



Exploring, Understanding, Overcoming

Life Paths Measurement Packet: Finalized Scales

Sherry Hamby

Sewanee, the University of the South

John Grych

Marquette University

Victoria Banyard

University of New Hampshire

Finalized scales, August, 2015

SEWANEE
THE UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH

Prepared with the assistance of:

Lindsey Roberts

Elizabeth Taylor

Matthew Hagler

Wojciech Kaczkowski

and

Jennifer Engle

Daniel McKelvey

Jordan Rothschild

Peter Thomas

Lindsay Selden

Jessica Deimler

Marcela Weber

Suggested citation:

Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program.

Online at: <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

All new material © 2013, 2015 Sherry Hamby, John Grych, Victoria Banyard.

Permission is granted to use our new scales without fee so long as appropriate citation to the source is given. We also grant permission to use our simplified wording of other items but recommend prospective users also contact the original authors.

We are happy to have typos identified or answer questions:

sherry.hamby@sewanee.edu or lifepaths@sewanee.edu.

This work was made possible through the support of a grant from the John Templeton Foundation.

The opinions expressed in this booklet are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the John Templeton Foundation.

CONCEPTUAL OVERVIEW OF MEASURES

SECTION 1: LAWS OF LIFE ESSAY AND OTHER NARRATIVES

Narrative Engagement Index (Hamby, Banyard, & Grych, 2013; Roberts, Hamby, Grych, & Banyard 2015)
 Laws of Life Essay Program: Participation Characteristics, Topic, & Impact (Hamby, Banyard, & Grych, 2013; some adapted from Pennebaker, Colder, & Sharp, 1990)

SECTION 2: STRENGTHS

Purpose: To assess the density and diversity of (relatively) stable characteristics, resources & behavior patterns:

- a) Provide an assessment of character as an outcome for narrative character development programs.
- b) Assess possible preventive effects against adversity, i.e., assess whether individuals with more of these resources experience less adversity.
- c) Facilitate resilience by examining whether the impact of adversity is minimized for individuals with more of these.

2A. REGULATORY STRENGTHS:

Anger Management Scale, Brief Trait Version (Hamby, Stith, Grych, & Banyard, 2013)

Coping: Appraisal and Behaviors (Hamby, Grych, & Banyard, 2013)

Endurance: Psychological Endurance Scale (Hamby, Grych, & Banyard, 2013; Partially adapted from Zimbardo & Boyd, 1999)

Emotional Awareness (adapted from Gratz & Roemer, 2004)

Emotional Regulation (adapted from Gratz & Roemer, 2004)

Honesty (adapted from Ashton & Lee, 2009)

2B. MEANING MAKING STRENGTHS:

Meaning Making (Banyard, Hamby, & Grych, 2013; Hamby, Thomas, Banyard, de St. Aubin, & Grych, 2015)

Subscales:

- Family Care
- Moral
- Other-Oriented
- Self-Oriented

Optimism (Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 1994)

Purpose (Steger, Frazier, Oishi, & Kaler, 2006; partially adapted from Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 1994)

Religious Meaning Making (partially adapted from Amato, 1990; Levin, Markides, & Ray, 1996; Pargament, Smith, Koenig & Perez, 1998; Putney & Middleton, 1961)

2C. INTERPERSONAL STRENGTHS:

Attachment—Maternal (adapted from Furman & Buhrmester, 2009)

Attachment—Paternal (adapted from Furman & Buhrmester, 2009)

Attachment—Romantic (adapted from Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000)

Compassion (Hamby, Grych, & Banyard, 2013; partially adapted from McCullough et al., 2002; Pommier, 2010; Sprecher & Fehr, 2005)

Community Support (adapted from Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997; U.S. Air Force, 2011)

Forgiveness (adapted from Gordon & Baucom, 2003)

Generative Roles (Hamby, Thomas, Banyard, de St. Aubin, & Grych, 2015)
 Generativity (adapted from McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992)
 Generous Behaviors (Banyard, Hamby, & Grych, 2013; Hamby, Thomas, Banyard, de St. Aubin, & Grych, 2015; partially adapted from Amato, 1990)
 Relationship Quality (Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000; Gordon & Baucom, 2003; Norton, 1983)
 Social Support—Friends & Adults (adapted from Turner, Finkelhor, & Ormrod, 2010; Zimet et al., 1988)
 Social Support—Immediate Family (Hamby, Grych, & Banyard, 2013; adapted from Turner et al., 2010; Zimet et al., 1988)
 Workplace Integration (Roberts, Hamby, Grych, & Banyard, 2015; adapted from U.S. Air Force, 2011)

SECTION 3: ADVERSITIES THAT CHALLENGE CHARACTER & COPING

“The ultimate measure of a [person] is not where he stands in moments of comfort and convenience, but where he stands at times of challenge and controversy.” Martin Luther King, Jr.

Adverse Life Events Index (Turner et al., 2013)
 Financial Strain Index (Hamby, Turner, & Finkelhor, 2011)
 Partner Victimization Scale (Hamby, 2015)
 Victimization: Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire—Key Domains Short Form (adapted from Finkelhor et al., 2005; Hamby, et al., 2011) — separated into three key domains:
 - Caregiver Maltreatment Subscale
 - Exposure to Domestic Violence Subscale
 - Peer and Community Subscale

SECTION 4: WELL-BEING & OTHER OUTCOMES (Psychological, Physical, & Spiritual)

Alcohol Misuse – Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test-Short Form (AUDIT-SF) (adapted from Babor, de la Fuente, Saunders, & Grant, 1992)
 Delinquency (adapted from Cuevas, Finkelhor, Turner, & Ormrod, 2007; Loeber & Dishion, 1983)
 Mental Health – Mental Health Symptoms (note: see Briere, 1996 and Finkelhor, Hamby, Ormrod, & Turner, 2007)
 Posttraumatic Growth – Posttraumatic Growth Inventory (adapted from Tedeschi & Calhoun, 1996)
 Physical Well-Being – Health Related Quality of Life (adapted from U.S. Centers for Disease Control, 2000)
 Spiritual Well-Being – The Awe Index (Hamby, Grych, & Banyard, 2013)
 Subjective Well-Being – (adapted from Battista & Almond, 1973; Diener, Emmons, Larson, & Griffin, 1985; Turner et al., 2012)

SECTION 5: DEMOGRAPHICS

Demographics (age, relationship status, employment status, etc.) (Hamby, Grych, & Banyard, 2013)

Alphabetical List of Scales

- Adverse Life Events Index (Turner et al., 2013)
- Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test – Short Form (AUDIT-SF) (adapted from Babor et al., 1992)
- Anger Management – Anger Management – Brief Trait Version (Hamby, Stith, Grych, & Banyard, 2013)
- Attachment—Maternal (adapted from Furman & Buhrmester, 2009)
- Attachment—Paternal (adapted from Furman & Buhrmester, 2009)
- Attachment—Romantic (adapted from Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000)
- Community Support (Hamby, Grych, & Banyard, 2015; Sampson et al., 1997; U.S. Air Force, 2011)
- Compassion (partially adapted from McCullough et al., 2002; Pommier, 2010; Sprecher & Fehr, 2005)
- Coping (partially adapted from Holahan & Moos, 1987; from Spitzberg & Copach, 2008)
- Delinquency (adapted from Cuevas, Finkelhor, Turner, & Ormrod, 2007; Loeber & Dishion, 1983)
- Demographics (Hamby, Grych, & Banyard, 2013)
- Emotional Awareness (adapted from Gratz & Roemer, 2004)
- Emotional Regulation (adapted from Gratz & Roemer, 2004)
- Endurance – Psychological Endurance Scale (partially adapted from Zimbardo & Boyd, 1999)
- Financial Strain Index (Hamby, Turner, & Finkelhor, 2011)
- Forgiveness (adapted from Gordon & Baucom, 2003)
- Generative Roles (Banyard, Hamby, Grych, 2013; Hamby, Thomas, Banyard, de St. Aubin, & Grych, 2015)
- Generativity (McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992)
- Generous Behaviors (Banyard, Hamby, & Grych, 2013; Hamby, Thomas, Banyard, de St. Aubin, & Grych, 2015; partially adapted from Amato, 1990)
- Honesty (adapted from Ashton & Lee, 2009)
- Laws of Life Essay Program: Participation Characteristics, Topic, & Impact (Hamby, Banyard, & Grych, 2013; partially adapted from Pennebaker, Colder, & Sharp, 1990)
- Meaning Making (Banyard, Hamby, & Grych, 2013; Hamby, Thomas, Banyard, de St. Aubin, & Grych, 2015)
- Family Care
 - Morals
 - Other Oriented
 - Self Oriented
- Narrative Engagement Index (Roberts, Hamby, Grych, & Banyard, 2015)
- Optimism (adapted from Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 1994)
- Partner Victimization (Hamby, 2013)
- Physical Well-being – Health Related Quality of Life (adapted from CDC, 2000)
- Posttraumatic Growth (adapted from Tedeschi & Calhoun, 1996)
- Purpose (Steger, Frazier, Oishi, & Kaler, 2006; Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 1994)
- Relationship Quality (adapted from Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000; Gordon & Baucom, 2003; Norton, 1983)
- Religious Meaning (from Amato, 1990; Levin, et al, 1996; Pargament, et al., 1998; Putney & Middleton, 1961)
- Social Support—Friends & Adults (adapted from Turner, Finkelhor, & Ormrod, 2010; Zimet et al., 1988)
- Social Support—Immediate Family (adapted from Hamby, Grych, & Banyard, 2013; Turner et al., 2010; Zimet et al., 1988)
- Spiritual Well-Being – The Awe Index (Hamby, Grych, & Banyard, 2013)
- Subjective Well-Being (from Battista & Almond, 1973; Diener, et al., 1985; Pavot & Diener, 1993; Pearlin & Schooler, 1978; from Rosenberg, 1965; Turner et al. 2012)
- Victimization – Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire-Key Domains Short Form (adapted from Finkelhor, Hamby, Turner, & Ormrod, 2005; Hamby et al., 2004)
- Caregiver Maltreatment
 - Exposure to Domestic Violence
 - Peer and Community
 - Follow-up questions
- Workplace Integration—General (adapted from U.S. Air Force, 2011; Roberts, Hamby, Grych, & Banyard, 2015)

Overview of Method for All Psychometric Data Reported Here

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted to assess reliability and validity of our new and adapted measures. For the pilot study, 104 pairs of participants were recruited through advertising and word-of-mouth, using a local classifieds email list and local contacts. Participants were asked to bring "someone who knew them well" to participate in the study as an informant. The main participant from each pair answered questions about himself/herself, while the study partner answered questions about the main participant on a subset of the measures.

People who had been in middle school or high school in the last 25 years were recruited to be the primary participant; the study partners could be any age. Both participants were offered a \$40 Wal-Mart gift card to thank them for their time.

Interviewers offered to meet participants in various places throughout the community (including our research center, other campus locations, and participants' homes), during daytime or evening hours. This flexibility allowed people with limited availability (and limited transportation) an opportunity to participate. The survey was offered on project laptops, and the survey software was specifically chosen to operate without internet connectivity so that the data collection would not be limited to settings with internet access.

Average age of pilot participants was 28.3 years (SD 11.7). The sample was 65% female. 31% were currently married, 39% were single, never married, with the rest in other relationship statuses. Median relationship length for those with a partner was 4 to 6 years. Median educational attainment was high school graduate. 91% of the sample described themselves as White, which is close to Census data for this rural, Appalachian community. Median household income was \$30,000 to less than \$40,000 per year. More than a 1/3 of this sample (35%) had total household incomes of less than \$20,000 per year.

Main Study

Participants were 2,565 individuals from the Appalachian region of 3 Southern states. The sample was 63.9% female. The sample included adolescents (age 12 and over) and adults, with an average age of 30.0 years (SD 13.2) and a median age of 27. Educational status included 18% who were still in middle or high school, 35% who had a high school diploma or equivalent, 7% with less than a high school education (and not currently in school), 19% with some college but no degree, 8% with an associate's degree, 8% with a bachelor's degree, and 5% with more than a bachelor's degree. Almost 2 in 5 (39%) of the sample reported household income less than \$20,000 per year, 36% earned \$20,000 to \$50,000, and 25% of the sample earned more than \$50,000 per year. More than a 1/3 of the sample (36%) receives some form of public assistance. The sample identified as 76% White/European-American (non-Latino), 12% Black/African-American (non-Latino), 6% Latino (any race), 1% American Indian/Alaska Native, 0.6% Asian, 0.3% Pacific Islander, and 4% multiracial.

Procedure

The majority of participants (76%) were recruited at local community events, such as festivals and county fairs. Word-of-mouth was the second most productive recruitment strategy, accounting for 12% of participants. The remaining 12% were recruited through other strategies, including flyers, newspaper and radio ads, and direct mail. This wide range of recruitment strategies allowed us to reach segments of the population who are rarely included in psychology research. Technical problems (such as iPads overheating) and time limitations prevented some individuals from completing the survey; overall, the completion rate was 85% and the median completion time was 53 minutes. This is an excellent result by current survey standards, especially considering the survey length, with current completion rates often under 70% (Abt SRBI, 2012) and sometimes under 50% (Galesic & Bosnjak, 2009). All participants received a \$30 Walmart gift card and information on local resources. All procedures in both studies were conducted in accordance with APA ethical principles and approved by the IRB of the study's home institution.

Analyses

We conducted exploratory factor analyses at the domain level (regulatory, meaning making, interpersonal and outcomes) to explore how these constructs performed in this sample and, where possible, as a data reduction technique to minimize the overlap among measures and to identify items to eliminate in future research. The scales presented here are the ones that emerged from this process. Earlier versions of the Life Paths Measurement Packet included all items in the survey, organized by originally published scale or construct. The survey as a whole has a 6th grade reading level based on Flesch-Kincaid readability score.

Adverse Lifetime Events
Turner et al., 2013

Stressful life events are common challenges to character and coping and a frequent theme in expressive writing. The Life Paths measure is adapted from the National Survey for Children's Exposure to Violence (NatSCEV; Turner et al., 2013). The original measure contains 16 items, of which we chose 11 to best suit our target population.

Reliability & validity: Because experiencing one adversity (such as a fire) does not necessarily indicate increased likelihood of another (such as an illness), we follow the standard for this type of measure and no internal consistency is reported. The scale is correlated with related constructs such as financial strain.

Scoring: An answer of "yes" is assigned a value of 1, while an answer of "no" is assigned a value of 0. Answers are then summed, with a higher score indicating more exposure to non-violent adversity over the lifetime.

Citation: Turner, H. A., Shattuck, A., Hamby, S., & Finkelhor, D. (2013). Community disorder, victimization exposure, and mental health in a national sample of youth. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 54(2), 258-275. doi: 10.13140/RG.2.1.3842.5762

Life Paths version: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

Now I'd like to ask you about some experiences that you may have had. Some of these things happen to most people at one time or another, while some happen to only a few people. I'd like to know about things that have happened to you in your lifetime.

1. In your whole life, were you ever in a very bad fire, flood, tornado, hurricane, earthquake or other disaster? This would be a time that your home was damaged and you might have had to live somewhere else for a while.
Yes 1
No 0
2. Did you ever have a very bad accident or illness (for example, at home, school, or in a car) where you had to go to the hospital and stay at least two nights? Has that ever happened?
Yes 1
No 0
3. Has someone you were really close to ever had a very bad accident or illness where they had to spend at least two nights in the hospital? This would be someone important to you, like a parent, brother or sister, or best friend.
Yes 1
No 0
4. Did you ever have anyone close to you die because of an illness or an accident?
Yes 1
No 0
5. Did you ever have to do a school year over again?
Yes 1
No 0
6. Have there ever been any times when your mother, father, or guardian lost a job or couldn't find work?
Yes 1
No 0
7. At any time in your life did a parent, step-parent, or guardian ever have to go to prison or jail?
Yes 1
No 0
8. Has there ever been a time that a member of your family drank or used drugs so often that it caused problems?
Yes 1
No 0
9. Has there ever been a time when your parents or step-parents were arguing, yelling, and angry at one another a lot of the time?
Yes 1

No 0

10. Has someone close to you ever tried to kill him or herself on purpose (like by shooting or cutting him or herself, or taking too many pills or drugs)?

Yes 1

No 0

11. Did a parent or someone who takes care of you ever have to leave the country to fight in a war and had to be away for several months or longer?

Yes 1

No 0

Alcohol Misuse
Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT) – Short Form
Adapted from Babor, de la Fuente, Saunders, & Grant, 1992

The Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT) is a widely-used measure designed by the World Health Organization that assesses problematic alcohol use. The original 10-item version has three subscales: hazardous alcohol use, dependence symptoms, and dangerous alcohol use. The AUDIT-Short Form (AUDIT-SF) was developed by the Life Paths Research Program and reduces the length of the AUDIT to five items. These items assess drinking frequency, amount consumed in a typical day of drinking, frequency of binge drinking, frequency of memory blackouts due to alcohol, and whether someone has expressed concern over the respondent's drinking habits. These items capture heavy problematic alcohol usage but provide less information on the distinction between abuse and dependency, which was not a main concern of the Life Paths study.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all outcome measures. All five items used in the main survey loaded onto the same factor. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.83 and 0.78, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate negative correlations with other outcome measures, such as Subjective Well-Being ($r = -.43$) and the Awe Index ($r = -.47$), as well as Honesty ($r = -.33$) and the Psychological Endurance Scale ($r = -.42$).

Scoring: The scale score is the sum of the raw scores for each item. Participants who reported no alcohol use were given a score of 0 (note that our survey program did not allow zero as a response category so this is a re-code). Higher sum scores indicate more problematic alcohol use.

Adapted from: Babor T. F., de la Fuente, J. R., Saunders J., Grant M. (1992). *The Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test: Guidelines for use in primary health care*. (WHO Publication No. 92.4). World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.

Life Paths version: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

Now I am going to ask you some questions about your use of alcoholic beverages during the past year.

1. How often do you have a drink containing alcohol?

Never	1
Monthly or less	2
2 to 4 times a month	3
2 to 3 times a week	4
4 or more times a week	5
[SKIP remaining questions if report never drinking alcohol]	
2. How many drinks containing alcohol do you typically have when you are drinking?

1 or 2	1
3 or 4	2
5 or 6	3
7, 8, or 9	4
10 or more	5
3. How often do you have six or more drinks on one occasion?

Never	1
Less than monthly	2
Monthly	3
Weekly	4
Daily or almost daily	5

4. How often during the last year have you been unable to remember what happened the night before because you had been drinking?
- Never 1
 - Less than monthly 2
 - Monthly 3
 - Weekly 4
 - Daily or almost daily 5
5. Has a relative, friend, or doctor or another health professional ever expressed concern about your drinking or suggested you cut down?
- No 1
 - Yes, but not in the last year 2
 - Yes, during the last year 3

Anger Management Scale – Brief Trait Version
Hamby, Stith, Grych, & Banyard, 2013

Anger management is a regulatory strength. Items were adapted from the 36-item Anger Management Scale (Stith & Hamby, 2002), originally developed to evaluate anger management within intimate partner relationships. For the current version, five items were selected from the Self-Awareness and Calming Strategies subscales and generalized to assess anger management in all relationships. Additionally, wording of some items was simplified.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all regulatory strengths. The analysis produced a factor consisting of all five items used in the main study. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.77 and 0.87, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate to strong correlations with other regulatory strengths, including Endurance ($r = .64$) and Emotional Awareness ($r = .43$), and strong correlations with measures of well-being, such as Subjective Well-being ($r = .51$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Higher scores indicate more ability to manage anger.

Citation: Hamby, S., Stith, S. M., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2013). Life Paths Research measurement packet. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. doi: 10.13140/RG.2.1.3318.2884

Adapted from: Stith, S.M., & Hamby, S. (2002). The Anger Management Scale: Development and preliminary psychometric properties. *Violence and Victims, 17*, 383-402.

1. I can calm myself down when I am upset.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
2. I can tell when I am beginning to get angry.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
3. I can usually tell when I am about to lose my temper.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
4. Before I let myself get really angry, I think about what will happen if I lose my temper.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
5. When I feel myself getting angry, I try to tell myself to calm down.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1

Attachment—Maternal
Adapted from Furman & Buhrmester, 2009

Attachment to parental figures, romantic partners, and friends is an important aspect in determining security and healthy functioning (Bowlby, 1969). This scale has a behavioral focus. The Attachment Behaviors Scale is adapted from Furman and Buhrmester's (2009) Network of Relationships Inventory: Behavioral Systems Version (NRI-BSV). Six of the original 24 items were included in the current study, representing both the Seeks Safe Haven and Seeks Secure Base subscales, and answer choices were changed from a 5-point to a 4-point Likert scale. In addition, wording of some items was simplified to be suitable for a community sample that included many people with limited educational attainment or who may speak English as a second language. Further, we developed parallel items for attachment to mothers and attachment to fathers (or mother or father figures).

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all interpersonal strengths. The analysis produced a factor consisting of all six items used in the main study. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.67 and 0.93, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate to strong correlations with other interpersonal strengths, including Paternal Attachment ($r = .38$) and Social Support – Immediate Family ($r = .51$), in addition to Subjective Well-being ($r = .34$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all the items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Higher scores indicate better maternal attachment. Exploratory analyses indicated that mother absence was similar, psychologically, to poor mother attachment. To avoid creating missing data in samples with high rates of mother absence, we suggest assigning the low point on the scale.

Adapted from: Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D. (2009). Methods and measures: The network of relationships inventory: Behavioral systems version. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 33, 470-478.

Source: Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and Loss* v. 3 (Vol. 1). Random House.

Life Paths version: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

Answer the following questions about your mother (or mother figure). If she is deceased, answer these questions about when she was alive.

1. You seek out your mother (or mother figure) when you're upset.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
I did not have a mother figure when I was a child	0
[SKIP to father questions if no mother figure]	
2. You turn to your mother (or mother figure) when you're worried about something.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
3. You turn to your mother (or mother figure) for comfort when you're not feeling well.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
4. Your mother (or mother figure) encourages you to try new things that you'd like to do but are nervous about.

- Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
5. Your mother (or mother figure) encourages you to go after your goals and future plans.
- Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
6. Your mother (or mother figure) shows support for the things you do.
- Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1

Attachment—Paternal
Adapted from Furman & Buhrmester, 2009

Attachment to parental figures, romantic partners, and friends is an important aspect in determining security and healthy functioning (Bowlby, 1969). This scale has a behavioral focus. The Attachment Behaviors Scale is adapted from Furman and Buhrmester’s (2009) Network of Relationships Inventory: Behavioral Systems Version (NRI-BSV). Six of the original 24 items were included in the current study, representing both the Seeks Safe Haven and Seeks Secure Base subscales, and answer choices were changed from a 5-point to a 4-point Likert scale. In addition, wording of some items was simplified to be suitable for a community sample that included many people with limited educational attainment or who may speak English as a second language. Further, we developed parallel items for attachment to mothers and attachment to fathers (or mother or father figures).

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all interpersonal strengths. The analysis produced a factor consisting of all six items used in the main study. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.95 and 0.94, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate correlations with other interpersonal strengths, including Maternal Attachment ($r = .38$) and Social Support – Immediate Family ($r = .36$), in addition to Subjective Well-being ($r = .30$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Higher scores indicate better paternal attachment. Exploratory analyses indicated that mother absence was similar, psychologically, to poor father attachment. To avoid creating missing data in samples with high rates of father absence, we suggest assigning the low point on the scale.

Adapted from: Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D. (2009). Methods and measures: The network of relationships inventory: Behavioral systems version. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 33*, 470-478.

Source: Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and Loss v. 3* (Vol. 1). Random House.

Life Paths version: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

Answer the following questions about your father (or father figure). If he is deceased, answer these questions about when he was alive.

1. You seek out your father (or father figure) when you’re upset.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
I did not have a father figure when I was a child	0
[SKIP remaining questions if no father figure]	
2. You turn to your father (or father figure) when you’re worried about something.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
3. You turn to your father (or father figure) for comfort when you’re not feeling well.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
4. Your father (or father figure) encourages you to try new things that you’d like to do but are nervous about.

Mostly true about me	4
----------------------------	---

- Somewhat true about me 3
- A little true about me 2
- Not true about me 1
- 5. Your father (or father figure) encourages you to go after your goals and future plans.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
- 6. Your father (or father figure) shows support for the things you do.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1

Attachment—Romantic
Adapted from Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000

This attachment scale focuses on people's thoughts and feelings about relationships and provides an indicator of their internal working models for close relationships. Attachment is an important indicator of healthy functioning, and thus an important construct for positive psychology research. We adapted items from the Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire – Revised (Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000) for the current study by shortening the scale and simplifying the wording of items to suit individuals with limited reading levels. The scale assesses individuals' general experience of attachment in romantic relationships, not only their current one. These items were only asked of individuals who indicated they had at least one romantic partner at any point in their lives.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all interpersonal strengths. Of the 12 items on Romantic Attachment originally used in the main study, nine were maintained in the final factor solution. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.88 and 0.86, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with mild to strong correlations with other measures of interpersonal strengths, such as Social Support – Immediate Family ($r = .23$) and Forgiveness ($r = .23$), and with measures of well-being, such as Subjective Well-being ($r = .31$) and the Mental Health ($r = .60$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all the items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Items are negatively worded and reverse coded so that higher scores indicate more secure romantic attachment.

Adapted from: Fraley, R. C., Waller, N. G., & Brennan, K. A. (2000). An item response theory analysis of self-report measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(2), 350-365.

Life Paths version: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

Next, we ask about how you feel in romantic relationships. We are interested in how you generally experience relationships, not just your current relationships.

1. I worry about being left by my partner.

Mostly true about me	1
Somewhat true about me	2
A little true about me	3
Not true about me	4
2. I worry a lot about my relationships.

Mostly true about me	1
Somewhat true about me	2
A little true about me	3
Not true about me	4
3. Just when my partner starts to get close to me, I find myself pulling away.

Mostly true about me	1
Somewhat true about me	2
A little true about me	3
Not true about me	4
4. I worry that romantic partners won't care about me as much as I care about them.

Mostly true about me	1
Somewhat true about me	2
A little true about me	3
Not true about me	4

5. I don't feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners.
 Mostly true about me 1
 Somewhat true about me 2
 A little true about me 3
 Not true about me 4
6. I often wish that my partner felt as strongly about me as I do about him/her.
 Mostly true about me 1
 Somewhat true about me 2
 A little true about me 3
 Not true about me 4
7. I avoid getting too close to my partner
 Mostly true about me 1
 Somewhat true about me 2
 A little true about me 3
 Not true about me 4
8. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on romantic partners.
 Mostly true about me 1
 Somewhat true about me 2
 A little true about me 3
 Not true about me 4
9. I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be very close.
 Mostly true about me 1
 Somewhat true about me 2
 A little true about me 3
 Not true about me 4

Community Support
Hamby, Grych, & Banyard, 2015;
Adapted from: Sampson et al., 1997; U.S. Air Force, 2011

It is important to measure strengths at various ecological levels. This scale is a global measure assessing support at the community level – beyond an individual’s close family and friendships. It assesses the degree to which neighbors get along, help one another, and support neighborhood youth. Items 1 and 2 were adapted from Sampson et al.’s Neighborhood Collective Efficacy Index (1997), and items 3-9 were adapted from the U.S. Air Force’s Community Assessment Survey (2011).

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all interpersonal strengths. Items from the different source scales were presented separately but loaded together onto this 9-item factor. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.84 and 0.87, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate correlations with other interpersonal strengths, such as Social Support – Immediate Family ($r = .43$) and Social Support – Friends and Adults ($r = .35$), as well as Subjective Well-being ($r = .31$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all the items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Higher scores indicate more community support.

Citation: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

Adapted from: Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, 277, 918-924.
 U.S. Air Force. (2011). 2011 Air Force Community Assessment Survey: Survey data codebook. Lackland Air Force Base, TX: Author.

Also see: Roberts, L. T., Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. (2015). Beyond collective efficacy: New brief measures to assess the outer layers of the social ecology. *American Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 14-23.

1. My neighbors would take action if a fight broke out in front of their house.
 - Mostly true about my community 4
 - Somewhat true about my community 3
 - A little true about my community 2
 - Not true about my community 1
2. People in my neighborhood can be trusted.
 - Mostly true about my community 4
 - Somewhat true about my community 3
 - A little true about my community 2
 - Not true about my community 1
3. People in my neighborhood offer help to one another in times of need.
 - Mostly true..... 4
 - Somewhat true 3
 - A little true 2
 - Not true 1
4. People in my neighborhood talk to or visit with their neighbors.
 - Mostly true 4
 - Somewhat true 3
 - A little true 2
 - Not true 1

5. Where you live now, are there friends or neighbors who would let you borrow something such as tools, chairs, or food?
- Mostly true 4
 - Somewhat true 3
 - A little true 2
 - Not true 1
6. Where you live now, are there friends or neighbors who would give you a ride if you needed it?
- Mostly true 4
 - Somewhat true 3
 - A little true 2
 - Not true 1
7. Where you live now, are there friends or neighbors who would take care of someone's children in an emergency?
- Mostly true 4
 - Somewhat true 3
 - A little true 2
 - Not true 1
8. In this community, youth (between the ages of 10-18) are supported and valued by community leaders.
- Mostly true 4
 - Somewhat true 3
 - A little true 2
 - Not true 1
9. In this community, youth (between the ages of 10-18) have interesting and meaningful ways to spend their time.
- Mostly true 4
 - Somewhat true 3
 - A little true 2
 - Not true 1

Compassion

Adapted from: McCullough et al., 2002; Pommier, 2010; Sprecher & Fehr, 2005

Compassion is an important interpersonal strength, referring to the degree to which an individual displays care and concern for others and is motivated to help them. This scale was designed to measure compassion in a short form suitable for large survey research and using simplified wording accessible to individuals with limited reading levels. Items 1-3 were adapted from Pommier’s (2010) 24-item Compassion Scale, items 4 and 5 were adapted from Sprecher and Fehr’s (2005) 21- item measure of compassionate love, and item 6 is adapted from McCullough et al.’s (2002) scale on dispositional gratitude. Item 7, originally from a scale measuring grateful behavior, was written for the Life Paths study.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all interpersonal strengths. Items from the four scales had been presented separately but loaded together onto this 7-item factor. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.65 and 0.82, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate to strong correlations with related domains, such as Generativity ($r = .43$) and Meaning Making – Other-oriented ($r = .53$), as well as with outcome measures of well-being, such as the Awe Index ($r = .39$) and Subjective Well-being ($r = .36$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all the items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Higher scores indicate higher levels of compassion.

Life Paths version: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

Partially adapted from: McCullough, M. E., Emmons, R. A., & Tsang, J. (2002). The grateful disposition: A conceptual and empirical topography. *Journal of Family and Social Psychology, 82(1)*, 112-127.
 Pommier, E. A. (2010). *The Compassion Scale*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from the University of Texas Digital Repository. 2011-02-09T17:48:05Z.
 Sprecher, S. & Fehr, B. (2005). Compassionate love for close others and humanity. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 22*, 629-651.

1. If I see someone going through tough times, I try to be caring toward that person.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
2. My heart goes out to people who are unhappy.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
3. When others feel sad, I try to comfort them.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
4. Helping family or friends gives me a lot of meaning in my life.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1

5. When the people I love need me, I have been there for them.
- Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
6. As I get older, I am more thankful for the people and things that have been part of my life.
- Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
7. I have told a teacher, coach, religious leader, boss, or other important person in my life how much he or she has meant to me.
- Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1

Coping Scale
Hamby, Grych, & Banyard, 2013
Partially adapted from: Holahan & Moos, 1987; Spitzberg & Copach, 2008

This coping questionnaire assesses cognitive, emotional, and behavioral methods of dealing with problems. Some items, focusing on cognitive and emotional approaches, were adapted from Holahan and Moos’s (1987) widely-used Coping Strategies Scale (items 2, 3, and 4 below), while other cognitive and emotional items were original (1, 5, 6, and 8). The remainder of the items were adapted from Spitzberg and Copach's (2008) framework for assessing coping in response to stalking. Adapted items were reworded to focus on general coping patterns (versus a response to a specific situation) and simplified to suit a community sample in which some have limited reading levels and educational attainment.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. Of the 17 coping items used in the main sample of over 2500 participants, a domain-level factor analysis for all regulatory strengths produced this 13-item factor, consisting of items reflecting both appraisal and behavioral methods of coping. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.88 and 0.91, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with strong correlations with other measures of regulatory strengths, such as Anger Management ($r = .57$) and Endurance ($r = .63$), and with measures of well-being, such as Subjective Well-being ($r = .53$) and Posttraumatic Growth ($r = .65$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all the items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Higher scores indicate higher levels of coping.

Life Paths version: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

Partially adapted from: Holahan, C. J., & Moos, R. H. (1987). Personal and contextual determinants of coping strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(5), 946-955.

Spitzberg, B., & Cupach, W. (2008). Managing unwanted pursuit. In M. Motley (Ed.), *Studies in Applied Interpersonal Communication* (pp. 3-25). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

1. When dealing with a problem, I spend time trying to understand what happened.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
2. When dealing with a problem, I try to see the positive side of the situation.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
3. When dealing with a problem, I try to step back from the problem and think about it from a different point of view.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
4. When dealing with a problem, I consider several alternatives for handling the problem.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
5. When dealing with a problem, I try to see the humor in it.

- Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
6. When dealing with a problem, I think about what it might say about bigger lifestyle changes I need to make.
- Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
7. When dealing with a problem, I often wait it out and see if it doesn't take care of itself.
- Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
8. When dealing with a problem, I often try to remember that the problem is not as serious as it seems.
- Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
9. When dealing with a problem, I often use exercise, hobbies, or meditation to help me get through a tough time.
- Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
10. When dealing with a problem, I make jokes about it or try to make light of it.
- Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
11. When dealing with a problem, I make compromises.
- Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
12. When dealing with a problem, I take steps to take better care of myself and my family for the future.
- Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
13. When dealing with a problem, I work on making things better for the future by changing my habits, such as diet, exercise, budgeting, or staying in closer touch with people I care about.
- Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1

Delinquency

Adapted from: Cuevas, Finkelhor, Turner, & Ormrod, 2007; Loeber & Dishion, 1983

This scale was adapted from the Frequency of Delinquent Behavior by Loeber and Dishion (1983) for NatSCEV (Cuevas et al., 2007) and further adapted for Life Paths. Participants were asked whether they had engaged in each behavior. Participants aged 17 and under were asked if they had ever done these; adults were asked about their adolescence.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all regulatory measures. All nine items loaded onto the same factor. Internal consistency (coefficient alpha) for the main sample is 0.80. Validity was established in the main sample with mild to moderate correlations with Honesty ($r = -.30$) and Mental Health ($r = -.24$).

Scoring: For scoring purposes, “yes” was assigned a value of 1, and “no” a value of 0. The scale score is a sum of all items. Higher scores indicate more delinquency.

Adapted from: Cuevas, C. A., Finkelhor, D., Turner, H. A., & Ormrod, R. K. (2007). Juvenile delinquency and victimization: A theoretical typology. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22(12), 1581-1602.
Loeber, R., Dishion, T. J. (1983). Early predictors of male delinquency: A review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 94, 68-94.

[Adolescents] *Have you ever:*

[Adults] *Now, think back to when you were a teenager. A lot of people do things when they are teens that they don't do later on. When you were a teenager, did you ever:*

1. On purpose broken, damaged or destroyed something that belonged to someone else?
Yes 1
No..... 0
2. Hit, slapped or pushed other people or gotten into a physical fight with them?
Yes 1
No..... 0
3. Taken anything at school, at home, or from a store that did not belong to you?
Yes 1
No..... 0
4. Cheated on school tests or skipped school without an excuse?
Yes 1
No..... 0
5. Written things or spray painted on walls or sidewalks or cars, where you were not supposed to do that?
Yes 1
No..... 0
6. Smoked marijuana or taken any other drugs (that were not prescribed medication)?
Yes 1
No..... 0
7. Been arrested or taken into custody by the police?
Yes 1
No..... 0
8. Picked on another kid by chasing or grabbing him or her or by making him or her do something he or she didn't want to do?
Yes 1
No..... 0
9. Tried to scare or make another kid feel bad by calling him or her names, saying mean things, or saying you didn't want him or her around?
Yes 1
No..... 0

Demographics
Hamby, Grych, & Banyard, 2013

Although numerous demographic measures exist, we devised items that are tailored for a rural, low-income sample and for an age range that includes both adults and adolescents. For example, our household income measure is broken down into \$5,000 ranges for the lowest income brackets, and we include an assessment of governmental financial support (food stamps, etc.). Also see our Financial Strain measure elsewhere in this booklet. Some of this information, such as age, relationship status, and employment status, is used to classify individuals for other scales (for example, Work Integration is only asked of participants who are currently employed).

Citation: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2013). *Life Paths Research measurement packet*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program.

We have a few questions about you and your family.

1. How old are you?

—
2. Are you currently employed full-time, employed part-time, in the military, unemployed and looking for work, retired, student, homemaker or something else?
 1. Employed full-time
 2. Employed Part-time
 3. In the military
 4. Laid off
 5. Unemployed and looking for work
 6. Retired
 7. Student
 8. Homemaker
 9. Disabled or too ill to work
3. What is your current relationship/marital status?
 1. Married
 2. Unmarried but living with a partner
 3. Separated
 4. Divorced
 5. Widowed
 6. In a dating relationship
 7. Single (never married)

[If 3 = 3, 4, 5 or 7 SKIP TO 5]
4. How long have you been in this relationship (or how long did your most recent relationship last)?
 1. 0-11 months
 2. 1-3 years
 3. 4-6 years
 4. 7-9 years
 5. 10-15 years
 6. 16-20 years
 7. More than 20 years
5. How many spouses, live-in partners or dating partners have you had?
 1. 0
 2. 1
 3. 2
 4. 3
 5. 4
 6. 5-10
 7. 11-25
6. We have a few questions about you and your family. What is your sex?
 1. Male

2. Female
7. Including yourself, how many people currently live in your household?
 1. 1
 2. 2
 3. 3
 4. 4
 5. 5
 6. 6
 7. 7 or more
8. What is your biological/adoptive parents' current marital status? Let's start with your biological/adoptive mother. She is
 1. Married to your biological/adoptive father
 2. Married to someone else
 3. Unmarried but living with a partner
 4. Separated
 5. Divorced
 6. Widowed
 7. Single (never married)
 8. Deceased
 9. Unknown

[IF 8 = 1, SKIP TO 10]
9. What about your biological/adoptive father. He is
 1. Married to your biological/adoptive mother
 2. Married to someone else
 3. Unmarried but living with a partner
 4. Separated
 5. Divorced
 6. Widowed
 7. Single (Never married)
 8. Deceased
 9. Unknown
10. How long have you been living at your CURRENT residence?
 1. Less than 6 months
 2. 6 months to 1 year
 3. 1 to 5 years
 4. 6 to 10 years
 5. More than 10 years
11. How many times have you moved since you were born?
 1. Have not moved since I was born
 2. 1-3 times
 3. 4-6 times
 4. More than 6 times
12. What is the highest level of school you completed?
 1. Currently in middle school or high school
 2. Some high school, didn't graduate
 3. GED
 4. High school graduate
 5. Some college, no degree
 6. Associate (2 year) degree
 7. Bachelor's (4 year) degree
 8. Some graduate school, no additional degrees
 9. Master's degree
 10. Doctoral degree (PhD, MD, JD)
13. Do you consider yourself Hispanic or Latino?

1. Yes
2. No

14. Do you consider yourself White, Black, Asian, American Indian or Alaska Native, or Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander? Check all that apply.

1. White
2. Black or African American
3. Asian
4. American Indian or Alaska Native
5. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander

15. What was your total household income (including all wages, public assistance and child support) for 2012 before taxes? Counting all members in your household, was it

1. Less than \$20,000
2. \$20,000 to \$50,000
3. More than \$50,000

[IF 15 = 1, SKIP to 15a; if 15 = 2, SKIP TO 15b; IF 15 = 3, SKIP TO 15c]

15a. Would you say that your total [insert past year] household income was

1. \$5000 or less
2. \$5000 to less than \$10,000
3. \$10,000 to less than \$15,000
4. \$15,000 to less than \$20,000

15b. Would you say that your total [insert past year] household income was

1. \$20,000 to less than \$30,000
2. \$30,000 to less than \$40,000
3. \$40,000 to less than \$50,000

15c. Would you say that your total [insert past year] household income was

1. \$50,000 to less than \$75,000
2. \$75,000 to less than \$100,000
3. More than \$100,000

16. Do you [or your parents if you are under 18] currently receive Families First, food stamps (Snap), welfare, Medicaid, TennCare, or any other public assistance?

1. Yes
2. No

[Financial strain items are inserted here as 17a through e in our survey]

18. Would you describe the place you live as being a large city, the suburb of a large city, a smaller city, a town, a small town or a rural area?

1. Large city (population over 300,000)
2. Suburb of a large city
3. Smaller city (population about 100,000-300,000)
4. Town (population about 20,000-100,000)
5. Small town (population about 2,500-20,000)
6. Rural area (population under 2,500)

19. What county (Franklin, Coffee, Grundy, etc.) do you live in?

1. Franklin
2. Grundy
3. Marion
4. Moore
5. Coffee
6. Lincoln
7. Madison
8. Jackson
9. Other, please specify

Emotional Awareness
Adapted from Gratz & Roemer, 2004

Everybody experiences a range of emotions, but individuals vary in the degree to which they pay attention to and understand their emotional experiences. This is a 2-item scale, adapted from the original Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS), to assess the ability to monitor and identify one's own feelings. The wording on some items changed slightly to use simplified language for our community sample, and the rating scale was changed from a 5-item to a 4-item Likert scale.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we used eight of the 36 items in the original DERS and conducted domain-level factor analyses for all regulatory strengths. The analysis produced this factor, consisting of two items, as well as the 4-item Emotional Regulation factor. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.80 and 0.82, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate correlations with other regulatory strengths, such as Anger Management ($r = .43$), as well as measures of well-being, such as Subjective Well-being ($r = .46$) and the Awe Index ($r = .36$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. Participants' raw scores on each item were standardized into z-scores. The scale-level mean was calculated from the item-level z-scores, with higher scores indicating better emotional awareness.

Adapted from: Gratz, K. L. & Roemer, L. (2004). Multidimensional assessment of emotion regulation and dysregulation: Development, factor structure, and initial validation of the Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 26 (1), 41-54.

Life Paths version: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

1. I am aware of my feelings.

Mostly true about me 4
 Somewhat true about me 3
 A little true about me 2
 Not true about me 1

2. I pay attention to how I feel.

Mostly true about me 4
 Somewhat true about me 3
 A little true about me 2
 Not true about me 1

Emotional Regulation
Adapted from Gratz & Roemer, 2004

Negative emotions are inevitable and the ways an individual responds to them has strong implications for mental health and well-being. This scale includes 4 items adapted from the original Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS), assessing one's ability to maintain stability and manage distressing feelings. The rating scale was changed from a 5-item to a 4-item Likert scale, and the items were reworded to use simplified language for our community sample.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we used eight of the 36 items in the original DERS and conducted domain-level factor analyses for all regulatory strengths. The analysis produced this factor, consisting of 4 items, as well as the 2-item Emotional Awareness factor. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.83 and 0.82, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate to strong correlations to meaning making strengths, such as Optimism ($r = .44$) and well-being outcomes, such as Mental Health ($r = .57$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all the items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Items are negatively worded and reverse scored, so that higher scores indicate better emotional regulation.

Adapted from: Gratz, K. L. & Roemer, L. (2004). Multidimensional assessment of emotion regulation and dysregulation: Development, factor structure, and initial validation of the Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 26 (1), 41-54.

Life Paths version: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

1. I have difficulty making sense of my feelings.

Mostly true about me	1
Somewhat true about me	2
A little true about me	3
Not true about me	4
2. When I'm upset, I have difficulty focusing on other things.

Mostly true about me	1
Somewhat true about me	2
A little true about me	3
Not true about me	4
3. When I'm upset, I feel out of control.

Mostly true about me	1
Somewhat true about me	2
A little true about me	3
Not true about me	4
4. When I'm upset, it takes me a long time to feel better.

Mostly true about me	1
Somewhat true about me	2
A little true about me	3
Not true about me	4

Endurance
Psychological Endurance Scale
Hamby, Grych, & Banyard, 2013
Partially adapted from Zimbardo & Boyd, 1999

Endurance is an important regulatory strength during times of adversity. This scale measures psychological (not physical) endurance with items that are designed to assess an individual's tendencies to be a source of strength to others in times of need and to persist diligently when presented with difficulty. As with other Life Paths scales, it is designed to be suitable for community samples with a range of reading ability.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all regulatory strengths. The analysis produced a factor consisting of five items from Hamby et al.'s (2013) original Endurance scale (items 1-5) and one item adapted from Zimbardo and Boyd's (1999) Time Perspective Inventory (item 6). Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.81 and 0.86, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with strong correlations with other measures of regulatory strengths, such as Anger Management ($r = .64$) and Coping ($r = .63$), and with measures of well-being, such as Subjective Well-being ($r = .64$) and the Awe Index ($r = .52$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all the items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Higher scores indicate higher levels of psychological endurance.

Citation: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

Partially adapted from: Zimbardo, P.G., & Boyd, J.N. (1999). Putting time in perspective: A valid, reliable individual-differences metric. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 1721-88.

1. I am a source of strength to my family.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
2. People rely on me through good times and bad.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
3. I am quick to pick myself back up again when I get "knocked down."

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
4. I find it comforting to stick to my routine when I am facing tough times.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
5. I believe that what doesn't kill you makes you stronger.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2

6. I spend time planning for the future.
- Not true about me 1
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1

Financial Strain Index
Hamby, Turner, & Finkelhor, 2011

The Financial Strain Index is designed to assess a lack of ability to meet current financial needs. Income alone is not a sufficient indication of financial stability, and in recent years, it has become more apparent that people who would typically fall into a middle-class economic bracket (or even higher) may also feel the effects of financial strain. The Financial Strain Index was developed for NatSCEV and is based on the work of Conger and others.

Reliability & validity: Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.73 and 0.83, respectively. Validity was established with a moderate correlation with household income ($r = -.42$).

Scoring: Answer categories were assigned a value 1 through 3. The total score can be a sum or mean of all the items. Higher scores indicate more financial strain.

Citation: Hamby, S., Turner, H. A., & Finkelhor, D. (2011). Financial strain index. Durham, NH: Crimes Against Children Research Center. doi: 10.13140/RG.2.1.2368.0161

Please indicate whether the following are very true, a little true, or not true about your current financial situation.

1. You don't have enough money to buy the clothes or household items that you or your family need.

Very true	3
A little true	2
Not true	1
2. You are behind one month or more on your rent or mortgage payment.

Very true	3
A little true	2
Not true	1
3. You don't have enough money to pay your regular bills.

Very true	3
A little true	2
Not true	1
4. You don't have enough money to go out to dinner, or pay for entertainment or recreational activities.

Very true	3
A little true	2
Not true	1
5. It would be hard for you to find the money to cover an unexpected expense, such as a medical bill or repair that was \$500 or more.

Very true	3
A little true	2
Not true	1

Forgiveness
Adapted from Gordon & Baucom, 2003

Forgiveness has long been considered an important interpersonal strength. The forgiveness process described by Gordon and Baucom (2003) details three distinct stages, the third and final of which is characterized by the wronged person moving on from the incident. This stage is marked by both increasingly balanced views of the offender and decreasingly negative emotions towards him/her. The original measure consists of 25 items to assess all three stages of forgiveness in a romantic relationship. Three items measuring cognitive, behavioral, and emotional indices of the third stage of forgiveness were selected and adapted for use in the Life Paths study, with some wording simplified and generalized to any close relationship.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all interpersonal strengths. Of the five Forgiveness items used in the main survey, three items were maintained in this final factor solution. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) are 0.63 for both the pilot and main samples. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate correlations with related scales, such as Compassion ($r = .43$) and Meaning Making – Other-Oriented ($r = .32$), as well as Subjective Well-being ($r = .30$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all the items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Higher scores indicate higher levels of forgiveness.

Life Paths version: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

Adapted from: Gordon, K. C., & Baucom, D. H. (2003). Forgiveness and marriage: Preliminary support for a synthesized model of recovery from a marital betrayal. *American Journal of Family Therapy, 31*, 179-199.

For the next items, think about a recent argument or disagreement you have had with someone important in your life. This can be a romantic partner, parent, family member, or good friend.

1. I am ready to put what happened behind me.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
2. I know how I feel about continuing our relationship.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
3. Understanding what the other person did is more important to me than blaming him/her.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1

Generative Roles
Banyard, Hamby, Grych, 2013;
Hamby, Thomas, Banyard, de St. Aubin, & Grych, 2015

Generativity is characterized by the desire to care for younger and future generations, especially by passing on knowledge (McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992), but it is not limited to middle age. Most measures of generativity, including the Loyola Generativity Scale (also used in the Life Paths study), assess general patterns. To develop a more behavioral indicator, the Generative Roles scale assesses specific roles that people who have strong desires to nurture future generations are likely to fulfill. It also assesses the generative roles in which one's parents have served.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all interpersonal strengths. The final solution yielded this 9-item factor, which includes one item originally written for Generous Behaviors (item 9). Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.78 and 0.77, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate correlations with related scales, such as Generativity ($r = .34$) and Meaning Making – Other-oriented ($r = .32$), as well as Subjective Well-being ($r = .27$).

Scoring: For scoring purposes, “yes” was assigned a value of 1, and “no” a value of 0 and the scale score is the sum of all items. Higher scores indicated a greater number of generative roles.

Citation: Hamby, S., Thomas, L.A., Banyard, V., de St. Aubin, E., & Grych, J. (2015). Generative roles: Assessing sustained involvement in generativity. *American Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 24-32. doi: 10.13140/RG.2.1.1581.5845

1. Has one of your parents ever been a teacher or coach?
 Yes 1
 No 0
2. Has one of your parents ever been a Sunday school teacher, Bible study group leader, or church leader?
 Yes..... 1
 No 0
3. Has one of your parents ever been a volunteer in the community for a charity, scouts, or other community group?
 Yes 1
 No 0
4. At some time in my life, I have been a Bible study group leader.
 Yes 1
 No 0
5. At some time in my life, I have been a coach (volunteer or paid).
 Yes 1
 No 0
6. At some time in my life, I have been a scout leader/youth group leader (for example, for Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, 4H).
 Yes 1
 No 0
7. At some time in my life, I have been a captain of a team.
 Yes 1
 No 0
8. At some time in my life, I have been a tutor.
 Yes 1
 No 0
9. I have helped out at church, school, or a community organization.
 Yes 1
 No 0

Generativity
Adapted from McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992

Generativity is the emerging desire to care for younger and future generations. People tend to express a conscious concern for future generations in a variety of ways, the most common of which is the need to create a legacy through passing on knowledge (McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992). It is neither confined to one specific stage nor to one specific aspect of one's life. Five items were selected from the six-item Loyola Generativity Scale (LGS) short form; the wording on all items was slightly modified to be in the first person (to make consistent with other Life Paths scales).

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all interpersonal strengths. The analysis produced a factor consisting of all five items used in the main study. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.90 and 0.88, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate to strong correlations with Social Support – Immediate Family ($r = .48$) and Compassion ($r = .43$) as well as Meaning Making – Other-oriented ($r = .59$) and Subjective Well-being ($r = .59$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all the items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Higher scores indicate higher generativity.

Adapted from: McAdams, D. P., & de St. Aubin, E. (1992). A theory of generativity and its assessment through self-report, behavioral acts, and narrative themes in autobiography. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62, 1003-1015.

1. I have important skills that I can pass along to others.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
2. Many people come to me for advice.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
3. I feel that other people need me.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
4. I have had a good influence on the lives of many people.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
5. I like to teach things to people.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1

Generous Behaviors

***Banyard, Hamby, & Grych, 2013; Hamby, Thomas, Banyard, de St. Aubin, & Grych, 2015;
Partially adapted from Amato, 1990***

Generous behaviors are an important form of healthy social engagement. This was designed to assess the charitable activities in which individuals have engaged in the past year and uses wording accessible to individuals with limited reading levels. Items 4-6 were adapted from Amato's (1990) instrument assessing formal planned helping, informal planned helping, and spontaneous helping; items 1-3 were original to the Life Paths study.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all interpersonal strengths. Of the 15 original items in the Generous Behaviors Index used in the main study, six were maintained in this final factor solution. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.58 and 0.66, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate correlations with related domains, such as Meaning Making – Other-oriented ($r = .29$) and Meaning Making – Family Care ($r = .43$).

Scoring: For scoring purposes, “yes” was assigned a value of 1, and “no” a value of 0. The scale score is a sum of all items. Higher scores indicated a greater number of generous behaviors.

Citation: Banyard, V. L. Hamby, S., & Grych, J. (2013) *Generous Behaviors Index*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program.

Hamby, S., Thomas, L.A., Banyard, V., de St. Aubin, E., & Grych, J. (2015). Generative roles: Assessing sustained involvement in generativity. *American Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 24-32. doi: 10.13140/RG.2.1.3678.7367

Partially adapted from: Amato, P. R. (1990). Personality and social network involvement as predictors of helping behavior in everyday life. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 53, 31-43.

Select the activities you have participated in during the last year.

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| 1. Prepared a meal for someone who just had a baby, has just gotten out of the hospital, or has had a death in the family? | Yes 1 |
| | No 0 |
| 2. Prepared a holiday meal for people in need? | Yes 1 |
| | No 0 |
| 3. Supported U.S. troops by donating things or writing letters to send overseas? | Yes 1 |
| | No 0 |
| 4. Purchased or picked up an item in town for a person who was not able to pick it up? | Yes 1 |
| | No 0 |
| 5. Helped an animal that was lost or in distress? | Yes 1 |
| | No 0 |
| 6. Helped a stranger who had fallen over or appeared to be ill? | Yes 1 |
| | No 0 |

Honesty
Adapted from Ashton & Lee, 2009

This scale, adapted from the HEXACO-PI-R (Ashton & Lee, 2009), assesses participation in ethical behavior. To be more usable within large-scale survey research, we took two items from HEXACO-PI-R's 10-item Honesty and Humility Subscale and simplified the language to be suitable for a wide range of reading levels.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all regulatory strengths. The analysis produced a factor consisting of both items used in the main study. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.78 and 0.74, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with mild to moderate correlations with other measures of regulation, such as Emotional Regulation ($r = .27$) and Delinquency ($r = -.30$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all the items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Higher scores indicate more honesty and humility.

Adapted from: Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2009). The HEXACO-60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 91, 340-345.

Life Paths version: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

1. If I knew that I could never get caught, I might be willing to steal.

Mostly true about me	1
Somewhat true about me	2
A little true about me	3
Not true about me	4

2. I might pretend to like someone if I thought that person could do favors for me.

Mostly true about me	1
Somewhat true about me	2
A little true about me	3
Not true about me	4

*Laws of Life Essay Program: Participation Characteristics, Topic, & Impact
Hamby, Banyard, & Grych, 2013; partially adapted from Pennebaker, Colder, & Sharp, 1990*

Initially started in Franklin County, TN in 1987, the Templeton Laws of Life Essay Program offers people the opportunity to reflect upon and write about their core principles, such as integrity, trust, honesty, or perseverance. The goal of the program is character development. The program now takes place in many school districts around the U.S. and internationally with as many as 100,000 youth participating annually. This scale was constructed to measure participation in the program, as well as to assess general attitudes regarding participation. Although this measure was designed for this particular narrative program and this specific region, it may be adapted to accommodate similar writing exercises in any location. To account for the variety of ways that the program has been offered, certain items, such as items 3, 4, and 9a, have an open-ended “Other” option that allows participants to share their own experiences. Items 10, 13, 14, 15, and 16 were adapted from Pennebaker, Colder, & Sharp (1990), with minor wording edits made to better address the essay contest. For example, item 10 originally read: “Since the writing experiment, how much have you talked to other people about what you wrote?” Instead, we present it as “Not counting required class discussion, how often did you talk with other people about what you wrote?” Other items, such as item 12, were developed in part through past essay writers’ reflections of their essays (Veljkovic & Schwartz, 2001).

Citation: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

Sources: Pennebaker, J.W., Colder, M., & Sharp, L.K. (1990). Accelerating the coping process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 528-537.
Veljkovic, P., & Schwartz, A. J. (Ed.). (2001). *Writing from the heart*. Radnor, Pennsylvania: Templeton Foundation Press.

1. Many people who went to school in Tennessee took part in the Laws of Life Essay Contest. As you probably remember, this contest takes place every year and involves writing an essay about your personal values. Did you ever write an essay for the Laws of Life Essay Contest?

- Yes 1
- No 1

[IF NO THEN SKIP TO NEXT SECTION]

2. What grade were you in when you wrote an essay for the Laws of Life Essay Contest? (Check all that apply).

- 6th grade 1
- 7th grade 2
- 8th grade 3
- 9th grade 4
- 10th grade 5
- 11th grade 6
- 12th grade 7

3. What grade were you in when you wrote the essay that you remember the best or that meant the most to you?

- 6th grade 1
- 7th grade 2
- 8th grade 3
- 9th grade 4
- 10th grade 5
- 11th grade 6
- 12th grade 7
- Other

4. What school did you go to when you participated?

- North Jr./Middle School 1
- South Jr./Middle School 2
- Huntland School 3
- Franklin County High School 4
- St. Andrew’s Sewanee School 5

	School of the Good Shepherd	6
	Other, please specify	7
5. Was the Laws of Life Essay a required or optional assignment?		
	Required	1
	Optional	2
6. Did you get an award for your essay?		
	First place	1
	Second place	2
	Third place	3
	Honorable mention	4
	No award	5
7. Approximately how much time did you spend working on your essay?		
	Less than an hour	1
	About an hour	2
	About two hours	3
	About three to five hours	4
	More than five hours	5
8. How much work did you put into writing your essay?		
	More than for most school work.	1
	About the same as for other school work.	2
	Less than for most school work.	3
9. Did anyone encourage you while you were writing the essay?		
	Yes	1
	No	2
[IF 9 = NO THEN SKIP TO 10]		
9a. Who encouraged you?		
	Teacher	1
	Principal	2
	Parent	3
	Classmate	4
	Other, please specify	5
10. Not counting required class discussion, how often did you talk with other people about what you wrote?		
	More than 10 conversations	1
	5 to 9 conversations	2
	3 or 4 conversations	3
	2 conversations	4
	1 conversation	5
	No conversations.....	6
11. What Law of Life did you focus on?		
12. People write their essays about many different topics. What did you write your essay about?		
	Death or serious illness of a family member	1
	An inspiring person you have known	2
	How a parent influenced you	3
	A trip you took that made an impact on you	4
	A famous quote or famous person who had inspired you	5
	Being bullied or picked on by someone at school	6
	Dealing with a hard time in your life	7
	Other, please specify	8
	Not sure	9

[IF 12 = 9 GO TO 12a]

12a. Take a moment and try to remember what you wrote about. Although it may have been a while since you wrote it, many people can remember their essay if they take a moment to think back to those days. Do you remember anything at all about what you wrote your essay about? Some common topics are:

Death or serious illness of a family member 1

- An inspiring person you have known 2
- How a parent influenced you 3
- A trip you took that made an impact on you 4
- A famous quote or famous person who had inspired you 5
- Being bullied or picked on by someone at school 6
- Dealing with a hard time in your life 7
- Other, please specify 8
- Not sure 9

13. Overall, how personal was the essay that you wrote?
- Very personal 4
 - Somewhat personal 3
 - A little personal 2
 - Not at all personal 1

14. In the time since the Laws of Life Essay Contest, how often have you thought about what you wrote?
- More than 10 times 6
 - 5 to 9 times 5
 - 3 or 4 times 4
 - 2 times 3
 - 1 time 2
 - Not at all 1

15. Looking back on the Laws of Life Essay Contest, how much do you feel that the experience had a positive effect on you?
- Very positive 4
 - Somewhat positive 3
 - A little positive 2
 - Not at all positive 1

16. Looking back on the Laws of Life Essay Contest, how much do you feel that the experience had a negative effect on you?
- Very negative 1
 - Somewhat negative 2
 - A little negative 3
 - Not at all negative 4

Meaning Making – Family Care
Banyard, Hamby, & Grych, 2013;
Hamby, Thomas, Banyard, de St. Aubin, & Grych, 2015

Surprisingly few measures exist regarding the sources of psychological meaning in people’s lives. Schnell (2009, 2011) has conducted some of the only research in this area, developing an attitudinal/perceptual measure of the importance of more than two dozen possible domains of meaning making. For example, “Success is what matters to me” or “I am an achievement-oriented person.” Her measure contains 141 items. We used her ideas as a foundation for developing behavioral markers of creating meaning in one’s life. This Meaning Making subscale assesses the extent to which individuals help their loved ones and work on strengthening their family ties.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all meaning making strengths. Of the 31 items from the original Meaning Making Practices scale used in the main study, five were maintained in this subscale. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.80 and 0.76, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with mild to moderate correlations with other measures of meaning making strengths, such as Purpose ($r = .29$), Religious Meaning-Making ($r = .37$), in addition to outcome measures such as Post-Traumatic Growth ($r = .35$) and the Awe Index ($r = .31$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all the items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Higher scores indicate higher levels of family-oriented meaning making.

Citation: Banyard, V., Hamby, S., Grych, J., (2013). *Meaning Making Practices Scale*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. doi: 10.13140/RG.2.1.4629.0088

Hamby, S., Thomas, L.A., Banyard, V., de St. Aubin, E., & Grych, J. (2015). Generative roles: Assessing sustained involvement in generativity. *American Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 24-32.

Sources: Schnell, T. (2009). The Sources of Meaning and Meaning in Life Questionnaire (SoMe): Relations to demographics and well-being. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 4(6), 483-499.

Schnell, T. (2011). Individual differences in meaning-making: Considering the variety of sources of meaning, their density and diversity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51, 667-673.

1. I cook for my family almost every day.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
2. I take care of older or younger family members each week.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
3. I plan regular family gatherings.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
4. I regularly stay in touch with extended family members.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2

- Not true about me 1
- 5. I keep a family scrapbook or photo album.
- Mostly true about me 4
- Somewhat true about me 3
- A little true about me 2
- Not true about me 1

Meaning Making – Morals
Banyard, Hamby, & Grych, 2013;
Hamby, Thomas, Banyard, de St. Aubin, & Grych, 2015

Surprisingly few measures exist regarding the sources of psychological meaning in people’s lives. Schnell (2009, 2011) has conducted some of the only research in this area, developing an attitudinal/perceptual measure of the importance of more than two dozen possible domains of meaning making. For example, “Success is what matters to me” or “I am an achievement-oriented person.” Her measure contains 141 items. We used her ideas as a foundation for developing behavioral markers of creating meaning in one’s life. This Meaning Making subscale assesses the extent to which individuals find meaning through adhering to moral or ethical standards of behavior.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all meaning making strengths. Of the 31 items from the original Meaning Making Practices scale used in the main study, four were maintained in this subscale. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.83 and 0.81, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate correlations with other measures of meaning making strengths, such as Purpose ($r = .45$), Religious Meaning-Making ($r = .41$), in addition to outcome measures such as Post-Traumatic Growth ($r = .49$) and the Awe Index ($r = .42$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all items. We used z-scores of the scale score in analyses. Higher scores indicate higher levels of moralistic meaning making.

Citation: Banyard, V., Hamby, S., Grych, J., (2013). *Meaning Making Practices Scale*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. doi: 10.13140/RG.2.1.2007.5689

Hamby, S., Thomas, L.A., Banyard, V., de St. Aubin, E., & Grych, J. (2015). Generative roles: Assessing sustained involvement in generativity. *American Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 24-32.

Sources: Schnell, T. (2009). The Sources of Meaning and Meaning in Life Questionnaire (SoMe): Relations to demographics and well-being. *The Journal Of Positive Psychology*, 4(6), 483-499.

Schnell, T. (2011). Individual differences in meaning-making: Considering the variety of sources of meaning, their density and diversity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51, 667-673.

1. I make sure that in most situations I am following the rules.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
2. I make sure that each day I am doing the right thing.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
3. The choices I make in my daily life are based on traditional values.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
4. It is important to teach children that it is important to follow the rules.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1

Meaning Making – Other-Oriented
Banyard, Hamby, & Grych, 2013;
Hamby, Thomas, Banyard, de St. Aubin, & Grych, 2015

Surprisingly few measures exist regarding the sources of psychological meaning in people’s lives. Schnell (2009, 2011) has conducted some of the only research in this area, developing an attitudinal/perceptual measure of the importance of more than two dozen possible domains of meaning making. For example, “Success is what matters to me” or “I am an achievement-oriented person.” Her measure contains 141 items. We used her ideas as a foundation for developing behavioral markers of creating meaning in one’s life. This Meaning Making subscale assesses how individuals engage in activities helping others as a way to make their own lives meaningful.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all meaning making strengths. Of the 31 items from the original Meaning Making Practices scale used in the main study, ten were maintained in this subscale. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples were both 0.87. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate to strong correlations with other measures of meaning making strengths, such as Purpose ($r = .51$), Religious Meaning-Making ($r = .43$), in addition to outcome measures such as Subjective Well-Being ($r = .55$) and Post-Traumatic Growth ($r = .55$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all the items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Higher scores indicate higher levels of other-oriented meaning making.

Citation: Banyard, V., Hamby, S., Grych, J., (2013). *Meaning Making Practices Scale*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. doi: 10.13140/RG.2.1.3056.1444

Hamby, S., Thomas, L.A., Banyard, V., de St. Aubin, E., & Grych, J. (2015). Generative roles: Assessing sustained involvement in generativity. *American Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 24-32.

Sources: Schnell, T. (2009). The Sources of Meaning and Meaning in Life Questionnaire (SoMe): Relations to demographics and well-being. *The Journal Of Positive Psychology*, 4(6), 483-499.

Schnell, T. (2011). Individual differences in meaning-making: Considering the variety of sources of meaning, their density and diversity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51, 667-673.

1. I have a set of skills that are valuable to my community (including school, work, or family).

Mostly true about me 4

Somewhat true about me 3

A little true about me 2

Not true about me 1

2. I try to act and make choices like people who are successful.

Mostly true about me 4

Somewhat true about me 3

A little true about me 2

Not true about me 1

3. I set regular goals for myself and work hard to achieve them.

Mostly true about me 4

Somewhat true about me 3

A little true about me 2

Not true about me 1

4. I regularly celebrate transitions like graduations, births, and weddings.

Mostly true about me 4

Somewhat true about me 3

A little true about me 2

- Not true about me 1

5. I follow rituals or traditions to mark certain moments in life.

Mostly true about me 4

Somewhat true about me 3

A little true about me 2

Not true about me 1
- 6. I keep family traditions to honor my parents and grandparents.

Mostly true about me 4

Somewhat true about me 3

A little true about me 2

Not true about me 1
- 7. I spend time each day to really work on my relationships.

Mostly true about me 4

Somewhat true about me 3

A little true about me 2

Not true about me 1
- 8. I choose to spend time with other people each day.

Mostly true about me 4

Somewhat true about me 3

A little true about me 2

Not true about me 1
- 9. I spend as much time as possible with friends and/or family.

Mostly true about me 4

Somewhat true about me 3

A little true about me 2

Not true about me 1
- 10. I work hard to be an active member of my community.

Mostly true about me 4

Somewhat true about me 3

A little true about me 2

Not true about me 1

Meaning Making – Self-Oriented
Banyard, Hamby, & Grych, 2013;
Hamby, Thomas, Banyard, de St. Aubin, & Grych, 2015

Surprisingly few measures exist regarding the sources of psychological meaning in people’s lives. Schnell (2009, 2011) has conducted some of the only research in this area, developing an attitudinal/perceptual measure of the importance of more than two dozen possible domains of meaning making. For example, “Success is what matters to me” or “I am an achievement-oriented person.” Her measure contains 141 items. We used her ideas as a foundation for developing behavioral markers of creating meaning in one’s life. This Meaning Making subscale assesses the practices through which individuals make their lives meaningful by engaging in activities directly improving one’s own mental and physical well-being.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all meaning making strengths. Of the 31 items from the original Meaning Making Practices scale used in the main study, 8 were maintained in this subscale. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.80 and 0.78, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate correlations with other measures of meaning making strengths, such as Purpose ($r = .30$), Religious Meaning-Making ($r = .31$), in addition to outcome measures such as Subjective Well-Being ($r = .33$) and Post-Traumatic Growth ($r = .36$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all the items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Higher scores indicate higher levels of self-oriented meaning making.

Citation: Banyard, V., Hamby, S., Grych, J., (2013). *Meaning Making Practices Scale*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. doi: 10.13140/RG.2.1.1057.2967
 Hamby, S., Thomas, L.A., Banyard, V., de St. Aubin, E., & Grych, J. (2015). Generative roles: Assessing sustained involvement in generativity. *American Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 24-32.

Sources: Schnell, T. (2009). The Sources of Meaning and Meaning in Life Questionnaire (SoMe): Relations to demographics and well-being. *The Journal Of Positive Psychology*, 4(6), 483-499.
 Schnell, T. (2011). Individual differences in meaning-making: Considering the variety of sources of meaning, their density and diversity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51, 667-673.

1. I play an instrument, write, make art or crafts, or do other creative activities.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
2. I keep a journal, diary, or blog.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
3. I spend time each week learning something new.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
4. I take classes in the community.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3

- A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1

- 5. I read a lot.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1

- 6. I spend time with people who teach me things.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1

- 7. I spend time each week exercising.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1

- 8. I really try to eat healthy foods.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1

Narrative Engagement Index
Roberts, Hamby, Grych, & Banyard, 2015.

The Templeton Laws of Life Essay contest was started in 1987 and is designed to be a character building exercise in which participants are asked to reflect upon and write about a value, experience, or inspiration. Initially, it was only offered to adolescents (typically starting around high school) in Franklin County, TN, though it has since been offered to all age groups on an international scale. This measure was designed to gauge the effects of participation in this particular contest, though it may be adapted to further assess other similar narrative, autobiographical writing experiences. The items were developed in part through review of past essay writers' reflections on the impact of the essay, sometimes even years later.

Reliability & validity: Internal consistency (coefficient alpha) was .96. The first factor accounted for 54% of the variance; all 25 items loaded at .6 or above.

Scoring: Answer categories were assigned a value and summed, with higher scores indicating higher levels of narrative engagement.

Short Form: Items 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 19, 21, 22, and 23 may be used as a brief version of the scale. The short form correlated .97 with the full version and had an internal consistency of .94.

Citation: Roberts, L., Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. (2015). Narrative engagement: The importance of assessing individual investment in expressive writing. *American Journal of Social Sciences*, 3, 96-103.

1. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay give you a chance to spend some time thinking about something that has been on your mind?

Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1

2. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay give you a chance to think about how you really felt about someone who is important to you?

Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1

3. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay give you a chance to focus on the values that are most important to you?

Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1

4. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay give you a chance to express your thoughts and feelings?

Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1

5. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay give you a chance to share your story with other people?

Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1

6. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay let you think about how things that happened helped you become the person you are today?

Very much 4

- Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1
7. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay give you a chance to feel better about yourself as a writer?
 Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1
8. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay give you a chance to realize you have something important to say?
 Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1
9. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay give you a chance to share some things you had hesitated to tell anyone before?
 Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1
10. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay help you face difficult feelings?
 Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1
11. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay help you set goals for yourself?
 Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1
12. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay help you understand yourself better?
 Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1
13. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay increase your sense of who you are?
 Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1
14. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay help you feel in control of important parts of your life?
 Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1
15. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay help you feel like you could make a difference in your community?
 Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1
16. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay help you cope with something stressful that happened to you?
 Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2

- Not at all 1
17. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay help your relationships with your family or friends?
 Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1
18. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay help you understand your family or friends?
 Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1
19. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay help you feel more optimistic about the future?
 Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1
20. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay help you to reach out to other people?
 Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1
21. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay help you make your own decisions?
 Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1
22. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay help you learn to be yourself and not who others want you to be?
 Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1
23. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay help you learn to work through problems and not just give up?
 Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1
24. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay help you learn to be open to new information and ideas?
 Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1
25. How much did writing the Laws of Life Essay help you learn to be more honest with others?
 Very much 4
 Somewhat 3
 A little 2
 Not at all 1

Optimism
Adapted from Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 1994

Holding positive outcome expectancies, termed optimism, is a well-known protective factor associated with a range of beneficial health outcomes. These two items were adapted from the revised Life Orientation Test (LOT-R; Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 1994), a widely used 10-item assessment of dispositional optimism.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all regulatory strengths. Of the three items from the original scale used in the main study, two were maintained in this factor while one loaded with the purpose measure. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.85 and 0.80, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate correlations with Mental Health ($r = .41$) and Emotional Regulation ($r = .44$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all the items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Note that both items are negatively worded and reverse-scored so that higher scores indicate higher levels of optimism.

Adapted from: Scheier, M.F., Carver, C.S., & Bridges, M.W. (1994). Distinguishing optimism from neuroticism (and trait anxiety, self-mastery, and self-esteem): A reevaluation of the Life Orientation Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(6), 1063-1078.

Life Paths version: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

- 1. If something can go wrong for me, it will.
 - Mostly true about me 1
 - Somewhat true about me 2
 - A little true about me 3
 - Not true about me 4

- 2. I hardly ever expect things to go my way.
 - Mostly true about me 1
 - Somewhat true about me 2
 - A little true about me 3
 - Not true about me 4

Partner Victimization Scale (PVS)
Hamby, 2013; Hamby, online first (forthcoming 2016)

Intimate partner violence affects many couples and families every year. The Partner Victimization Scale is a new scale developed after methodological experimentation that has good evidence of reliability and validity and produces methodological convergence with gender patterns found in other indicators, such as arrests and witness reports (Hamby, online first). Lifetime history of partner victimization is assessed, with follow-up questions asking for incident details. The follow-up questions are based on the Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire (Finkelhor et al., 2005; Hamby et al., 2011—see information on that scale). These items are only asked of participants who report having had at least one romantic partner. In the Life Paths study, item 5 was not asked of participants under 18 years old.

Reliability & validity: In our rural, low-income sample, reliability was good at .75. Partner victimization was also found to correlate strongly with other indices of victimization and adversity.

Scoring: A “yes” response is scored as 1, and a “no” response is scored as 0. The response scores to the main “screener” items are summed for a total victimization score. Most follow-up questions are scored as dichotomous variables (1 for "yes", 0 for "no") or other categorical scoring. Follow-up questions are not included in the total victimization score or summed together.

Citation: Hamby, S. (online first). Self-report measures that do not produce gender parity in intimate partner violence: A multi-study investigation. *Psychology of Violence*.
 Hamby, S. (2013). *The Partner Victimization Scale*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. doi: 10.13140/RG.2.1.1319.4405

Answer the next questions about any boyfriend, girlfriend, husband, or wife you have had, including exes.

1. Not including horseplay or joking around, my partner threatened to hurt me and I thought I might really get hurt.

Yes	1
No	0
2. Not including horseplay or joking around, my partner pushed, grabbed, or shook me.

Yes	1
No	0
3. Not including horseplay or joking around, my partner hit me.

Yes	1
No	0
4. Not including horseplay or joking around, my partner beat me up.

Yes	1
No	0
5. My partner made me do sexual things when I didn't want to.

Yes	1
No	0

Follow-up questions

*If endorsed, all items are asked follow-ups a, b, f, fa, fb, e, g, and h.

*If endorsed, items 2, 3, 4, and 5 are also asked follow-up c.

- a. How old were you when this happened? [check all that apply]

Early Childhood (birth to 5)	1
Childhood (6-12)	2
Adolescence (13-18)	3
Early Adulthood (19-25)	4
Adulthood (26 or older)	5
- b. How many times did this happen to you in your whole life?

Answer the next questions about the last time this happened.

- c. Were you physically hurt when this happened? [not asked for item 1]
 - Yes 1
 - No 0
- d. [omitted for this scale]
- e. Who did this?
 - Husband.....1
 - Boyfriend.....2
 - Ex-boyfriend.....3
 - Wife.....4
 - Girlfriend.....5
 - Ex-girlfriend.....6
- f. Did any teen or grown-up see what happened besides you and the person who did this?
 - Family member of victim or perpetrator 1
 - Other person you know, such as a friend, teacher or neighbor 2
 - Police 3
 - Stranger 4
 - No one saw this.....5
- fa. Did anyone who saw what happened:
 - Help in any way 1
 - Make things worse 2
 - Both helped and made it worse 3
 - Didn't help and didn't make it worse 4
- fb. Did any witness get hurt or threatened?
 - Yes 1
 - No 0
- g. Thinking back to when it happened, how afraid did you feel? Would you say you felt:
 - Not at all afraid 1
 - A little afraid 2
 - Very afraid 3
- h. Did you miss any days of school, work, or your normal routine because of what happened?
 - Yes 1
 - No 0

***Physical Well-Being
Health Related Quality of Life***
Adapted from Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2000

Physical health is a vital component of well-being. The Life Paths measure is adapted from the “Healthy Days Measure” used by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). The CDC measure includes 14 items across three modules. We selected items which broadly assess physical health: three from the Healthy Days Core module, one from the Activities Limitation module, and one from the Healthy Days Symptoms Module.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all outcome measures of well-being. All five of the items used in the main survey loaded onto the same factor. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.74 and 0.81, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate correlations with other outcome measures, such as Subjective Well-Being ($r = .33$) and Mental Health ($r = .38$).

Scoring: Items 2, 3, and 4 are reverse coded as noted below and items are summed with scoring as noted for individual items below. Scale scores were standardized in our analyses. Higher scores indicate better physical health.

Adapted from: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2000). *Measuring Healthy Days: Population Assessment of Health-Related Quality of Life*. Retrieved from: <http://www.cdc.gov/hrqol/pdfs/mhd.pdf>

Life Paths version: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

1. Would you say that, in general, your health is:

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| Excellent..... | 5 |
| Very good..... | 4 |
| Good..... | 3 |
| Fair..... | 2 |
| Poor..... | 1 |

2. During the past 30 days, how many days was your physical health, which includes physical illness and injury, not good?

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| 0..... | 6 |
| 1 week or less..... | 5 |
| About 2 weeks..... | 4 |
| About 3 weeks..... | 3 |
| Almost every day..... | 2 |
| Every day..... | 1 |

3. During the past 30 days, for about how many days did poor physical or mental health keep you from doing your usual activities, such as self-care, school/work, or recreation?

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| 0..... | 6 |
| 1 week or less..... | 5 |
| About 2 weeks..... | 4 |
| About 3 weeks..... | 3 |
| Almost every day..... | 2 |
| Every day..... | 1 |

4. During the past 30 days, for about how many days did PAIN make it hard for you to do your usual activities, such as self-care, school/work, or recreation?

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| 0..... | 6 |
| 1 week or less..... | 5 |
| About 2 weeks..... | 4 |
| About 3 weeks..... | 3 |

- Almost every day..... 2
- Every day..... 1
- 5. During the past 30 days, for about how many days have you felt VERY HEALTHY AND FULL OF ENERGY?
 - 0..... 1
 - 1 week or less..... 2
 - About 2 weeks..... 3
 - About 3 weeks..... 4
 - Almost every day..... 5
 - Every day..... 6

Posttraumatic Growth
Adapted from Tedeschi & Calhoun, 1996

Posttraumatic Growth (PTG) refers to positive outcomes as described by individuals who have experienced adverse or stressful events. This measure assesses increased strengths, spiritual change, new life possibilities, and appreciation of life. The Posttraumatic Growth Inventory developed by Tedeschi and Calhoun (1996) included 21 items that assessed the positive impact of negative events. We developed a 9-item short form.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all outcome measures of well-being. Of the ten items used in the main survey, nine items were maintained in the final PTG factor. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples were both 0.90. Validity was established in the main sample with strong correlations with other outcome measures, such as Subjective Well-being ($r = .56$) and the Awe Index ($r = .58$). It also had moderate to strong correlations with Optimism ($r = .41$), Emotional Regulation ($r = .57$), Coping ($r = .65$), Psychological Endurance ($r = .67$), and Purpose ($r = .60$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all the items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Higher scores indicate more posttraumatic growth.

Adapted from: Tedeschi, R. G., & Calhoun, L. G. (1996). The posttraumatic growth inventory: Measuring the positive legacy of trauma. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 9*, 455-471.

Life Paths version: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

Answer these questions about the most stressful event you experienced in the past year.

1. I changed my priorities about what is important in life.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
2. I have a greater appreciation for the value of my own life.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
3. I established a new path for my life.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
4. I have a greater sense of closeness with others.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
5. Now I know that I can handle hard times.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
6. I am able to do better things with my life.

- Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
7. I have a stronger religious faith.
- Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
8. I discovered that I am stronger than I thought I was.
- Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
9. I learned a great deal about how wonderful people are.
- Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1

Purpose
Steger, Frazier, Oishi, & Kaler, 2006
Partially adapted from Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 1994

Purpose is an important construct in the study of positive psychology, yet it remains relatively understudied. It refers to the degree to which an individual has a sense of meaning in life and a reason for living. This scale consists of three items: two from Steger et al.'s (2006) Meaning of Life Questionnaire (items 1 and 2 below) and one item from Scheier, Carver, & Bridges's (1994) Life Orientation Test (item 3 below).

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all meaning making strengths. The analysis produced a 3-item factor combining items from both scales. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples were both 0.82. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate to strong correlations with other measures of meaning making strengths, such as Religious Meaning-Making ($r = .42$) and Meaning Making – Morals ($r = .45$), and with well-being measures, such as Subjective Well-Being ($r = .71$) and Post-Traumatic Growth ($r = .59$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all the items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Higher scores indicate higher levels of purpose.

Citation: Steger, M. F., Frazier, P., Oishi, S., & Kaler, M. (2006). The meaning in life questionnaire: Assessing the presence of and search for meaning in life. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 53, 80-93. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.53.1.80

Partially adapted from: Scheier, M.F., Carver, C.S., & Bridges, M.W. (1994). Distinguishing optimism from neuroticism (and trait anxiety, self-mastery, and self-esteem): A reevaluation of the Life Orientation Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(6), 1063-1078.

Life Paths version: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

1. My life has a clear sense of purpose.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
2. I have a good sense of what makes my life meaningful.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
3. Overall, I expect more good things to happen to me than bad.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1

Relationship Quality

Adapted from Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000; Gordon & Baucom, 2003; Norton, 1983

Relationship quality is comprised of items from Norton's widely used Quality Marriage Index (QMI; 1983), the Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire-Revised (Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000), and the Forgiveness Inventory (Gordon & Baucom, 2003). Wording was also simplified for some items compared to the original. For example, Item 10 was reworded from "I really feel like part of a team with my partner" in the QMI to "My partner and I are really a team."

Items 1-3, and 7-10 were only asked of participants who reported being in current romantic relationships. This factor only held together for adults and should be considered exploratory.

Reliability & validity: Our domain-level factor analyses produced somewhat different results for people with a current romantic partner. In that subgroup, these items held together as a single construct that may be better suited for studies with a strong focus on intimate relationships. In our rural, low income sample, internal consistency (coefficient alpha) for this scale was .87. The scale was moderately correlated with related interpersonal domains, such as romantic attachment ($r = .41$) and compassion ($r = .42$) as well as with subjective well-being ($r = .41$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all the items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Higher scores indicate better relationship quality

Adapted from:

Fraley, R. C., Waller, N. G., & Brennan, K. A. (2000). An item response theory analysis of self-report measures of adult attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(2), 350-365.

Gordon, K. C., & Baucom, D. H. (2003). Forgiveness and marriage: Preliminary support for a synthesized model of recovery from a marital betrayal. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 31, 179-199.

Norton, R. (1983). Measuring marital quality: A critical look at the dependent variable. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 45, 141-151.

Life Paths version: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

1. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner.

Mostly true about me	1
Somewhat true about me	2
A little true about me	3
Not true about me	4
2. I don't mind asking romantic partners for comfort, advice, or help.

Mostly true about me	1
Somewhat true about me	2
A little true about me	3
Not true about me	4
3. I find it easy to get close to my partner.

Mostly true about me	1
Somewhat true about me	2
A little true about me	3
Not true about me	4
4. I am ready to put what happened behind me.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
5. I know how I feel about continuing our relationship.

Mostly true about me	4
----------------------------	---

- Somewhat true about me 3
- A little true about me 2
- Not true about me 1
- 6. Understanding what the other person did is more important to me than blaming him/her.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
- 7. We have a good relationship.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
- 8. My relationship with my partner is strong.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
- 9. My relationship with my partner makes me happy.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
- 10. My partner and I are really a team.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1

Religious Meaning Making

Partially adapted from Amato, 1990; Levin, Markides, & Ray, 1996; Pargament, Smith, Koenig, & Perez, 1998; Putney & Middleton, 1961

Religion is an important source of coping, meaning, and resilience in many people's lives. Yet, it has been historically understudied in the field of psychology. We originally included several measures of religiosity and spirituality to explore how to best assess these constructs. A domain-level factor analysis of all meaning making items produced an 11-item measure. Further analysis indicated this could be trimmed to 8 items with no loss of psychometric quality. This global measure of religiosity assesses the extent to which individuals engage in religious and spiritual practices as a way to improve their well-being, cope with adversity, and find meaning in their lives. It includes two items adapted from the RCOPE scale (Pargament, Smith, Koenig, & Perez, 1998; items 2 and 3 below), a single item from Amato's helping scale (1990; item 1 below), three items adapted from the Dimensions of Religious Ideologies scale (Putney & Middleton, 1961; items 4, 5 and 6 below), one item assessing Private Religious Practices (adapted from Levin, Markides, & Ray, 1996; item 7 below), and a new item assessing participation in organized religion (item 8 below).

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all meaning making strengths. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.88 and 0.87, respectively (for the 8-item version). Validity was established in the main sample with moderate to strong correlations with other measures of meaning making strengths, such as Purpose ($r = .44$), Meaning Making – Morals ($r = .43$), in addition to outcome measures of well-being, such as the Awe Index ($r = .71$) and Post-Traumatic Growth ($r = .51$).

Scoring: Response categories vary by item. The total score is a sum of all the items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Higher scores indicate higher levels of religious meaning making.

Partially adapted from: Amato, P. R. (1990). Personality and social network involvement as predictors of helping behavior in everyday life. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 53, 31-43.

Levin, J. S., Markides, K. S., & Ray, L. A. (1996). Religious Attendance and Psychological Well-Being in Mexican Americans: A Panel Analysis of Three-Generations Data. *The Gerontologist*, 36(4), 454-463.

Pargament, K. I., Smith, B. W., Koenig, H. G., & Perez, L. (1998). Patterns of positive and negative religious coping with major life stressors. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 37, 711-725.

Putney, S. & Middleton, R. (1961). Dimensions and correlates of religious ideologies. *Social Forces*, 39(4), 285-290.

Life Paths version: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

1. Have you ever prayed for the well-being of others?

Yes	1
No.....	0
2. When dealing with a problem, I look for spiritual support from religious leaders.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
3. When dealing with a problem, I ask others to pray for me.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
4. My faith or spiritual beliefs affect my views on other things.

Mostly true about me	4
----------------------------	---

- Somewhat true about me 3
- A little true about me 2
- Not true about me 1
- 5. My faith or spiritual beliefs are very important in my life.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
- 6. I often think about my faith or spiritual beliefs.
 - Mostly true about me 4
 - Somewhat true about me 3
 - A little true about me 2
 - Not true about me 1
- 7. How often do you pray privately in places other than at church or at synagogue?
 - Several times a day 7
 - Once a day 6
 - A few times a week 5
 - Once a week 4
 - A few times a month 3
 - Once a month or less..... 2
 - Never 1
- 8. How often do you attend religious services and other activities at a place of worship, such as weekly dinners?
 - Several times a day 7
 - Once a day 6
 - A few times a week 5
 - Once a week 4
 - A few times a month 3
 - Once a month or less 2
 - Never 1

Social Support – Friends and Adults
Adapted from Turner, Finkelhor, & Ormrod, 2010; from Zimet et al., 1988

Perceived social support is an important interpersonal resource derived from one's immediate social network and may promote resilience and coping during times of stress. This scale focuses on support beyond the immediate family from friends and non-parent adults. The items were adapted for NatSCEV (Turner et al., 2010) from Zimet et al., (1988), with some further simplification of wording for the Life Paths project.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all interpersonal strengths. Of the 11 items from the original Social Support scale used in the main study, six were maintained in this factor while four loaded onto Social Support – Immediate Family. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples were both 0.90. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate correlations with other measures of interpersonal strengths, such as Compassion ($r = .44$) and Community Support ($r = .35$), in addition to Meaning Making–Other-oriented ($r = .54$) and Subjective Well-being ($r = .49$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all the items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Higher scores indicate higher levels of social support.

Adapted from: Turner, H. A., Finkelhor, D., & Ormrod, R. (2010). Poly-victimization in a national sample of children and youth. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 38(3), 323-330.

Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. (1988). The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 52, 30-41.

Life Paths version: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

1. My friends really try to help me.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
2. I can count on my friends when things go wrong.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
3. I can talk about my problems with my friends.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
4. In my life right now, there are adults other than my parents who care about my feelings and what happens to me.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
5. In my life right now, there are adults other than my parents who would give me good suggestions and advice.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1

6. In my life right now, there are adults other than my parents who would help me with practical needs, like getting somewhere or help with a project.

- Mostly true about me 4
- Somewhat true about me 3
- A little true about me 2
- Not true about me 1

Social Support – Immediate Family

Adapted from: Hamby, Grych, & Banyard, 2013; Turner, Finkelhor, & Ormrod, 2010; Zimet et al., 1988

Perceived social support is an important interpersonal resource derived from one's immediate social network and may promote resilience and coping during times of stress. This scale focuses on support from members of an individual's immediate family. Items 1 and 2 are original to the Life Paths study and are designed to assess access to more tangible forms of support, an aspect missing from most social support questionnaires. Items 2 through 6 were adapted for NatSCEV (Turner et al., 2010) from Zimet et al., (1988).

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all interpersonal strengths. Of the 11 items from the original Social Support scale used in the main study, four were maintained in this factor in addition to two items (1 and 2) originally from a measure of Tangible Family Resources. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.82 and 0.88, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate to strong correlations with other measures of interpersonal strengths, such as Compassion ($r = .37$) and Community Support ($r = .35$), in addition to Meaning Making–Other-oriented ($r = .50$) and Subjective Well-being ($r = .52$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all the items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Higher scores indicate higher familial social support.

Adapted from: Turner, H. A., Finkelhor, D., & Ormrod, R. (2010). Poly-victimization in a national sample of children and youth. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 38(3), 323-330.

Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. (1988). The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 52, 30-41.

Life Paths version: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

1. I could borrow more than \$100 from my parents or other family member if I needed it.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
2. I could borrow a car or get a ride from my parents or other family member if I needed it.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
3. My family really tries to help me.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
4. My family lets me know that they care about me.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
5. I can talk about my problems with my family.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2

- Not true about me 1
- 6. My family is willing to help me make decisions.
- Mostly true about me 4
- Somewhat true about me 3
- A little true about me 2
- Not true about me 1

***Spiritual Well-Being:
The Awe Index
Hamby, Grych, and Banyard, 2013***

Measures of spiritual well-being are surprisingly lacking, given the central importance of this form of well-being in many people's lives. There are more measures of religious involvement. Further, some spiritual well-being scales include items that tap into other dimensions such as optimism instead of solely focusing on well-being. *The Awe Index* assesses spiritual well-being from diverse sources, including one's sense of God as well as less religious sources such as connectedness to nature.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all outcome measures of well-being. All five items loaded onto the same factor. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.81 and 0.85, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with strong correlations with other outcome measures, such as Subjective Well-Being ($r = .59$) and Posttraumatic Growth ($r = .58$), as well as Religious Meaning Making ($r = .71$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all the items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Higher scores indicate higher spiritual well-being.

Citation: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. (2013). *Life Paths measurement packet*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. doi: 10.13140/RG.2.1.4465.1683

1. I feel a sense of well-being from my personal relationship with God.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
2. I feel a sense of well-being from a connection with nature.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
3. My relationship with God gives me a sense of inner peace.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
4. I often feel a sense of wonder and awe about the world.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1
5. I feel a sense of well-being from being in touch with forces that are bigger than me.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1

Subjective Well-being

Partially adapted from: Battista & Almond, 1973; Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985; Pavot & Diener, 1993; Pearlin & Schooler, 1978; Rosenberg, 1965; Turner et al. 2012

Subjective well-being encompasses one's satisfaction with the quality of life and represents an attempt to move beyond mental health symptomology (or its absence) as an outcome. The 5-item Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985; Pavot & Diener, 1993) was presented in simplified language (items 1-5 below). The scale also included 4 items from Turner et al.'s (2012) Self-Concept scale (originally adapted from Pearlin & Schooler, 1979; Rosenberg, 1965; items 6-9 below) and 4 items from Battista and Almond's Life Regard Index (1973; items 10-13 below).

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all outcome measures. Items from the three scales were presented separately but loaded together onto the same 13-item factor. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.95 and 0.94, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate to strong correlations with other measures of well-being, such as the Awe Index ($r = .59$), Mental Health ($r = .38$), Posttraumatic Growth ($r = .56$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all the items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Higher scores indicate higher levels of subjective well-being.

Partially adapted from:

- Battista, J., & Almond, R. (1973). The development of meaning in life. *Psychiatry: Journal for the Study Of Interpersonal Processes*, 36(4), 409-427.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R.A., Larsen, R.J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71-75.
- Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (1993). Review of the Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Psychological Assessment*, 5(2), 164-172.
- Pearlin, L. I. & Schooler, C. (1978). The structure of coping. *Journal of Health & Social Behavior*, 19, 2-21.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society of the Adolescent Self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton university press.
- Turner, H. A., Finkelhor, D., Ormrod, R., Hamby, S., Leeb, R. T., Mercy, J. A., & Holt, M. (2012). Family context, victimization, and child trauma symptoms: Variations in safe, stable, and nurturing relationships during early and middle childhood. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 82(2), 209-219.

Life Paths version: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

1. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1

2. The conditions of my life are excellent.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2
Not true about me	1

3. I am satisfied with my life.

Mostly true about me	4
Somewhat true about me	3
A little true about me	2

- Not true about me 1
4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.
 Mostly true about me 4
 Somewhat true about me 3
 A little true about me 2
 Not true about me 1
5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.
 Mostly true about me 4
 Somewhat true about me 3
 A little true about me 2
 Not true about me 1
6. I am happy with myself.
 Mostly true about me 4
 Somewhat true about me 3
 A little true about me 2
 Not true about me 1
7. I have a lot to be proud of.
 Mostly true about me 4
 Somewhat true about me 3
 A little true about me 2
 Not true about me 1
8. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
 Mostly true about me 4
 Somewhat true about me 3
 A little true about me 2
 Not true about me 1
9. I can change important things in my life.
 Mostly true about me 4
 Somewhat true about me 3
 A little true about me 2
 Not true about me 1
10. I really feel good about my life.
 Mostly true about me 4
 Somewhat true about me 3
 A little true about me 2
 Not true about me 1
11. When I look at my life, I feel I have really worked to accomplish something.
 Mostly true about me 4
 Somewhat true about me 3
 A little true about me 2
 Not true about me 1
12. I feel that I'm really going to get what I want in life.
 Mostly true about me 4
 Somewhat true about me 3
 A little true about me 2
 Not true about me 1
13. I get so excited by what I'm doing that I find energy I didn't know I had.
 Mostly true about me 4
 Somewhat true about me 3
 A little true about me 2
 Not true about me 1

Victimization
Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire-Key Domains Short Form
Adapted from Finkelhor, Hamby, Turner, & Ormrod, 2005; Hamby et al., 2011

The Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire (JVQ) is a widely used measure of interpersonal victimization and the tool used in the nation's primary surveillance of victimizations against youth (Finkelhor et al., 2005; Hamby et al., 2011). It allows a broad spectrum assessment of challenges to character development and coping. In the Life Paths study, lifetime history is assessed, with follow-up questions asking for incident details. The assault and peer victimization items more clearly distinguish between adult and child perpetrators at the screener level than in the original JVQ. Most follow-ups are selected from NatSCEV, but new follow-ups were developed to assess developmental stage during which victimization occurred and ones were adapted from Planty (2002) to assess bystander presence and impact. Adolescents were not asked item 21 or the follow-up questions to items 9 to 14. See below for a description of which follow-ups go with each item. Item 21 and follow-up questions were not included in the factor analysis. Three subscales emerged for this set of items, caregiver maltreatment, peer and community victimization, and exposure to domestic violence.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted a factor analysis for all main JVQ items.

Peer & Community Victimization. Eight items (#1 through 8 below) loaded together in the final solution. Internal consistency (coefficient alpha) for the pilot and main samples was 0.71 and 0.83, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate correlations with measures of Adverse Life Events ($r = .34$) and Mental Health ($r = -.36$).

Caregiver Maltreatment formed one six-item factor in the final solution (items 9 through 14 below). Internal consistency (coefficient alpha) for the pilot and main samples was 0.83 and 0.80, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate correlations with measures of Adverse Life Events ($r = .40$) and Mental Health ($r = -.33$).

Exposure to Domestic Violence. Five items (#15 through 19 below) loaded together in the final solution. Internal consistency (coefficient alpha) for the pilot and main samples was 0.76 and 0.85, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate correlations with measures of Adverse Life Events ($r = .43$) and Mental Health ($r = -.28$).

Two additional items were included in our total score, items 20 and 21.

Scoring: A "yes" response is scored as 1, and a "no" response is scored as 0. Items are summed to create a total score, also called a poly-victimization score. Higher scores indicate greater victimization exposure.

Adapted from: Finkelhor, D., Hamby, S., Ormrod, R., & Turner, H. (2005). The Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire: Reliability, validity, and national norms. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 29, 383-412.

Hamby, S., Finkelhor, D., Turner, H., & Kracke, K. (2011). The Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire toolkit. Retrieved from http://www.unh.edu/ccrc/jvq/index_new.html.

Life Paths version: Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. L. (2015). *Life Paths measurement packet: Finalized scales*. Sewanee, TN: Life Paths Research Program. <http://www.lifepathsresearch.org/strengths-measures/>

Also see:

Hamby, S., Weber, M., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. (online first). What difference do bystanders make? The association of victim outcomes with bystander involvement in a community sample. *Psychology of Violence*.

Banyard, V., Weber, M., Grych, J., & Hamby, S. (in press). Where are the helpful bystanders? Ecological niche and victims' perceptions of bystander intervention. *Journal of Community Psychology*.

1. At any time in your life, in real life, did you SEE anyone get attacked or hit on purpose WITH a stick, rock, gun, knife, or something that would hurt? Somewhere like at home, at school, at a store, in a car, on the street, or anywhere else?

Yes 1

No 0

2. At any time in your life, in real life, did you SEE anyone get attacked or hit on purpose WITHOUT using a stick, rock, gun, knife or something that would hurt?

Yes 1

No 0

3. During your childhood, did any kids, even a brother or sister, pick on you by chasing you, grabbing you, or by making you do something you didn't want to do?

Yes 1

No 0

4. During your childhood, did you get scared or feel really bad because kids were calling you names, saying mean things to you, or saying they didn't want you around?

Yes 1

No 0

5. During your childhood, did any kids ever tell lies or spread rumors about you, or try to make others dislike you?

Yes 1

No 0

6. During your childhood, did any kids ever keep you out of things on purpose, exclude you from their group of friends, or completely ignore you?

Yes 1

No 0

7. Sometimes kids are hit by brothers, sisters, or cousins. During your childhood, did another child in your family ever hit or attack you on purpose? Somewhere like: at home, at school, at a store, in a car, on the street, or anywhere else?

Yes 1

No 0

8. During your childhood, did any other kid ever hit you on purpose?

Yes 1

No 0

Next, we are going to ask about grown-ups who took care of you. This means parents, adults who lived with you, or others who watched you.

9. Not including spanking on your bottom, during your childhood did a grown-up in your life hit you?

Yes 1

No 0

10. When you were a child, did you get scared or feel really bad because grown-ups called you names, said mean things to you, or said they didn't want you?

Yes 1

No 0

11. When someone is neglected, it means that grown-ups didn't take care of them the way they should have. They might not get them enough food, take them to the doctor when they are sick, or make sure they have a safe place to stay. During your childhood, were you neglected?

Yes 1

No 0

12. Was there a time in your life that you often had to look after yourself because a parent drank too much alcohol, took drugs, or wouldn't get out of bed?

Yes 1

No 0

13. Was there a time in your life when you often had to go looking for a parent because the parent left you alone, or with brothers and sisters, and you didn't know where the parent was?

Yes 1

No 0

14. Was there a time in your life when your parents often had people over at the house who you were afraid to be around?

- Yes 1
- No 0

The next set of questions are about people who have taken care of you – that would include your parents, stepparents, and your parents’ boyfriends or girlfriends, whether you lived with them or not. It would also include other grown-ups, like grandparents or foster parents, if they took care of you on a regular basis. When we say “parent” in these next questions, we mean any of these people.

15. During your childhood, did one of your parents threaten to hurt another parent and it seemed they might really get hurt?

- Yes 1
- No 0

16. During your childhood, did one of your parents, because of an argument, break or ruin anything belonging to another parent, punch the wall, or throw something?

- Yes 1
- No 0

17. During your childhood, did one of your parents get hit or pushed by another parent?

- Yes 1
- No 0

18. During your childhood, did one of your parents get kicked, choked, or beat up by another parent?

- Yes 1
- No 0

19. Now we want to ask you about fights between any grown-ups and teens, not just between your parents. During your childhood, did any grown-up or teen who lived with you push, hit, or beat up someone else who lived with you, like a parent, brother, grandparent, or other relative?

- Yes 1
- No 0

Assault

20. At any time in your life, did any grown-up ever hit or attack you on purpose? This person could be a teacher, coach, someone else you know, or a stranger.

- Yes 1
- No 0

21. At any time in your life, did someone make you do sexual things when you didn’t want to?

- Yes 1
- No 0

Follow-up Questions

*If endorsed, all items (1 to 21) are asked follow-ups a, b, d, f, fa, fb, g, and h.

*If endorsed, items 7, 8, 9, 20, and 21 are asked follow-up c.

*If endorsed, items 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15 are asked follow-up e.

a. How old were you when this happened? [check all that apply]

- Early Childhood (birth to 5) 1
- Childhood (6-12) 2
- Adolescence (13-18) 3
- Early Adulthood (19-25) 4
- Adulthood (26 or older) 5

b. How many times did this happen to you in your whole life?

Answer the next questions about the last time this happened.

c. Were you physically hurt when this happened?

- Yes 1
- No 0

d. Who did this?

Brother or other boy child who lives with you (cousin, foster sibling, etc.)	1
Sister or other girl child who lives with you	2
Biological or adoptive father	3
Step-father or parent's boyfriend	4
Biological or adoptive mother	5
Step-mother or parent's girlfriend	6
A male relative (uncle, grandfather, etc.)	7
A female relative (aunt, grandmother, etc.)	8
Your husband, boyfriend or ex-boyfriend	9
Your wife, girlfriend or ex-girlfriend	10
Another male adult you know (teacher, coach, friend, etc.)	11
Another female adult you know (teacher, coach, friend, etc.)	12
A boy you know (friend, schoolmate, etc.)	13
A girl you know (friend, schoolmate, etc.)	14
A male stranger	15
A female stranger	16
Other, please specify	17
e. Who did this happen to? How do you know this person?	
Brother or other boy child who lives with you (cousin, foster sibling, etc.)	1
Sister or other girl child who lives with you	2
Biological or adoptive father	3
Step-father or parent's boyfriend	4
Biological or adoptive mother	5
Step-mother or parent's girlfriend	6
A male relative (uncle, grandfather, etc.)	7
A female relative (aunt, grandmother, etc.)	8
Your husband, boyfriend or ex-boyfriend	9
Your wife, girlfriend or ex-girlfriend	10
Another male adult you know (teacher, coach, friend, etc.)	11
Another female adult you know (teacher, coach, friend, etc.)	12
A boy you know (friend, schoolmate, etc.)	13
A girl you know (friend, schoolmate, etc.)	14
A male stranger	15
A female stranger	16
Other, please specify	17
f. Did any teen or grown-up see what happened besides you and the person who did this?	
Family member of victim or perpetrator	1
Other person you know, such as a friend, teacher or neighbor	2
Police	3
Stranger	4
No one saw this	5
fa. Did anyone who saw what happened:	
Help in any way	1
Make things worse	2
Both helped and made it worse	3
Didn't help and didn't make it worse	4
fb. Did any witness get hurt or threatened?	
Yes	1
No	0
g. Thinking back to when it happened, how afraid did you feel? Would you say you felt:	
Not at all afraid	1
A little afraid	2
Very afraid	3

- h. Did you miss any days of school, work, or your normal routine because of what happened?
 - Yes 1
 - No 0

Workplace Integration
Roberts, Hamby, Grych, & Banyard, 2015
Adapted from U.S. Air Force, 2011

The psychological impact of people's relationships with their workplaces is neither well understood nor well researched. The Workplace Integration Scale assesses how well work is integrated into the respondent's personal life and how cohesive their workplace is. The original scale used in the Air Force Community Assessment contains 12 items; we chose and adapted four items that best suited our community. We selected positively worded items and further simplified the wording on some items. Questions were also adapted to be applicable to any profession rather than just military service. Items were only asked of individuals who indicated they were employed.

Development and validation of measure in pilot study and main sample: To establish reliability and validity for new and adapted items, we conducted a pilot study with 104 participants from the same community as the main sample, recruited through a local email classifieds list and word-of-mouth. In the main sample of over 2500 participants, we conducted domain-level factor analyses for all interpersonal strengths. The analysis produced a factor consisting of all four items used in the main study. Internal consistencies (coefficient alphas) for the pilot and main samples are 0.83 and 0.85, respectively. Validity was established in the main sample with moderate correlations with other domains of interpersonal strengths, including Community Support ($r = .32$) and Social Support – Friends and Adults ($r = .32$).

Scoring: Each answer category was assigned a value from 4 to 1. The total score can be a sum or mean of all the items. We used z-scores of the scale score in our analyses. Higher scores indicate higher workplace integration.

Citation: Roberts, L.T., Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. (2015). Beyond collective efficacy: New brief measures to assess the outer layers of the social ecology. *American Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 14-23. doi: 10.13140/RG.2.1.4727.3121

Also see:

Hagler, M., Hamby, S., Grych, J., & Banyard, V. (in press). Working for well-being: Uncovering the protective benefits of work through mixed methods analysis. *Journal of Happiness Studies*.

Adapted from: U.S. Air Force. (2011). 2011 Air Force Community Assessment Survey: Survey data codebook. Lackland Air Force Base, TX: Author.

- 1. The people at my job really stick together.
 - Mostly true about my workplace 4
 - Somewhat true about my workplace 3
 - A little true about my workplace 2
 - Not true about my workplace 1
- 2. The people at my job work together as a team.
 - Mostly true about my workplace 4
 - Somewhat true about my workplace 3
 - A little true about my workplace 2
 - Not true about my workplace 1
- 3. I enjoy discussing my job with people outside of it.
 - Mostly true about my workplace 4
 - Somewhat true about my workplace 3
 - A little true about my workplace 2
 - Not true about my workplace 1
- 4. I feel like “part of the family” at my workplace.
 - Mostly true about my workplace 4
 - Somewhat true about my workplace 3
 - A little true about my workplace 2
 - Not true about my workplace 1



Exploring, Understanding, Overcoming

© 2013, 2015 Sherry Hamby, John Grych, Victoria Banyard.