

Appendices

Appendix A: Glossary of Statistical Symbols and Terms in this Report

Appendix B: Dissemination of Research Findings

Appendix C: Timeline for Measures

Appendix D: Measure Descriptions and Examples

Appendix E: Flow Charts of NEW VISTAS Data Management

Special Thanks

Research Team Members

Appendix A: Glossary of Statistical Symbols and Terms in this Report

TERM	NAME	DESCRIPTION
<i>M</i>	Sample Mean	The average of all scores reported by each case in the sample or category.
<i>t</i>	<i>t</i> -test statistic	<p>A statistical test used to determine whether the difference between two sample means is significantly different.</p> <p>Two variations of this test have been utilized in this analysis:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Independent Samples t-test</i>: compares the mean scores on a single variable from two different samples. 2. <i>Paired Samples t-test</i>: compares the mean scores on a single variable from the same sample.
<i>p</i>	Probability value	The probability that a statistical result would occur by chance. A probability value less than .050 (i.e., $p < .050$) would suggest that the probability of obtaining observed scores would occur fewer than five out of 100 times. Therefore, when probability values are less than .050, observed scores can be described as “significantly different” since there is a low likelihood of obtaining these observed scores by chance alone.
<i>F</i>	<i>F</i> -statistic; Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)	A statistical method used to determine whether several sample means on one or more variables are significantly different.
χ^2	Chi-Square statistic	A statistical method used to determine whether the number or percentage of cases falling into specified categories is significantly different than what is expected to occur.
<i>r</i>	Correlation statistic	A statistical method used to measure the level of association between two variables.
<i>(df)</i>	Degrees of freedom	Value associated with a statistical test that is used to determine the level of significance; this value is dependent on the number of cases and/or number of samples utilized in the statistical test.
<i>SD</i>	Standard Deviation	A measure of the spread/dispersion of scores around the mean score.

Appendix B: Dissemination of Research Findings

Conference Presentations

- Furlong, M. J., O'Brien, K. M., & Sharkey, J. D. (2003, April). *Assets and Risks Among Adolescents Involved in Delinquent Behavior: Understanding the Role of Gender and Age*. Paper presented at the National Association of School Psychologists conference, Toronto, Canada.
- Jimerson, S. R., O'Brien, K. M., Furlong, M. J., & Sharkey, J. D. (2003, April). *The Santa Barbara Assets and Risks Assessment: Development, Implementation, and Analyses*. Presented to the California Board of Correction, Sacramento, CA.
- Jimerson, S. R., O'Brien, K. M., Furlong, M. J., & Sharkey, J. D. (2003, March). *Assets and Risks Among Adolescents Involved in Delinquent Behavior: Understanding the Role of Gender and Age*. Paper presented at the California Association of School Psychologists conference, Los Angeles, CA.
- Jimerson, S. R., O'Brien, K. M., Sharkey, J. D., Sia, A. B., & Benoit, J. (2003, March). *The Relationship between Acculturation and Antisocial Behavior for Mexican American Adolescents*. Paper presented at the California Association of School Psychologists conference, Los Angeles, CA.
- O'Brien, K., Jimerson, S. R., Sharkey, J. D., Sia, A. B., & Benoit, J. (2003, March). *The Efficacy of a Comprehensive Intervention Program for Diverse At-Risk Adolescents. Michael Goodman Memorial Research Award winner*. Paper presented at the California Association of School Psychologists conference, Los Angeles, CA.
- Jimerson, S. R., O'Brien, K. M. (2003, February). *Overview of the Santa Barbara Assets and Risks Assessment and Preliminary Findings from NEW VISTAS*. Presented to the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors, Santa Barbara, CA.
- O'Brien, K. M. & Jimerson, S. R. (2002, July). *The Santa Barbara Assets and Risks Assessment: Data Designed to Facilitate Supervision and Services for At-Risk Adolescents*. Presented at the International School Psychology Association colloquium, Nyborg, Denmark.
- Jimerson, S. R., O'Brien, K. M., & Furlong, M. J. (2002, April). *Santa Barbara Challenge II-NEW VISTAS: Research Examining the Efficacy of A Neighborhood-Based, Family-Focused, Intervention Service Delivery Model for Adolescents in the Juvenile Justice System*. Presented to the Santa Barbara County Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council, Santa Barbara, CA.
- Furlong, M. J., O'Brien, K. M., Saxton, J. D., & Jimerson, S. R. (2002, March). *Using Assets to Enhance the Prediction of Antisocial Behavior*. Workshop presented at the California Association of School Psychologists Conference, Costa Mesa, CA.

- Jimerson, S. R., O'Brien, K. M., & Furlong, M. J. (2002, March). *An Overview of Research Examining the Efficacy of A Neighborhood-Based, Family-Focused, Intervention Service Delivery Model for Adolescents Involved in the Juvenile Justice System*. Presented at the CII Board Of Corrections Meeting, Santa Barbara, CA.
- O'Brien, K. M., Jimerson, S. R., Sia, A. B., Saxton, J. D., & Furlong, M. J. (2002, March). *Development of the Santa Barbara Assets and Risks Assessment*. Poster presented at the California Association of School Psychologists Conference, Sacramento, CA.
- O'Brien, K. M., Saxton, J. D., Jimerson, S. R., Sia, A. B., & Furlong, M. J. (2002, March). *Gender Differences and Delinquency: Identifying Appropriate Intervention Services*. Paper presented at the California Association of School Psychologists Conference, Sacramento, CA.
- Saxton, J. D., Furlong, M. J., & O'Brien, K. M. (2002, February). *Using Assets to Enhance the Prediction of Antisocial Behavior*. Paper presented at the National Association of School Psychologists Conference, Chicago, IL.
- O'Brien, K. M., Saxton, J. D., Jimerson, S. R., Anderson, G. E., & Furlong, M. J. (2001, April). *Exploring the School Environments of Adolescents on Probation: Analyses of Quantitative and Qualitative Data*. Paper presented at the National Association of School Psychologists Conference, Washington, DC.
- Saxton, J. D., O'Brien, K. M., & Anderson, G. E. (2001, April). *School Environments of Adolescents on Probation: Quantitative and Qualitative Data*. Poster presented at the National Association of School Psychologists Conference, Washington, DC.
- O'Brien, K., Saxton, J. D., Jimerson, S. R., Anderson, G. E., & Furlong, M. J. (2001, March). *School Environments of Adolescents on Probation: Quantitative and Qualitative Data*. Paper presented at the California Association of School Psychologists Conference, Costa Mesa, CA.
- Jimerson, S., O'Brien, K., Sia, A., Furlong, M., & Saxton, J. (2000, July). *A Transactional-Ecological, Strength-Based Perspective: Assessment of Assets and Risks Among Adolescents Involved in the Juvenile Justice System*. Workshop presented at the Santa Barbara County Probation Department, Santa Barbara, CA.
- O'Brien, K., Jimerson, S., Saxton, J., Anderson, G., Sharma, B., Casas, M., & Furlong, M. (2000, March). *Examining Predictors of Female Juvenile Delinquency: Results of Analyses Exploring Gender and Ethnicity of At-Risk Mexican-American and Caucasian Adolescents*. Paper presented at the California Association of School Psychologists Conference, Monterey, CA.

O'Brien, K., Jimerson, S., Saxton, J., Sharma, B., Furlong, M., & Casas, M. (2000, March). *From Profiles to predictors: Results of Analyses Exploring Gender and Ethnicity of At-Risk Mexican American and Caucasian Adolescents*. Presented at the meeting of the Society for Research in Adolescence, Chicago, IL.

Technical Reports

Jimerson, J. R., O'Brien, K. M., Furlong, M. J., Sharkey, J. D., Sia, A., & Graydon, K. (2003, February). *A four-year longitudinal study of a neighborhood-based, family-focused, intervention program: Preliminary analyses of at-risk youth and families*. Santa Barbara, CA: Santa Barbara Probation Department.

Jimerson, S. R., O'Brien, K. M., Furlong, M. J., Sharkey, J. D., Sia, A. (2002, August). *Characteristics and consequences associated with participation in a neighborhood-based, family-focused, intervention program: A preliminary analysis of at-risk youth and families*. Santa Barbara, CA: Santa Barbara Probation Department.

Jimerson, S. R., O'Brien, K. M., Furlong, M. J., Saxton, J. D. (2002, February). *Examining characteristics and outcomes among at-risk adolescents participating in a neighborhood-based, family-focused, intervention program*. Santa Barbara, CA: Santa Barbara Probation Department.

Jimerson, S. R., O'Brien, K. M., Furlong, M. J., Saxton, J. D. (2001, August). *Understanding the family, school, and neighborhood environments of at-risk adolescents participating in a neighborhood-based, family-focused, intervention program*. Santa Barbara, CA: Santa Barbara Probation Department.

Jimerson, S. R., O'Brien, K. M., Furlong, M. J., Saxton, J. D. (2001, February). *Profiles of adolescents at-risk for criminal activity participating in a neighborhood-based, family-focused, intervention program*. Santa Barbara, CA: Santa Barbara Probation Department.

NEW VISTAS Research & Evaluation Team (2000, August). *Santa Barbara NEW VISTAS Semi-Annual Report*. Report to the Board of Corrections regarding grant program progress.

Papers

Sharkey, J. D. (2003). *Examining the relationship between risk and protective factors and juvenile recidivism for male and female probationers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California.

Awards

2002 Challenge Research Award
California State Association of Counties

Appendix C: Timeline for Measures

Measure Name	Intake	Exit	FUP1	FUP2	FUP3
Adolescent Addiction Severity Instrument	X	X	X	X	X
Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans – II		X			
Alabama Parenting Questionnaire	X	X	X	X	X
Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale	X	X	X	X	X
Board of Corrections – Additional Data Elements	X	X			
Board of Corrections – Core Data Elements	X	X	X	X	X
Board of Corrections – School Data	X	X	X	X	X
Child Behavior Checklist	X	X	X	X	X
Client Satisfaction Questionnaire		X			
Community Policing Questionnaire	Time 1	Time 2	Time 3	Time 4	
Family Adaptability and Cohesiveness Evaluation Scale	X	X	X	X	X

Timeline for Measures Continued

Measure Name	Intake	Exit	FUP1	FUP2	FUP3
Family Satisfaction Questionnaire		X			
Healthy Kids Resilience Assessment	X	X	X	X	X
Juvenile Risk Assessment	X				
Parent-Adolescent Communication	X	X	X	X	X
Parenting Stress Index	X	X	X	X	X
Parent Substance Behaviors	X	X	X	X	X
Parent Substance Use	X	X	X	X	X
Youth Self-Report	X	X	X	X	X
Santa Barbara Assets and Risks Assessment	X				

Appendix D: Measure Descriptions and Examples

Adolescent Addiction Severity Instrument

Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans – II

Alabama Parenting Questionnaire

Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale

Board of Corrections – Additional Data Elements

Board of Corrections – Core Data Elements

Board of Corrections – School Data

Child Behavior Checklist

Client Satisfaction Questionnaire

Community Policing Questionnaire

Family Adaptability and Cohesiveness Evaluation Scale

Family Satisfaction Questionnaire

Healthy Kids Resilience Assessment

Juvenile Risk Assessment

Parent-Adolescent Communication

Parenting Stress Index

Parent Substance Behaviors

Parent Substance Use

Youth Self-Report

Santa Barbara Assets and Risks Assessment

Adolescent Addiction Severity Instrument. The AASI is a semi-structured interview designed to evaluate treatment outcomes for adolescents with drug and alcohol addictions (McLellan et al., 1992). Administered to youth, it addresses seven potential problem areas in substance abusing patients: medical status, employment and support, drug use, alcohol use, legal status, family/ social status, and psychiatric status. The AASI provides two types of scores: (a) severity ratings of the client's need for treatment derived by interviewer report and (b) composite scores for each of the seven potential problem areas that indicate problem severity during the prior 30 days as calculated by a computerized scoring program. The AASI has shown to be a highly reliable and valid assessment tool for treatment planning.

Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans - II (ARSMA-II). The ARSMA – II is a measure of acculturation developed specifically for use with Mexican American populations (Cuéllar, Arnold, & Maldonado, 1995). The measure consists of two sub-measures, one to measure a respondent's involvement with Mexican and American culture and another to measure a respondent's acceptance of Mexican and American attitudes and behaviors. Only the first measure was used for the current study. This section consists of 30 items assessing Mexican and American cultural practices (e.g., I enjoy listening to Spanish language music), language use and preference (e.g., I enjoy speaking English), ethnic identification (e.g., I associate with Mexicans and/or Mexican Americans) and social affiliation (e.g., My friends are now of Anglo origin). Youth respond to each question using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (not at all) to 5 (extremely often or almost always). A Mexican Orientation subscale score is subtracted from an Anglo Orientation subscale score to yield a linear acculturation score. This score can be translated to a 5 point scale: 1 (Very Mexican Oriented), 2 (Mexican Orient Bicultural), 3 (Slightly Anglo Orient Bicultural), 4 (Strongly Anglo Orient), and 5 (Very Assimilated). The overall internal consistency of the ARSMA was demonstrated to be .87 and the test-retest reliability to be .96 (Cuéllar et al. 1995).

Alabama Parenting Questionnaire (APQ). The APQ (Shelton, Frick, & Wootton, 1996) is a self-report measure completed by parents and children that assesses parental involvement, discipline, and monitoring of their children. The original instrument consists of six scales: Positive Parenting, Poor Monitoring/Supervision, Inconsistent Discipline, Involvement, Corporal Punishment, and Other Discipline Practices. For the purposes of the current study, only the first three scales were used, consisting of 23 items. Youth respond to each question using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always). The Positive Parenting scale measures what types encouragement and support parents provide their children (e.g., “You praise your child if he/she behaves well” and “You hug or kiss your child when he/she has done something well.”) Shelton et al. (1996) found the internal consistency alpha for this subscale to be .80 for parent questionnaire format and .90 for child questionnaire format. The Poor Monitoring/Supervision scale measures whether parents know where their children are and whom they are with (e.g., “Your child is out with friends you do not know” and “Your child is at home without adult supervision”). Shelton et al. (1996) found the internal consistency alpha to be .67 for parent questionnaire format and .69 for child questionnaire format. The Inconsistent Discipline scale measures inconsistently parents reinforce discipline with their children (e.g., “The punishment you give your child depends on your mood” and “You let your child out of a punishment early”). Shelton et al. (1996) found the internal consistency alpha to be .76 for adult questionnaire format and .56 for child questionnaire format.

Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale (BERS). The BERS (Epstein & Sharma, 1998) is a 52-item, standardized, norm-referenced scale that is completed by parents. The BERS measures five aspects of the behavioral and emotional strengths of children and adolescents aged 5 years 0 months to 18 years 11 months. Parents respond to each question using a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (not at all like my child) to 4 (very much like my child). The Interpersonal Strength subscale measures a youth's ability to control his or her emotions or behaviors in social situations (e.g., "Uses anger management skills," and "Considers consequences of own behavior"). It has an internal consistency alpha of .96 and a test-retest reliability of .86. The Family Involvement subscale measures a child's participation in and involvement with his or her family (e.g., "Demonstrates a sense of belonging to family," and "Interacts positively with parents"). It has an internal consistency alpha of .93 and a test-retest reliability of .99. The School Functioning subscale measures competence in school and classroom tasks (e.g., "Pays attention in class," and "Completes a task on first request"). It has an internal consistency alpha of .91 and a test-retest reliability of .95. The Intrapersonal Strength subscale measures a youth's outlook on his or her competence and accomplishments (e.g., "Is self-confident," and "Demonstrates a sense of humor"). It has an internal consistency alpha of .91 and a test-retest reliability of .93. Finally, the Affective Strength subscale measures the ability of a child to accept affection from others and express feelings towards others (e.g., "Accepts a hug," and "Asks for help"). It has an internal consistency alpha of .90 and a test-retest reliability of .85. The BERS also provides an overall Strength Quotient made up of all items on the scale. The Strength Quotient is the most reliable of all scales, with an internal consistency alpha of .98 and a test-retest reliability of .99. This measure was adapted so that the youths in the study could also complete the measure. There are no reliability and validity data available for this procedure.

Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL). The CBCL is a standardized measure designed for parents to report about a variety of their child's problem behaviors (Achenbach, 1991). Parents respond to each question using a 3-point Likert scale, ranging from 0 (not true) to 2 (very true or often true). The original instrument contains eight subscales: Withdrawn Behavior, Somatic Complaints, Anxious/Depressed, Delinquent Behavior, Aggressive Behavior, Social Problems, Thought Problems, and Attention Problems. For the purposes of the current study, only the first five subscales were used, for a total of 64 items. Three subscales characterize internal feelings and are clustered within an Internalizing grouping: Withdrawn Behavior (9 items; e.g., "Would rather be alone than with other" and "Secretive"), Somatic Complaints (9 items; e.g., "Feels Dizzy" and "Overtired"), and Anxious/ Depressed (14 items; e.g., "Complains of loneliness" and "Feels he/she has to be perfect"). The test-retest reliability for the Internalizing grouping was .89 and for individual subscales within this grouping ranged from .82 to .85. Two subscales characterize external behaviors and are clustered within an Externalizing Behavior grouping: Delinquent Behavior (13 items; e.g., "Lying or cheating" and "Steals outside of home") and Aggressive Behavior (19 items; e.g., "Argues a lot" and "Cruelty, bullying, or meanness to others"). The test-retest reliability for the Externalizing grouping was .93 and for individual subscales within this grouping were .86 and .91 respectively.

Client Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ). Based on a questionnaire developed by Attkisson and Greenfield (1999), the CSQ is a self-report form that was developed in order to gain an understanding of how satisfied youth participants are about services they received. The goal of this survey is to gain information in order to improve program services based on youth feedback. Youth reported on how much they liked the help they received, the desirability of the help, the amount of help (i.e., whether they needed more help than they received and whether they received too much assistance), and the efficacy of the help they received. The total questionnaire consists of 11 questions. Youth responded to the first eight questions using various 4-point Likert scales and to the last three questions in an open-ended format.

Community Policing Questionnaire (CPQ). The CPQ is a city-level crime victimization survey that was developed through a collaborative effort between the Bureau of Justice Statistics and Community Oriented Policing Services (Smith, Steadman, Minton, & Townsend, 1999). Specific questions were adapted from policing surveys in a number of cities in order to measure victimization, community attitudes, and attitudes towards the police and community policing. To assess the simultaneous impact of Challenge II on neighborhood crime victimization, a modified version of the CPQ was completed by a representative sample of the families living in the targeted neighborhoods. In consultation with probation staff, staff of community agencies, and neighborhood residents, the CPQ was modified to provide the most efficient and effective measurement tool for gathering information on neighborhood crime. The Challenge II CPQ includes 12 questions regarding the types of crimes occurring in the neighborhood (e.g., Have any serious crimes occurred in your neighborhood in the past 12 months?), 3 questions about neighborhood satisfaction and fear (e.g., How fearful are you about crime in your neighborhood?), and 11 questions each regarding satisfaction with police and probation services (How much work are police doing with the residents of your neighborhood to prevent crime and safety problems?).

Family Adaptability and Cohesiveness Evaluation Scale (FACES II). The FACES-II is a 30-item self-report measure that assesses family adaptability and family cohesion (Olson, Portner, & Bell, 1982). Youth and parents respond to each question using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (almost never) to 5 (almost always). The Cohesion subscale is made up of 16 items and measures whether families are separated or connected in their emotional bonding to each other. Item categories within this subscale include Emotional Bonding, Family Boundaries, Coalitions, Time, Space, Friends, Decision-Making, and Interests and Recreation. Sample questions are “It is easier to discuss problems with people outside the family than with other family members” and “Our family does things together.” The Cohesion subscale has an internal consistency alpha of .87 and a four to five week test-retest of .83. The Adaptability subscale is made up of the remaining 14 items and measures the extent to which the family is flexible in response to change. Item categories include Assertiveness, Leadership, Discipline, Negotiation, Roles, and Rules. Sample questions are “In our family, it is easy for everyone to express his/her opinion” and “Each family member has input regarding major family decisions.” The Adaptability subscale has an internal consistency alpha of .78 and a four to five week test-retest reliability of .80.

Family Satisfaction Questionnaire (FSQ). The FSQ is the parent version of the Client Satisfaction Questionnaire, based on the same questionnaire developed by Attkisson and Greenfield (1999). The goal of this survey was to gain information in order to improve program services based on parent feedback. Parents report on the quality of the services received, the desirability of those services, the utility of services, whether they would recommend the program to friends, satisfaction with amount of help provided by the program, the efficacy of the services, overall satisfaction with the services, and whether they would return to the program if given the chance. The total questionnaire consists of 11 questions. Parents respond to the first eight questions using various 4-point Likert scales and to the last three questions in an open-ended format.

Healthy Kids Resilience Assessment (HKRA). The HKRA (Constantine, Benard, & Diaz, 1999) is an optional self-report module of the California Healthy Kids Survey, a comprehensive assessment of youth health risk behavior. The six clusters of the HKRA were designed to allow educators to better understand what resilience factors are associated with positive youth growth and development. Three clusters measure external influences considered to be protective factors within home, school, community and peer domains: Caring Relationships (e.g., “In my home there is a parent or some other adult who is interested in my school work”), High Expectations (e.g., “At my school, there is a teacher or some other adult who tells me when I do a good job”), and Meaningful Participation (e.g., “Outside of my home and school, I take lessons in music, art, sports, or a hobby”). Three clusters measure internal influences considered to be resilience traits: Social Competence (e.g., “I enjoy helping others”), Autonomy and Sense of Self (e.g., “I try to do what is fair”), and Sense of Meaning and Purpose (e.g., “There will always be people in my life who I can count on”). Within each of the six clusters are two to four subscales. Both Caring Relationships and High Expectations clusters are made up of four similarly titled subscales: Adults in Home, Adults in School, Adults in Community, and Peers. Meaningful Participation is made up of the same subscales, without Peers. Social Competence is made up of three subscales: Cooperation and Communication Skills, Empathy and Respect, and Problem Solving Skills. Autonomy and Sense of Self is made up of three subscales: Personal Conviction, Self-efficacy, and Self-awareness. Finally, Sense of Meaning and Purpose is made up of two subscales, Optimism and Goals and Achievement Motivation. Youth respond to each of 65 items using a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (not at all true) to 4 (very much true). After preliminary analyses of sample questions, items were condensed based on the strength of internal consistency alphas. Items for the Meaningful Participation in the Community were replaced with new items to be tested. Internal consistency alphas for the remaining subscales ranged from .55 to .88 with a median of .72 (Constantine et al., 1999). Validity analyses and test-retest reliability analyses are currently underway.

Juvenile Risk Assessment. Santa Barbara County's Juvenile Risk Assessment is based on an assessment developed and used by Orange County Probation Department in order to evaluate which youths, after referral to probation for a first offense, are at most risk to re-offend. Through a series of studies, researchers associated with Orange County determined 10 items to have the best predictive capability: (a) prior record, (b) institutional commitment, (c) age at intake, (d) drug abuse, (e) alcohol abuse, (f) parental control, (g) school/employment discipline problems, (h) learning problems, (i) runaway/escape behavior, and (j) negative peer influence (Baird, 1984). For each item, answers are assigned a weighted score, and these item scores are added together to yield a total risk score. Weightings were assigned such that discrimination between groups based on probabilities of reoffense was maximized (see Baird, 1984). For example, on the drug abuse item, "no known use" is scored as a "0," "occasional use" is scored as a "1," and "dependency" is scored as a "5." Youths with a total score on the Juvenile Risk Assessment between 0 and 5 are considered to be at low risk of reoffending, those with scores between 6 and 14 are considered to be at medium risk, and those with scores 15 or higher are considered to be at high risk (Santa Barbara County Probation Department, 1998). The Santa Barbara County Probation Department adopted this measure, creating an instructional booklet guiding its use. It states that a probation officer use all available information in order to rate the youth's level of risk, including court reports, police reports, interviews, and records checks.

Parent-Adolescent Communication (PAC). The PAC is a 20-item self-report measure that assesses youth and parent perceptions of how they communicate within their parent-child relationships (Barnes & Olson, 1985). Youth and parents respond to each question using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Through use of two subscales, the PAC measures both positive (i.e. Open Family Communication) and negative (i.e. Problems in Family Communication) aspects of communication. The Open Communication subscale consists of 10 items and focuses on the freedom to exchange both factual and emotional information as well as the degree of satisfaction experienced within parent-child interactions. Sample items are “I find it easy to talk with my mother/father/child” and “If I were in trouble I could tell my mother/father/child.” This subscale had an internal consistency alpha of .87. The Problems in Family Communication scale consists of 10 items and focuses on negative styles of interaction and hesitancy to share. Sample items are “I am sometimes afraid to ask my mother/father/child for what I want” and “I am careful about what I say to my mother/father/child.” This subscale had an internal consistency alpha of .78.

Parent Substance Use (PSU). The PSU was developed by UCSB research team members in order to provide data about parent substance use behaviors. Respondents note the number of times in their lifetime and the past 30 days they had used specific substances ranging from alcohol to Heroin. Route of administration and date of last use were included in this report. The measure also questioned parents about the extent to which various substances has been a problem in their lives, and whether or not they had received treatment for such substance abuse problems. Questions were modeled after the Addiction Severity Instrument, which is a measure designed to evaluate treatment outcomes for adults with drug and alcohol addictionzxs.


Parent Substance Behavior (PSB). The PSB was developed by UCSB research team members in order to reflect the American Psychological Association's definition of substance abuse. Twelve items were created in order to measure substance abuse behaviors within a respondent's lifetime, the past year, and past month. A sample item is, "Have there ever been significant periods of time during which you continued to use a substance while in situations that were physically dangerous or hazardous?" Responses were "Yes," or "No," for each time period. No reliability or validity data are available for this measure as it was created specifically for use in this project.

Parenting Stress Index (PSI). One use of the Parenting Stress Index (Abidin, 1995) is to conduct research examining how stress affects parent-child interactions in relation to other psychological variables. The measure consists of various subscales evaluating Total Stress, Child Domain, Parent Domain, and Life Stress. For the purposes of the current study, only the Life Stress subscale was used. This scale, completed by parents, consists of 19 items about stressful events that may have happened to the family in the last 12 months. Events include “Divorce”, “Marriage”, “Promotion at Work”, and “Death of Immediate Family Member.” Parents respond Yes if they have experienced the event within the specified time period and No if they have not. Scores are weighted according to how much stress each event has been found to add to a family life. For instance, Divorce was given a score of “7” for a “Yes” answer and Legal Problems a score of “2” for a “Yes” answer. A total score of 17 or greater on this scale is considered significant. Reliabilities are not available for the Life Stress Scale. Four items not included in the actual scale were added for NV purposes in order to gain additional information about the NV population: Chronic Illness, Homelessness, Gang involvement, and Incarceration. However, these items were not included in the total scale score.


Santa Barbara Assets and Risks Assessment (SB ARA). The SB ARA is an instrument designed to improve the efficiency of services provided by the probation department with the goal of preventing reoffense among juvenile offenders (O'Brien, Jimerson, Saxton, & Furlong, 2001). Through a review of relevant theoretical orientations, previous research findings, case study interviews, and probation interviews a number of asset and risk factors associated with juvenile delinquency were compiled for use in the measure. The SB ARA is unique in its focus on items relevant to both males and females and its equal focus on assets and risks. The SB ARA consists of 56 items within 12 domains: Parent-Child Relationships, Family Criminality, Family Substance Abuse, Family Mental Health, Individual Factors, Individual Criminality, Individual Substance Use, Community Factors, Peer Factors, School Factors, Sexual Activity, and History of Trauma. Each item has a continuum of response, ranging from high risk to strong asset. For example, within School Factors, Excellent Attendance would be scored as a strong asset while Unacceptable Attendance (truancy) would be scored as a high risk. Not all items cover the full range of asset to risk. For example, gang involvement ranges from Neutral to High Risk. The SB ARA includes two subscales: Assets, which is a sum of all items scored in the asset range, and Risks, which is a sum of all items scored in the risk range. A Total score, which is the Risk score subtracted from the Asset score, is available as well. The SB ARA is completed by a professional trained in its use, such as a probation officer, based on data compiled from a variety of available sources. The main source of information is an interview with youth and parents, but professionals are encouraged to seek information from schools, community centers, other family members, and other professionals involved with the youth. Pilot studies are underway in order to test the reliability and validity of the SB ARA.

Youth Self-Report (YSR). The YSR is a standardized self-report measure completed by youths ages 11 to 18 years old. At a fifth grade reading level, it can either be completed independently by the youth, or administered orally to the youth. Youths respond to each question using a 3-point Likert scale, ranging from 0 (not true) to 2 (very true or often true). The original instrument contains eight subscales: Withdrawn Behavior, Somatic Complaints, Anxious/Depressed, Delinquent Behavior, Aggressive Behavior, Social Problems, Thought Problems, and Attention Problems. For the purposes of the current study, only the first five subscales were used, for a total of 62 items. Three subscales characterize internal feelings and are clustered within an Internalizing grouping: Withdrawn Behavior (7 items; e.g., “I would rather be alone than with others” and “I am secretive or keep things to myself”), Somatic Complaints (9 items; e.g., “I feel dizzy” and “I feel tired”), and Anxious/ Depressed (16 items; e.g., “I feel lonely” and “I feel that I have to be perfect”). The test-retest reliability for the Internalizing grouping was .80 and for individual subscales within this grouping ranged from .65 to .81. Two subscales characterize external behaviors and are clustered within an Externalizing Behavior grouping: Delinquent Behavior (11 items; e.g., “I lie or cheat” and “I steal at home”) and Aggressive Behavior (19 items; e.g., “I argue a lot” and “I physically attack people”). The one-week test-retest reliability for the Externalizing grouping was .81 and for individual subscales within this grouping were .72 and .79 respectively.


YOUTH INTAKE




Primary Caregiver 1 Intake



BOC CDE Intake



Primary Caregiver 2 Intake



Community Times 1-3

