

ICPSR 34263

## **Oregon Youth Substance Use Project (OYSUP), 1998-2010**

Judy Andrews  
*Oregon Research Institute*

Codebook for Parents Scales - Year 5

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

# Terms of Use

The terms of use for this study can be found at:  
<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/studies/34263/terms>

## Information about Copyrighted Content

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

### NOTICE

#### WARNING CONCERNING COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS

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

# **ICPSR 34263**

## **Oregon Youth Substance Use Project (OYSUP), 1998-2010**

### **Variable Description and Frequencies**

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

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

## Oregon Youth Substance Use Project (OYSUP), 1998-2010

### Parents Scales - Year 5

#### Variable Groups

##### Variable Groups Containing Variables

<i>Variable Group Name</i>	<i>Variable Group Label</i>	<i>Page</i>
<a href="#">VG1F1</a>	Identification Information	2
<a href="#">VG2F1</a>	Scales	2
<a href="#">VG3F1</a>	Cohort Information	3
<a href="#">VG4F1</a>	Mode of Assessment	3

#### VG1F1

##### Identification Information

###### *Variables within this Variable Group*

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Variable Label</i>	<i>Page</i>
<a href="#">CASEID</a>	CASE IDENTIFICATION NUMBER	3
<a href="#">FAMID</a>	FAMILY ID NUMBER	3
<a href="#">SUBJID</a>	SUBJECT ID NUMBER	4

#### VG2F1

##### Scales

###### *Variables within this Variable Group*

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Variable Label</i>	<i>Page</i>
<a href="#">ACADC5</a>	ACHENBACH ACADEMIC COMPETENCE-CHILD [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER ACADEMIC COMPETENCE]	4
<a href="#">ACADF5</a>	ACHENBACH ACADEMIC COMPETENCE-CHILD'S FRIEND [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER ACADEMIC COMPETENCE]	4
<a href="#">INTERN5</a>	ACHENBACH INTERNALIZATION (ANXIETY AND WITHDRAWAL) [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER INTERNALIZING BEHAVIOR]	5
<a href="#">REL5</a>	CRICK AGGRESSION SCALE-RELATIONAL [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER RELATIONAL AGGRESSION]	7
<a href="#">OVT5</a>	CRICK AGGRESSION SCALE-OVERT [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER OVERT AGGRESSION]	8
<a href="#">PRO5</a>	CRICK AGGRESSION SCALE-PROSOCIAL [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR]	9
<a href="#">APSP055</a>	ALABAMA PARENTING SCALE- POSITIVE PARENTING [HIGHER SCORES INDICATE GREATER FREQUENCY OF SCALE BEHAVIOR]	10
<a href="#">APSMON5</a>	ALABAMA PARENTING SCALE- POOR MONITORING/SUPERV. [HIGHER SCORES INDICATE GREATER FREQUENCY OF SCALE BEHAVIOR]	11
<a href="#">APSDIS5</a>	ALABAMA PARENTING SCALE- INCONSISTENT DISCIPLINE [HIGHER SCORES INDICATE GREATER FREQUENCY OF SCALE BEHAVIOR]	13

- Study 34263 -

<i>Variables within this Variable Group</i>		
<i>Variable</i>	<i>Variable Label</i>	<i>Page</i>
<a href="#">DAS5</a>	DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER SATISFACTION]	14
<a href="#">CESD5</a>	CESD SCALE [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER DEPRESSION]	15
<a href="#">CBQ5</a>	CONFLICT BEHAVIOR SCALE [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER CONFLICT]	17
<a href="#">SPUB5</a>	DAD/MOM ABOUT SON: PUBERTY SCALE [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER DEVELOPMENT]	17
<a href="#">DPUB5</a>	DAD/MOM ABOUT DAUGHTER: PUBERTY SCALE [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER DEVELOPMENT]	18
<a href="#">AS5</a>	FEELINGS ABOUT CHILD SMOKING CIGS [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES MORE NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARDS USE]	19
<a href="#">AA5</a>	FEELINGS ABOUT CHILD DRINKING ALCOHOL [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES MORE NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARDS USE]	20
<a href="#">AP5</a>	FEELINGS ABOUT CHILD SMOKING MARIJUANA [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES MORE NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARDS USE]	20
<a href="#">OC5</a>	HARMFULNESS OF SMOKING CIGARETTES [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER PERCEPTION OF HARM]	21
<a href="#">OCT5</a>	HARMFULNESS OF USING CHEWING TOBACCO [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER PERCEPTION OF HARM]	22
<a href="#">OA5</a>	HARMFULNESS OF DRINKING ALCOHOL [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER PERCEPTION OF HARM]	23
<a href="#">OI5</a>	HARMFULNESS OF SNIFFING [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER PERCEPTION OF HARM]	23
<a href="#">OM5</a>	HARMFULNESS OF SMOKING MARIJUANA [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER PERCEPTION OF HARM]	24

**VG3F1 Cohort Information**

<i>Variables within this Variable Group</i>		
<i>Variable</i>	<i>Variable Label</i>	<i>Page</i>
<a href="#">COHORT</a>	COHORT: GRADE AT T1	25
<a href="#">GRADE5C</a>	COHORT GRADE AT T5	25

**VG4F1 Mode of Assessment**

<i>Variables within this Variable Group</i>		
<i>Variable</i>	<i>Variable Label</i>	<i>Page</i>
<a href="#">PHONE5</a>	TYPE OF ASSESSMENT	25

**CASEID CASE IDENTIFICATION NUMBER**

Location: 1-4 (width: 4; decimal: 0)  
 Variable Type: numeric  
 Based upon 1521 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**FAMID FAMILY ID NUMBER**

- Study 34263 -

Location: 5-8 (width: 4; decimal: 0)  
 Variable Type: numeric  
 Range of Missing Values (M): -99 , -9

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>
-99 (M)	Phone
-9 (M)	Missing

Based upon 1521 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**SUBJID SUBJECT ID NUMBER**

Location: 9-11 (width: 3; decimal: 0)  
 Variable Type: numeric  
 Range of Missing Values (M): -99 , -9

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
2	Mom	887	58.3 %	58.3%
3	Dad	634	41.7 %	41.7%

Based upon 1521 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**ACADC5 ACHENBACH ACADEMIC COMPETENCE-CHILD [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER ACADEMIC COMPETENCE]**

Location: 12-14 (width: 3; decimal: 0)  
 Variable Type: numeric  
 Range of Missing Values (M): -99 , -9  
 Question: Achenbach Academic Competence - Child: Scale scored 0 - 4, with higher scores indicating greater academic competency. (sum of 2 items)

(0) Not true  
 (1) Somewhat true  
 (2) Very true

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	22	1.4 %	1.6%
1	-	59	3.9 %	4.3%
2	-	372	24.5 %	26.9%
3	-	345	22.7 %	24.9%
4	-	586	38.5 %	42.3%
-99 (M)	Phone	112	7.4 %	-
-9 (M)	Missing	25	1.6 %	-

Based upon 1384 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**ACADF5 ACHENBACH ACADEMIC COMPETENCE-CHILD'S FRIEND [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER ACADEMIC COMPETENCE]**

- Study 34263 -

Location: 15-17 (width: 3; decimal: 0)  
 Variable Type: numeric  
 Range of Missing Values (M): -99 , -9  
 Question: Achenbach Academic Competence - Friend: Scale scored 0 - 4, with higher scores indicating greater academic competency. (sum of 2 items)  
 (0) Not true  
 (1) Somewhat true  
 (2) Very true

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	-	19	1.2 %	1.4%
1	-	51	3.4 %	3.8%
2	-	546	35.9 %	41.2%
3	-	312	20.5 %	23.5%
4	-	398	26.2 %	30.0%
-99 (M)	Phone	113	7.4 %	-
-9 (M)	Missing	82	5.4 %	-

Based upon 1326 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**INTERN5 ACHENBACH INTERNALIZATION (ANXIETY AND WITHDRAWL) [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER INTERNALIZING BEHAVIOR]**

Location: 18-23 (width: 6; decimal: 2)  
 Variable Type: numeric  
 Range of Missing Values (M): -99.00 , -9.00  
 Question: Internalizing Behavior: Scale scored 0 - 44, with higher scores indicating greater internalizing behavior (Adapted from Child Behavior Checklist, Achenbach, 1991). (sum of 22 items)  
 (0) Not true  
 (1) Somewhat true  
 (2) Very true

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0.00	-	128	8.4 %	9.2%
1.00	-	140	9.2 %	10.1%
1.05	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.10	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
2.00	-	137	9.0 %	9.9%
2.10	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
2.20	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
3.00	-	138	9.1 %	10.0%

- Study 34263 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
3.14	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
4.00	-	111	7.3 %	8.0%
5.00	-	98	6.4 %	7.1%
5.24	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
6.00	-	92	6.0 %	6.6%
7.00	-	83	5.5 %	6.0%
7.33	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
8.00	-	67	4.4 %	4.8%
8.38	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
9.00	-	60	3.9 %	4.3%
9.90	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
10.00	-	38	2.5 %	2.7%
10.48	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
11.00	-	39	2.6 %	2.8%
11.52	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
12.00	-	39	2.6 %	2.8%
13.00	-	37	2.4 %	2.7%
14.00	-	25	1.6 %	1.8%
14.30	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
14.67	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
15.00	-	23	1.5 %	1.7%
16.00	-	15	1.0 %	1.1%
16.50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
16.76	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
17.00	-	15	1.0 %	1.1%
18.00	-	12	0.8 %	0.9%
19.00	-	16	1.1 %	1.2%
20.00	-	5	0.3 %	0.4%
21.00	-	12	0.8 %	0.9%
22.00	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
23.00	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
24.00	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
26.00	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
27.00	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
28.00	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
29.00	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
31.00	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
32.00	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
34.00	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
38.00	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%



- Study 34263 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
-99.00 (M)	Phone	130	8.5 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Missing	5	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1386 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**REL5 CRICK AGGRESSION SCALE-RELATIONAL [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER RELATIONAL AGGRESSION]**

Location: 24-29 (width: 6; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

Range of Missing Values (M): -99.00 , -9.00 , -5.00

Question: Relational Aggression: Scale scored 5 - 25, with higher scores indicating greater relational aggression. (sum of 5 items)

Grade 1 to Grade 8

- (1) Never true
- (2) Not often true
- (3) Sometimes true
- (4) Often true
- (5) Almost always true

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
5.00	-	95	6.2 %	10.9%
6.00	-	91	6.0 %	10.4%
6.25	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
7.00	-	120	7.9 %	13.7%
7.50	-	4	0.3 %	0.5%
8.00	-	111	7.3 %	12.7%
8.75	-	4	0.3 %	0.5%
9.00	-	105	6.9 %	12.0%
10.00	-	84	5.5 %	9.6%
11.00	-	73	4.8 %	8.4%
11.25	-	3	0.2 %	0.3%
12.00	-	54	3.6 %	6.2%
12.50	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
13.00	-	32	2.1 %	3.7%
13.75	-	3	0.2 %	0.3%
14.00	-	24	1.6 %	2.7%
15.00	-	26	1.7 %	3.0%
16.00	-	18	1.2 %	2.1%
17.00	-	11	0.7 %	1.3%
18.00	-	3	0.2 %	0.3%

- Study 34263 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
19.00	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
20.00	-	4	0.3 %	0.5%
21.00	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
21.25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
22.00	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-99.00 (M)	Phone	76	5.0 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Missing	5	0.3 %	-
-5.00 (M)	Question not asked on this form	566	37.2 %	-

Based upon 874 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**OVT5**

**CRICK AGGRESSION SCALE-OVERT [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER OVERT AGGRESSION]**

Location: 30-32 (width: 3; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

Range of Missing Values (M): -99 , -9 , -5

Question:

Overt Aggression: Scale scored 4 - 20, with higher scores indicating greater overt aggression. (sum of 4 items)

Grade 1 to Grade 8

- (1) Never true
- (2) Not often true
- (3) Sometimes true
- (4) Often true
- (5) Almost always true

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
4	-	571	37.5 %	66.9%
5	-	97	6.4 %	11.4%
6	-	60	3.9 %	7.0%
7	-	33	2.2 %	3.9%
8	-	35	2.3 %	4.1%
9	-	23	1.5 %	2.7%
10	-	15	1.0 %	1.8%
11	-	7	0.5 %	0.8%
12	-	6	0.4 %	0.7%
13	-	5	0.3 %	0.6%
15	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
17	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-99 (M)	Phone	76	5.0 %	-
-9 (M)	Missing	25	1.6 %	-

- Study 34263 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
-5 (M)	Question not asked on this form	566	37.2 %	-

Based upon 854 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**PRO5 CRICK AGGRESSION SCALE-PROSOCIAL [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR]**

Location: 33-35 (width: 3; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

Range of Missing Values (M): -99 , -9 , -5

Question:

Prosocial Behavior: Scale scored 4 - 20, with higher scores indicating greater prosocial behavior. (sum of 4 items)

Grade 1 to Grade 8

- (1) Never true
- (2) Not often true
- (3) Sometimes true
- (4) Often true
- (5) Almost always true

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
4	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
5	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
6	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
8	-	6	0.4 %	0.7%
9	-	3	0.2 %	0.4%
10	-	11	0.7 %	1.3%
11	-	27	1.8 %	3.2%
12	-	55	3.6 %	6.4%
13	-	87	5.7 %	10.2%
14	-	82	5.4 %	9.6%
15	-	95	6.2 %	11.1%
16	-	154	10.1 %	18.0%
17	-	98	6.4 %	11.5%
18	-	72	4.7 %	8.4%
19	-	72	4.7 %	8.4%
20	-	90	5.9 %	10.5%
-99 (M)	Phone	76	5.0 %	-
-9 (M)	Missing	24	1.6 %	-
-5 (M)	Question not asked on this form	566	37.2 %	-

Based upon 855 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

- Study 34263 -

**APSP05 ALABAMA PARENTING SCALE- POSITIVE PARENTING [HIGHER SCORES INDICATE GREATER FREQUENCY OF SCALE BEHAVIOR]**

Location: 36-40 (width: 5; decimal: 1)

Variable Type: numeric

Range of Missing Values (M): -99.0 , -9.0

Question:

Alabama Parenting Scale: Positive Parenting. (Shelton, et .al, 1996)  
Scale scored 6 - 30, with higher scores indicating greater frequency of behavior. (sum of 6 items)

- (1) Never
- (2) Almost never
- (3) Sometimes
- (4) Often
- (5) Always

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
12.0	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
13.0	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
14.0	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
15.0	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
16.0	-	17	1.1 %	1.2%
17.0	-	24	1.6 %	1.7%
18.0	-	41	2.7 %	2.9%
19.0	-	60	3.9 %	4.3%
19.2	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
20.0	-	76	5.0 %	5.4%
20.4	-	5	0.3 %	0.4%
21.0	-	118	7.8 %	8.4%
21.6	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
22.0	-	151	9.9 %	10.8%
22.8	-	11	0.7 %	0.8%
23.0	-	199	13.1 %	14.2%
24.0	-	188	12.4 %	13.4%
25.0	-	109	7.2 %	7.8%
25.2	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
26.0	-	101	6.6 %	7.2%
27.0	-	85	5.6 %	6.1%
27.6	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
28.0	-	84	5.5 %	6.0%
28.8	-	5	0.3 %	0.4%
29.0	-	67	4.4 %	4.8%
30.0	-	38	2.5 %	2.7%
-99.0 (M)	Phone	111	7.3 %	-

- Study 34263 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
-9.0 (M)	Missing	8	0.5 %	-

Based upon 1402 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**APSMON5**

**ALABAMA PARENTING SCALE- POOR MONITORING/SUPERV. [HIGHER SCORES INDICATE GREATER FREQUENCY OF SCALE BEHAVIOR]**

Location: 41-46 (width: 6; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

Range of Missing Values (M): -99.00 , -9.00

Question:

Alabama Parenting Scale: Poor monitoring/supervision. (Shelton, et .al, 1996) Scale scored 10 - 50, with higher scores indicating greater frequency of behavior. (sum of 10 items)

- (1) Never
- (2) Almost never
- (3) Sometimes
- (4) Often
- (5) Always

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
10.00	-	66	4.3 %	4.7%
11.00	-	50	3.3 %	3.6%
11.11	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
11.25	-	53	3.5 %	3.8%
12.00	-	85	5.6 %	6.0%
12.22	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
12.50	-	29	1.9 %	2.1%
13.00	-	85	5.6 %	6.0%
13.33	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
13.75	-	47	3.1 %	3.3%
14.00	-	86	5.7 %	6.1%
14.44	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
15.00	-	109	7.2 %	7.8%
15.56	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
16.00	-	78	5.1 %	5.6%
16.25	-	38	2.5 %	2.7%
16.67	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
17.00	-	67	4.4 %	4.8%
17.14	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
17.50	-	49	3.2 %	3.5%
17.78	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
18.00	-	72	4.7 %	5.1%

- Study 34263 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
18.75	-	34	2.2 %	2.4%
18.89	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
19.00	-	42	2.8 %	3.0%
20.00	-	81	5.3 %	5.8%
21.00	-	43	2.8 %	3.1%
21.11	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
21.25	-	23	1.5 %	1.6%
21.43	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
22.00	-	21	1.4 %	1.5%
22.50	-	35	2.3 %	2.5%
22.86	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
23.00	-	25	1.6 %	1.8%
23.33	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
23.75	-	22	1.4 %	1.6%
24.00	-	23	1.5 %	1.6%
24.29	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
24.44	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
25.00	-	32	2.1 %	2.3%
25.56	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
26.00	-	12	0.8 %	0.9%
26.25	-	11	0.7 %	0.8%
27.00	-	5	0.3 %	0.4%
27.14	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
27.50	-	8	0.5 %	0.6%
28.00	-	5	0.3 %	0.4%
28.75	-	11	0.7 %	0.8%
29.00	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
30.00	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
31.00	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
31.25	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
32.00	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
32.50	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
32.86	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
33.00	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
34.00	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
34.29	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
35.00	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
38.00	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
39.00	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
40.00	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 34263 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
41.25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-99.00 (M)	Phone	111	7.3 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Missing	5	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1405 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**APSDIS5**

**ALABAMA PARENTING SCALE- INCONSISTENT DISCIPLINE [HIGHER SCORES INDICATE GREATER FREQUENCY OF SCALE BEHAVIOR]**

Location: 47-51 (width: 5; decimal: 1)

Variable Type: numeric

Range of Missing Values (M): -99.0 , -9.0

Question:

Alabama Parenting Scale: Inconsistent discipline. (Shelton, et .al, 1996) Scale scored 6 - 30, with higher scores indicating greater frequency of behavior. (sum of 6 items)

- (1) Never
- (2) Almost never
- (3) Sometimes
- (4) Often
- (5) Always

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
6.0	-	40	2.6 %	2.8%
7.0	-	43	2.8 %	3.1%
7.2	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
8.0	-	66	4.3 %	4.7%
8.4	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
9.0	-	90	5.9 %	6.4%
9.6	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
10.0	-	117	7.7 %	8.3%
10.8	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
11.0	-	158	10.4 %	11.2%
12.0	-	139	9.1 %	9.9%
13.0	-	164	10.8 %	11.7%
14.0	-	141	9.3 %	10.0%
14.4	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
15.0	-	101	6.6 %	7.2%
15.6	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
16.0	-	107	7.0 %	7.6%
17.0	-	92	6.0 %	6.5%
18.0	-	50	3.3 %	3.6%
19.0	-	34	2.2 %	2.4%

- Study 34263 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
19.2	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
20.0	-	24	1.6 %	1.7%
21.0	-	14	0.9 %	1.0%
22.0	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
23.0	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
24.0	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
25.0	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
-99.0 (M)	Phone	111	7.3 %	-
-9.0 (M)	Missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1406 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**DAS5**

**DYADIC ADJUSTMENT SCALE [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER SATISFACTION]**

Location: 52-54 (width: 3; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

Range of Missing Values (M): -99 , -9

Question:

Dyadic Adjustment Scale: Modified satisfaction subscale of dyadic adjustment (Spanier, 1976). Scale scored 0 - 46, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction.

- (0) All the time (0) Extremely unhappy
- (1) Most of the time (1) Fairly unhappy
- (2) More often than not (2) A little unhappy
- (3) Occasionally (3) Happy
- (4) Rarely (4) Very happy
- (5) Never (5) Extremely happy
- (6) Perfect

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
4	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
9	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
10	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
11	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
12	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
13	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
14	-	3	0.2 %	0.3%
15	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
16	-	2	0.1 %	0.2%
17	-	4	0.3 %	0.4%
18	-	3	0.2 %	0.3%
19	-	3	0.2 %	0.3%
20	-	4	0.3 %	0.4%



- Study 34263 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
21	-	4	0.3 %	0.4%
22	-	9	0.6 %	0.8%
23	-	12	0.8 %	1.1%
24	-	10	0.7 %	0.9%
25	-	12	0.8 %	1.1%
26	-	17	1.1 %	1.5%
27	-	19	1.2 %	1.7%
28	-	23	1.5 %	2.1%
29	-	22	1.4 %	2.0%
30	-	31	2.0 %	2.8%
31	-	28	1.8 %	2.5%
32	-	38	2.5 %	3.4%
33	-	53	3.5 %	4.8%
34	-	74	4.9 %	6.7%
35	-	72	4.7 %	6.5%
36	-	98	6.4 %	8.8%
37	-	80	5.3 %	7.2%
38	-	94	6.2 %	8.5%
39	-	97	6.4 %	8.7%
40	-	72	4.7 %	6.5%
41	-	82	5.4 %	7.4%
42	-	46	3.0 %	4.1%
43	-	49	3.2 %	4.4%
44	-	22	1.4 %	2.0%
45	-	14	0.9 %	1.3%
46	-	6	0.4 %	0.5%
-99 (M)	Phone	137	9.0 %	-
-9 (M)	Missing	272	17.9 %	-

Based upon 1112 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**CESD5**

**CESD SCALE [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER DEPRESSION]**

Location: 55-60 (width: 6; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

Range of Missing Values (M): -99.00 , -9.00

Question:

CESD: Scale scored 0 - 30, with higher scores indicating greater depression. (sum of 10 items)

- (0) Rarely or none of the time
- (1) Some or a little of the time
- (2) Moderate amount of the time

- Study 34263 -

(3) Most or all of the time

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0.00	-	159	10.5 %	11.4%
1.00	-	149	9.8 %	10.7%
1.11	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
2.00	-	178	11.7 %	12.7%
2.22	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
3.00	-	153	10.1 %	11.0%
3.33	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
4.00	-	144	9.5 %	10.3%
4.44	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
5.00	-	110	7.2 %	7.9%
5.56	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
6.00	-	81	5.3 %	5.8%
6.25	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
6.67	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
7.00	-	65	4.3 %	4.7%
8.00	-	74	4.9 %	5.3%
8.89	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
9.00	-	53	3.5 %	3.8%
10.00	-	47	3.1 %	3.4%
11.00	-	30	2.0 %	2.1%
11.11	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
12.00	-	30	2.0 %	2.1%
12.22	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
13.00	-	28	1.8 %	2.0%
13.33	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
14.00	-	16	1.1 %	1.1%
15.00	-	8	0.5 %	0.6%
15.56	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
16.00	-	9	0.6 %	0.6%
16.67	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
17.00	-	8	0.5 %	0.6%
17.78	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
18.00	-	11	0.7 %	0.8%
19.00	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
20.00	-	9	0.6 %	0.6%
21.00	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
22.00	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
23.00	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 34263 -

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
25.00	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
26.00	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
27.00	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
-99.00 (M)	Phone	112	7.4 %	-
-9.00 (M)	Missing	12	0.8 %	-

Based upon 1397 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**CBQ5 CONFLICT BEHAVIOR SCALE [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER CONFLICT]**

Location: 61-66 (width: 6; decimal: 2)

Variable Type: numeric

Range of Missing Values (M): -99.00 , -9.00

Question:

Conflict Behavior Questionnaire: Abbreviated CBQ by Prinz, Foster, Kent, and O'Leary, 1979. Scale scored 0 - 7, with higher scores indicating greater conflict. (sum of 7 items)

(0) Mostly false

(1) Mostly true

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
0.00	-	663	43.6 %	43.8%
1.00	-	394	25.9 %	26.0%
1.17	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
2.00	-	242	15.9 %	16.0%
2.33	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
3.00	-	122	8.0 %	8.1%
4.00	-	49	3.2 %	3.2%
4.67	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
5.00	-	20	1.3 %	1.3%
6.00	-	10	0.7 %	0.7%
7.00	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
-9.00 (M)	Missing	7	0.5 %	-

Based upon 1514 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**SPUB5 DAD/MOM ABOUT SON: PUBERTY SCALE [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER DEVELOPMENT]**

Location: 67-71 (width: 5; decimal: 1)

Variable Type: numeric

Range of Missing Values (M): -99.0 , -9.0

Question:

Pubertal Development Scale: Parent about son puberty. (Peterson, Crockett, Richards, and Boxer, 1987) Scale



- Study 34263 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1.2	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
1.4	-	4	0.3 %	0.6%
1.6	-	9	0.6 %	1.3%
1.8	-	17	1.1 %	2.5%
2.0	-	15	1.0 %	2.2%
2.2	-	14	0.9 %	2.0%
2.4	-	26	1.7 %	3.8%
2.6	-	44	2.9 %	6.4%
2.8	-	34	2.2 %	5.0%
3.0	-	47	3.1 %	6.9%
3.2	-	192	12.6 %	28.1%
3.4	-	100	6.6 %	14.6%
3.6	-	65	4.3 %	9.5%
3.8	-	56	3.7 %	8.2%
4.0	-	59	3.9 %	8.6%
-99.0 (M)	Phone	127	8.3 %	-
-9.0 (M)	Missing	711	46.7 %	-

Based upon 683 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**AS5 FEELINGS ABOUT CHILD SMOKING CIGS [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES MORE NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARDS USE]**

Location: 77-79 (width: 3; decimal: 0)  
 Variable Type: numeric  
 Range of Missing Values (M): -99 , -9  
 Question:

Parent Attitude About Child's Substance Use: Feelings about child smoking cigarettes. Scale scored 3 - 15, with higher scores indicating more negative attitude towards use. (sum of 3 items)

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Not sure
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly agree

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
3	-	13	0.9 %	0.9%
4	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
6	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
7	-	8	0.5 %	0.5%
9	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%

- Study 34263 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
10	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
11	-	32	2.1 %	2.1%
12	-	50	3.3 %	3.3%
13	-	72	4.7 %	4.8%
14	-	147	9.7 %	9.7%
15	-	1181	77.6 %	78.0%
-9 (M)	Missing	7	0.5 %	-

Based upon 1514 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**AA5 FEELINGS ABOUT CHILD DRINKING ALCOHOL [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES MORE NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARDS USE]**

Location: 80-82 (width: 3; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

Range of Missing Values (M): -99 , -9

Question:

Parent Attitude About Child's Substance Use: Feelings about child drinking alcohol. Scale scored 3 - 15, with higher scores indicating more negative attitude towards use. (sum of 3 items)

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Not sure
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly agree

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
3	-	11	0.7 %	0.7%
6	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
7	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
8	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
9	-	13	0.9 %	0.9%
10	-	15	1.0 %	1.0%
11	-	43	2.8 %	2.8%
12	-	83	5.5 %	5.5%
13	-	104	6.8 %	6.9%
14	-	138	9.1 %	9.1%
15	-	1092	71.8 %	72.0%
-9 (M)	Missing	5	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1516 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**AP5 FEELINGS ABOUT CHILD SMOKING MARIJUANA [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES MORE NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARDS USE]**

- Study 34263 -

Location: 83-85 (width: 3; decimal: 0)  
 Variable Type: numeric  
 Range of Missing Values (M): -99 , -9  
 Question:

Parent Attitude About Child's Substance Use: Feelings about child smoking marijuana. Scale scored 3 - 15, with higher scores indicating more negative attitude towards use. (sum of 3 items)

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Not sure
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly agree

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
3	-	11	0.7 %	0.7%
6	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
7	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
8	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
9	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
10	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
11	-	21	1.4 %	1.4%
12	-	49	3.2 %	3.2%
13	-	30	2.0 %	2.0%
14	-	70	4.6 %	4.6%
15	-	1317	86.6 %	86.8%
-9 (M)	Missing	4	0.3 %	-

Based upon 1517 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**OC5 HARMFULNESS OF SMOKING CIGARETTES [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER PERCEPTION OF HARM]**

Location: 86-88 (width: 3; decimal: 0)  
 Variable Type: numeric  
 Range of Missing Values (M): -99 , -9  
 Question:

Perceived Harmfulness of Substances: Smoking cigarettes. Scale scored 3 - 15, with higher scores indicating greater perception of harm. (sum of 3 items)

- (1) Not harmful
- (3) Somewhat harmful
- (5) Very harmful

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
6	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%

- Study 34263 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
7	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
8	-	6	0.4 %	0.4%
9	-	22	1.4 %	1.5%
10	-	29	1.9 %	1.9%
11	-	51	3.4 %	3.4%
12	-	186	12.2 %	12.3%
13	-	262	17.2 %	17.4%
14	-	265	17.4 %	17.6%
15	-	682	44.8 %	45.3%
-99 (M)	Phone	2	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Missing	12	0.8 %	-

Based upon 1507 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**OCT5 HARMFULNESS OF USING CHEWING TOBACCO [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER PERCEPTION OF HARM]**

Location: 89-91 (width: 3; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

Range of Missing Values (M): -99 , -9

Question:

Perceived Harmfulness of Substances: Chewing tobacco. Scale scored 3 - 15, with higher scores indicating greater perception of harm. (sum of 3 items)

- (1) Not harmful
- (3) Somewhat harmful
- (5) Very harmful

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
3	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
5	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
6	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
7	-	4	0.3 %	0.3%
8	-	14	0.9 %	0.9%
9	-	44	2.9 %	2.9%
10	-	43	2.8 %	2.9%
11	-	49	3.2 %	3.3%
12	-	227	14.9 %	15.1%
13	-	178	11.7 %	11.9%
14	-	210	13.8 %	14.0%
15	-	724	47.6 %	48.3%
-99 (M)	Phone	3	0.2 %	-
-9 (M)	Missing	18	1.2 %	-



- Study 34263 -

Based upon 1500 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**OAS HARMFULNESS OF DRINKING ALCOHOL [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER PERCEPTION OF HARM]**

Location: 92-94 (width: 3; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

Range of Missing Values (M): -99 , -9

Question:

Perceived Harmfulness of Substances: Drinking alcohol. Scale scored 3 - 15, with higher scores indicating greater perception of harm. (sum of 3 items)

- (1) Not harmful
- (3) Somewhat harmful
- (5) Very harmful

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%	Valid %
3	-	2	0.1 %	0.1%
4	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
5	-	12	0.8 %	0.8%
6	-	30	2.0 %	2.0%
7	-	53	3.5 %	3.5%
8	-	102	6.7 %	6.8%
9	-	242	15.9 %	16.0%
10	-	229	15.1 %	15.2%
11	-	237	15.6 %	15.7%
12	-	210	13.8 %	13.9%
13	-	161	10.6 %	10.7%
14	-	62	4.1 %	4.1%
15	-	169	11.1 %	11.2%
-99 (M)	Phone	1	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Missing	10	0.7 %	-

Based upon 1510 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**OI5 HARMFULNESS OF SNIFFING [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER PERCEPTION OF HARM]**

Location: 95-97 (width: 3; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

Range of Missing Values (M): -99 , -9

Question:

Perceived Harmfulness of Substances: Sniffing. Scale scored 3 - 15, with higher scores indicating greater perception of harm. (sum of 3 items)

- (1) Not harmful

- Study 34263 -

(3) Somewhat harmful  
(5) Very harmful

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
3	-	1	0.1 %	0.1%
9	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
10	-	3	0.2 %	0.2%
11	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
12	-	38	2.5 %	2.5%
13	-	28	1.8 %	1.9%
14	-	100	6.6 %	6.6%
15	-	1326	87.2 %	88.0%
-99 (M)	Phone	2	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Missing	13	0.9 %	-

Based upon 1506 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**OM5**

**HARMFULNESS OF SMOKING MARIJUANA [HIGHER SCORE INDICATES GREATER PERCEPTION OF HARM]**

Location: 98-100 (width: 3; decimal: 0)

Variable Type: numeric

Range of Missing Values (M): -99 , -9

Question:

Perceived Harmfulness of Substances: Smoking marijuana. Scale scored 3 - 15, with higher scores indicating greater perception of harm. (sum of 3 items)

(1) Not harmful  
(3) Somewhat harmful  
(5) Very harmful

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
3	-	13	0.9 %	0.9%
4	-	7	0.5 %	0.5%
5	-	14	0.9 %	0.9%
6	-	22	1.4 %	1.5%
7	-	23	1.5 %	1.5%
8	-	26	1.7 %	1.7%
9	-	102	6.7 %	6.8%
10	-	74	4.9 %	4.9%
11	-	87	5.7 %	5.8%
12	-	189	12.4 %	12.6%
13	-	141	9.3 %	9.4%
14	-	191	12.6 %	12.7%

- Study 34263 -

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
15	-	616	40.5 %	40.9%
-99 (M)	Phone	2	0.1 %	-
-9 (M)	Missing	14	0.9 %	-

Based upon 1505 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**COHORT**

**COHORT: GRADE AT T1**

Location: 101-101 (width: 1; decimal: 0)  
 Variable Type: numeric  
 Question: Cohort subject was a part of at T1.

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
1	Cohort 1	312	20.5 %	20.5%
2	Cohort 2	336	22.1 %	22.1%
3	Cohort 3	304	20.0 %	20.0%
4	Cohort 4	294	19.3 %	19.3%
5	Cohort 5	275	18.1 %	18.1%

Based upon 1521 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**GRADE5C**

**COHORT GRADE AT T5**

Location: 102-103 (width: 2; decimal: 0)  
 Variable Type: numeric  
 Question: Grade the subject was in at this time period.

<i>Value</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
6	312	20.5 %	20.5%
7	336	22.1 %	22.1%
8	304	20.0 %	20.0%
9	294	19.3 %	19.3%
10	275	18.1 %	18.1%

Based upon 1521 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.

**PHONES**

**TYPE OF ASSESSMENT**

Location: 104-106 (width: 3; decimal: 0)  
 Variable Type: numeric  
 Range of Missing Values (M): -99 , -9  
 Question: Did this interview take place over the phone?

<i>Value</i>	<i>Label</i>	<i>Unweighted Frequency</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Valid %</i>
0	Questionnaire	1377	90.5 %	90.5%
1	Phone	144	9.5 %	9.5%

- Study 34263 -

Based upon 1521 valid cases out of 1521 total cases.