

AFL Care Core Evaluation Instrument – Constructs

This document was created to accompany the AFL Care Core Evaluation Pregnant Baseline, Parenting Baseline, and Follow-up instruments approved by OMB 2/20/09. The table below provides names of constructs, item numbers in the survey, sources of items, and tips for analysis, including findings from a pilot test by RTI International and the role of some constructs in the conceptual model of AFL Care projects (shown on page 13).

Construct	AFL Instrument and Question Numbers Preg = Pregnant Baseline Par = Parenting Baseline F = Follow-up # = Question Number	Source(s)	Analysis Tips (Conceptual model delineating mediators, moderators, and primary outcomes is included on page 13)
“About the Future”			
Educational aspirations	Pre, Par, F #1, 2, 3	Adapted from the Youth Asset Survey (YAS) Oman, R.F., Vesely, S.K., McLeroy, K.R., Harris-Wyatt, V., Aspy, C.B., Rodine, S., & Marshall, L. (2002). Reliability and validity of the youth asset survey (YAS). <i>Journal of Adolescent Health, 31</i> (3), 247-255. Adapted from the National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG) Adapted from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health)	Analyze as a mediator: Projects are expected to improve adolescents’ attitudes about future education. Items may be combined for analysis. Cronbach’s alpha in RTI pilot test = .77
“What You Think”			
Attitudes about marriage	Pre, Par, F #4	Adapted from NSFG	
Peer role models	Pre, Par, F #5	Adapted from YAS (Oman et al., 2002)	
Self-efficacy to make responsible choices	Pre, Par, F #6, 7	Adapted from YAS (Oman et al., 2002)	Correlation in RTI pilot test = .41. Because the correlation was relatively small, items may

Construct	AFL Instrument and Question Numbers Preg = Pregnant Baseline Par = Parenting Baseline F = Follow-up # = Question Number	Source(s)	Analysis Tips (Conceptual model delineating mediators, moderators, and primary outcomes is included on page 13)
			need to be analyzed separately.
Opinions about adoption	Pre, Par, F #8	Original Abt instrument	
Parent-child communication	Pre, Par, F #9	Adapted from YAS (Oman et al., 2002)	Analyze as a mediator: projects are expected to improve parent involvement
Parenting enjoyment	Par #10	Adapted from the Fragile Families Follow-up (FFFU), <i>Fragile Families and Child Well-being Study</i>	In the RTI pilot test, these four items as a scale were analyzed, $\alpha = .47$. This low Cronbach's alpha suggests that the items do not hang together well and may need to be analyzed separately. Note that items 11 and 13 are worded in the opposite direction from items 10 and 12. Reverse code items 11 and 13 if you plan to analyze the four items as a scale.
	Par #11	Adapted from the original Abt instrument	
	Par #12	Adapted from FFFU	
	Par #13	Adapted from NSFG	
“About Your Child”/“About You”			
Child's birthday	Par #14, F #11		This is an opportunity to note the birth date of the referent child so that it is clear who the respondent is answering questions about, and so that it is possible to track developmental outcomes according to age (such as immunization).
Child living	F #10, 16		These items are included so that respondents whose pregnancy did not end in a live birth or whose child has died can skip out of questions about the child in the follow-up survey.
Gestational age	Par #15, F #12	Adapted from NSFG	
Birth weight	Par #16, F #13	Adapted from NSFG	
Child healthcare	Par #17, 18	Adapted from NSFG	

Construct	AFL Instrument and Question Numbers Preg = Pregnant Baseline Par = Parenting Baseline F = Follow-up # = Question Number	Source(s)	Analysis Tips (Conceptual model delineating mediators, moderators, and primary outcomes is included on page 13)
	F #17, 18		
Breastfeeding	Par #19, 20 F #14, 15	Adapted from NSFG	
Where referent child lives	Par #21, 22 F #19, 20	Adapted from NSFG	
Child immunization	Par #23, 24 F #21, 22	Item created based on Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) 2008 immunization schedule Adapted from the National Immunization Survey (NIS)	Analyze as a primary outcome: Projects are expected to improve child immunization schedule compliance. Items may be combined for analysis. Cronbach's alpha in RTI pilot test (adolescent report) = .82
Child immunization records abstraction	Par, F Staff section #1-3	Record abstraction based on CDC 2008 immunization schedule	
Child Care	Par #25, 26, 27 F #23, 24, 25	Original Abt item	
Relationship with child's father	Pre #15, Par #28, F #26	Adapted from Add Health	Analyze as a moderator: Project effects may vary as a function of the adolescents' relationship with the child's father. Since this relationship may change over time, the item is included in the baseline and follow-up surveys.
Support from the child's father	Pre #16-18 Par #29-31 F # 27-29	Adapted from FFBL survey, <i>Fragile Families and Child Well-being Study</i>	Analyze as a mediator: Projects are expected to increase involvement of the child's father. Items may be combined for analysis. Cronbach's alpha in RTI pilot test = .69 (the latter two items were highly correlated, $r = .78$)
"About Your Health"			

Construct	AFL Instrument and Question Numbers Preg = Pregnant Baseline Par = Parenting Baseline F = Follow-up # = Question Number	Source(s)	Analysis Tips (Conceptual model delineating mediators, moderators, and primary outcomes is included on page 13)
Preventing sexually transmitted infections	Pre #10, Par #34, F #32		
Gestational age	Pre #11	Adapted from NSFG	Analyze as a moderator: Project effects may vary based on how early in pregnancy adolescents enter programs. This item can be recoded into either weeks or months since respondents should only complete one or the other.
Gravida status	Pre #12, Par #36		Analyze as a moderator: Project effects may vary based on the number of times adolescent has already been pregnant.
Repeat pregnancy	F #33, 34		Analyze as a primary outcome: programs are expected to reduce repeat pregnancy
Pregnancy prevention	Par #35, F #35	Adapted from NSFG	Analyze as a mediator: programs are expected to increase contraceptive use.
Reproductive healthcare utilization	F #36	Adapted from NSFG	
“About You” / “About Your Child”			
Age	Pre #13, Par #37	Adapted from NSFG	Analyze as a moderator: program effects may vary as a function of demographic characteristics This item can be recoded such that the score corresponds to the respondent’s actual age.
Marital status	Pre #14, Par #32, F	Adapted from NSFG	Analyze as a moderator: program effects may

Construct	AFL Instrument and Question Numbers Preg = Pregnant Baseline Par = Parenting Baseline F = Follow-up # = Question Number	Source(s)	Analysis Tips (Conceptual model delineating mediators, moderators, and primary outcomes is included on page 13)
	#30		vary as a function of demographic characteristics
Household composition	Pre# 19, Par #33, F #31	Adapted from NSFG	Analyze as a moderator: Project effects may vary as a function of demographic characteristics. This item could be used to create a household composition variable with values representing different household arrangements (e.g., two-parent, single parent, partner only, etc).
Number of children in adolescent's care	Pre #20, 21 Par #38, 39	Adapted from NSFG	Analyze as a moderator: Project effects may vary as a function of how many children the adolescent is already responsible for.
Ethnicity	Pre# 22, Par #40	Office of Management and the Budget (OMB)-required measure of ethnicity	Analyze as a moderator: Project effects may vary as a function of demographic characteristics.
Race	Pre# 23, Par #41	OMB required item about race Adapted from NSFG	Analyze as a moderator: Project effects may vary as a function of demographic characteristics. This item can be recoded to reflect bi-racial or multi-racial respondents, since they can mark more than one option.
Educational status	Pre #24, 26 Par #42, 44 F #37, 39	Adapted from NSFG	Analyze as a primary outcome: Projects are expected to improve educational attainment. This item can be recoded so that the score corresponds to the respondent's actual grade

Construct	AFL Instrument and Question Numbers Preg = Pregnant Baseline Par = Parenting Baseline F = Follow-up # = Question Number	Source(s)	Analysis Tips (Conceptual model delineating mediators, moderators, and primary outcomes is included on page 13)
			("some college" could be coded 13,14 or 15; college degree or more could be coded 16 or 17).
Childbearing goals	Pre# 25, Par #43, F #38		Analyze as a moderator: Project effects may vary as a function of pre-program risk levels, such as pregnancy intention
Job training	Pre #27, 28 Par #45, 46 F #40, 41	Adapted from NSFG	
Number of hours worked	Pre #29, Par #47, F #42	Adapted from NSFG	
Financial assistance	Pre #30, Par #48, F #43	Adapted from NSFG	
Financial source	Pre #31, Par #49, F #44	Adapted from NSFG	