items by scale: Degree of openness: 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 14, 16, 17 Extent of problems: 2, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18, 19, 20</p>
RELIABILITY	<p>The internal consistency of the scores, measured by Cronbach's alpha, were 0.87 for the openness subscale and 0.78 for the problems subscale. The test-retest reliabilities were 0.78 and 0.77 for the openness and problems subscales, respectively. Using a sample on Hispanic parents, the internal consistency was 0.78 (Joshi & Gutierrez, 2006).</p>
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	<p>Barnes, H. L., & Olson, D. H. (1982). Parent-adolescent communication scale. In D. H. Olson, H. I. McCubbin, H. Barnes, A. Larsen, M. Muxen and M. Wilson (Eds.), <i>Family inventories: Inventories used in a national survey of families across the family life-cycle</i> (pp. 33-48). St. Paul: Family Social Science, University of Minnesota.</p>
OTHER REFERENCES	<p>Barnes, H. L., & Olson, D. H. (1985). Parent-adolescent communication and the circumplex model. <i>Child Development</i>, 56, 438-447.</p> <p>Joshi, A., & Gutierrez, B. J. (2006). Parenting stress in parents of Hispanic adolescents. <i>North American Journal of Psychology</i>, 8(2), 209-216.</p> <p>Gutierrez, B. J. (2006). <i>Parenting stress among parents of Hispanic adolescents</i>. Unpublished master's thesis. California State University, Los Angeles, CA.</p>
COPYRIGHT	<p>The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.</p>

Items

ADOLESCENT FORM:

1. I can discuss my beliefs with my mother/father without feeling restrained or embarrassed.
2. Sometimes I have trouble believing everything my mother/father tells me.
3. My mother/father is always a good listener.
4. I am sometimes afraid to ask my mother/father for what I want.
5. My mother/father has a tendency to say things to me that would be better left unsaid.
6. My mother/father can tell how I'm feeling without asking.
7. I am very satisfied with how my mother/father and I talk together.
8. If I were in trouble, I could tell my mother/father.
9. I openly show affection to my mother/father.
10. When we are having a problem, I often give my mother/father the silent treatment.
11. I am careful about what I say to my mother/father.
12. When talking to my mother/father, I have a tendency to say things that would be better left unsaid.
13. When I ask questions, I get honest answers from my mother/father.
14. My mother/father tries to understand my point of view.
15. There are topics I avoid discussing with my mother/father.
16. I find it easy to discuss problems with my mother/father.
17. It is very easy for me to express all my true feelings to my mother/father.
18. My mother/father nags/bothers me.
19. My mother/father insults me when s/he is angry with me.
20. I don't think I can tell my mother/father how I really feel about some things.

PARENT FORM:

1. I can discuss my beliefs with my child without feeling restrained or embarrassed.
2. Sometimes I have trouble believing everything my child tells me.
3. My child is always a good listener.
4. I am sometimes afraid to ask my child for what I want.
5. My child has a tendency to say things to me that would be better left unsaid.
6. My child can tell how I'm feeling without asking.
7. I am very satisfied with how my child and I talk together.
8. If I were in trouble, I could tell my child.
9. I openly show affection to my child.
10. When we are having a problem, I often give my child the silent treatment.
11. I am careful about what I say to my child.
12. When talking with my child, I have a tendency to say things that would be better left unsaid.
13. When I ask questions, I get honest answers from my child.
14. My child tries to understand my point of view.
15. There are topics I avoid discussing with my child.
16. I find it easy to discuss problems with my child.
17. It is very easy for me to express all my true feelings to my child.
18. My child nags/bothers me.
19. My child insults me when s/he is angry with me.
20. I don't think I can tell my child how I really feel about some things.

Parental Knowledge

DESCRIPTION	<p>The Parental Knowledge subscale contains 9 items that evaluate parents' knowledge of their children's whereabouts, activities, and associations. Children and parents answer the same questions (Stattin & Kerr, 2000).</p> <p>In addition to <i>parental knowledge</i> ("Do your parents know about..."), later research has expanded this construct to include <i>parental solicitation</i> ("Do your parents ask about...") and <i>child disclosure</i> of information ("Do you tell your parents about...") (Eaton et al. 2009).</p>
RESPONSE FORMAT	<p>1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Most of the time 5 = Always or almost always</p>
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Adolescents and parents
SCORING AND DIRECTION	Scale scores are calculated by averaging the responses to the nine items. Higher scores indicate higher parental knowledge.
RELIABILITY	<p>The internal consistency, measured by Cronbach's alpha, for the parental monitoring scale was .86 for the child report and .89 for the parent report. The test-retest reliability for the children's report was $r(36)=.83$ (Statin & Kerr, 2000). The correlation between the parent and child measure were .35 and .41 in two measurements (Kerr et al., 2010).</p>
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Stattin, H., & Kerr, M. (2000). Parental monitoring: A reinterpretation. <i>Child Development, 71</i> (4), 1072-1085.
OTHER REFERENCES	<p>Eaton, N. R., Krueger, R. F., Johnson, W., McGue, M., & Iacono, W. G. (2009). Parental monitoring, personality, and delinquency: Further support for a reconceptualization of monitoring. <i>Journal of Research in Personality, 43</i>(1), 49-59.</p> <p>Kerr, M., Stattin, H., & Burk, W. J. (2010). A reinterpretation of parental monitoring in longitudinal perspective. <i>Journal of Research on Adolescence, 20</i>(1), 39-64.</p>
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

CHILD VERSION:

10. Do your parents know what you do during your free time?
11. Do your parents know who you have as friends during your free time?
12. Do your parents usually know what type of homework you have?
13. Do your parents know what you spend your money on?
14. Do your parents usually know when you have an exam or paper due at school?
15. Do your parents know how you do in different subjects at school?
16. Do your parents know where you go when you are out with friends at night?
17. Do your parents normally know where you go and what you do after school?
18. In the past month, have your parents had no idea where you were at night?

PARENT VERSION:

10. Do you know what your child does during his or her free time?
11. Do you know who your child has as friends during his or her free time?
12. Do you know what type of homework your child has?
13. Do you know what your child spends his or her money on?
14. Do you know when your child has an exam or paper due at school?
15. Do you know how your child does in different subjects at school?
16. Do you know where your child goes when he or she is out with friends at night?
17. Do you normally know where your child goes and what he or she does after school?
18. In the past month, have you had no idea where your child was at night?

Parental Monitoring Assessment (PMA)

DESCRIPTION	<p>The Parental Monitoring Assessment (PMA) was originally an 8-item scale that assessed parents' knowledge of the whereabouts of their children. The revised PMA includes only six items—the first six items in the list (Li et al., 2000).</p> <p>Note that item four may not be applicable to younger children who do not go out at night without an adult. Also item eight may not be applicable to low income, young children who do not handle money.</p>
RESPONSE FORMAT	<p>1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Most of the time 5 = Always</p>
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	<p>Adolescents</p>

Parental Monitoring Assessment (PMA)

SCORING AND DIRECTION	To calculate the scale score, add all items. A higher score indicates higher parental knowledge of the whereabouts of their children.
RELIABILITY	The internal consistency, measured by Cronbach's alpha, has ranged between 0.70 and 0.87 (Small & Kerns, 1993; Li et al., 2000).
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Small, S.A., & Kerns, D. (1993). Unwanted sexual activity among peers during early and middle adolescence: Incidence and risk factors. <i>Journal of Marriage and the Family</i> , 55, 941-952.
OTHER REFERENCES	Li, X., Feigelman, S., & Stanton, B. (2000). Perceived parental monitoring and health risk behaviors among urban low-income African-American children and adolescents. <i>Journal of Adolescent Health</i> , 27, 43-48.
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

1. My parents know where I am after school.
2. If I am going to be home late, I am expected to call my parent(s) to let them know.
3. I tell my parent(s) who I am going to be with before I go out.
4. When I go out at night, my parent(s) know where I am.
5. I talk with my parent(s) about the plans I have with my friends.
6. When I go out, my parent(s) ask me where I am going.
7. My parents know who my friends are.
8. My parents know how I spend my money.

Parental Support for Fighting

DESCRIPTION	<p>The purpose of this 10-item measure is to evaluate the students' perception of their parents' support for aggressive and non-aggressive solutions as a means of solving conflicts. The questionnaire was first used as a single scale in the Students for Peace Project (Orpinas, Murray, & Kelder, 1999). Items were originally obtained from focus groups with middle schools students (Kelder et al., 1996; Orpinas et al., 2000). For the Multisite Violence Prevention Project, two subscales are scored. One subscale consists of five items reflecting aggressive solutions to conflict. The other subscale is composed of the five non-aggressive solution items. The items are declarative statements about aggressive or peaceful solutions to conflict.</p>
RESPONSE FORMAT	<p>0 = No 1 = Yes</p>
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	<p>Middle school students</p>
SCORING AND DIRECTION	<p>All scores are based on the mean item response and range from 0 to 1.</p> <p>Two subscales are scored:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parental Support for Aggressive Solutions = Items: 1, 2, 3, 5, 9 • Parental Support for Non-aggressive Solutions = Items: 4, 6, 7, 8, 10 <p>High scores indicate a perception of parental support for aggressive solutions or non-aggressive solutions, respectively.</p>
RELIABILITY	<p>This scale was used in the Multisite Violence Prevention Project with a large sample of sixth graders. The internal consistency of the scores, as measured by Cronbach's alpha, was :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aggressive Solutions Scale = 0.62 • Non-aggressive Solutions Scale = 0.66 <p>In previous studies, the internal consistency of the scale's scores (Cronbach's Alpha) was 0.81 (Orpinas, Murray, & Kelder, 1999).</p>
MISSING VALUES	<p>Scale scores can be calculated if at least 4 of the 5 items are answered.</p>

Parental Support for Fighting

REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Orpinas, P., Murray, N., & Kelder, S. (1999). Parental influences on students' aggressive behavior and weapon-carrying. <i>Health Education and Behavior</i> , 26(6), 774-787.
OTHER REFERENCES	<p>Kelder, S.H., Orpinas, P., McAlister, A., Frankowski, R., Parcel, G.S., & Friday, J. (1996). The Students for Peace Project: A comprehensive violence- prevention program for middle school students. <i>American Journal of Preventive Medicine</i>, 12(5), 22-30.</p> <p>Orpinas, P., Kelder, S., Frankowski, R., Murray, N., Zhang, Q., & McAlister, A. (2000). Outcome evaluation of a multi-component violence-prevention program for middle school students: The Students for Peace project. <i>Health Education Research</i>, 15(1), 45-58.</p>
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

SCALE: PARENTAL SUPPORT FOR AGGRESSIVE SOLUTIONS TO CONFLICT DOES YOUR PARENT TELL YOU THESE THINGS ABOUT FIGHTING?

1. If someone hits you, hit them back.
2. If someone calls you names, hit them.
3. If someone calls you names, call them names back.
5. If someone asks you to fight, hit them first.
9. If you can't solve the problem by talking, it is best to solve it through fighting.

SCALE: PARENTAL SUPPORT FOR AGGRESSIVE SOLUTIONS TO CONFLICT DOES YOUR PARENT TELL YOU THESE THINGS ABOUT FIGHTING?

4. If someone calls you names, ignore them.
6. If someone asks you to fight, you should try to talk your way out of a fight.
7. You should think the problem through, calm yourself, and then talk the problem out with your friend.
8. If another student asks you to fight, you should tell a teacher or someone older.
10. No matter what, fighting is not good; there are other ways to solve problems.

Parenting Practices

<p>DESCRIPTION</p>	<p>The Parenting Practices measure assesses two main constructs related to parents' behavior toward their children: discipline and monitoring. This measure was used in the Chicago Youth Development Study (CYDS) and the SAFE Children study, both of which adapted questions from the Pittsburgh Youth Study (Loeber, Farrington, Stouthamer-Loeber, & Van Kammen, 1989). This measure was adapted over several years and used in multiple studies to its present form. There are five Parenting Practices subscales: Monitoring and Involvement, Supervision and Rules, Positive Parenting, Discipline Effectiveness, and Discipline Avoidance. This manual includes the subscales below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Discipline Effectiveness</i> refers to how effective parental discipline is in controlling the child's behavior. • <i>Monitoring and Involvement</i> pertains to caregiver involvement in daily activities and routines, as well as knowledge of the child's whereabouts. • <i>Positive Parenting</i> refers to the use of positive rewards and encouragement of appropriate behavior. 		
<p>RESPONSE FORMAT</p>	<p><i>Monitoring and Involvement Scale:</i></p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="613 1100 971 1465"> <p><i>Questions 1 and 3:</i> 1 = Don't know 2 = More than 30 days ago 3 = Within last 30 days, but not within the last week 4 = Within the last week, but not yesterday or today 5 = Yesterday/today</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1024 1100 1252 1245"> <p><i>Questions 7 to 14:</i> 1 = Hardly ever 3 = Sometimes 5 = Often</p> </td> </tr> </table> <p><i>Positive Parenting Scale and Discipline Effectiveness:</i> 1 = Almost never 3 = Sometimes 5 = Almost always</p> <p><i>Questions 2 and 4:</i> 1 = Don't know 2 = Less than once a month 3 = Within the last 30 days, but less than once per week 4 = At least once this week, but less than once per day 5 = Every day or almost every day</p>	<p><i>Questions 1 and 3:</i> 1 = Don't know 2 = More than 30 days ago 3 = Within last 30 days, but not within the last week 4 = Within the last week, but not yesterday or today 5 = Yesterday/today</p>	<p><i>Questions 7 to 14:</i> 1 = Hardly ever 3 = Sometimes 5 = Often</p>
<p><i>Questions 1 and 3:</i> 1 = Don't know 2 = More than 30 days ago 3 = Within last 30 days, but not within the last week 4 = Within the last week, but not yesterday or today 5 = Yesterday/today</p>	<p><i>Questions 7 to 14:</i> 1 = Hardly ever 3 = Sometimes 5 = Often</p>		

Parenting Practices

INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Parents and their adolescent children
SCORING AND DIRECTION	<p>All scores are based on the mean item response.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Discipline Effectiveness</i>: Mean of 5 items. Higher scores indicate greater belief in the effectiveness of discipline methods. • <i>Monitoring and Involvement</i>: Mean of 12 items, none were reversed scored. Higher scores indicate greater parental involvement with children. • <i>Positive Parenting</i>: Mean of 6 items. Higher scores indicate that parents are more likely to use positive supportive words and actions in relating to children.
RELIABILITY	<p>This scale was used in the Multisite Violence Prevention Project with a large sample of high-risk sixth graders and their parents. The internal consistency scores, measured by Cronbach's alpha, were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Discipline Effectiveness</i>: .77 (parent) • <i>Monitoring and Involvement</i>: .80 (parent and child) • <i>Positive Parenting</i>: .78 (parent), .81 (child) <p>Gorman-Smith et al. (1996) reported consistency scores of .69 for Discipline Effectiveness, .78 and .79 for Monitoring and Involvement, and .84 and .85 for Positive Parenting.</p>
MISSING VALUES	Scale scores can be calculated if at least 65% items are answered.
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Gorman-Smith, D., Tolan, P. H., Zelli, A., & Huesmann, I. R. (1996). The relation of family functioning to violence among inner-city minority youth. <i>Journal of Family Psychology, 10</i> , 101-116.
OTHER REFERENCES	<p>Loeber, R., Farrington, D., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., & VanHammen, W. (1989). <i>Antisocial Behavior and Mental Health Problems: Explanatory Factors in Childhood and Adolescence</i>. NIMH Grant Proposal.</p> <p>Miller-Johnson, S., Sullivan, T. N., & Simon, T. R. (2004). Evaluating the impact of interventions in the Multisite Violence Prevention Study: Samples, procedures, and measures. <i>American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 26</i>(1), 48-61.</p>

OTHER REFERENCES	<p>Tolan, P.H., Gorman-Smith, D., & Henry, D. (1996). <i>Predatory and relationship violence of inner-city youth</i>. Grant Proposal, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.</p> <p>Tolan, P. H., Gorman-Smith, D., & Henry, D. (2000). <i>Final report of the SAFEChildren Project</i>. Technical Report, Institute for Juvenile Research, University of Illinois at Chicago: Author.</p>
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

DISCIPLINE EFFECTIVENESS SUBSCALE

6. In the past 30 days, how often was the discipline you used effective for your son/daughter? Did it work?
7. In the past 30 days, if your son/daughter was punished, did the punishment work?
8. In the past 30 days, if you punished _____, how often did his/her behavior get worse?
9. In the past 30 days, when you were by yourself, how often did you have much difficulty controlling _____?
10. In the past 30 days, when other adults were present, how often did you have much difficulty controlling _____?

MONITORING AND INVOLVEMENT SUBSCALE

13. When was the last time that you talked with a parent about what you were going to do for the coming day?
14. How often does a parent talk to you about what you are going to do for the coming day?
15. When was the last time that you talked with a parent about what you had actually done during the day?
16. How often does a parent talk with you about what you had actually done during the day?
17. In the past 30 days, how often did you help with family fun activities?
18. In the past 30 days, how often did you like to get involved in family activities?
19. In the past 30 days, how often did a parent have time to listen to you when you wanted to talk with one of them?
20. In the past 30 days, how often did you and a parent do things together at home?
21. In the past 30 days, how often did you go with members of the family to movies, sports events, or other outings?
22. In the past 30 days, how often did you have a friendly talk with a parent?
23. In the past 30 days, how often did you help with chores, errands and/or other work around the house?
24. In the past 30 days, how often did a parent talk with you about how you are doing in school?

Items

POSITIVE PARENTING SUBSCALE

7. How often did one of them give you a wink or a smile?
8. How often did one of them say something nice about you; praise or approval?
9. How often did one of them give you a hug, pat on the back, or kiss for it?
10. How often did one of them give you some reward for it, like a present, extra allowance or something special to eat?
11. How often did one of them give you some special privilege such as staying up late, watching TV, or doing some special activity?
12. How often did one of them do something special together with you, such as going to the movies, playing a game or going somewhere special?

Parental Monitoring (Students for Peace)

DESCRIPTION	The Students for Peace Project (Kelder et al., 1996; Orpinas, Murray, & Kelder, 1999) used two items to examine the adolescents' perception of parental monitoring.
RESPONSE FORMAT	1 = Never or almost never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Almost always
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Adolescents
SCORING AND DIRECTION	Item 1 is reverse scored. The scale is calculated by averaging both items. High score indicates stronger parental monitoring.
VALIDITY	In a large sample of mostly Latino middle school students, this scale showed strong association with aggressive behaviors. As adolescents reported a lower parental monitoring the prevalence of aggressive behaviors, fights at school, injuries due to fights, and weapon carrying significantly increased (Orpinas, Murray, & Kelder, 1999).
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Orpinas, P., Murray, N., & Kelder, S. (1999). Parental influences on students' aggressive behaviors and weapon carrying. <i>Health Education & Behavior</i> , 26(6), 774-787.

OTHER REFERENCES	Kelder, S. H., Orpinas, P., McAlister, A., Frankowski, R., Parcel, G. S., & Friday, J. (1996). The students for peace project: A comprehensive violence-prevention program for middle school students. <i>American Journal of Preventive Medicine</i> , 12(5), 22-30.
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

1. Do your parents let you come and go as you please? [REVERSE CODING]
2. When you are away from home, do your parents know where you are and who you are with?

Parental Monitoring-Curfew (H/L ATS)

DESCRIPTION	<p>The Hispanic/Latino Adult Tobacco Survey (H/L ATS) is designed to measure the tobacco related behaviors, knowledge, attitudes, and opinions of Hispanic and Latino persons. The H/L ATS is uniquely suited for administration among Hispanic/Latino populations: the questions and vocabulary reflect the experience and language of Hispanic/Latino persons. In addition, the Spanish translation was carefully developed to be understood by Spanish-speakers from various countries of origin.</p> <p>This section includes two questions on parental monitoring related to curfew during weekdays and weekend.</p>
RESPONSE FORMAT	Format varies per question. Refer to questions below.
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Adult Latino parents
RELIABILITY	No information is reported.

Parental Monitoring-Curfew (H/L ATS)

REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). <i>Hispanic/Latino Adult Tobacco Survey Questionnaire</i> . Atlanta, Georgia: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2007. http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/data_statistics/surveys/hispanic_latino_ats_guide/index.htm
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

- 1. Does your child have to be home by a specific time at night when he/she has to go to school the next day?**
 1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Child never goes out of the house at night when there is school the following day

- 2. Does your child have to be home by a specific time on weekend nights?**
 1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Child never goes out of the house on weekend nights

Parent-Child Communication about Smoking (H/L ATS)

DESCRIPTION	The Hispanic/Latino Adult Tobacco Survey (H/L ATS) is designed to measure the tobacco related behaviors, knowledge, attitudes, and opinions of Hispanic and Latino persons. The H/L ATS is uniquely suited for administration among Hispanic/Latino populations: the questions and vocabulary reflect the experience and language of Hispanic/Latino persons. In addition, the Spanish translation was carefully developed to be understood by Spanish-speakers from various countries of origin. This section reports on four questions on parent-child communication related to smoking.
RESPONSE FORMAT	Response categories are listed after the question.
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Adult Latino parents

REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). <i>Hispanic/Latino Adult Tobacco Survey Questionnaire</i> . Atlanta, Georgia: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2007. http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/data_statistics/surveys/hispanic_latino_ats_guide/index.htm
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.
EDITORS' NOTE	Parental communication regarding drugs and alcohol are important deterrents of drug use.

Items

1. **During the past 6 months, how many times have you spoken with your child about what he/she may or may not do in regard to tobacco?**
 1. Never
 2. Once
 3. Twice
 4. Three or more times

2. **During the past 6 months, how many times have you told your child that he/she cannot use tobacco?**
 1. Never
 2. Once
 3. Twice
 4. Three or more times

3. **Which of the following statements best describes what you think?**
 1. You are sure that your child does not smoke
 2. You believe that your child does not smoke
 3. You do not know whether your child smokes or not
 4. You suspect that your child smokes
 5. You are sure that your child smokes

4. **How much would it please or displease you if you learned that your child currently smokes cigarettes?**
 1. It would please me very much
 2. It would please me somewhat

Items

3. It would neither please nor displease me
4. It would displease me somewhat
5. It would displease me very much

Relationship with Parents

DESCRIPTION	The Students for Peace Project (Kelder et al., 1996; Orpinas, Murray, & Kelder, 1999) used one item to examine the adolescents' perception of how well they got along with their family.
RESPONSE FORMAT	1 = Very well 2 = Well 3 = Just ok 4 = Bad 5 = Very bad
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Adolescents
SCORING AND DIRECTION	High score indicates worse relationship with parents.
VALIDITY	In a large sample of mostly Latino middle school students, this item showed strong association with aggressive behaviors. As adolescents reported a worse relationship with parents/caregivers the prevalence of aggressive behaviors, fights at school, injuries due to fights, and weapon carrying significantly increased (Orpinas, Murray, & Kelder, 1999).
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Orpinas, P., Murray, N., & Kelder, S. (1999). Parental influences on students' aggressive behaviors and weapon carrying. <i>Health Education & Behavior, 26</i> (6), 774-787.
OTHER REFERENCES	Kelder, S. H., Orpinas, P., McAlister, A., Frankowski, R., Parcel, G. S., & Friday, J. (1996). The students for peace project: A comprehensive violence-prevention program for middle school students. <i>American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 12</i> (5), 22-30.
COPYRIGHT	Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

1. How well do you get along with the parent or guardian that you live with all or most of the time?

Social Influences on Smoking (H/L ATS)

<p>DESCRIPTION</p>	<p>The Hispanic/Latino Adult Tobacco Survey (H/L ATS) is designed to measure the tobacco related behaviors, knowledge, attitudes, and opinions of Hispanic and Latino persons. The H/L ATS is uniquely suited for administration among Hispanic/Latino populations: the questions and vocabulary reflect the experience and language of Hispanic/Latino persons. In addition, the Spanish translation was carefully developed to be understood by Spanish-speakers from various countries of origin.</p> <p>This section includes five questions on social influences on smoking. These questions evaluate the level of social support from friends and family.</p>
<p>RESPONSE FORMAT</p>	<p>For questions 2, 3, and 4: 1 = Strongly agree 2 = Agree 3 = Disagree 4 = Strongly disagree</p> <p>For questions 1 and 5, response categories are listed after the question.</p>
<p>INTENDED RESPONDENTS</p>	<p>Adult Latino parents</p>
<p>REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE</p>	<p>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). <i>Hispanic/Latino Adult Tobacco Survey Questionnaire</i>. Atlanta, Georgia: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2007.</p> <p>http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/data_statistics/surveys/hispanic_latino_ats_guide/index.htm</p>
<p>COPYRIGHT</p>	<p>The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.</p>
<p>EDITORS' NOTE</p>	<p>Youth who live in a family where parents smoke or where most of the adults in the family support smoking will be more likely to start smoking. Note that these questions could be adapted for adolescents to measure the number of friends who smoke and whether friends and family members support smoking.</p>

Items

1 = STRONGLY AGREE 2 = AGREE 3 = DISAGREE 4 = STRONGLY DISAGREE

1. How many of your friends use any tobacco product?

1. None
2. A few
3. Less than half
4. Around half
5. All or most

2. People close to you would be bothered if you smoked.

3. People close to you are bothered because you smoke.

4. Your children are bothered because you smoke.

5. Have your children ever asked you to stop smoking?

1. Yes
2. No



Section II:

PEER AND SCHOOL INFLUENCES

Academic Achievement

DESCRIPTION	Two items measure a student's self-reported academic achievement in two core classes: English and Math. Researcher should identify the core classes that most students take and develop a response format that follows the academic grades in their country.
RESPONSE FORMAT	5 = Mostly As 4 = Mostly As and Bs (90s and 80s) 3 = Mostly Bs and Cs (80s and 70s) 2 = Mostly Cs and Ds (70s and 60s) 1 = Mostly Ds and Fs (60s and lower)
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Adolescents
SCORING AND DIRECTION	Higher values indicate higher grades.
REFERENCES	Kelder, S. H., Orpinas, P., McAlister, A., Frankowski, R., Parcel, G. S., & Friday, J. (1996). The students for peace project: A comprehensive violence-prevention program for middle school students. <i>American Journal of Preventive Medicine</i> , 12(5), 22-30.
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

1. What grades have you received so far this semester in English?
2. What grades have you received so far this semester in math?

Engagement vs. Disaffection with Learning: Student Report

DESCRIPTION	<p>The student report of the Engagement vs. Disaffection with Learning assesses students' behavioral and emotional engagement and disaffection in the classroom consisting of 25 items. This report was used with a sample of students in grades third through sixth ranging from working to middle class status (Skinner et al., 2009). The Engagement versus Disaffection with Learning scale includes positively and negatively worded items that measure the following constructs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Behavioral Engagement (5 items) measures students' effort, attention, and persistence to participate in learning activities. 2) Behavioral Disaffection (5 items) measures students' lack of effort and withdrawal to participate in learning activities. 3) Emotional Engagement (5 items) measures students' motivation to participate in learning activities. 4) Emotional Disaffection (9 items) measures students' emotional motivated withdrawal/alienation from learning activities.
RESPONSE FORMAT	<p>Four-point scale with only endpoints labeled 1 = Not at all true for me 4 = Very true</p>
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	<p>Children</p>
SCORING AND DIRECTION	<p>Calculate subscales by averaging the items for each construct. Higher scores indicate more engagement. Use reverse coding for negatively worded items [indicated by (-)].</p>
RELIABILITY	<p>The internal consistency of the scores, measured by Cronbach's alpha, was reported in the fall and in spring. Scores were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Behavioral Engagement: .61, .72 2) Behavioral Disaffection: .71, .78 3) Emotional Engagement: .76, .82 4) Emotional Disaffection: .83, .85
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	<p>Skinner, E. A., Kindermann, T. A., & Furrer, C. J. (2009). A motivational perspective on engagement and disaffection. <i>Educational and Psychological Measurement, 69</i>(3), 493-525.</p>
COPYRIGHT	<p>The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.</p>

Items

Behavioral Engagement

1. I try hard to do well in school.
2. In class, I work as hard as I can.
3. When I'm in class, I participate in class discussions.
4. I pay attention in class.
5. When I'm in class, I listen very carefully.

Emotional Engagement

1. When I'm in class, I feel good.
2. When we work on something in class, I feel interested.
3. Class is fun.
4. I enjoy learning new things in class.
5. When we work on something in class, I get involved.

Behavioral Disaffection

1. When I'm in class, I just act like I'm working.
2. I don't try very hard at school.
3. In class, I do just enough to get by.
4. When I'm in class, I think about other things.
5. When I'm in class, my mind wanders.

Emotional Disaffection

1. a. When we work on something in class, I feel bored.
b. When I'm doing work in class, I feel bored.
c. When my teacher first explains new material, I feel bored.
2. a. When I'm in class, I feel worried.
b. When we start something new in class, I feel nervous.
c. When I get stuck on a problem, I feel worried.
3. When we work on something in class, I feel discouraged.
4. Class is not all that fun for me.
5. a. When I'm in class, I feel bad.
b. When I'm working on my classwork, I feel mad.
c. When I get stuck on a problem, it really bothers me.
d. When I can't answer a question, I feel frustrated.

Parent Involvement in School

DESCRIPTION	<p>This measure assesses students' and parents' perceptions of parental involvement in the school and teacher involvement with the parent. Ratings are made on different types of school activities, including homework, communication with teachers, and attendance at school events. The measure is composed of three scales for a total of 18 items :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Parent involvement with the child (7 items) 2) Parent involvement with the teacher and school (6 items) 3) Teacher involvement with the parent (5 items) <p>The measure was developed for the Multisite Violence Prevention Project (Miller-Johnson et al., 2004) based on previous scales from Smith et al. (1997) and Eccles & Harold (1993).</p> <p>Note that norms about parent and teacher communication may vary by country. Researchers may need to adapt these scales to their community.</p>		
RESPONSE FORMAT	<table border="0"> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top;"> Items 1-7: 0 = Never 1 = Once a month 2 = Once a week 3 = Several times a week 4 = Everyday </td> <td style="vertical-align: top; padding-left: 20px;"> Items 8-18: 0 = Never 1 = Hardly ever 2 = Sometimes 3 = Often 4 = Very often </td> </tr> </table>	Items 1-7: 0 = Never 1 = Once a month 2 = Once a week 3 = Several times a week 4 = Everyday	Items 8-18: 0 = Never 1 = Hardly ever 2 = Sometimes 3 = Often 4 = Very often
Items 1-7: 0 = Never 1 = Once a month 2 = Once a week 3 = Several times a week 4 = Everyday	Items 8-18: 0 = Never 1 = Hardly ever 2 = Sometimes 3 = Often 4 = Very often		
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Adolescents and parents		
SCORING AND DIRECTION	<p>This measure is divided into the following three subscales:</p> <p>Parent Involvement with Child: 1-7 Parent Involvement with Teacher/School: 8-13 Teacher Involvement with Parent: 14-18</p> <p>Scores are calculated based on the mean value for items in each subscale with higher scores indicating greater parental involvement.</p>		
RELIABILITY	<p>The internal consistency of the scales, measured by Cronbach's alpha, ranged from 0.69 to 0.76 in a large multi-ethnic sample in the United States (Miller-Johnson, et al., 2004).</p>		

REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	<p>Eccles, J.S. & Harold, R.D. (1993). Parent-school involvement during the early adolescent years. In R. Takanishi (Ed.), <i>Adolescence in the 1990's: Risk and Opportunity</i>. New York, NY: Columbia University Teachers' College.</p> <p>Miller-Johnson, S., Sullivan, T. N., & Simon, T. R. (2004). Evaluating the impact of interventions in the Multisite Violence Prevention Study: Samples, procedures, and measures. <i>American Journal of Preventive Medicine</i>, 26(1), 48-61.</p> <p>Smith, E.P., Connell, C.M., Wright, G., Sizer, M., Norman, J.M., Hurley, A., & Walker, S.N. (1997). An ecological model of home, school, and community partnerships: Implications for research and practice. <i>Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation</i>, 8, 339-360.</p>
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

STUDENT VERSION:

Parent Involvement with Child

14. How often does a parent talk with you about your homework?
15. How often does a parent ask what you did at school?
16. How often does a parent go over graded papers with you?
17. How often does a parent talk with you about your schoolwork?
18. How often does a parent talk with you about how you behave at school?
19. How often does a parent talk with you about doing your best at school?
20. How often does a parent ask you about one of your teachers at school?

Parent Involvement with Teacher/School

21. How often does a parent talk with one of your teachers?
22. How often does your parent attend functions at your school like open house, fund-raisers, PTA meetings, and the like?
23. How often does your parent volunteer to help at a school-related function like a field-trip, athletic game, or other event?
24. How often does your parent attend parent-teacher conferences when they are scheduled?
25. How often does your parent contact your school to request a meeting with a teacher or school official concerning your behavior?
26. How often does your parent call a teacher on the telephone or write a note concerning your schoolwork?

Items

Teacher Involvement with Parent

19. How often does the teacher provide information to a parent on how well you are doing in your behavior?
20. How often does the teacher provide information to a parent on how well you are doing in your schoolwork?
21. How often does the teacher provide information to a parent in advance on upcoming assignments, projects, etc.?
22. How often does the teacher provide information on how you are behaving in school?
23. How often does the teacher provide information on your accomplishments in school?

PARENT VERSION:

Parent Involvement with Child

1. How often do you check your child's homework?
2. How often do you ask your child what he/she did at school?
3. How often do you go over graded papers with your child?
4. How often do you talk with you about your schoolwork?
5. How often do you talk with your child about how he/she behaves at school?
6. How often do you talk with your child about doing his/her best at school?
7. How often do you ask or talk with your child about one of his/her teachers at school?

Parent Involvement with Teacher/School

8. How often do you talk with one of your child's teachers?
9. How often does your parent attend functions in the school like open house, fund-raisers, PTA meetings, and the like?
10. How often do you volunteer to help at a school-related function like a field-trip, athletic game, or other event?
11. How often do you attend parent-teacher conferences when they are scheduled by your child's school?
12. How often do you contact your child's school to request a meeting with a teacher or school official concerning your child's behavior?
13. How often do you call a teacher on the telephone or write a note to the teacher concerning your child's schoolwork?

Teacher Involvement with Parent

14. How often does your child's teacher contact you to request a meeting to discuss your child's your behavior?
15. How often does the teacher provide information to you on how your child is doing in their schoolwork?
16. How often does the teacher provide information to you in advance on upcoming assignments, projects, or events for your child at school?
17. How often does the teacher provide information to you on how your child is behaving in school?
18. How often does the teacher provide information on your child's accomplishments in school?

Parent Report on Child's Close Friends

<p>DESCRIPTION</p>	<p>The Parent Report on Child's Close Friends measures parents' concern about their child's best friend, child's second best friend, and child's close friends regarding negative, aggressive or truant behavior. The measure consists of 10 items that evaluate four constructs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Trouble with Adults (items 1, 4, 7) (2) Parental Disapproval of Friends (items 2, 5, 8) (3) Parental Concern over Negative Influence of Friends (items 3, 6, 9) (4) Total Parent Concern (all 10 items). 															
<p>RESPONSE FORMAT</p>	<p>Response categories for items 1-9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 = Very much 2 = Somewhat 3 = A little 4 = Not at all <p>Response categories for item 10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 = Never 2 = Almost never 3 = Some 4 = Frequently 5 = All the time 															
<p>INTENDED RESPONDENTS</p>	<p>Parents</p>															
<p>SCORING AND DIRECTION</p>	<p>Add all items. A low score indicates less concern while a high score indicates more concern about their child's friends. Items are reverse scored, and it is imperative that you keep the response options in the same order. Users should use the SAS scoring program on the Fast Track website.</p>															
<p>RELIABILITY</p>	<p>The internal consistency, measured by Cronbach's alpha, was calculated for each subscale using a high-risk sample and a normative sample from various states in the United States. The scores below are for year 8.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="646 1688 1396 1906"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>High risk</th> <th>Normative</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>(1) Trouble with adults</td> <td>0.58</td> <td>0.67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(2) Parental disapproval of friends</td> <td>0.69</td> <td>0.65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(3) Parental concern over negative influence of friends</td> <td>0.68</td> <td>0.68</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Total parental concern</td> <td>0.87</td> <td>0.88</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		High risk	Normative	(1) Trouble with adults	0.58	0.67	(2) Parental disapproval of friends	0.69	0.65	(3) Parental concern over negative influence of friends	0.68	0.68	(4) Total parental concern	0.87	0.88
	High risk	Normative														
(1) Trouble with adults	0.58	0.67														
(2) Parental disapproval of friends	0.69	0.65														
(3) Parental concern over negative influence of friends	0.68	0.68														
(4) Total parental concern	0.87	0.88														

Parent Report on Child's Close Friends

REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group (CPPRG). (1990). <i>Parent Report on Child's Close Friends</i> [On-line]. Available: http://www.fasttrackproject.org [Contact: Pamela K. Ahrens]
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

We would like you to think about the friends your child spent the most time with last year.

Think about your son's/daughter's first best friend.

11. Does this friend get into trouble with teachers, the police, or other adults?
12. Does this friend do things you disapprove of?
13. Are you concerned about the negative influence this friend has on your child?

Now, think about the second best friend and answer the same questions.

14. Does this friend get into trouble with teachers, the police, or other adults?
15. Does this friend do things you disapprove of?
16. Are you concerned about the negative influence this friend has on your child?

Now, think about the other friends your child hangs around with and answer the same questions.

17. Do these friends get into trouble with teachers, the police, or other adults?
18. Do these friends do things you disapprove of?
19. Are you concerned about the negative influence these friends have on your child?
20. How much does your son/daughter hang around with kids who get into trouble?

Peer Deviancy

DESCRIPTION	The original Peer Deviancy scale first asks students how many friends they would consider to be close friends. This question is then followed by 10 questions where the student indicates how many of their friends have done certain delinquent activities in the last 3 months. Parents respond to similar questions about their perception of their child's friends'. This measure was adapted from the "Things That My Friends Have Done" used by the Fast Track project (Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 1998). The items listed below come from several sources including the Peer Deviancy scale, Multisite Violence Prevention Project, Students for Peace, and measurement scales from the book by Chadwick et al. (2010).
--------------------	---

RESPONSE FORMAT	<p>0 = None of them 1 = Very few of them 2 = Some of them 3 = Most of them 4 = All of them</p>
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Adolescents and parents
SCORING AND DIRECTION	<p>A total score, “Peer Deviancy (student rating)” or “Peer Deviancy (parent rating),” is calculated based on the mean of the 10 items (items 2-11).</p> <p>A higher score reflects a greater degree of friend involvement in delinquent behavior.</p>
RELIABILITY	<p>This scale was used in the Multisite Violence Prevention Project with a large sample of sixth graders. The internal consistency of the scores, as measured by Cronbach’s alpha, was .85 for a random sample, .88 for a high-risk sample, and .84 for a parent sample (Miller-Johnson et al., 2004). In this study, scores of 3 and 4 were recoded to 2, due to their low frequency.</p>
MISSING VALUES	Scale scores can be calculated if at least 65% items are answered.
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	This manual
OTHER REFERENCES	<p>Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group (1998). <i>Technical reports for the Fast Track assessment battery</i> (Rep. No. Unpublished technical report).</p> <p>Chadwick, B. A., Top, B. L., & McClendon, R. J. (2010). <i>Shield of faith: The power of religion in the lives of LDS youth and young adults</i>. Provo, UT: BYU Religious Studies Center. http://rsc.byu.edu/archived/shield-faith-power-religion-lives-lds-youth-and-young-adults/appendix-b-measurement-scales</p> <p>Miller-Johnson, S., Sullivan, T. N., & Simon, T. R. (2004). Evaluating the impact of interventions in the Multisite Violence Prevention Study: Samples, procedures, and measures. <i>American Journal of Preventive Medicine</i>, 26(1), 48-61.</p>
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

How many of your closest friends have: (How many of your son's/daughter's best friends have):

1. Taken something of value from someone else's locker, desk, purse, or home?
2. Taken something from a store without paying for it?
3. Taken a car or other motor vehicle for a ride without the owner's permission?
4. Broken into a building, car, house, etc. to steal something?
5. Purposely damaged or destroyed things at school, store, or home?
6. Hit someone really badly?
7. Hit or slapped a boyfriend/girlfriend really badly?
8. Used a weapon or force to hurt another person?
9. Used a weapon or force to get money or things from another person?
10. Carried a weapon, like a knife or gun, to school?
11. Drank alcohol?
12. Smoked cigarettes?
13. Been in a gang fight?

Academic-related behaviors

14. Skipped school without an excuse?
15. Cheated on tests or homework?
16. Lied to a teacher about something they did?
17. Act up and make trouble in school?

Personal Value on Achievement Scale

DESCRIPTION	The Personal Value on Achievement Scale (Jessor & Jessor, 1977) assesses students' personal value on academic performance and achievement. The nine items evaluate the importance of achieving particular goals in an academic setting. A parent version of the same items was used to assess parents' perceptions of their children's values (Miller-Johnson et al., 2004).
RESPONSE FORMAT	1 = Not important 2 = Slightly important 3 = Very important 4 = Extremely important
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Adolescents and parents
SCORING AND DIRECTION	The scale score is calculated as the average of the 9 items. A high score indicates a higher personal value on academic achievement.

RELIABILITY	The internal consistency, measured by Cronbach's alpha, was .92 for the parent survey and .78 for the students in a large multiethnic study in the United States (Miller-Johnson et al., 2004).
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Jessor, R., & Jessor, S. L (1977). <i>Problem behavior and psychosocial development: A longitudinal study of youth</i> . New York: Academic Press.
OTHER REFERENCE	Miller-Johnson, S., Sullivan, T. N., & Simon, T. R. (2004). Evaluating the impact of interventions in the Multisite Violence Prevention Study: Samples, procedures, and measures. <i>American Journal of Preventive Medicine</i> , 26(1), 48-61.
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

How IMPORTANT is it to ME...?

1. To get at least a B average this year.
2. To understand class lessons.
3. To have good enough grades to go to college.
4. To do better on tests than most of the other students.
5. For other students to think I am a good student.
6. To do well in tough classes.
7. To be on Honor Roll all year.
8. To be able to help other students with school work.
9. For the teachers to think I am a good student.

School Safety Problems

DESCRIPTION	The purpose of the scale is to evaluate the students' and teachers' perception of threats to safety in the school. Some items were taken from the School and Staffing Survey; others were developed for a large multi-ethnic study in the United States.
RESPONSE FORMAT	0 = Not a problem 1 = Minor problem 2 = Moderate problem 3 = Serious problem

School Safety Problems

INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Adolescent students and their teachers
SCORING AND DIRECTION	The scale is calculated as the mean score of all items; thus, the scale ranges from 0 to 3. Higher scores indicate more serious problems.
RELIABILITY	In the Multisite Violence Prevention Project—a large study conducted in four states in the United States—the internal consistency of the scores, as measured by Cronbach’s alpha, was .89 for sixth graders (Miller-Johnson et al., 2004).
MISSING VALUES	Scale scores can be calculated if at least 65% items are answered.
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Multisite Violence Prevention Project. (2004). The Multisite Violence Prevention Project: Background and overview. <i>American Journal of Preventive Medicine</i> , 26(1), 3-11. U.S. Department of Education (1999-2000). <i>Public school teacher questionnaire: Schools and staffing survey- 1999-2000 School year</i> . Web site: http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass/ .
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

Please enter the answer that best describes how you feel at your school. To what extent is each of the following a problem at YOUR SCHOOL?

1. Fighting (hitting and kicking) among students
2. Students wrecking school property
3. Students carrying weapons
4. Student disrespect for teachers
5. Racial tension or racism
6. Gangs
7. Unsafe areas in the school
8. Teachers ignore it when students threaten other students
9. Teachers ignore it when students tease other students
10. Teachers not knowing what kids are up to



Section III:
COMMUNITY COHESION



Collective Efficacy

<p>DESCRIPTION</p>	<p>Collective Efficacy is a 10-item scale created for the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN) to assess collective efficacy. Collective efficacy is defined as social cohesion within a neighborhood including the willingness of neighbors to intervene for the common good. The Collective Efficacy scale consists of two subscales:</p> <p>(1) Informal Social Control (5 items) (2) Social Cohesion and Trust (5 items)</p> <p>Higher collective efficacy was associated with less community violence. This subscale was used on a diverse sample including White, Black, and Latino individuals.</p>
<p>RESPONSE FORMAT</p>	<p>Social Control/Shared Expectations</p> <p>1 = Very unlikely 2 = Unlikely 3 = Neither likely nor unlikely 4 = Likely 5 = Very likely *“Don’t know” recoded to middle category of “neither likely nor unlikely”</p> <p>Social Cohesion and Trust</p> <p>1 = Strongly disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neither agree nor disagree 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly agree *“Don’t know” recoded to middle category of “neither agree nor disagree”</p>
<p>INTENDED RESPONDENTS</p>	<p>Parents</p>
<p>SCORING AND DIRECTION</p>	<p>All items are added. A higher score indicates higher collective efficacy.</p>
<p>RELIABILITY</p>	<p>The internal consistency, measured by Cronbach’s alpha, was .87. The reliability ranged from .80 (for sample size of 20 raters) to .91 (sample size of 50 raters) (Sampson et al., 1997). Echeverria et al. (2004) reported a 2-week test-retest reliability of .90 for the Social Cohesion and Trust subscale and an internal consistency of .82 and .86, in two different assessments.</p>

REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. <i>Science</i> , 277(5328), 918-924.
OTHER REFERENCES	Echeverría, S. E., Diez-Roux, A. V., & Link, B. G. (2004). Reliability of self-reported neighborhood characteristics. <i>Journal of Urban Health</i> , 81(4), 682-701.
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items:

SOCIAL CONTROL/SHARED EXPECTATIONS

For each of the following, please tell me if it is very likely, likely, unlikely, or very unlikely that people in your neighborhood would act in the following manner.

1. If a group of neighborhood children were skipping school and hanging out on a street corner, how likely is it that your neighbors would do something about it?
2. If some children were spray-painting graffiti on a local building, how likely is it that your neighbors would do something about it?
3. If there was a fight in front of your house and someone was being beaten or threatened, how likely is it that your neighbors would break it up?
4. If a child was showing disrespect to an adult, how likely is it that people in your neighborhood would scold that child?
5. Suppose that because of budget cuts the fire station closest to your home was going to be closed down by the city. How likely is it that neighborhood residents would organize to try to do something to keep the fire station open?

SOCIAL COHESION/TRUST

For each of these statements, please tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree:

1. People around here are willing to help their neighbors.
2. This is a close-knit neighborhood
3. People in this neighborhood can be trusted.
4. People in this neighborhood generally don't get along with each other. (reverse coded)
5. People in this neighborhood do not share the same values. (reverse coded)

Argentine Loneliness Scale for Adolescents

DESCRIPTION	<p>The Adolescent Loneliness Assessment consists of 32 items measuring feelings of loneliness related to parents, peers, personal inadequacy, family deficits, and significant separation due to relocation or change of schools. The scale was completed by 1,233 secondary school students aged 13-16 years in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Responses yielded four factors:</p> <p>(1) Peer Rejection (8 items): the feeling of being rejected by peers due to social isolation in the absence of an engaging social network.</p> <p>(2) Family Deficits/Parent Rejection (8 items): feeling of poor ability to approach others and enter into dyadic relationships due to adolescents' perception of parental lack of attention and non-sharing, and family break-up.</p> <p>(3) Personal Inadequacy (8 items): deep feelings of incompetence, lack of self-confidence and insecurity as regards social skills and the feeling of being unwillingly alone, which reflects emotional isolation in the absence of a close emotional attachment.</p> <p>(4) Social inability when faced with significant separation (8 items): feeling of difficulty in adapting and feeling lonesome with no established cause due to an external event such as relocation or change of schools, which implies separation from old peer groups and joining new ones.</p>
RESPONSE FORMAT	<p>1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Often 5 = Very often</p>
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	<p>Adolescents aged 13-16 years</p>
SCORING AND DIRECTION	<p>Scale scores are calculated as the average of the eight items of each subscale.</p>
RELIABILITY	<p>The internal consistency scores, measured by Cronbach's alpha, ranged from 0.70 to 0.87.</p>
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	<p>Richaud de Minzi, M. C., & Sacchi, C. (2004). Adolescent loneliness assessment. <i>Adolescence</i>, 39(156), 701-709.</p>
COPYRIGHT	<p>The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.</p>

Items

FACTOR	ORDER	ITEM	DIMENSION
Peer Rejection	4	I feel sad because I do not have friends.	
	13	I feel my friends do not love me.	
	17	When I suggest doing something (a game, a sport activity), nobody likes to join in.	
	18	I feel excluded by my classmates.	
	25	Other children mock me.	
	26	I think my classmates criticize me and leave me out.	
	27	Others pretend not to see me.	
	29	I doubt anybody loves me.	
Family Deficits/ Parents Rejection	24	My parents do not listen to me when I say something.	Lack of attention
	20	My parents never had any spare time for me.	Lack of attention
	14	I feel my parents were not emotionally supportive of me.	Lack of attention
	23	Feelings are not openly shared in my family.	Not sharing
	19	I feel there is a lack of trust between the members of my family.	Not sharing
	11	My parents are emotionally distant.	Not sharing
	21	I feel that the relationship with my parents has been interrupted.	Family break-up
	22	I feel rejected by my family.	Family break-up
Personal Inadequacy	1	I am afraid to be rejected when I get close to someone.	
	2	I feel intimidated by persons of the opposite sex.	
	5	I blame myself when things go wrong.	
	6	I am not considered a special person by my partner.	
	7	I believe that I will not be able to achieve my goals.	
	9	I cannot share the most intimate thoughts with my partner.	
	10	I do not know how to behave in a social setting.	
	15	I am not able to express my feelings.	
Social Inability	3	When moving or changing schools, I experienced difficulties making new friends.	
	8	When we moved, it was hard to adapt to new places.	
	12	When we moved, I was separated from my friends for a long period of time.	
	16	When moving, I felt homesick for my previous place or school.	

School Safety Problems

FACTOR	ORDER	ITEM	DIMENSION
Social Inability	28	I do not have a close friend to whom I can tell everything.	
	30	There is nobody I can have a good chat with.	
	31	I wish I had more friends.	
	32	I have no friends to have fun with.	

Beliefs about Aggression and Alternatives

DESCRIPTION	The Beliefs about Aggression and Alternatives measure has two subscales: Beliefs that support the use of aggression (7 items) and beliefs that support the use of non-aggressive strategies (5 items). The scales were adapted from Farrell, Meyer, and White (2001), and later published by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in a measurement manual (Dahlberg et al., 2005).
RESPONSE FORMAT	1 = Strongly disagree 2 = Disagree somewhat 3 = Agree somewhat 4 = Strongly agree
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Adolescents
SCORING AND DIRECTION	Calculate the scales as the average of the items. For the Beliefs about Aggression Scale, higher scores indicate stronger support for using aggression. For the Beliefs about Alternatives Scale, higher scores indicate stronger support for using nonviolent strategies.
RELIABILITY	This scale was used in the Multisite Violence Prevention Project with a large sample of sixth graders. The internal consistency scores, as measured by Cronbach's alpha, were .72 for each subscale.
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Dahlberg, L. L., Toal, S. B., Swahn, M. H., & Behrens, C. B. (2005). <i>Measuring violence-related attitudes, behaviors, and influences among youths: A compendium of assessment tools</i> . Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc/pub-res/pdf/YV/YV_Compndium.pdf

OTHER REFERENCES	Farrell, A.D., Meyer, A.L., & White, K.S. (2001). Evaluation of Responding in Peaceful and Positive Ways (RIPP): A School-Based Prevention Program for Reducing Violence Among Urban Adolescents. <i>Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 30</i> , 451-463.
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

Personal Beliefs about Aggression

3. It's O.K. for me to hit someone to get them to do what I want.
4. Sometimes a person doesn't have any choice but to fight.
6. If I back down from a fight, everyone will think I'm a coward.
9. I feel big and tough when I push someone around.
10. If people do something to make me really mad, they deserve to be beaten up.
11. Sometimes I have only two choices: get punched or punch the other kid first.
12. If I get crazy with anger it's O.K. to hit someone.

Personal Beliefs about Alternatives

1. If I'm mad at someone, I just ignore them.
2. Even if other kids would think I'm weird, I would try to stop a fight.
5. When my friends fight, I try to get them to stop.
7. There are better ways to solve problems than fighting.
8. I try to talk out a problem instead of fighting.

Questionnaire on Optimal Experience

DESCRIPTION	<p>The concept of "flow" was developed by Csikszentmihalyi (1999, 1998), who defines it as a mental state of optimal experience. It is a positive, complex, and gratifying state characterized by deep involvement, concentration, and joy in the realization of a task. Optimal experience has been identified in a wide range of activities, including work, study, recreational activities during free time, and sports. Moreover, research shows that "flow" can be experienced by people of different cultures.</p> <p>The Questionnaire on Optimal Experience is a self-report that was used with a sample of primary and secondary students from 9 to 15 years old, of average socioeconomic level, in Argentina (Mesurado, 2008, 2009a, 2009b). The questionnaire contains two parts:</p>
--------------------	---

Questionnaire on Optimal Experience

<p>DESCRIPTION</p>	<p>Part I:</p> <p>I. Investigates whether the person has had an optimal experience and in what specific activity (Items 1, 2, and 3)</p> <p>II. Investigates the exercise of will in relation to the choice of task (Item 4)</p> <p>Part II:</p> <p>III. Investigates the quality of the experience across two dimensions:</p> <p>(1) Affection and Cognition: Evaluates the affective and cognitive experience during the activity</p> <p>(2) Perception of Achievement and Ability: Evaluates these two aspects during the activity. (Items 1 to 26)</p> <p>IV. Asks whom the child/adolescent is usually with when he/she experiences a state of flow. (Item 27)</p>
<p>RESPONSE FORMAT</p>	<p>Part I of the Questionnaire has two open-ended questions that are later coded (Items 2 and 3) and two multiple-choice questions (Items 1 and 4).</p> <p>Part II of the Questionnaire presents 12 items from the Likert Scale from 1 to 5 points (items 1 to 5 and 20 to 26) and 14 items from the Semantic Differential from 1 to 7 points (items 6 to 19). Finally, the last item of Part II is multiple-choice (item 27).</p>
<p>INTENDED RESPONDENTS</p>	<p>Children and adolescents from 9 to 15 years of age</p>
<p>SCORING AND DIRECTION</p>	<p>The exploratory and confirmatory factorial analyses showed the existence of two dimensions:</p> <p>(1) Affection and Cognition during the activity: items 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 25. Item 25 is scored inversely.</p> <p>(2) Perception of Achievement and Ability during the activity: items 1, 3, 4, 5, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 26.</p>
<p>RELIABILITY</p>	<p>Internal consistency, measured by Cronbach's alpha coefficient, was 0.85 for the total questionnaire, 0.80 for the Affection and Cognition dimension, and 0.77 for the Perception of Achievement and Ability dimension (Mesurado, 2008).</p>
<p>REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE</p>	<p>Mesurado, B. (2008). Validez factorial y fiabilidad del cuestionario de experiencia óptima (flow) para niños y adolescentes. <i>Revista Iberoamericana de Diagnóstico y Evaluación Psicológica</i>, 25(1), 159-178.</p>

OTHER REFERENCES

Mesurado, B. (2009a). Actividad estructurada vs. actividad desestructurada, realizadas en solitario vs. en compañía de otros y la experiencia óptima. *Anales de Psicología*, 25(2), 308-315.

Mesurado, B. (2009b). Comparación de tres modelos teóricos explicativos del constructo experiencia óptima o flow. *Interdisciplinaria*, 26(1), 121-137.

Mesurado, B. (2010). Hacia una conceptualización de la experiencia subjetiva de flow. Diferentes alternativas para su medición. *Acta Psiquiátrica y Psicológica de América Latina*, 56(1), 39-52.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1999). Flow. In: A. E. Kazdin (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 381-382). New York: Oxford University Press.

Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Csikszentmihalyi, I. (1998). *Experiencia óptima. Estudios psicológicos del flujo en la conciencia*. Bilbao: Desclée de Brouwer.

COPYRIGHT

The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

PART I:

1. Have you ever had the experience described below, when you were doing some activity you enjoyed very much?
I'm not thinking about anything other than what I'm doing. I'm completely involved in what I'm doing. I feel good, I don't feel pain, and it seems as though I can't hear anything. It's as though I am distant from everything. I forget my problems. I don't realize that I'm concentrating. I think that if my mother called me, or if the doorbell or telephone rang, I wouldn't hear it. Once I finish doing that activity I get "connected" with the world again.

Mark an "X" to show your answer. (If the response is negative, the evaluation is suspended.)

Yes ____ No ____

2. What activity were you doing when this happened to you? [Open response that will be coded later by activity.]
3. What do you think about when you do that activity? [Open response that will be coded later.]
4. Why do you do that activity? (Mark an "X" to show your answer.)
Because I have to do it () Because I want to do it () Because I don't have anything else to do ()

Items

PART II:

Below are four sets of statements or adjectives that refer to your state of mind or feelings while you were doing the activity reported in Part I. For each item, mark an "X" for the answer that indicates to what extent you were feeling or thinking this way. (Extremely, Very much, Somewhat, Just a little, Not at all).

[Scoring of questions 1–5: Extremely: 5. Very much: 4. Somewhat: 3. Just a little: 2. Not at all: 1].

1. Do you concentrate deeply while you are doing that activity?
2. Do you feel good about yourself while you are doing that activity?
3. Do you feel in control of the situation?
4. Do you feel that you are fulfilling your expectations, your goals?
5. Do you feel that you are fulfilling what other people expect from you? For example, your parents, siblings, friends, etc.

How do you feel while you are doing that activity? [The scoring goes from 7 to 1, with the highest score corresponding to the positive adjective].

		(Extremely	Very	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Very	Extremely)	
			Much				Much		
6.	Happy	0	o	.	-	.	o	0	Sad
7.	Annoyed	0	o	.	-	.	o	0	Contented
8.	Enthusiastic	0	o	.	-	.	o	0	Indifferent
9.	Nervous, anxious	0	o	.	-	.	o	0	Calm
10.	Aggressive	0	o	.	-	.	o	0	Friendly
11.	Bored	0	o	.	-	.	o	0	Interested
12.	Free	0	o	.	-	.	o	0	Compelled
13.	Ashamed	0	o	.	-	.	o	0	Proud

What is your state of mind while you are doing that activity? [The scoring goes from 7 to 1, with the highest score corresponding to the positive adjective].

		(Extremely	Very	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Very	Extremely)	
			Much				Much		
14.	Alert, wide awake	0	o	.	-	.	0	0	Sleepy or drowsy
15.	Attentive	0	o	.	-	.	0	0	Careless
16.	Active	0	o	.	-	.	0	0	Passive
17.	Confused clearly	0	o	.	-	.	0	0	Thinking
18.	Strong	0	o	.	-	.	0	0	Weak
19.	Committed	0	o	.	-	.	0	0	Disinter- ested

[Questions 20–26 are scored as follows: Extremely: 5. Very much: 4. Somewhat: 3. Just a little: 2. Not at all: 1. Item 25 should be scored inversely, from Extremely: 1 to Not at all: 5].

20. While you are doing the activity, do you feel that it offers you a challenge? (Understanding “challenge” in a positive sense as an obstacle to be overcome).
21. Do you feel capable of meeting that challenge?
22. Is it an important activity for you?
23. Is it an important activity for other people? For example, for your parents, siblings, friends, etc.
24. Do you feel successful while you are doing the activity?
25. Do you wish you were doing something else?
26. While you are doing the activity, are you satisfied with the way you’re doing it?
27. Who is with you, in general, while you are doing the activity?

Alone () Mother () Father () Siblings () Friends () Strangers () Professors ()
 Other

Scale of Beliefs on the Role of the Father after a Divorce (ECRP-D)

DESCRIPTION	
	<p>The scale was designed to assess the beliefs that fathers have concerning their paternal role after a divorce. Specifically, it measures beliefs about two dimensions of the paternal role: the economic role and the affective role. Both seem to coexist in the representations of fathers, not as mutually exclusive but as two aspects that contribute differently to the role of the father in the post-divorce relationship.</p> <p>The scale consists of 12 items that measure these two dimensions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The economic role (6 items) emphasizes the belief that fathers should be good economic providers in order to fulfill their paternal responsibilities after a divorce (“If I pay I can see my children more often”). 2. The affective role (6 items) describes the belief that the principal role of the father after a divorce consists of providing emotional support to the children (“Showing affection helps me have a better relationship with my children”). <p>This instrument is short and simple to apply. It allows the professional who intervenes in family crises triggered by separation and divorce arrangements—custody, visitation, and child support payments by the noncustodial parent—to evaluate beliefs about the role of the divorced father after the marriage ends.</p> <p>This scale assumes that children will live with the mother after the divorce, although this is not always the case. The scale has not yet been adapted to evaluate the role of the mother after a divorce.</p>

Scale of Beliefs on the Role of the Father after a Divorce (ECRP-D)

RESPONSE FORMAT	1 = Strongly disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Undecided 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly agree
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	It is a self-administered instrument directed to divorced fathers.
SCORING AND DIRECTION	The responses to the items in each subscale are averaged. Higher scores indicate greater support for the beliefs reflected in the subscale.
RELIABILITY	In a sample of 200 Costa Rican divorced parents, the subscale on the affective role showed internal consistency, measured by Cronbach's alpha coefficient, of 0.91, while the subscale on the economic role showed a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.73.
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Vega, I. & Smith-Castro, V. (2009). Correlatos y predictores del cumplimiento de pago de la pensión alimentaria en padres divorciados o separados. <i>Revista Interamericana de Psicología</i> , 43, 395-404. Vega, I. & Smith-Castro, V. Creencias en torno al rol paterno posdivorcio: Primeras evidencias de validez y confiabilidad de su medida (unpublished document).
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

INSTRUCTIONS:

Below are a series of statements about relationships with children. Please indicate your disagreement or agreement with each phrase using the following scale: 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree.

ITEMS	DIMENSION
1. It is important for a father to spend time with his children.	Affective role
2. It is important for children to spend time with their father.	Affective role
3. Spending more time with my children makes me feel like a better father.	Affective role
4. Showing affection helps me have a better relationship with my children.	Affective role
5. Divorced/separated fathers should have more opportunities to spend time with their children.	Affective role
6. I believe that paying child support is not my only obligation as a father.	Affective role
7. If I pay child support I can see my children more often.	Economic role
8. I believe that if I pay child support, the mother of my children allows me to spend more time with them.	Economic role
9. I believe that paying child support helps me have a better relationship with my children.	Economic role
10. I believe that if I don't pay child support I lose the right to see my children.	Economic role
11. I believe that by paying child support I meet my obligation as a father.	Economic role
12. I believe that if I pay child support, the mother of my children allows me to participate in their education.	Economic role

Note. When the instrument is administered, the items in the two subscales should be mixed.



Section V:
HIGH-RISK BEHAVIORS



Alcohol Screening

DESCRIPTION	The alcohol screening tool, developed by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA), is a simple alcohol screening tool recommended for health care professionals to identify young patients at risk of having problems with alcohol. The alcohol screening consists of two questions: one about friends' drinking and the other on the patient's own drinking. The questions must be asked in the order presented below. The questions differ by grade level: elementary (ages 9-11), middle (ages 11-14), and high school (ages 14-18). For the two younger age groups, the question about friends' drinking behavior helps identify early involvement with alcohol. These questions can be incorporated into a clinical interview, self-reported questionnaire, or computer screening.
RESPONSE FORMAT	Response varies by question
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Children and adolescents ages 9-18 years old
SCORING AND DIRECTION	Use the chart below for the estimated level of risk. Binge drinking is defined as the following number of drinks on one occasion: Girls 9-17 years: 3 or more drinks Boys 9-13 years: 3 or more drinks Boys 14-15 years: 4 or more drinks Boys 16+ years: 5 or more drinks
REFERENCE	National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. (2011). <i>Alcohol screening and brief intervention for youth: A practitioner's guide</i> . NIH Publication No. 11-7805. www.niaaa.nih.gov/YouthGuide
COPYRIGHT	The screening tool is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (AGES 9-11)

1. [Friends] Do you have any friends who drank beer, wine, or any drink containing alcohol in the past year? -YES/NO [ANY drinking by friends heightens concern]
2. [Patient] How about you—have you ever had more than a few sips of beer, wine, or any drink containing alcohol? -YES/NO [ANY DRINKING: Highest risk]

MIDDLE SCHOOL (AGES 11-14)

1. [Friends] Do you have any friends who drank beer, wine, or any drink containing alcohol in the past year? -YES/NO [ANY drinking by friends heightens concern]
2. [Patient] How about you—in the past year, on how many days have you had more than a few sips of beer, wine, or any drink containing alcohol? -Number of days
[ANY DRINKING: Moderate or Highest Risk]

HIGH SCHOOL (AGES 14-18)

1. [Patient] In the past year, on how many days have you had more than a few sips of beer, wine, or any drink containing alcohol? -Number of days
[Lower, Moderate, or Highest Risk, as shown in the chart below]
2. [Friends] If your friends drink, how many drinks do they usually drink on an occasion?
-Number of drinks [Binge drinking by friends heightens concern: See “Scoring and Direction” for number of drinks defined as binge drinking]

For patients who DO drink...

ON HOW MANY DAYS IN THE PAST YEAR DID YOUR PATIENT DRINK?					
Age	1-5 days	6-11 days	12-23 days	24-51 days	52+ days
≤11	Highest risk				
12-15	Lower risk	Medium risk	Highest risk		
16			Highest risk		
17		Medium risk		Highest risk	
18		Medium risk		Highest risk	
Estimated risk levels by age and frequency in the past year					

Highest risk: Brief motivational interviewing + possible referral

Moderate risk: Brief advice or motivational interviewing

Lower risk: Brief advice

Source: Alcohol screening and brief intervention for youth: A practitioner’s guide (pg. 10)

Aggression Scale

DESCRIPTION	<p>The Aggression Scale was designed to measure frequency of self-reported aggressive behaviors among middle school children. The scale was developed based on student and teacher input on most frequent children’s behavior. The scale is composed of 11 items. Because two of these items measure feelings of anger, some researchers have excluded them from the scale. However, in multiple studies, all 11 items have shown a high internal consistency.</p> <p>Orpinas and Frankowski (2001) described three studies on the psychometric properties of the scale. The scale was also described in CDC’s widely-utilized compendium of measures of violence-related attitudes and behaviors (CDC, 1998, 2005; http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc/pub-res/measure.htm). The scale was adapted with Chilean adolescents (López y Orpinas, 2012).</p>
RESPONSE FORMAT	<p>0 = 0 times 1 = 1 time 2 = 2 times 3 = 3 times 4 = 4 times 5 = 5 times 6 = 6+ times</p>
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	<p>The scale was developed for middle school students, grades 6-8. The authors have used it with upper elementary and high school students.</p>
SCORING AND DIRECTION	<p>The scores are additive, and the scale ranges from 0 to 66 points. High values indicate higher frequency of perpetrating aggressive behaviors.</p>
RELIABILITY	<p>Based on data collected from two independent samples of young adolescents (n=253 and n=8,695; Orpinas & Frankowski, 2001), the internal consistency of the scores, as measured by Cronbach’s alpha, was .87 and .88, respectively. Internal consistency scores did not vary by gender or race.</p>
MISSING VALUES	<p>Scale scores can be calculated if at least 8 items are answered.</p>
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	<p>Orpinas, P., & Frankowski, R. (2001). The aggression scale: A self-report measure of aggressive behavior for young adolescents. <i>Journal of Early Adolescence</i>, 21(1), 51-68.</p>

OTHER REFERENCES	<p>Dahlberg, L. L., Toal, S. B., Swahn, M., & Behrens, C. B. (2005). <i>Measuring violence-related attitudes, behaviors, and influences among youths: A compendium of assessment tools</i>. (2nd ed.) Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc/pub-res/pdf/YV/YV_Compndium.pdf</p> <p>López, V., & Orpinas, P. (2012). Las escalas de agresión y victimización: Validación y prevalencia en estudiantes chilenos. <i>Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología</i>, 44(2), 109-124.</p>
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

INSTRUCTIONS:

Think about what happened DURING THE LAST 7 DAYS, when you answer these questions.

DURING THE LAST 7 DAYS:

1. I teased students to make them angry.
2. I got angry very easily with someone.
3. I fought back when someone hit me first.
4. I said things about other kids to make other students laugh.
5. I encouraged other students to fight.
6. I pushed or shoved other students.
7. I was angry most of the day.
8. I got into a physical fight because I was angry.
9. I slapped or kicked someone.
10. I called other students bad names.
11. I threatened to hurt or to hit someone.

Gang Membership

DESCRIPTION	This item asks youth how they feel about joining a gang.
RESPONSE FORMAT	<p>1 = I don't want to join a gang.</p> <p>2 = I would like to join a gang.</p> <p>3 = I am in a gang now.</p> <p>4 = I am in a gang, but would like to get out of it.</p>

Gang Membership

INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Children and adolescents
REFERENCE	Orpinas, P., Kelder, S., Frankowski, R., Murray, N., Zhang, Q., & McAlister, A. (2000). Outcome evaluation of a multi-component violence-prevention program for middle schools: The Students for Peace project. <i>Health Education Research</i> , 15(1), 45-58.
OTHER REFERENCES	Miller-Johnson, S., Sullivan, T. N., & Simon, T. R. (2004). Evaluating the impact of interventions in the Multisite Violence Prevention Study: Samples, procedures, and measures. <i>American Journal of Preventive Medicine</i> , 26(1), 48-61.

Items

1. Which answer best describes how you feel about joining a gang?



Reduced Aggression and Victimization Scales (RAVS)

DESCRIPTION	<p>The Reduced Aggression and Victimization Scales (RAVS) were designed to measure the self-reported frequency of being victimized or being the perpetrator of aggressive behaviors during the week prior to the survey. The scales were developed by Orpinas as an elementary school version of the Aggression Scale (Orpinas & Frankowski, 2001). However, the scales have been used in middle schools. Each scale is composed of six items. The first four items of each scale measure overt aggression/victimization behaviors (teasing, name-calling, threats, and pushing or hitting). The last two items of each scale measure relational aggression/victimization.</p> <p>The scales were published by Orpinas & Horne (2006). The scale is also described in CDC's compendium of measures of violence-related attitudes and behaviors (CDC, 1998, 2005; http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc/pub-res/measure.htm).</p>
RESPONSE FORMAT	<p>0 = 0 times 1 = 1 time 2 = 2 times 3 = 3 times 4 = 4 times 5 = 5 times 6 = 6+ times</p>

INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Upper elementary and middle school students.
SCORING AND DIRECTION	The scores are additive, and each scale ranges from 0 to 36 points. High values indicate higher frequency of aggression/victimization.
RELIABILITY	In a study of fourth and fifth graders (n = 411), the internal consistency of the scores, as measured by Cronbach's alpha, was .86 (range by gender and race = .84 to .89) for aggression and .84 (range by gender and race = .80 to .87) for victimization (Orpinas & Horne, 2006). In a sample of middle school students (n = 903) the internal consistency of the scores was .89 (.89 for boys, .86 for girls) for aggression and .87 (.88 for boys, .84 for girls) for victimization (Houston, 2007).
MISSING VALUES	Scale scores can be calculated if at least 5 items are answered.
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Orpinas, P. & Horne, A. (2006). <i>Creating a positive school climate and developing social competence</i> . Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
OTHER REFERENCES	Houston, K. P. (2007). Are there differences in bullies? An analysis of bullying and social skills. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens, GA. Orpinas, P., & Frankowski, R. (2001). The aggression scale: A self-report measure of aggressive behavior for young adolescents. <i>Journal of Early Adolescence</i> , 21(1), 51-68.
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

Think about what happened DURING THE LAST 7 DAYS, when you answer these questions about your CLASSROOM.

DURING THE LAST 7 DAYS:

1. How many times did a kid from your classroom tease you?
2. How many times did a kid from your classroom push, shove, or hit you?
3. How many times did a kid from your classroom call you a bad name?
4. How many times did kids from your classroom say that they were going to hit you?
5. How many times did other kids in your classroom leave you out on purpose?
6. How many times did a student in your classroom make up something about you to make other kids not like you anymore?

Items

7. How many times did you tease a kid from your classroom?
8. How many times did you push, shove, or hit a kid from your classroom?
9. How many times did you call a kid from your classroom a bad name?
10. How many times did you say that you would hit a kid in your classroom?
11. How many times did you leave out another classmate on purpose?
12. How many times did you make up something about other students in your classroom to make other kids not like them anymore?

Self-Efficacy for Alternatives to Aggression

DESCRIPTION	The Self-Efficacy for Alternatives to Aggression Scale measures the adolescent's confidence in his or her ability to control anger and resolve conflict in non-violent ways. For each question, the individual rates the level of confidence in engaging in a particular behavior. The scale presented in this manual was originally developed by Bosworth & Espelage (published in Dahlberg et al., 2005) and later adapted for the Multisite Violence Prevention Project.
RESPONSE FORMAT	<p>1 = Not at all confident</p> <p>2 = Not very confident</p> <p>3 = Unsure</p> <p>4 = Somewhat confident</p> <p>5 = Very confident</p>
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Middle school students, grades 6-8.
SCORING AND DIRECTION	Calculate the scale by averaging all items. Higher scores indicate more confidence in resolving potential conflict situations in a non-violent manner.
RELIABILITY	<p>This scale was used in the Multisite Violence Prevention Project with a large sample of sixth graders. The internal consistency of the scores, as measured by Cronbach's alpha, was:</p> <p>Cohort-wide sample = .81</p> <p>Targeted sample = .83</p>
MISSING VALUES	Scale scores can be calculated if at least 65% items are answered.

REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Bosworth, K., & Espelage, D. (1995). <i>Teen conflict survey</i> . Bloomington, IN: Center for Adolescent Studies, Indiana University.
OTHER REFERENCES	Dahlberg, L. L., Toal, S. B., Swahn, M. H., & Behrens, C. B. (2005). <i>Measuring violence-related attitudes, behaviors, and influences among youths: A compendium of assessment tools</i> . Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc/pub-res/pdf/YV/YV_Compndium.pdf
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

How confident are you that you would be able to do the following things if you wanted to?

1. Stay out of fights?
2. Talk out a disagreement?
3. Calm down when you are mad?
4. Ignore someone who is making fun of you?
5. Avoid a fight by walking away?
6. Apologize to the other student?
7. Seek help from an adult?
8. Understand another person's point of view?

Victimization Scale

DESCRIPTION	<p>The 10-item Victimization Scale for middle school children was designed to measure frequency of self-reported victimization during the week prior to the survey. The scale was developed based on the aggression scale for middle school students (Orpinas & Frankowski, 2001).</p> <p>The scale is also described in CDC's compendium of measures of violence-related attitudes and behaviors (CDC, 1998, 2005; http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc/pub-res/measure.htm).</p>
--------------------	---

Victimization Scale

RESPONSE FORMAT	0 = 0 times 1 = 1 time 2 = 2 times 3 = 3 times 4 = 4 times 5 = 5 times 6 = 6+ times
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Middle school students, grades 6-8, and upper elementary students (grades 3-5).
SCORING AND DIRECTION	The scores are additive, and the scale ranges from 0 to 60 points. High values indicate higher frequency of being the victim of aggressive acts.
RELIABILITY	In a sample of 9115 middle school students from Texas, the internal consistency of the scores, as measured by Cronbach's alpha, was .85 (Boys = .86; girls = .84). Pearson correlation between the Aggression Scale and the Victimization Scale was .50.
MISSING VALUES	Scale scores can be calculated if at least 8 items are answered.
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Dahlberg, L. L., Toal, S. B., Swahn, M., & Behrens, C. B. (2005). <i>Measuring violence-related attitudes, behaviors, and influences among youths: A compendium of assessment tools</i> . (2nd ed.) Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc/pub-res/pdf/YV/YV_Compndium.pdf Orpinas, P., & Frankowski, R. (2001). The aggression scale: A self-report measure of aggressive behavior for young adolescents. <i>Journal of Early Adolescence</i> , 21(1), 51-68.

<p>OTHER REFERENCES</p>	<p>Kelder, S.H., Orpinas, P., McAlister, A., Frankowski, R., Parcel, G.S., & Friday, J. (1996). The Students for Peace Project: A comprehensive violence- prevention program for middle school students. <i>American Journal of Preventive Medicine</i>, 12(5), 22-30.</p> <p>Orpinas, P., Horne, A.M., Staniszewski, D. (2003). School Bullying: Changing the Problem by Changing the School. <i>School Psychology Review</i>, 32(3), 431-444.</p> <p>Orpinas, P., Kelder, S., Frankowski, R., Murray, N., Zhang, Q., & McAlister, A. (2000). Outcome evaluation of a multi-component violence-prevention program for middle school students: <i>The Students for Peace project. Health Education Research</i>, 15(1), 45-58.</p>
<p>COPYRIGHT</p>	<p>The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.</p>

Items

INSTRUCTIONS:

Think about what happened DURING THE LAST 7 DAYS, when you answer these questions.

DURING THE LAST 7 DAYS:

1. A student teased me to make me angry.
2. A student beat me up.
3. A student said things about me to make other students laugh (made fun of me).
4. Other students encouraged me to fight.
5. A student pushed or shoved me.
6. A student asked me to fight.
7. A student slapped or kicked me.
8. A student called me (or my family) bad names.
9. A student threatened to hurt or to hit me.
10. A student tried to hurt my feelings.

Section VI:

MODERATORS: DEMOGRAPHIC
CHARACTERISTICS



Alcohol and Tobacco for Adults (BRFSS)

DESCRIPTION	<p>The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) is a state-based system of health surveys that collects information on health risk behaviors, preventive health practices, and health care access primarily related to chronic disease and injury.</p> <p>Modules included in this summary cover tobacco and alcohol use. Questions on tobacco examine current and previous tobacco use and attempts at cessation. Questions on alcohol use explore frequency and quantity of alcohol consumption. CDC standards require that, if items are used, they must be used without modification.</p>
RESPONSE FORMAT	Format varies per question. Refer to questions below.
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Adult males and females aged 18+ years
RELIABILITY	<p>There are no reported reliability measures. This article represents the most comprehensive attempt at obtaining reliability measures for the various modules of the survey: Nelson DE, Holtzman D, Bolen J, Stanwyck CA, Mack KA. Reliability and validity of measures from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS). <i>Social and Preventive Medicine</i>, 2001; 46, Suppl 1:S03-S42.</p>
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	<p>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). <i>Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System Survey Questionnaire</i>. Atlanta, Georgia: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2011.</p> <p>http://www.cdc.gov/brfss/index.htm</p>
COPYRIGHT	The questions are available for public use in English and Spanish; they can be reproduced without permission.

Items

TOBACCO CONSUMPTION (T) [DO NOT READ THE ALTERNATIVE "DON'T KNOW/NOT SURE"]

T1. Have you smoked at least 100 cigarettes in your life? [NOTE: 5 packs = 100 cigarettes]

- 1. Yes
- 2. No [Skip to T5]
- 7. Don't know/not sure [Skip to T5]
- 9. Refused [Skip to T5]

T2. At present, do you smoke cigarettes every day, some days, or never?

- 1. Every day
- 2. Some days
- 3. Never [Skip to T4]
- 7. Don't know/not sure [Skip to T5]
- 9. Refused [Skip to T5]

T3. During the past 12 months, have you stopped smoking for a day or more because you were trying to quit smoking?

- 1. Yes [Skip to T5]
- 2. No [Skip to T5]
- 7. Don't know/not sure [Skip to T5]
- 9. Refused [Skip to T5]

T4. When did you stop smoking cigarettes regularly?

- 1. Within the past month (less than 1 month ago)
- 2. Within the past 3 months (at least 1 month but less than 3 months ago)
- 3. Within the past 6 months (at least 3 months but less than 6 months ago)
- 4. Within the past year (at least 6 months but less than 1 year ago)
- 5. Within the past 5 years (at least 1 year but less than 5 years ago)
- 6. Within the past 10 years (at least 5 years but less than 10 years ago)
- 7. 10 years ago or more

- 77. Don't know/not sure
- 99. Refused

T5. At present, do you use chewing tobacco, snuff, or "snus" every day, some days, or never? [NOTE: "Snus" (or Swedish snuff) is moist tobacco that is not smoked. It is usually sold in small bags that are placed under the lip, pressing against the gum.]

- 1. Every day
- 2. Some days
- 3. Never
- 7. Don't know/not sure
- 9. Refused

ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION (A)

A1. During the past 30 days, how many days per week or per month did you consume at least one drink of any alcoholic beverage such as beer, malt beverage, or liquor?

__ Days per week __ Days in the past 30 days

- 88 No drinks at all in the past 30 days [Finish the questions on alcohol]
- 77 Don't know/not sure [Finish the questions on alcohol]
- 99 Refused [Finish the questions on alcohol]

Items

A2. A “drink” is defined as a beer of 12 ounces (350 cl), a glass of wine of 5 ounces (150 cl), or a shot of liquor. During the past 30 days, on the days when you drank, approximately how many drinks did you consume on average? [NOTE: A beer of 40 ounces would be equivalent to three drinks; a cocktail with two shots of alcohol would be equivalent to two drinks.]

- ___ Number of drinks
- 77 Don't know/not sure
- 99 Refused

A3. Taking into account all types of alcoholic beverages, how many times during the past 30 days did you consume X drinks or more [X = 5 for men, X = 4 for women] on one occasion?

- ___ Time(s)
- 88 Never
- 77 Don't know/not sure
- 99 Refused

A4. During the past 30 days, what was the maximum number of drinks that you consumed on one occasion?

- ___ Number of drinks
- 77 Don't know/not sure
- 99 Refused

Health-Related Quality of Life: Healthy Days Symptoms

DESCRIPTION	In order to evaluate Health-Related Quality of Life (HRQOL), the US Centers for Disease Control developed a measure that contains 14 questions, organized in three modules: 1) Healthy Days Core Module, 2) Activity Limitations Module, and 3) Healthy Days Symptoms Module (http://www.cdc.gov/hrqol/hrqol14_measure.htm). This manual presents only the third module, which includes five questions on pain, depression, anxiety, insomnia, and vitality. These questions are short and easy to administer. People with many symptoms may have problems that hinder them from participating in prevention programs, and if they participate, they may not obtain the maximum benefit of these programs.
RESPONSE FORMAT	Number of days [0 to 30] Don't know/not sure = 77 Refused = 99
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Adults

SCORING AND DIRECTION	<p>For questions 1 to 4, healthy days are calculated by subtracting the number of unhealthy days indicated by the surveyed person from 30 days. For question 5, healthy days are the number of days indicated by the person surveyed.</p> <p>Question 1: Pain = 30 – # of days Question 2: Depression = 30 – # of days Question 3: Anxiety = 30 – # of days Question 4: Insomnia = 30 – # of days Question 5: Vitality = # of days</p>
RELIABILITY	<p>Several studies have examined the reliability of the items in adults with arthritis and cancer. More information is available at http://www.cdc.gov/hrqol/pubs/measurement/validity_psync.htm.</p>
MISSING VALUES	<p>Code “don’t know/not sure” or “refused” as missing values.</p>
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	<p>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (November 2000). <i>Measuring healthy days: Population assessment of health-related quality of life</i>. Atlanta, Georgia: CDC, November 2000. http://www.cdc.gov/hrqol/pdfs/mhd.pdf</p> <p>Centros para el Control y la Prevención de Enfermedades. <i>Medida de los días saludables</i>. Atlanta, Georgia: CDC, Noviembre 2000. http://www.cdc.gov/hrqol/spanish.htm</p>
OTHER REFERENCES	<p>Cintron, Y., & Kobau, R. Health-related quality of life—Puerto Rico, 1996-2000. (March 1, 2000). <i>MMWR</i>, 51(8), 166-168. Available in English (http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/PDF/wk/mm5108.pdf) and Spanish (http://www.cdc.gov/spanish/mmwr/smm5108a3.htm).</p>
COPYRIGHT	<p>The scale is free. The instrument is available for public use in English and Spanish.</p>

Items

DURING THE PAST 30 DAYS, FOR ABOUT HOW MANY DAYS:

1. Has pain made it hard for you to do your usual activities such as self-care, work, or recreation?
2. Have you felt sad, blue, or depressed?
3. Have you felt worried, tense, or anxious?
4. Have you felt you did not get enough rest or sleep?
5. Have you felt very health and full of energy?

Food Security Status – Short form

<p>DESCRIPTION</p>	<p>The US Department of Agriculture measures annually the access that people have to food. The standard form of this survey contains 18 items (Bickel et al., 2000). This survey has been translated to Spanish and used with Latino populations (e.g., Harrison et al., 2003). This section presents the short form of the 12-month Food Security Scale, which contains only 6 items. Questions relate to whether the person has not had enough money to purchase food, has compromised a balanced diet, or has reduced portion sizes to feed a household. Bickel et al. (2000, p. 6) provide the following definitions:</p> <p>Food security: “Access by all people at all times to enough food for an active, healthy life. Food security includes at a minimum: (1) the ready availability of nutritionally adequate and safe foods, and (2) an assured ability to acquire acceptable foods in socially acceptable ways (e.g., without resorting to emergency food supplies, scavenging, stealing, or other coping strategies).”</p> <p>Food insecurity: “Limited or uncertain availability of nutritionally adequate and safe foods or limited or uncertain ability to acquire acceptable foods in socially acceptable ways.”</p> <p>Hunger: “The uneasy or painful sensation caused by a lack of food. The recurrent and involuntary lack of access to food. Hunger may produce malnutrition over time....Hunger ... is a potential, although not necessary, consequence of food insecurity.”</p>
<p>RESPONSE FORMAT</p>	<p>Responses vary by question.</p>
<p>INTENDED RESPONDENTS</p>	<p>Adults</p>
<p>SCORING AND DIRECTION</p>	<p>The sum of the affirmative responses yields the following categories:</p> <p>0-1 = Food secure 2-4 = Food insecure without hunger 5-6 = Food insecure with hunger</p>
<p>RELIABILITY</p>	<p>This short form has reasonably high specificity and sensitivity and minimal bias with respect to the 18-item measure and provides a reliable indicator of high risk of children’s hunger within the household.</p>

MISSING VALUES	Must respond to all items. If the respondent gives a negative answer to the first three questions, skip the last three questions.
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Bickel, G., Nord, M. Price, C., Hamilton, W., & Cook, J. (2000). Measuring food security in the United States: Guide to measuring household food security. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Alexandria VA. http://www.fns.usda.gov/fsec/FILES/FSGuide.pdf
OTHER REFERENCES	Harrison, G. G., Stormer, A., Herman, D. R., & Winham, D. M. (2003). Development of a Spanish-language version of the U.S. Household Food Security Survey module. <i>The Journal of Nutrition</i> , 133(4), 1192-1197.
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

INSTRUCTIONS:

I'm going to read you two statements that people have made about their food situation. Please tell me whether the statement was **OFTEN**, **SOMETIMES**, or **NEVER** true for (you/you and the other members of your household) in the last 12 months.

- The first statement is, "The food that (I/we) bought just didn't last, and (I/we) didn't have money to get more." Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?
 [1] Often true
 [2] Sometimes true
 [3] Never true
 [Don't know, Refused]
- "(I/we) couldn't afford to eat balanced meals." Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?
 [1] Often true
 [2] Sometimes true
 [3] Never true
 [DK, R]
- In the last 12 months, since (date 12 months ago) did (you/you or other adults in your household) ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?
 [1] Yes
 [2] No
 [DK, R]

Items

If any of the first three questions are answered affirmatively (Q1, Q2 = Often true, Sometimes true; Q3 = Yes), proceed to the next 3 questions. Otherwise, skip the next 3 questions.

4. How often did this happen --almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only 1 or 2 months?

[1] Almost every month

[2] Some months but not every month

[3] Only 1 or 2 months

[DK, R]

5. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?

[1] Yes

[2] No

[DK, R]

6. In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?

[1] Yes

[2] No

[DK, R]



Section VII:

LATINO ETHNIC PRIDE,
ACCULTURATION, AND IMMIGRATION



Bicultural Involvement Questionnaire (BIQ)

DESCRIPTION	<p>The Bicultural Involvement Questionnaire (BIQ) consists of 33 items that measure two dimensions: (1) biculturalism, ranging from monoculturalism to biculturalism, and (2) cultural involvement, ranging from cultural marginality to cultural involvement. Scores are calculated on the basis of two subscales: Americanism and Hispanicism.</p>
RESPONSE FORMAT	<p>Five-point scale with only endpoints labeled (items 1-24).</p> <p>Items 1-10 1 = Not at all comfortable 5 = Very comfortable</p> <p>Items 11-24 1 = Not at all 5 = Very much</p> <p>Items 25-33 1 = I would wish to be this to be completely Hispanic 2 = I would wish this to be mostly Hispanic 3 = I would wish this to be both Hispanic & American 4 = I would wish this to be mostly American 5 = I would wish this to be completely American</p>
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	<p>Adolescents</p>
SCORING AND DIRECTION	<p>Americanism: Sum items 6-10, 18-24, and 25-33 Hispanicism: Sum items 1-5, 11-17, and the reverse weights of items 25-33</p> <p>The biculturalism scale is obtained by: Biculturalism score = Hispanicism score – Americanism score</p> <p>Scores close to zero indicate biculturalism while scores away from zero indicate monoculturalism. A positive difference indicates monoculturalism in the Hispanic direction while a negative difference indicates monoculturalism in the American direction.</p> <p>The cultural involvement score is obtained by adding the Hispanicism and Americanism score; a high score indicates cultural involvement while a low score indicates cultural marginality.</p>

RELIABILITY	The internal consistency, measured by Cronbach's alpha, using a sample of 12- to 16-year-old students was .93 for Hispanicism and .89 for Americanism scales. The internal consistency of the Biculturalism Scale was .94 and of the Cultural Involvement was .79.
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Szapocznik, J., Kurtines, W. M., & Fernandez, T. (1980). Bicultural involvement and adjustment in Hispanic-American youths. <i>International Journal of Intercultural Relations</i> , 4(3-4), 353-365.
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation..

Items

A. How comfortable do you feel speaking SPANISH:

[1 = Not at all comfortable to 5 = Very comfortable]

1. at HOME
2. in SCHOOL
3. at WORK
4. with FRIENDS
5. in GENERAL

B. How comfortable do you feel speaking ENGLISH:

[1 = Not at all comfortable to 5 = Very comfortable]

6. at HOME
7. in SCHOOL
8. at WORK
9. with FRIENDS
10. in GENERAL

C. How much do you enjoy: [1 = Not at all to 5 = Very much]

11. Hispanic music
12. Hispanic dances
13. Hispanic-oriented places
14. Hispanic type recreation
15. Hispanic T.V. programs
16. Hispanic radio station
17. Hispanic books and magazines

Items

D. How much do you enjoy: [1 = Not at all to 5 = Very much]

- 18. American music
- 19. American dances
- 20. American-oriented places
- 21. American-type recreation
- 22. American T.V. programs
- 23. American radio stations
- 24. American books and magazines

E. Sometimes life is not as we really want it. If you could have your way, how would you like the following aspects of your life to be like? [1 = I would wish to be this to be completely Hispanic to 5 = I would wish this to be completely American]

- 25. Food:
- 26. Language:
- 27. Music:
- 28. T.V. programs
- 29. Books/magazines
- 30. Dances:
- 31. Radio programs
- 32. Way of celebrating birthdays
- 33. Way of celebrating weddings

Brief Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire-Community Version (Brief PEDQ-CV)

DESCRIPTION

Brondolo et al. (2005) adapted the Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire-Community Version (PEDQ-CV) from the Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire (PEDQ) (Contrada et al., 2001). The full PEDQ-CV contains 70 items and evaluates perceived racism and ethnic discrimination among students and community samples. It can be utilized across various ethnic groups to assess multiple dimensions of racism. The Brief PEDQ-CV, an abbreviated version of the full PEDQ-CV, is recommended for research studies with limited time available for the administration of the questionnaire. This manual only includes the Brief PEDQ-CV. The Brief PEDQ-CV consists of 17 items and measures five factors:

(1) Lifetime exposure: Assesses the degree of exposure to race-based maltreatment over the course of the lifetime. The scale is composed of four subscales plus a single item assessing exposure to race-based maltreatment from police. The four subscales are described below.

DESCRIPTION	<p>Brondolo et al. (2005) adapted the Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire-Community Version (PEDQ-CV) from the Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire (PEDQ) (Contrada et al., 2001). The full PEDQ-CV contains 70 items and evaluates perceived racism and ethnic discrimination among students and community samples. It can be utilized across various ethnic groups to assess multiple dimensions of racism. The Brief PEDQ-CV, an abbreviated version of the full PEDQ-CV, is recommended for research studies with limited time available for the administration of the questionnaire. This manual only includes the Brief PEDQ-CV. The Brief PEDQ-CV consists of 17 items and measures five factors:</p> <p>(1) Lifetime exposure: Assesses the degree of exposure to race-based maltreatment over the course of the lifetime. The scale is composed of four subscales plus a single item assessing exposure to race-based maltreatment from police. The four subscales are described below.</p> <p>(2) Exclusion/ rejection: Assesses the degree to which individuals report having been isolated, excluded, or ignored because of their race or ethnicity.</p> <p>(3) Stigmatization/devaluation: Assesses the degree to which individuals report having been treated in a demeaning or stigmatizing way because of their race or ethnicity.</p> <p>(4) Discrimination at work/school: Assesses the degree to which individuals report having been treated unfairly at work or school because of their race or ethnicity.</p> <p>(5) Threat/aggression: Assesses the degree to which individuals report that they (or their property) were harmed or threatened with harm because of their race or ethnicity.</p>
RESPONSE FORMAT	<p>1 = Never happened 3 = Sometimes 5 = Happened very often</p>
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	<p>The scale has been tested in children ages 18 and older and adults. It has been validated in samples of individuals who self-identify as Black, Latino(a) or Asian from a number of different ethnic groups.</p>
SCORING AND DIRECTION	<p>Scale scores are calculated by averaging participants' responses. A higher score means a higher perception of racism.</p>

**Brief Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire-Community
Version (Brief PEDQ-CV)**

<p>RELIABILITY</p>	<p>The internal consistency for the 17-item Brief PEDQ-CV ranged from .65 to .88 using a full group, community, and student sample.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="527 499 1333 720"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Full</th> <th>Community</th> <th>Student</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>(1) Lifetime exposure</td> <td>.87</td> <td>.87</td> <td>.88</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(2) Exclusion/rejection</td> <td>.70</td> <td>.70</td> <td>.69</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(3) Stigmatization/devaluation</td> <td>.74</td> <td>.70</td> <td>.78</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(4) Discrimination at work/school</td> <td>.69</td> <td>.71</td> <td>.65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(5) Threat/aggression</td> <td>.80</td> <td>.75</td> <td>.88</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Items: (1) Lifetime exposure [mean of all 17 items] (2) Exclusion/rejection (items 8,11,12,13) (3) Stigmatization/devaluation (items 10,15,16,17) (4) Discrimination at work/school (items 1,2,9,14) (5) Threat/aggression (items 3,4,6,7) Unfair treatment from police: Item 5</p>		Full	Community	Student	(1) Lifetime exposure	.87	.87	.88	(2) Exclusion/rejection	.70	.70	.69	(3) Stigmatization/devaluation	.74	.70	.78	(4) Discrimination at work/school	.69	.71	.65	(5) Threat/aggression	.80	.75	.88
	Full	Community	Student																						
(1) Lifetime exposure	.87	.87	.88																						
(2) Exclusion/rejection	.70	.70	.69																						
(3) Stigmatization/devaluation	.74	.70	.78																						
(4) Discrimination at work/school	.69	.71	.65																						
(5) Threat/aggression	.80	.75	.88																						
<p>REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE</p>	<p>Brondolo, E., Kelly, K. P., Coakley, V., Gordon, T., Thompson, S., Levy, E., . . . Contrada, R. J. (2005). The Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire: Development and preliminary validation of a community version. <i>Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 35</i>(2), 335-365.</p>																								
<p>OTHER REFERENCES</p>	<p>Contrada, R. J. (2001). Measures of ethnicity-related stress: Psychometric properties, ethnic group differences, and associations with well-being. <i>Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31</i>(9), 1775-1820.</p> <p>Kwok, J., Atencio, J., Ullah, J., Crupi, R., Chen, D., Roth, A., Chaplin, W., & Brondolo, E., (2011). The Perceived Ethnic Discrimination Questionnaire – Community Version: Validation in a multi-ethnic Asian sample. <i>Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 17</i>(3), 271–282.</p>																								
<p>COPYRIGHT</p>	<p>The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.</p>																								

Items

Think about your **ethnicity/race**. What group do you belong to? **Do you think of yourself as:** Asian? Black? Latino? White? Native American? American? Caribbean? Irish? Italian? Korean? Another group?

Your Ethnicity/Race: _____

How often have any of the things listed below ever happened to you, **because of your ethnicity?**

BECAUSE OF YOUR ETHNICITY/RACE...

A. How often . . .

1. Have you been treated unfairly by teachers, principals, or other staff at school?
2. Have others thought you couldn't do things or handle a job?
3. Have others threatened to hurt you (ex: said they would hit you)?
4. Have others actually hurt you or tried to hurt you (ex: kicked or hit you)?
5. Have policeman or security officers been unfair to you?
6. Have others threatened to damage your property?
7. Have others actually damaged your property?
8. Have others made you feel like an outsider who doesn't fit in because of your dress, speech, or other characteristics related to your ethnicity?
9. Have you been treated unfairly by co-workers or classmates?
10. Have others hinted that you are dishonest or can't be trusted?
11. Have people been nice to your face, but said bad things about you behind your back?
12. Have people who speak a different language made you feel like an outsider?
13. Have others ignored you or not paid attention to you?
14. Has your boss or supervisor been unfair to you?
15. Have others hinted that you must not be clean
16. Have people not trusted you?
17. Has it been hinted that you must be lazy?

If you would like to tell us more about your experiences of discrimination, please write your story here:

Immigration Risk Index

DESCRIPTION	<p>The Immigration Risk Index is composed of four risk indicators, selected by immigration experts, characteristic of immigrant families such as parents' education, citizenship status, year of entry, and language ability. The number of risk factors is directly associated with child poverty. The child poverty rate for 2007 demonstrates the close association of the increase of risk factors with an increase in child poverty rate. Children of immigrant families are considered "at risk" if they have at least 3 of the 4 indicators.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="591 688 1286 909"> <thead> <tr> <th>Number of risk factors</th> <th>Child poverty rate, 2007</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>14%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>31%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>38%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>48%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Source: PRB analysis of the 2007 American Community Survey</i></p>	Number of risk factors	Child poverty rate, 2007	0	9%	1	14%	2	31%	3	38%	4	48%
Number of risk factors	Child poverty rate, 2007												
0	9%												
1	14%												
2	31%												
3	38%												
4	48%												
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Parents												
REFERENCE	<p>Mather, M. (2009). <i>Children in immigrant families chart new path</i>. Washington, DC: Population Reference Bureau. Retrieved from http://www.prb.org/pdf09/immigrantchildren.pdf</p>												

Items

5. Neither parent is proficient in English.
6. Neither parent is a U.S. citizen
7. Neither parent has more than a ninth grade education.
8. Neither parent has been in the country more than 10 years.

Familial Ethnic Socialization (FES)

DESCRIPTION	The Familial Ethnic Socialization (FES)—a revised and expanded version of the Familial Ethnic Socialization Measure (FESM, 9 items; Umaña-Taylor, 2001)—assesses the degree to which adolescents perceive that their family socialized them in regards to their ethnicity. The FES is composed of 12 items that measure two constructs: Covert FES and Overt FES.
RESPONSE FORMAT	Five-point scale with only endpoints labeled. 1 = Not at all 5 = Very much
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	The scale was developed for ethnically diverse adolescents.
SCORING AND DIRECTION	To scale score is calculated by adding all items. The scale ranges from 12 to 60 points. Higher scores indicate higher levels of familial ethnic socialization. Items Covert FES: Items 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12 Overt FES: Items 1, 2, 6, 7, 9
RELIABILITY	The internal consistency of the scores, measured by Cronbach's alpha, ranged from .92 to .94 with ethnically diverse samples. The internal consistency of the scores of the original 9-item FESM, measured by Cronbach's alpha, was .82 with a sample of Mexican-origin adolescents.
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Umaña-Taylor, A. J. & Fine, M. A. (2004). Examining ethnic identity among Mexican-origin adolescents living in the United States. <i>Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences</i> , 26, 36-59. Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Yazedjian, A. & Bámaca-Gómez, M. Y. (2004). Developing the Ethnic Identity Scale using Eriksonian and social identity perspectives. <i>Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research</i> , 4, 9-38.
OTHER REFERENCES	Umaña-Taylor, A. J. (2001). <i>Ethnic identity development among Mexican-origin Latino adolescents living in the U.S.</i> Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia.
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation.

Items

INSTRUCTIONS:

Please rate (between 1 and 5) how much you agree with each of the following items.

1. My family teaches me about my ethnic/cultural background.
2. My family encourages me to respect the cultural values and beliefs of our ethnic/cultural background.
3. My family participates in activities that are specific to my ethnic group.
4. Our home is decorated with things that reflect my ethnic/cultural background.
5. The people who my family hangs out with the most are people who share the same ethnic background as my family.
6. My family teaches me about the values and beliefs of our ethnic/cultural background.
7. My family talks about how important it is to know about my ethnic/cultural background.
8. My family celebrates holidays that are specific to my ethnic/cultural background.
9. My family teaches me about the history of my ethnic/cultural background.
10. My family listens to music sung or played by artists from my ethnic/cultural background.
11. My family attends things such as concerts, plays, festivals, or other events that represent my ethnic/cultural background.
12. My family feels a strong attachment to our ethnic/cultural background.

Revised Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM-R)

DESCRIPTION

The Revised Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM-R) evaluates respondents' sense of ethnic identification and their feeling of belonging to a particular ethnicity. Phinney (1992) developed the original MEIM consisting of 20 items. Later adapted it to a shorter version in 1999 consisting of 12 items, and in 2007 created the MEIM-R with only 6 items. The MEIM-R assesses two constructs:

(1) Exploration (items 1, 4, and 5): Looking for information and experiences related to one's ethnicity

(2) Commitment (items 2, 3, and 6): Strong attachment and one's investment to their ethnic group

Each MEIM version asks questions regarding the respondents' and parents' ethnicity but this information is not used for scoring the scale.

The MEIM has been used with various ethnic populations and has been used in several countries. Smith (2002) translated the items into Spanish and used the scale in Costa Rica. She added three new items that are not part of Phinney's 1999 version.

DESCRIPTION	Researchers should determine the relevance of measuring ethnic identity in their research. This manual includes Phinney's 1999 and 2007 versions, as well as Smith's 2002 translation.
RESPONSE FORMAT	1 = Strongly disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neutral 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly agree
INTENDED RESPONDENTS	Adolescents
SCORING AND DIRECTION	The score is calculated by obtaining the mean of each subscale.
RELIABILITY	The internal consistency, measured by Cronbach's alpha, was .76 for exploration and .78 for commitment. The alpha for the combined 6-item scale was .81 (Phinney, 2007). In the Costa Rica study, the internal consistency was .80 (Smith, 2002).
REFERENCE FOR THE SCALE	Phinney, J. (1992). The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure: A new scale for use with adolescents and young adults from diverse groups. <i>Journal of Adolescent Research, 7</i> , 156-176. Phinney, J., & Ong, A. (2007). Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic identity: Current status and future directions. <i>Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54</i> , 271-281. Roberts, R., Phinney, J., Mase, L., Chen, Y., Roberts, C., & Romero, A. (1999). The structure of ethnic identity in young adolescents from diverse ethnocultural groups. <i>Journal of Early Adolescence, 19</i> , 301-322. Smith, V. (2002). La Escala de Identidad Etnica Multigrupo (ELEM) en el contexto costarricense. <i>Actualidades en Psicología, 18</i> (105), 47.
COPYRIGHT	The scale is free. Researchers should use proper citation..

Items

(Phinney, 2007)

INSTRUCTIONS:

There should be two open-ended questions after these six items about the respondent's and parents' ethnicity. These items are not used in the scoring of the scale but only used to identify the respondent's ethnicity.

1. I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs.
2. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.
3. I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me.
4. I have often done things that will help me understand my ethnic background better.
5. I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group.
6. I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.

(Phinney, 1999)

INSTRUCTIONS:

Please fill in: In terms of ethnic group, I consider myself to be _____

Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

1. I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs.
2. I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group.
3. I have a clear sense of ethnic background and what it means for me.
4. I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership.
5. I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to.
6. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.
7. I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me.
8. In order to learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group.
9. I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group.
10. I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs.
11. I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.
12. I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background.
13. My ethnicity is
 - (1) Asian or Asian American, including Chinese, Japanese, and others
 - (2) Black or African American
 - (3) Hispanic or Latino, including Mexican American, Central American, and others.
 - (4) White, Caucasian, Anglo, European American; not Hispanic
 - (5) American Indian/Native American
 - (6) Mixed; Parents are from two different groups
 - (7) Other (write in): _____

14. My father's ethnicity is (use numbers above)
15. My mother's ethnicity is (use numbers above)

*Items 6, 7, and 15 are not part of Phinney's 1999 version



APPENDIX A:

Contact Information

Pamela K. Ahrens, MS

Director, Fast Track Data Center
Center for Child and Family Policy
Duke University
Durham, NC USA
Email: ahrens@duke.edu

Sergio Barroilhet, MD, PhD

Profesor
Escuela de Psicología
Universidad de los Andes
Santiago, CHILE
Email: sbarroilhet@uandes.cl

Elizabeth N. Brondolo, PhD

Professor
Department of Psychology
St. John's University
Jamaica, NY USA
Email: brondole@stjohns.edu

Sonia Carrillo, PhD

Profesora Asociada
Departamento de Psicología
Universidad de los Andes
Bogotá, COLOMBIA
Email: scarrill@uniandes.edu.co

Nathan B. Epstein, MD

Professor Emeritus
Department of Psychiatry & Human
Behavior
Brown University
Providence, RI USA
Email: Nathan_Epstein@brown.edu

Rand D. Conger, PhD

Distinguished Professor
Department of Human and
Community Development
University of California
Davis, CA USA
Email: rdconger@ucdavis.edu

Ramon Florenzano, MD, PhD

Profesor
Universidad de los Andes
Santiago, CHILE
Email: rflorenzano@gmail.com

Paul J. Frick, PhD

University Distinguished Professor/
Chair of Psychology
Department of Psychology
University of New Orleans
New Orleans, LA USA
Email: pfrick@uno.edu

Mark T. Greenberg, PhD

Director, The Prevention Research
Center
Department of Human Development
and Family Studies
Penn State University
University Park, PA USA
Email: mxg47@psu.edu

**Vincent Guilamo-Ramos, PhD,
LCSW**

Professor and Co-Director, CLAFH
Center for Latino Adolescent and
Family Health
Silver School of Social Work
New York University
New York, NY USA
Email: vincent.ramos@nyu.edu

Richard Jessor, PhD

Distinguished Professor of
Behavioral Science
Research Professor of Behavioral
Science
Professor of Psychology, Emeritus
Director, Health and Society
Program
Institute of Behavioral Science
University of Colorado at Boulder
Boulder, CO USA
Email: jessor@colorado.edu

Anupama Joshi, PhD

Acting Dean
College of Professional Studies
California State University,
Dominguez Hills
Carson, CA USA
Email: ajoshi@csudh.edu

Anne M. Mauricio, PhD

Faculty Research Associate
Department of Psychology
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ USA
Email: Anne.Mauricio@asu.edu

Matilde Maddaleno, MD, MPH

Coordinadora de Proyecto/Project
Coordinator
Curso de Vida Saludable/Healthy
Life Course
Organización Panamericana de
la Salud/Pan American Health
Organization
Washington DC USA
Email: maddalem@paho.org

Lourdes Michele Martinez

College of Public Health
University of Georgia
E-mail: lmart09@uga.edu

María del Carmen Melgarejo Romero, PhD

Profesora Catedrática
Facultad de Psicología
Universidad Autónoma del Estado
Morelos
Cuernavaca, Morelos, MEXICO
Universidad Tec Milenio
Temixco, Morelos, MEXICO
Email: mcmelga@yahoo.com

Belén Mesurado, PhD

Investigadora Asistente
Centro Interdisciplinario de
Investigaciones en Psicología
Matemática y Experimental
(CIIPME)
Unidad Ejecutora de Consejo
Nacional de Investigaciones
Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET)
Buenos Aires, ARGENTINA
Email: mesuradob@gmail.com

David H. Olson, PhD

Professor Emeritus
Department of Family Social
Science
University of Minnesota
St. Paul, MN USA
Email: dolson@prepare-enrich.com

Pamela Orpinas, PhD

Professor
Department of Health Promotion
and Behavior
The University of Georgia
Athens, GA USA
Email: porpinas@uga.edu

Jean S. Phinney, PhD

Professor of Psychology
Department of Psychology
California State University
Los Angeles, CA USA
Email: jphinne@calstatela.edu

María Cristina Richaud de Minzi, PhD

Directora
Centro Interdisciplinario de
Investigaciones en Psicología
Matemática y Experimental
(CIIPME)
Consejo Nacional de
Investigaciones Científicas y
Técnicas (CONICET)
Buenos Aires, ARGENTINA
Email: minzi@ciudad.com.ar

Adriana Rico, MPH

College of Public Health
University of Georgia
E-mail: rico8@uga.edu

María del Pilar Roque Hernández, PhD

Profesora
Facultad de Estudios Superiores
Zaragoza
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de
México
Ciudad de México, MEXICO
Email: roquehp@yahoo.com.mx

Robert J. Sampson, PhD

Henry Ford II Professor of the
Social Sciences
Department of Sociology
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA USA
Email:
rsampson@wjh.harvard.edu

Mateu Servera Barceló, PhD

Deputy Vice-Chancellor of
Academic Affairs and European
Convergence
Department of Psychology
University of the Balearic Islands
Palma, BALEARIC ISLANDS
Email: mservera@gmail.com

Ellen A. Skinner, PhD

Professor of Human Development
Psychology Associate Chair
Department of Psychology
Portland State University
Portland, OR USA
E-mail: skinnere@pdx.edu

Appendix A: Contact Information *Continued*

Stephen Small, PhD

Professor of Human Development & Family Studies
Department of Human Development & Family Studies
The University of Wisconsin-Madison
Madison, WI USA
Email: sasmall@wisc.edu

Håkan Stattin, PhD

Professor of Psychology
School of Law, Psychology and Social Work
Örebro University
Örebro, SWEDEN
Email: hakan.stattin@oru.se

Vanessa Smith Castro, PhD

Profesora Asociada
Instituto de Investigaciones Psicológicas
Universidad de Costa Rica.
San Pedro, San José COSTA RICA
Email: vanessa.smith@ucr.ac.cr

José Szapocznik, PhD

Chair, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health
Associate Dean for Community Development
Director, Center for Family Studies
University of Miami-Miller School of Medicine
Miami, FL USA
Email: jszapocz@med.miami.edu

Adriana J. Umaña-Taylor, PhD

Associate Professor
School of Social and Family Dynamics
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ USA
Email: Adriana.Umana-Taylor@asu.edu

Isabel Vega Robles, PhD

Profesora Catedrática
Instituto de Investigaciones Psicológicas
Universidad de Costa Rica
San Pedro, San José COSTA RICA
Email: isabelv69@gmail.com

Gregory D. Zimet, PhD

Professor of Pediatrics & Clinical Psychology
School of Medicine
Indiana University
Indianapolis, IN USA
Email: gzimet@iupui.edu

