

*Psychosocial and Lifestyle Questionnaire
2006 - 2010*

**Documentation Report
Core Section LB**

Jacqui Smith, Gwenith Fisher, Lindsay Ryan, Philippa Clarke, Jim House and David Weir
The HRS Psychosocial Working Group

Survey Research Center
Institute for Social Research
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

February 2013

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	4
<i>Overview</i>	4
<i>2004 Survey Methodology</i>	7
<i>2006 Survey Methodology</i>	7
<i>2008 Survey Methodology</i>	8
<i>2010 Survey Methodology</i>	8
Weighting.....	8
Special Methodological Issues to Consider	9
<i>Response Scales</i>	9
<i>Recoding Responses and Negative Wording of Survey Items</i>	9
<i>Who Completed the Questionnaire?</i>	9
The Content and Format of this User Guide.....	10
<i>Note on Construct Question Numbers</i>	10
Q1. Social Participation - Social Engagement.....	11
Q2. Retrospective Social Participation.....	12
Q3. Life Satisfaction	13
Q4. – Q18. Social Network - Social Integration - Quality of Relationships - Social Support	14
Q19a - Q19e. Cynical Hostility.....	17
Q19f - Q19k. Optimism / Pessimism.....	18
Q19l - Q19o. Hopelessness.....	19
Q20. Loneliness	20
Q21. Neighborhood Disorder / Neighborhood Social Cohesion.....	21
Q22 - Q23. Sense of Control - Self-Efficacy - Agency - Mastery.....	22
Q24 - Q26. Domain Specific Control (Efficacy)	23
Q27. Positive and Negative Affect	24
Q28. Religiosity / Spirituality	26
Q29. Self-Perceptions of Aging: Subjective Age and Aging Satisfaction	27
Q30. Everyday Discrimination	29
Q31. Attributions of Everyday Discrimination	30
Q32. Social Effort / Reward Balance	31
Q32a. Quality of Relationships with parents in Early Life	32
Q33. The "Big 5" Personality Traits	33
Q34. Personality Sub-Facet Traits: Conscientiousness and Impulsiveness	35
Q34a. Need for Cognition.....	38
Q35. Psychological Well-Being.....	38
Q36. Major Experiences of Lifetime Discrimination	40
Q37a. Lifetime Traumas	41
Q37b. Quality of Relationship with Mother Early in Life	42
Q37c. Lifetime Traumas Before the Age of 18	42
Q38. Recent Stressful Life Events	43
Q39. Satisfaction with Domains of Life	44

Q40. Experience of Financial Strain	44
Q40a. Ongoing Chronic Stressors.....	45
Q41. Anxiety.....	46
Q42. Anger	47
Q43 - Q44. Subjective Social Status (Ladder).....	48
Q45. Currently Working	49
Q46. Job Lock	49
Q47. Perceived Ability to Work	49
Q48. Work/Non-work Interference and Enhancement	50
Q49. Chronic Work Discrimination.....	51
Q50a - Q50o. Job Stressors and Job Satisfaction	52
Q50p - Q50t. Work Environment	53
Q50u - Q50w. Coworker Support	54
Q50x - Q50za. Supervisor Support	54
2006 Scales or Specific Items Not Included in 2010 or 2008 Survey Content	56
Q2. Community Meeting Attendance	56
Q29. Frequency of Prayer	56
Q35. Psychological Well-Being (Two subscales)	56
Q46-47. Work/Family Priorities	58
Additional HRS Documentation for Psychosocial Data.....	59
Other Related Studies	59
English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA).....	59
Survey of Health, Ageing, and Retirement in Europe (SHARE)	59
Appendix A: Psychosocial Measure Concordance among 2006, 2008, and 2010 Questionnaires.....	60

Introduction

Overview

In 2004, HRS piloted a new feature for data collection in the form of self-administered questionnaires that were left with respondents upon the completion of an in-person Core Interview. Since 2006, this mode of data collection has been utilized to obtain information about participants' evaluations of their life circumstances, subjective wellbeing, and lifestyle. This psychosocial information is obtained in each biennial wave from a rotating (random) 50% of the core panel participants who complete the enhanced face-to-face interview (EFTF). Longitudinal data will be available at four-year intervals: the 2010 wave provides the first longitudinal psychosocial data from the 2006 participants. Some longitudinal data is also available for the 2004 participants in subsequent waves. Electronic versions of the HRS Participant (Psychosocial) Lifestyle Questionnaires used in the 2004 pilot, and the 2006, 2008, and 2010 waves are available on the HRS website (Documentation/Questionnaires - scroll down to the end of the Biennial Content to Psychosocial - Section LB). Because the questionnaire was left with respondents at the end of the EFTF interview for them to complete and mail back to study offices, the questionnaire came to be known and is referred to on the HRS website as the Leave-Behind (LB). We use the terms Participant Lifestyle Questionnaire and Leave-Behind (or LB) in this report to refer to the self-administered psychosocial data collection.

Background

Since its inception in 1992, the HRS survey has focused on the health, economics, and demographics of aging and the retirement process. Initially, the assessment of psychosocial issues in aging was not a goal of the HRS. In 2003, the NIA-HRS Data Monitoring Committee commissioned a report by Professor Carol Ryff of the University of Wisconsin, which described the research opportunities from expansion into this area. That report is online at:

<http://hrsonline.isr.umich.edu/papers/dmc/HRSReview-RyffPsychosocialVariables.pdf>

The launch of the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA) in 2002 provided a starting-point model for psychosocial data collection in HRS. The HRS then formed a Working Group under the direction of Jim House to consider content and methods toward four aims: 1) to determine the extent to which psychosocial measures may improve understanding of causes and effects of health, well-being, and retirement in middle and later life, 2) to improve understanding of social disparities in health, 3) to increase utilization of HRS data by researchers in additional social science fields, including social epidemiology, social gerontology, and psychology, and 4) to facilitate the cross-cultural comparison of data from the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA; <http://www.ifs.org.uk/elsa/index.php>) and the Survey of Health, Aging, and Retirement in Europe (SHARE; <http://www.share-project.org/>).

In 2004, the HRS Psychosocial Working Group developed a pilot Participant Lifestyle Questionnaire and administered it as a leave-behind self-administered questionnaire to a pilot sample of about 4,000 respondents. In 2005, the scientific review of the HRS renewal proposal strongly endorsed this new content and recommended an approach more strongly grounded in psychological theory than that taken by ELSA. In conjunction with a subcommittee of the NIA-

HRS Data Monitoring Committee (Lisa Berkman, John Cacioppo, Nicholas Christakis, and Carol Ryff), the HRS consulted widely with experts in the psychology of aging and conducted a workshop at the Annual Meeting of the Gerontological Society of America in Orlando, FL on November 18, 2005. The purpose of this meeting was to review the data collected from the pilot study, and discuss plans for a revised survey to be administered in 2006.

Participants at the November 18, 2005 Psychosocial Workshop included:

Toni Antonucci, University of Michigan
Elizabeth Breeze, University College, London
Deborah Carr, Rutgers University
Philippa Clarke, University of Michigan
Sheldon Cohen, Carnegie Mellon University
Eileen Crimmins, University of Southern California
Gwenith Fisher, University of Michigan
Robert Hauser, University of Wisconsin
Tess Hauser, University of Wisconsin
Jim House, University of Michigan
James Jackson, University of Michigan
Margie Lachman, Brandeis University
John J. McArdle, University of Southern California
Carol Ryff, University of Wisconsin
Richard Schulz, University of Pittsburgh
Jacqui Smith, Max Planck Institute of Human Development, now University of Michigan
Ron Spiro, VA Boston Healthcare System and Boston University
David Weir, University of Michigan
Robert Willis, University of Michigan

Since 2007, the content of the Psychosocial Questionnaire has been regularly discussed and revised by the HRS Co-PIs. The co-authors of this study guide are especially grateful for the valuable assistance provided by Rachel King and Jennifer Morack in various phases of preparation.

Overview of Psychosocial Content and Timeline 2004-2010

After the 2004 pilot, the psychosocial questionnaire content was revised and updated in 2006. The psychosocial and lifestyle questionnaires from 2006 to 2010 now cover six substantive areas that interest researchers across many disciplines: namely 1) subjective well-being; 2) lifestyle and experience of stress; 3) quality of social ties; 4) personality traits; 5) work-related beliefs; 6) self-related beliefs. Figure 1 provides an outline of the constructs assessed in each of these areas. With the exception of some additions, the content in the 2008 and 2010 waves has not changed substantially since 2006. Specific information about the scales together with their psychometrics and sources is included below in this documentation report. Information about cross-wave concordance is provided below for each construct and is summarized in Appendix A.

Figure 1: Overview of Content in the HRS Psychosocial and Lifestyle Questionnaire: 2006-2010

<p>Subjective Wellbeing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Life satisfaction Domain satisfaction* Depressive symptoms Positive affect Negative affect Purpose in life Personal growth Financial strain 	<p>Lifestyle & Stress</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities in daily life* Social participation Neighborhood cohesion Religiosity Discrimination Lifetime traumas Early life experiences Stressful life events Ongoing stress experiences 	<p>Quality of Social Ties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social network composition Quality of relationships: Positive and negative support received from spouse/child/kin/friends Early parental relationships* Frequency of contact with friends, children, family Loneliness
<p>Personality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extraversion Neuroticism Openness Agreeableness Conscientiousness* Impulsivity* Cynical hostility Anxiety Anger 	<p>Work-related Beliefs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work stress Work discrimination Work satisfaction Perceived Capacity to work* Effort-reward balance Work support Work/family priorities Work/life balance 	<p>Self-related Beliefs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personal mastery (control) Perceived constraints Domain-specific control Hopelessness Subjective age* Self-perceptions of aging* Subjective social status Optimism/Pessimism Need for cognition*

* Items added in 2008 /2010

Figure 2 illustrates the current and planned longitudinal timeline for the collection of psychosocial constructs in HRS. The top row indicates the information available in the core interview protocol. Prior to 2006, HRS included limited information on psychosocial topics in the core biennial survey. The primary measure was a 2-item screening for 12-month incidence of major depression at study entry together with an 8-item version of the CES-D measure of depressive symptoms collected biennially in the Core (section D). As of 2008, all participants in the core are also asked a single item of global well-being (Section B). In addition, from 2006 onward, participants scheduled for the in-person interview (Enhanced Face-To-Face -EFTF) are given the self-administered Participant Lifestyle Questionnaire to complete and return by mail. Each wave, a random 50% of the longitudinal panel are scheduled for an in-person interview. In

Figure 2, we notated the two 50% panel splits as A (begins in 2006) and B (begins in 2008). The first longitudinal psychosocial data were collected from the same people in the initial 50% random subsample (A). Longitudinal data was collected in 2012 from the second 50% panel (B). This rotational design will continue in future waves. After 2012, some psychosocial constructs that require a one-time collection (e.g., retrospective information about early life trauma and relationships with parents) might only be collected only for new cohorts.

Figure 2: Timeline for Collection of Psychosocial Data in HRS

							<i>PLANNED</i>	
	Prior	2004	2006	2008	2010	2012	2014	2016
Core Sample	+*	+	+	+◇	+◇	+◇	+◇	+◇
LB Sample			A	B	A	B	A	B

- + = Indicators of depression
- * = Various small sample modules
- ◇ = Single life satisfaction item
- A = First random 50% subsample
- B = Second random 50% subsample

Survey Methodology

2004 Survey Methodology

In the 2004 wave of HRS, two questionnaires were administered to separate random subsamples of living, non-institutionalized respondents who completed the EFTF interview. One was a Participant Questionnaire on Work and Health which consisted of a series of work disability vignettes and was targeted toward respondents under 75 years of age. The other was a Participant Lifestyle Questionnaire that contained questions on psychosocial topics and was administered to respondents of all ages. Respondents were asked to complete the questionnaires and mail them back to the main field office at the University of Michigan.

Administration of the leave-behind questionnaires began around April 27 and continued through the end of the 2004 field period. Questionnaire assignments were made by Primary Sampling Unit (PSU) in such a way as to provide roughly equal numbers of respondents for each of the two leave-behind questionnaires. In households containing two respondents, both respondents received the same type of questionnaire.

Response rate: Among respondents who completed a core interview in 2004 and were eligible for the psychosocial leave-behind, the response rate is 76.8%. Factoring in the 2004 core response rate of 88.9%, the overall response rate is 68.3%.

2006 Survey Methodology

In 2006, the updated and revised Participant Lifestyle Questionnaire was administered, but the disability questionnaire (the Participant Questionnaire on Work and Health) was not repeated. As

in 2004, HRS respondents received a questionnaire if they were selected into the random 50% subsample for the EFTF interview as long as they were alive and either they or a proxy completed at least part of the interview in person (designated as subsample A in the Figure 2 timeline). Telephone follow-ups were conducted with respondents who had not returned a questionnaire after the second reminder notice.

Response rate: In 2006, the response rate for the leave behind questionnaire was about 90% among those who completed the EFTF interview. Among all those assigned to the enhanced interview who completed any sort of interview, the response rate was about 82% percent. Factoring in the 2006 core response rate of 90% for those assigned to the EFTF interview, the overall response rate was about 74 percent.

2008 Survey Methodology

For the 2008 wave, the psychosocial questionnaire was revised based on a review of the 2006 content and data. In 2008, HRS respondents who had not completed the EFTF interview in 2006 rotated into this mode of data collection (random 50% subsample B in Figure 2). Participants received a questionnaire if they were selected for the EFTF interview as long as they were alive and either they or a proxy completed at least part of the interview in person. Telephone follow-ups were conducted with respondents who had not returned a questionnaire after the second reminder notice.

Response rate: In 2008, the response rate for the leave behind was just under 89% among those who completed the EFTF interview. Among all those assigned to get the enhanced interview who completed any sort of interview, the response rate was about 80 percent. Factoring in the 2008 core response rate of 88.4% for those assigned to EFTF, the overall response rate was about 71 percent.

2010 Survey Methodology

For the 2010 wave, the psychosocial questionnaire was minimally revised based on a review of 2006 and 2008 content and data. In 2010, HRS respondents who had completed the EFTF interview in 2006 again rotated into this mode of data collection. This rotation design provides the first longitudinal data for the random 50% subsample (A) as shown in Figure 2. Participants received a questionnaire if they were selected for the EFTF interview as long as they were alive and either they or a proxy completed at least part of the interview in person. Telephone follow-ups were conducted with respondents who had not returned a questionnaire after the second reminder notice.

Response rate: Information about the 2010 response rate for the leave behind for both the longitudinal panel and new cohort will be available when the cross-wave tracker file is updated.

Weighting

Because not all HRS respondents were asked to complete a psychosocial questionnaire, separate respondent-level survey weights are constructed to adjust for the sample selection. The 2004, 2006 and 2008 are available in the current cross-wave tracker file. Weights for 2010 will be included in future cross-wave tracker file updates.

The psychosocial leave behind respondent weight developed for each wave is the product of a) the HRS respondent-level weight for the respective wave (e.g., 2006, 2008, etc.) and b) a non-response adjustment factor. The non-response adjustment factor was obtained from a propensity

model predicting the probability of completing the psychosocial leave-behind questionnaire among all eligible cases. The propensity model was estimated by logistic regression and weighted by the HRS respondent-level weight. Predictor variables included age, sex, race/ethnicity, language of interview, coupleness, education, work status, self-rated health, a dichotomous indicator of chronic disease, vision rating, cognitive status, proxy status, and two general indicators of cooperativeness: whether the respondent completed an interview in the prior wave and total number of interviewer calls required to complete the interview in that wave. The inverse of the fitted probabilities of completion formed the non-response adjustment factor. The resulting weight was trimmed at the fifth and ninety-fifth percentiles. This weight is defined for respondents who completed the psychosocial leave-behind questionnaire. The psychosocial sample weights developed for subsequent waves were done using the 2006 method and response propensity model. We recommend using the psychosocial weight when analyzing data from the psychosocial questionnaire to account for the complex sample structure. The decision to use weights or not of course depends on the research question and discipline.

Special Methodological Issues to Consider

Response Scales

The Participant Lifestyle Questionnaire is comprised of a variety of items and scales that are described in more detail later in this document. Note that the response categories in the questionnaire vary across scales, and it is very important to consult the codebooks and questionnaires (available on the HRS website) for the response scales for each item. The wording of scales is intended to maximize comparability with response scales used in other surveys (e.g., ELSA, SHARE, MIDUS) and with previous research literature.

Recoding Responses and Negative Wording of Survey Items

Many of the items within measures in the questionnaire will need to be recoded so that higher values correspond with higher levels on a given item or measure. For example, the positive affect items in Question 27 are asked using a scale as follows: 1=All of the time, 2=Most of the time, 3=some of the time, 4=A little of the time, and 5=None of the time. By recoding the values so that 1=None of the time, 2=a little of the time, etc., higher values will correspond to higher levels of positive affect.

Similarly, items vary in terms of being positively and negatively worded. This is a practice frequently employed in the assessment of psychosocial issues to combat response sets (e.g., when a respondent circles the same answer for every question). The values for negatively worded items need to be reversed to obtain a positive composite score. For example, Question 22d to assess control reads “I have little control over the things that happen to me.” The values on this item will need to be recoded in order to be consistent with other items where higher values indicate having more control when creating a composite score. This documentation report provides information on when to reverse-code items.

Who Completed the Questionnaire?

Question 51 was asked at the end of the survey as an indicator of whether or not a proxy respondent was used to complete the questionnaire: “Were the questions in this booklet answered

by the person whose name is written on the front cover?” Approximately 1-2% of psychosocial questionnaires are completed by proxy respondents. In many cases where the participant is very old, a caregiver acts as a scribe especially if the participant is vision impaired or finds it difficult to hold a pen due to arthritis.

Note on Terminology

The terms used in this report to describe each construct are prevalent in the sociology and psychology literatures and consistent with the original item/scale source. Sometimes you may find papers from researchers who use a different general term to describe a construct built from the same items or who form composite scores from different sets of items. For this reason, we suggest that users search for specific items as well as overall topics in the questionnaire.

The Content and Format of this User Guide

This User Guide provides information about the psychosocial constructs included in the waves 2006, 2008, and 2010. For each construct, we provide citations for the source(s) of the items, list the items in the questionnaire, report the response coding and inter-item consistency (reliability) information, and as far as possible include citations for several papers to illustrate how the construct has been used in the literature.

Note on Construct Question Numbers

While most constructs, scales, and question numbering are the same across these waves, there are some differences. In order to provide a method for easy comparison across the three waves of the psychosocial questionnaires covered in this guide, each main construct is listed using the **2010 question numbering**. If the question numbering was identical in the questionnaires for earlier waves (e.g., 2006 and 2008), we list these waves in parentheses to the right. Instances of inconsistent question numbers or when a construct was not included in a prior wave are noted directly below the construct label. You can also refer to Appendix A at the end of this document for a table summary of content concordance across 2006, 2008, and 2010.

Q1. Social Participation - Social Engagement (2006, 2008, & 2010)

The 20 items included in 2010 cover a wide range of activities and ask frequency of participation. Earlier questionnaires covered reduced lists of activities: only 18 items of these 20 were in 2008 for example. The small set of activities covered in 2006 have mostly been integrated into different sections of the 2008 and 2010 questionnaires. Composite scores for types and frequencies of activities can be constructed using the 2008 and 2010 items. However, because some activity wordings are slightly different between 2008 and 2010, and with the addition of 2 new activities in 2010 (namely Q01b activities with grandchildren and Q01j watch TV), please pay close attention to the variable names as they may not match across the two surveys. The 2006 items are Y/N, 2008 changed to a 6-point Likert scale (Daily to Not in the last month), and 2010 changed to a 7-point scale adding the category Never/Not relevant.

Sources:

Hultsch, D.F., Hertzog, C., Dixon, R.A., & Small, B.J. (1999). Use it or lose it: Engaged lifestyle as a buffer of cognitive decline in aging. *Psychology and Aging, 14*, 245-263.

Jopp, D. S., & Hertzog, C. (2010). Assessing adult leisure activities: An extension of a self-report activity questionnaire. *Psychological Assessment, 22*(1), 108-120.

Levin, J.S. (2003). Private Religious Practices. In N. W. Group (Ed.), *Multidimensional measurement of religiousness/spirituality for use in health research: A report of the Fetzer Institute/National Institute on Aging Working Group* (2nd ed., pp. 39-42). Kalamazoo, MI: John E. Fetzer Institute.

Parslow, R.A., Jorm, A.F., Christensen, H., & Mackinnon, A. (2006). An instrument to measure engagement in life: Factor analysis and associations with sociodemographic, health, and cognition measures. *Gerontology, 52*, 188-198.

Salthouse, T.A., Berish, D.E., & Miles, J.D. (2002). The role of cognitive stimulation on the relations between age and cognitive functioning. *Psychology and Aging, 17*, 548-557.

Items: 20 items (Q01a-Q01t)

(These first questions are about the activities in your life now. Please tell us HOW OFTEN YOU DO EACH ACTIVITY.)

- Q01a Care for a sick or disabled adult?
- Q01b Do activities with grandchildren, nieces/nephews, or neighborhood children? (2010 only)
- Q01c Do volunteer work with children or young people? (Q01b in 2008)
- Q01d Do any other volunteer or charity work? (Q01c in 2008)
- Q01e Attend an educational or training course? (Q01d in 2008)
- Q01f Go to a sport, social, or other club? (Q01e in 2008)
- Q01g Attend meetings or non-religious organizations, such as political, community, or other interest groups? (Q01f in 2008)
- Q01h Pray privately in places other than church or a synagogue? (Q01g in 2008)
- Q01i Read books, magazines, or newspapers? (Q01h in 2008)

Q01j	Watch television? (2010 only)
Q01k	Do word games such as crossword puzzles or Scrabble? (Q01i in 2008)
Q01l	Play cards or games such as chess? (Q01j in 2008)
Q01m	Do writing (such as letters, stories, or journal entries)? (Q01k in 2008)
Q01n	Use a computer for e-mail, Internet or other tasks? (Q01l in 2008)
Q01o	Do home or car maintenance or gardening? (Q01m in 2008)
Q01p	Bake or cook something special? (Q01n in 2008)
Q01q	Make clothes, knit, embroider, etc.? (Q01o in 2008)
Q01r	Work on a hobby or project? (Q01p in 2008)
Q01s	Play sports or exercise? (Q01q in 2008)
Q01t	Walk for 20 minutes or more? (Q01r in 2008)

Coding: 1=Daily, 2=Several times a week, 3=Once a week, 4=Several times a month, 5=At least once a month, 6=Not in the last month, 7=Never/Not Relevant (2010 only). Note regarding Missing responses in 2008: If participants responded to at least 2 activities we suggest recoding missings in other activities as 6 or 7. Note regarding coding in 2006: Response scale was 1 = yes, 5 = no.

Scaling: Depending on topical interest, researchers could count the number and frequency of activities (e.g., physical exercise, volunteering) or create a sum score for various categories of activity.

Psychometrics: Due to the nature of the question, a coefficient alpha was not calculated.

Background:

Agahi, N., & Parker, M.G. (2008). Leisure activities and mortality: Does gender matter? *Journal of Aging and Health, 20*, 855-871.

Levasseur, M., Richard, L., Gauvin, L., & Raymond, E. (2010). Inventory and analysis of definitions of social participation found in the aging literature: Proposed taxonomy of social activities. *Social Science & Medicine, 71*(12), 2141-2149.

Tan, E.J., Rebok, G.W., Yu, Q., Frangakis, Carlson, M.C., Wang, T., et al. (2009). The long term relationship between high-intensity volunteering and physical activity in older African-American women. *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences, 64*, 304-311.

Q2. Retrospective Social Participation (2008 & 2010)

Not included in 2006

This retrospective self-report item was developed by HRS.

Items: 1 item (Q02)

(Think back to the number of activities you did in your life when you were about 30. How does the number you do now compare to back then?)

Coding: 1=Less now, 2=The same, 3=More now

Q3. Life Satisfaction (2006, 2008, & 2010)

This is Diener's measure of life satisfaction, an established and reliable measure of subjective well-being that has been used extensively in international comparative studies.

Source:

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.

Items: 5 items (Q03a – Q03e)

(Please say how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.)

Q03a In most ways my life is close to ideal.

Q03b The conditions of my life are excellent.

Q03c I am satisfied with my life.

Q03d So far, I have gotten the important things I want in life.

Q03e If I could live my life again, I would change almost nothing

Coding: 2008 and 2010: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Somewhat disagree, 3=Slightly disagree, 4=Neither agree nor disagree, 5=Slightly agree, 6=Somewhat agree, 7=Strongly agree

2006: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Somewhat disagree, 3=Slightly disagree, 4=Slightly agree, 5=Somewhat agree, 6=Strongly agree

Scaling: Create an index of life satisfaction by averaging the scores across all 5 items. Set the final score to missing if there are three or more items with missing values.

Psychometrics: 2010 Alpha = .89 (2008 Alpha = .88; 2006 Alpha=.89)

Background:

Diener, E., Lucas, R. E., & Scollon, C. (2006). Beyond the hedonic treadmill: Revising the adaptation theory of well-being. *American Psychologist*, 61(4), 305-314.

Diener, E., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). Beyond money: Toward an economy of well-being. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 5(1), 1-31.

Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(2), 276-302.

Stone, A.A., Schwartz, J.E., Broderick, J.E., Deaton, A. (2010). A snapshot of the age distribution of psychological well-being in the United States. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 107(22), 9985-9990.

Q4. – Q18. Social Network - Social Integration - Quality of Relationships - Social Support
(2006, 2008, & 2010)

This series of questions assesses several indicators of social integration (number of social ties) and the contact and quality of interaction with those social ties. Separate questions are asked about spouse/partner (Q.4-6), children (Q.7-10), family (Q. 11-14), and friends (Q. 15-18). Equivalent items are included in ELSA.

Sources:

Schuster, T. L., Kessler, R. C., & Aseltine, R. H. Jr. (1990). Supportive interactions, negative interactions, and depressed mood. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 18, 423-438.

Turner, R. J., Frankel, G., & Levin, D. M. (1983). Social support: Conceptualization, measurement, and implications for mental health. In J. R. Greenley & R. G. Simmons (Eds.), *Research in Community and Mental Health* (pp. 67-111). Greenwich: JAI Press.

Composition of Social Network

Four questions ask respondents if they have spouses/partners, children, family, and friends.

<u>Items:</u>	4 items (Q04, Q07, Q11, Q15)
Q04	Do you have a husband, wife, or partner with whom you live?
Q07	Do you have any living children?
Q11	Do you have any other immediate family, for example, any brothers or sisters, parents, cousins or grandchildren?
Q15	Do you have any friends?

Coding: 1=Yes, 5=No

Scaling: Create a sum variable by counting the number of 'yes' responses for respondents in order to obtain the composition of social networks. Scores will range from 0-4.

Number of close social relationships

Four questions assess the close relationships within the respondents' social networks. One question is used to examine the closeness respondents feel with their spouses (Q06). Three questions ask for the number of close relationships with children, family members, and friends.

Items: 4 items (Q06, Q10, Q14, Q18)

Q06	How close is your relationship with your spouse or partner?
Q10	How many of your children would you say you have a close relationship with?
Q14	How many of these family members would you say you have a close relationship with?
Q18	How many of your friends would you say you have a close relationship with?

Coding Q06.: 1=Very close, 2=Quite close, 3=Not very close, 4=Not at all close

Contact with Social Network

Nine questions assess the extent to which respondents are in contact with their social networks (excluding spouses). Similar questions refer to contact with children (Q 9a-c), other family (Q 13a-c), and friends (Q17a-c).

Items: 9 items (Q9a-c, Q13a-c, Q17a-c)

(On average, how often do you do each of the following? Please check the answer which shows how you feel about each statement.)

- a Meet up (include both arranged and chance meetings)
- b Speak on the phone
- c Write or email

Coding: 1=Three or more times a week, 2=Once or twice a week, 3=Once or twice a month, 4=Every few months, 5=Once or twice a year, 6=Less than once a year or never

Scaling: Reverse code all items. Depending on your research question, average or sum across items for each specific relation category or across all relation categories for a measure of overall contact with the social network. Set the final score to missing if there is more than one item with missing values.

Psychometrics: Due to the nature of the question, a high degree of internal consistency was not expected of these items. Therefore a coefficient alpha was not calculated.

Perceived Social Support (Relationship Quality)

Four sets of 7 items (Q5, Q8, Q12, Q16) examine the perceived support that respondents receive from their spouses (Q5), children (Q8), family (Q12), and friends (Q16). For each relationship category there are 3 positively worded items (items a-c) and 4 negatively worded items (items d-g). Some researchers use these items as indicators of perceived relationship quality rather than support.

Items: 28 items (Q5a-g, Q8a-g, Q12a-g, Q16a-g)

(Please check the answer which best shows how you feel about each statement.)

Positive Social Support (items a-c)

- a How much do they really understand the way you feel about things?
- b How much can you rely on them if you have a serious problem?
- c How much can you open up to them if you need to talk about your worries?

Negative Social Support (items d-g)

- d How often do they make too many demands on you?
- e How much do they criticize you?
- f How much do they let you down when you are counting on them?
- g How much do they get on your nerves?

Coding: 1=A lot, 2=Some, 3=A little, 4=Not at all.

Scaling: Reverse code all items. Create an index of positive social support and an index of negative social support for each relationship category by averaging the scores within each dimension [positive (a-c) and negative (d-g)]. Set the final score to missing if there is more than one item with missing values for the positive social support scale, or more than two items with missing values for the negative social support scale.

Psychometrics:

Alpha Reliability Across 4 Relationship Categories: 2010, 2008, and 2006

	Spouse	Children	Other Family	Friends
Positive Social Support	'10 = .82 ('08 = .82) ('06 = .81)	'10 = .82 ('08 = .82) ('06 = .83)	'10 = .86 ('08 = .86) ('06 = .86)	'10 = .85 ('08 = .83) ('06 = .84)
Negative Social Support	'10 = .78 ('08 = .79) ('06 = .78)	'10 = .76 ('08 = .78) ('06 = .78)	'10 = .78 ('08 = .78) ('06 = .78)	'10 = .75 ('08 = .76) ('06 = .76)

Background:

Cohen, S. (2004). Social relationships and health. *American Psychologist*, 59, 676-684.

Uchino, B. N. (2009). Understanding the links between social support and physical health: A life-span perspective with emphasis on the separability of perceived and received support. *Perspectives on Psychological Sciences*, 4, 236-255.

Q19a - Q19e. Cynical Hostility (2006, 2008, & 2010)

These five items from the Cook-Medley Hostility Inventory have been used in several important studies evaluating potential health consequences of hostility. Note: Q19a. reads, “Most people inwardly dislike putting themselves out to help other people” in the 2006 questionnaire.

Sources:

Cook, W. W., & Medley, D. M. (1954). Proposed hostility and pharisaic-virtue scales for the MMPI. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 38(6), 414-418.

Costa, P. T., Zonderman, A. B., McCrae, R. R., & Williams, R. B. (1986). Cynicism and paranoid alienation in the Cook and Medley HO Scale. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 48(3/4), 283-285.

Items: 5 items (Q19a-Q19e)

(Please say how much you agree or disagree with the following statements:)

- Q19a Most people dislike putting themselves out to help other people
Q19b Most people will use somewhat unfair means to gain profit or an advantage rather than lose it.
Q19c No one cares much what happens to you.
Q19d I think most people would lie in order to get ahead.
Q19e I commonly wonder what hidden reasons another person may have for doing something nice for me.

Coding: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Somewhat disagree, 3=Slightly disagree, 4=Slightly agree, 5=Somewhat agree, 6=Strongly agree

Scaling: Create an index of cynical hostility by averaging the scores across all items. Set the final score to missing if there are more than three items with missing values.

Psychometrics: 2010 Alpha= .80 (2008 Alpha = .79; 2006 Alpha =.79)

Background:

Eckhardt, C., Norlander, B., & Deffenbacher, J. (2004). The assessment of anger and hostility: A critical review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 9, 17-43.

Tindle H.A., Chang Y., Kuller, L.H., Manson, J.E., Robinson, J.G., Rosal, M.C., Siegle, G.J., & Matthews, K.A. (2009). Optimism, cynical hostility, and incident coronary heart disease and mortality in the women’s health initiative. *Circulation*, 120(8), 656-662.

Q19f - Q19k. Optimism/Pessimism (2006, 2008, & 2010)

These items assess dispositional optimism and pessimism. A slightly modified version is included in SHARE.

Source:

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.

Items: 6 items (Q19f-Q19k)

(Please say how much you agree or disagree with the following statements:)

- Q19f If something can go wrong for me it will.
Q19g I'm always optimistic about my future.
Q19h In uncertain times, I usually expect the best.
Q19i Overall, I expect more good things to happen to me than bad.
Q19j I hardly ever expect things to go my way.
Q19k I rarely count on good things happening to me.

Coding: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Somewhat disagree, 3=Slightly disagree,
4=Slightly agree, 5=Somewhat agree, 6=Strongly agree

Scaling: Create an index of optimism by averaging the scores across items Q19g, Q19h, and Q19i. Set the optimism score to missing if there is more than one item with missing values.
Create an index of pessimism by averaging the scores across items Q19f, Q19j, and Q19k. Set the pessimism score to missing if there is more than one item with missing values.

Psychometrics: Optimism 2010 Alpha = .79 (2008 Alpha = .79; 2006 Alpha = .80)
Pessimism 2010 Alpha = .78 (2008 Alpha = .76; 2006 Alpha = .77)

Background:

Peterson, C. (2000). The future of optimism. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 44-45.

Taylor, S. E., Kemeny, M. E., Reed, G. M., Bower, J. E., & Gruenewald, T. L. (2000). Psychological resources, positive illusions, and health. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 99-109.

Q19l - Q19o. Hopelessness (2006, 2008, & 2010)

This measure consists of two items from Everson et al. (1997) (Q. 19l-m) and two from Beck et al. (1974) (Q19n-o).

Sources:

Beck, A. T., Weissman, A., Lester, D., & Trexler, L. (1974). The measurement of pessimism: The hopelessness scale. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42(6), 861-865.

Everson, S. A., Kaplan, G. A., Goldberg, D. E., Salonen, R., & Salonen, J. T. (1997). Hopelessness and 4-year progression of carotid atherosclerosis: The Kuopio Ischemic Heart Disease Risk Factor Study. *Arteriosclerosis, Thrombosis, and Vascular Biology*, 17, 1490-1495.

Items: 4 items (Q19l-Q19o)

(Please say how much you agree or disagree with the following statements:)

- Q19l I feel it is impossible for me to reach the goals that I would like to strive for.
Q19m The future seems hopeless to me and I can't believe that things are changing for the better.
Q19n I don't expect to get what I really want.
Q19o There's no use in really trying to get something I want because I probably won't get it.

Coding: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Somewhat disagree, 3=Slightly disagree, 4=Slightly agree, 5=Somewhat agree, 6=Strongly agree

Scaling: Create an index of hopelessness by averaging the scores across all items. Set the final score to missing if there are more than two items with missing values.

Psychometrics: 2010 Alpha = .85 (2008 Alpha = .84; 2006 Alpha = .86)

Q20. Loneliness (2006, 2008, & 2010)

This measure was developed by Hughes and colleagues in 2004 to assess loneliness in large scale surveys. The 2010 and 2008 surveys included 11 items but only the first three items (a-c) were in the 2006 questionnaire.

Source:

Hughes, M. E., Waite, L. J., Hawkey, L. C., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2004). A short scale for measuring loneliness in large surveys: results from two population-based studies. *Research on Aging*, 655-672.

Items: 11 items (Q20a-Q20k)

(The next questions are about how you feel about different aspects of your life. HOW MUCH OF THE TIME DO YOU FEEL...)

- Q20a You lack companionship?
- Q20b Left out?
- Q20c Isolated from others?
- Q20d That you are “in tune” with the people around you?
- Q20e Alone?
- Q20f That there are people you can talk to?
- Q20g That there are people you can turn to?
- Q20h That there are people who really understand you?
- Q20i That there are people you feel close to?
- Q20j Part of a group of friends?
- Q20k That you have a lot in common with the people around you?

Coding: 1=Often, 2=Some of the time, 3=Hardly ever or never

Scaling: Create an index of loneliness by reverse-coding items 20a, 20b, 20c, and 20e and averaging the scores across all 11 items. Set the final score to missing if there is more than five items with missing values.

Psychometrics: 2010 Alpha = .88 (2008 Alpha = .88)

Background:

Cacioppo, J. T., Hawkey, L. C., Crawford, E., Ernst, J. M., Burlison, M. H., Kowalewski, R. B., et al. (2002). Loneliness and health: potential mechanisms *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 407-417.

Hawkey, L., & Cacioppo, J. (2010). Loneliness matters: A theoretical and empirical review of consequences and mechanisms. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*. 40(2), 218-227.

Q21. Neighborhood Disorder/Neighborhood Social Cohesion (2006, 2008, & 2010)

The measure assesses two dimensions of neighborhood context: (i) physical disorder (vandalism/graffiti, rubbish, vacant/deserted houses, crime) and (ii) social cohesion/social trust (I feel part of this area, trust people, people are friendly, people will help you). Most items were included in Wave 3 (2006) of ELSA, and the last item was modified from the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods.

Items: 8 items (Q21a-Q21h)

(These questions ask how you feel about your local area, that is everywhere within a 20 minute walk or about a mile of your home)

- Q21a I really feel part of this area/I feel that I don't belong in this area
- Q21b There is no problem with vandalism and graffiti in this area/ Vandalism and graffiti are a big problem in this area
- Q21c Most people in this area can be trusted/Most people in this area can't be trusted
- Q21d People feel safe walking alone in this area after dark/ People would be afraid to walk alone in this area after dark
- Q21e Most people in this area are friendly/Most people in this area are unfriendly
- Q21f This area is kept very clean/This area is always full of rubbish and litter
- Q21g If you were in trouble, there are lots of people in this area who would help you/If you were in trouble, there is nobody in this area who would help you
- Q21h There are no vacant or deserted houses or storefronts in this area/There are many vacant or deserted houses or storefronts in this area

Coding: 7-point scale (range 1 – 7)

Scaling: Create an index of **neighborhood physical disorder** (items 21b, d, f, h) by averaging the scores across all 4 items. Set the final score to missing if there are more than two items with missing values.

Create an index of **neighborhood social cohesion** (items 21a, c, e, g) by reverse-scoring all items and averaging the scores across all 4 items. Set the final score to missing if there are more than two items with missing values. Note: In 2006, items 21b, d, and h had to be reverse coded when creating the index of physical disorder.

Psychometrics: Neighborhood Physical Disorder: 2010 Alpha = .82 ('08 = .83, '06 = .64)
Neighborhood Social Cohesion: 2010 Alpha = .86 ('08 = .86, '06 = .82)

Background:

Mendes de Leon, C.F., Cagney, K.A., Bienias, J.L., Barnes, L.L., Skarupski, K.A., Scherr, P.A., & et al. (2009). Neighborhood social cohesion and disorder in relation to walking in community-dwelling older adults: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Aging and Health, 21*, 155-171.

Q22. - Q23. Sense of Control - Self-Efficacy - Agency - Mastery (2006, 2008, & 2010)

Authors in the literature use a variety of terms for these constructs. The same items are included in MIDUS (Waves 1 and 2).

Sources:

Lachman, M. E., & Weaver, S. L. (1998). The sense of control as a moderator of social class differences in health and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(3), 763-773.

Pearlin, L. I., & Schooler, C. (1978). The structure of coping. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 19(1), 2-21.

Perceived Constraints on Personal Control

Items: 5 items for constraints (Q22a-Q22e);

(Please say how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.)

- Q22a I often feel helpless in dealing with the problems of life.
- Q22b Other people determine most of what I can and cannot do.
- Q22c What happens in my life is often beyond my control.
- Q22d I have little control over the things that happen to me.
- Q22e There is really no way I can solve the problems I have.

Perceived Mastery

Items: 5 items for mastery (Q23a-Q23e)

(Please say how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.)

- Q23a I can do just about anything I really set my mind to.
- Q23b When I really want to do something, I usually find a way to succeed at it.
- Q23c Whether or not I am able to get what I want is in my own hands.
- Q23d What happens to me in the future mostly depends on me.
- Q23e I can do the things that I want to do.

Coding: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Somewhat disagree, 3=Slightly disagree,
4=Slightly agree, 5=Somewhat agree, 6=Strongly agree

Scaling: Create an index of Constraints by averaging the scores across items Q22a-Q22e. Set the final score to missing if there are more than three items with missing values.

Create an index of Mastery by averaging the scores across items Q23a-Q23e. Set the final score to missing if there are more than three items with missing values.

Psychometrics: Constraints: 2010 Alpha = .88 (2008 Alpha = .87, 2006 Alpha = .86)
Mastery: 2010 Alpha = .90 (2008 Alpha = .89, 2006 Alpha = .89)

Background:

Lachman, M. E. (2006). Perceived control over aging-related declines: Adaptive beliefs and behaviors. *Current Directions in Psychological Sciences*, 15, 282-286.

Mirowsky, J., & Ross, C.E. (2007). Life course trajectories of perceived control and their relationship to education. *American Journal of Sociology*, 112, 1339-1382.

Pearlin, L. I., Nguyen, K. B., Schieman, S., Milkie, M. A. (2007). The life-course origins of mastery among older people. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 48, 164-180

Skinner, E. A. (1996). Personality processes and individual differences: A guide to constructs of control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(3), 549-570.

Q24 -Q26. Domain Specific Control (Efficacy) (2006, 2008, & 2010)

Three single-item measures of domain specific control for **health** (Q24), **social life** (Q25), and **finances** (Q26) that come directly from MIDUS are included in 2008 and 2010. In 2006, Q25 was control over **your work situation**.

(Using a 0 to 10 scale where 0 means “no control at all” and 10 means “very much control,” how would you rate the amount of control you have over your (Q24 health, Q25 social life, Q26 financial situation) these days?)

Coding: 11 point scale (range 0-10)

Q26a. Perceived Change in Control over Financial Situation in the Last Year (2010 only)

Source: HRS

Item: Has the amount of control you have over your financial situation changed in the last year?

Coding: 1 = YES, I have less control now
2 = YES, I have more control now
3 = NO, the amount of control I have has stayed the same

Q27. Positive and Negative Affect (2006, 2008, & 2010)

The 2010 and 2008 questionnaires utilize a different measure of positive and negative affect than the 2006 questionnaire. Most of these 25 items in the 2008 and 2010 questionnaires were chosen from the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule – Expanded Form (PANAS-X). Some items were obtained from other researchers' work in this area of study (Carstensen et al., 2000; Watson & Clark, 1994).

Sources:

Carstensen, L. L., Pasupathi, M., Mayr, U., & Nesselroade, J. R. (2000). Emotional experience in everyday life across the adult life span. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(4), 644-655.

Ong, A.D., Edwards, L.M., & Bergeman, C.S. (2006). Hope as a source of resilience in later adulthood. *Personality and Individual Differences*. 41(7), 1263-1273.

Watson, D., & Clark, L.A. (1994). The PANAS-X: Manual for the positive and negative affect schedule – expanded form. Unpublished manuscript. University of Iowa. (<http://www.psychology.uiowa.edu/Faculty/Clark/PANAS-X.pdf>)

Items: 25 items (Q27a – Q27y)

(During the last 30 days, TO WHAT DEGREE DID YOU FEEL ...?)

Q27a	Afraid?
Q27b	Upset?
Q27c	Determined?
Q27d	Enthusiastic?
Q27e	Guilty?
Q27f	Active?
Q27g	Proud?
Q27h	Interested?
Q27i	Scared?
Q27j	Frustrated?
Q27k	Happy?
Q27l	Bored?
Q27m	Hostile?
Q27n	Jittery?
Q27o	Ashamed?
Q27p	Attentive?
Q27q	Content?
Q27r	Nervous?
Q27s	Sad?

Q27t	Inspired?
Q27u	Hopeful?
Q27v	Alert?
Q27w	Distressed?
Q27x	Calm?
Q27y	Excited?

Coding: 1=Very much, 2=Quite a bit, 3=Moderately, 4=A little, 5=Not at all

Scaling: Create an index of **positive affect** by reverse-coding items Q27c, d, f, g, h, k, p, q, t, u, v, x, and y and averaging the scores across all 13 items. Set the final score to missing if there are more than six items with missing values.

Create an index of **negative affect** by reverse-coding items Q27 a, b, e, i, j, l, m, n, o, r, s, and w and averaging the scores across all 12 items. Set the final score to missing if there are more than six items with missing values

Psychometrics: Negative affect: 2010 Alpha = .90 (2008 Alpha = .89)
Positive affect: 2010 Alpha = .92 (2008 Alpha = .92)

Background:

Chida, Y., & Steptoe, A. (2008). Positive psychological well-being and mortality: a quantitative review of prospective observational studies. *Psychosomatic Medicine* 70 (7), 741–756.

Steptoe, A., Wardle, J., & Marmot, M. (2005). Positive affect and health-related neuroendocrine, cardiovascular, and inflammatory processes. *PNAS*, 102:6508-6512.

Watson, D., Wiese, D., Vaidya, J., & Tellegen, A. (1999). The two general activation systems of affect: structural findings, evolutionary considerations, and psychobiological evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(5), 820-838.

Q28. Religiosity/Spirituality (2006, 2008, & 2010)

These 4 items are designed to assess religious beliefs, meaning and values. (Note: Religious affiliation and attendance are collected in the Demographics section of the core HRS.)

Source:

Fetzer Institute. (2003). Brief Multidimensional Measure of Religiousness/Spirituality: 1999. In N. W. Group (Ed.), *Multidimensional measurement of religiousness/spirituality for use in health research: A report of the Fetzer Institute/National Institute on Aging Working Group* (2nd ed., pp. 85-88). Kalamazoo, MI: John E. Fetzer Institute.

Items: 4 items (Q28a-Q28d)

(Please say how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements)

- Q28a I believe in a God who watches over me.
Q28b The events in my life unfold according to a divine or greater plan.
Q28c I try hard to carry my religious beliefs over into all my other dealings in life.
Q28d I find strength and comfort in my religion.

Coding: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Somewhat disagree, 3=Slightly disagree, 4=Slightly agree, 5=Somewhat agree, 6=Strongly agree

Scaling: Create an index of religiosity by averaging the scores across all 4 items. Set the final score to missing if there are more than two items with missing values.

Psychometrics: 2010 Alpha = .93 (2008 Alpha = .92, 2006 Alpha = .92)

Background

Krause, N. (2003). Religious meaning and subjective well-being in late life. *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences*, 58B, S160–S170

McCullough, M. E., & Willoughby, B. L. (2009). Religion, self-regulation, and self-control: Associations, explanations, and implications. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135, 69–93

Q29. Self-Perceptions of Aging: Subjective Age and Aging Satisfaction (2008 & 2010)

Not included in 2006

Q29a. Subjective Age

This item is designed to reveal the age a person feels regardless of chronological age.

Source:

Kastenbaum, R., Durbin, V., Sabatini, P., Artt, S. (1972). "The ages of me": Toward personal and interpersonal definitions of functional aging. *Aging and Human Development*, 3, 197-211.

Items: 1 item (Q29a)
(Many people feel older or younger than they actually are.)

Q29a What age do you feel?

Coding: Any age may be given. Some researchers use the age given while others make a discrepancy score by subtracting the subjective age from the chronological age.

Background:

Rubin, D. C., & Berntsen, D. (2006). People over forty feel 20% younger than their age: Subjective age across the lifespan. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 13(5), 776-780.

Montepare, J.M. & Lachman, M.E. (1989). "You're only as old as you feel": Self perceptions of age, fears of aging, and life satisfaction from adolescence to old age. *Psychology and Aging*, 4, 73-78.

Q29b. Self-perceptions of Aging (Satisfaction with Aging)

These 8 items assess participants' positive and negative evaluation of their experiences of aging.

Sources:

Lawton, M.P. (1975). The Philadelphia Geriatric Center Morale Scale: A revision. *Journals of Gerontology*, 30, 85-89.

Liang, J. & Bollen, K.A. (1983). The structure of the Philadelphia Geriatric Center Morale Scale: A reinterpretation. *Journals of Gerontology*, 38, 181-189.

Additional items from various studies in the literature, including the Berlin Aging Study.

Items: 8 items (Q29b1 – Q29b8)
(The next statements are about the way people feel about their age and about the things that happen as they get older. Please tell us how much you agree or disagree with each statement for you personally.)

- Q29b1 Things keep getting worse as I get older.
 Q29b2 I have as much as pep as I did last year.
 Q29b3 The older I get, the more useless I feel.
 Q29b4 I am as happy now as I was when I was younger.
 Q29b5 As I get older, things are better than I thought they would be.
 Q29b6 So far, I am satisfied with the way that I am aging.
 Q29b7 The older I get, the more I have had to stop doing things that I liked.
 Q29b8 Getting older has brought with it many things that I do not like.

Coding: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Somewhat disagree, 3=Slightly disagree, 4=Slightly agree, 5=Somewhat agree, 6=Strongly agree

Scaling: Create a rating of aging satisfaction by reverse coding items Q29 b1, b3, b7, and b8 and averaging the scores across all 8 items. Set the final score to missing if there are more than four items with missing values.

Alternatively, separate scores may be obtained for positive and negative aging satisfaction. Average across items Q29 b2, b4, b5, and b6 to get a rating of positive aging satisfaction. Average across items Q29 b1, b3, b7, and b8 to get a rating of negative aging satisfaction.

Psychometrics: Aging Satisfaction: 2010 Alpha = .83 (2008 Alpha = .82)

Positive Aging Satisfaction: 2010 Alpha = .78 (2008 Alpha: .78)

Negative Aging Satisfaction: 2010 Alpha = .77 (2008 Alpha: .78)

Background:

Kleinspehn-Ammerlahn, A., Kotter-Gruhn, D., & Smith, J. (2008). Self-perceptions of aging: Do subjective age and satisfaction with aging change during old age? *The Journals of Gerontology*, 63, 377-385.

Kotter-Grühn, D., Kleinspehn-Ammerlahn, A., Gerstorf, D., & Smith, J. (2009). Self-perceptions of aging predict mortality and change with approaching death: 16-year longitudinal results from the Berlin Aging Study. *Psychology and Aging*, 24, 654-667.

Levy, B.R. & Myers, L.M. (2004). Preventive health behaviors influenced by self-perceptions of aging. *Preventive Medicine*, 39, 625-629.

Levy, B. R., Slade, M. D., Kunkel, S. R., & Kasl, S. V. (2002). Longevity increased by positive self-perceptions of aging. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 261-270.

Q30. Everyday Discrimination (2006, 2008, & 2010)

These 6 items are designed to tap into the hassles and chronic stress associated with perceived everyday discrimination. Q. 31 is a follow-up question which asks about this reason attributed to the discrimination. Similar questions are in MIDUS.

This scale includes the same items that were in the 2006 questionnaire, except that Q30f was added in 2008.

Source:

Williams, D. R., Yu, Y., Jackson, J. S., & Anderson, N. B. (1997). Racial differences in physical and mental health: socio-economic status, stress and discrimination. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 2, 335-351.

Items: 6 items (Q30a-Q30f)

(In your day-to-day life how often have any of the following things happened to you?)

- Q30a You are treated with less courtesy or respect than other people.
- Q30b You receive poorer service than other people at restaurants or stores.
- Q30c People act as if they think you are not smart.
- Q30d People act as if they are afraid of you.
- Q30e You are threatened or harassed.
- Q30f You receive poorer service or treatment than other people from doctors or hospitals.

Coding: 1=Almost every day, 2=At least once a week, 3=A few times a month, 4=A few times a year, 5=Less than once a year, 6=Never

Scaling: Create an index of discrimination by reverse-coding all items and averaging the scores across all six items. Set the final score to missing if there are more than three items with missing values.

Psychometrics: 2010 Alpha = .80 (2008 Alpha = .82)

Background:

Williams, D.R., Neighbors, H.W., & Jackson, J.S. (2003). Racial/ethnic discrimination and health: Findings from community studies. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93, 200-208.

Q31. Attributions of Everyday Discrimination (2006, 2008, & 2010)

Two of the 11 attribution categories were not included in the 2006 questionnaire:
Religion and Your Financial Status.

Source:

Kessler, R. C., Mickelson, K. D., & Williams, D. R. (1999). The prevalence, distribution, and mental health correlates of perceived discrimination in the United States. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 40(3), 208-230.

Items:

(If any of the above (Q30) have happened to you, what do you think were the reasons why these experiences happened to you? (Mark (X) all that apply.)

Q31M1 through Q31M11 Reason(s) selected for perceived discrimination

Coding:

- 1 = Your ancestry or national origin,
- 2 = Your gender,
- 3 = Your race,
- 4 = Your age,
- 5 = Religion,
- 6 = Your weight,
- 7 = A physical disability,
- 8 = Other aspect of your physical appearance,
- 9 = Your sexual orientation,
- 10 = Your financial status
- 11 = Other (string)

(2006 Coding: 1=Your ancestry or national origin, 2=Your gender, 3=Your race, 4=Your age, 5= Your weight, 6=A physical disability, 7=Other aspect of your physical appearance, 8=Your sexual orientation, 9=Other)

Q31 allows for multiple responses which are delivered in several variables (Q31M1 through Q31M11). These variables indicate only where marks were made among the options and could take on values of any of the discrimination codes listed above.

Use the following SPSS syntax to create variables for each type of discrimination. Respondents who indicated each type of discrimination will have a value of “1” in that variable; all other respondents will have a value of “0” (which could be recoded to missing if desired).

```
COUNT discr_ancestry = Q31M1 to Q31M11(1).  
execute.
```

COUNT discr_gender= Q31M1 to Q31M11(2).
execute.
COUNT discr_race=Q31M1 to Q31M11(3).
execute.
COUNT discr_age=Q31M1 to Q31M11(4).
execute.
COUNT discr_religion=Q31M1 to Q31M11(5).
execute.
COUNT discr_weight=Q31M1 to Q31M11(6).
execute.
COUNT discr_physdis=Q31M1 to Q31M11(7).
execute.
COUNT discr_physapp=Q31M1 to Q31M11(8).
execute.
COUNT discr_sexorient=Q31M1 to Q31M11(9).
execute.
COUNT discr_finstatus=Q31M1 to Q31M11(10).
execute.
COUNT discr_other=Q31M1 to Q31M11(11).
execute.

Additional Background:

Pascoe, E. A., & Richman, L. S. (2009). Perceived Discrimination and Health: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135, 531–554.

Harrell, S. P. A. (2000). Multidimensional Conceptualization of Racism-Related Stress: Implications for the Well-Being of People of Color. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 70, 42-57.

Q32. Social Effort/ Reward Balance (2006, 2008, & 2010)

This question is referred to as “Balance/Reciprocity” in the 2006 documentation. The three items assess the balance that participants experience in the efforts that they put forth socially (in relationships and activities) and the rewards received from this effort.

Source:

Wahrendorf, M., von dem Knesebeck, O., Siegrist, J. (2006). Social productivity and the well-being of older people: baseline results from the SHARE study. *European Journal of Ageing*, 3, 67-73.

Von dem Knesebeck, O., Siegrist, J. (2003). Reported nonreciprocity of the social exchange and depressive symptoms Extending the model of effort-reward imbalance beyond work. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 55, 209-214.

Items: 3 items (Q32 in the questionnaire; Q32a-Q32c in the data)

(The following statements are about people's expectations of each other. Please tell us how much you agree or disagree with each statement for you personally.)

- Q32a I have always been satisfied with the balance between what I have given my partner and what I have received in return
- Q32b I have always received adequate appreciation for providing help in my family
- Q32c In my current major activity (job, looking after home, voluntary work) I have always been satisfied with the rewards I received for my efforts

Coding: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree, 6=Does not apply

Scaling: Create an index by averaging responses across items where responses range from 1-5. It may be useful to code the "does not apply" responses as missing. Set the final score to missing if there is more than one item with missing values.

Psychometrics: 2010 Alpha = .77 (2008 Alpha = .78, 2006 Alpha = .73)

Q32a. Quality of Relationships with Parents Early in Life (2008 & 2010)

(Not included in 2006)

These two items tap into the quality of relationships early in life with mothers (Q32d) and with fathers (Q32e). A modified version also appears in MIDUS.

Source:

Rossi, A.S. (2001). *Caring and doing for others: Social responsibility in the domains of family, work, and community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
: Ch. 7. Developmental Roots of Adult Social Responsibility.

Items: 2 items (Q32d-32e)

(The next statements are about people's relationships with their parents early in life (before age 18). Please tell us how much you agree or disagree with each statement for you personally.)

- Q32d I had a good relationship with my mother before age 18.
- Q32e I had a good relationship with my father before age 18.

Coding: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree, 6=Does not apply

Q33. The "Big 5" Personality Traits (2006, 2008, & 2010)

These 31 (26 in 2006-2008) items assess the 'Big 5' personality items (Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness). The source of the original 26 items in the 2006 and 2008 was MIDUS. In 2010, items were added to expand coverage of sub-facets of conscientiousness. These are derived from the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP files which can be accessed on the website : <http://ipip.ori.org/>).

Source:

Lachman, M. E., & Weaver, S. L. (1997). Midlife Development Inventory (MIDI) personality scales: Scale construction and scoring. Unpublished Technical Report. Brandeis University. (<http://www.brandeis.edu/projects/lifespan/scales.html>)

Items: 31 items (Q33a-Q33z)

(Please indicate how well each of the following describes you.)

Q33a	Outgoing
Q33b	Helpful
Q33c	Reckless (2010 only)
Q33d	Moody (Q33c in 2008 and 2006)
Q33e	Organized (Q33d in 2008 and 2006)
Q33f	Friendly (Q33e in 2008 and 2006)
Q33g	Warm (Q33f in 2008 and 2006)
Q33h	Worrying (Q33g in 2008 and 2006)
Q33i	Responsible (Q33h in 2008 and 2006)
Q33j	Lively (Q33i in 2008 and 2006)
Q33k	Caring (Q33j in 2008 and 2006)
Q33l	Nervous (Q33k in 2008 and 2006)
Q33m	Creative (Q33l in 2008 and 2006)
Q33n	Hardworking (Q33m in 2008 and 2006)
Q33o	Imaginative (Q33n in 2008 and 2006)
Q33p	Softhearted (Q33o in 2008 and 2006)
Q33q	Calm (Q33p in 2008 and 2006)
Q33r	Self-disciplined (2010 only)
Q33s	Intelligent (Q33q in 2008 and 2006)
Q33t	Curious (Q33r in 2008 and 2006)
Q33u	Active (Q33s in 2008 and 2006)
Q33v	Careless (Q33t in 2008 and 2006)
Q33w	Broad-minded (Q33u in 2008 and 2006)
Q33x	Impulsive (2010 only)
Q33y	Sympathetic (Q33v in 2008 and 2006)
Q33z	Cautious (2010 only)

Neuroticism: 2010 Alpha = .71 (2008 Alpha= .72, 2006 Alpha = .70)
Openness: 2010 Alpha = .80 (2008 Alpha= .79, 2006 Alpha = .79)
Extraversion 2010 Alpha = .75 (2008 Alpha= .74, 2006 Alpha = .75)

Background:

Caspi, A., Roberts, B. W., & Shiner, R. L. (2005). Personality development: Stability and change. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 453-484.

Mroczek, D. K., Spiro, A., & Griffin, P. W. (2006). Personality and aging. In J. E. Birren & K. W. Schaie (Eds.), *Handbook of the Psychology of Aging* (6th ed., pp. 363-377). Burlington, MA: Elsevier Press.

Ozer, D. J., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2006). Personality and the prediction of consequential outcomes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 401-421.

Roberts, B., Kuncel, N.R., Shiner, R., Caspi, A., & Goldberg, L.R. (2007). The power of personality: The comparative validity of personality traits, socioeconomic status, and cognitive ability for predicting important life outcomes. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 2, 313-345.

Q34. Personality Sub-Facet Traits: Conscientiousness and Impulsiveness (2008 & 2010)
(Not included in 2006)

These scales were included to expand the assessment of conscientiousness. Four items each tap into each of the six facets of conscientiousness: Self-Control, Order, Industriousness, Traditionalism, Virtue, and Responsibility.

Source:

Roberts, B.W., Chernyshenko, O.S., Stark, S., & Goldberg, L.R. (2005). The structure of conscientiousness: An empirical investigation based on seven major personality questionnaires. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 103-139.

Items: 30 items (Q34a- Q34z_5)

(Please say how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.)

Self-Control Facet (Q34a-Q34d)

- Q34a I am easily talked into doing silly things. (-)
Q34b I often rush into action without thinking about potential consequences. (-)
Q34c I rarely jump into something without first thinking about it.
Q34d I am careful with what I say to others.

Order Facet (Q34e-Q34h)

- Q34e I hardly ever lose or misplace things.

- Q34f Most of the time my home is a complete mess. (-)
 Q34g Every item in my home has its own particular place.
 Q34h For me, being organized is unimportant. (-)

Industriousness Facet (Q34i-Q34l)

- Q34i I do not work as hard as the majority of the people around me. (-)
 Q34j I do what is required, but rarely anything more. (-)
 Q34k I have high standards and work toward them.
 Q34l I make every effort to do more than what is expected of me.

Traditionalism Facet (Q34m-Q34p)

- Q34m I do not intend to follow every little rule that others make up. (-)
 Q34n When I was in school, I used to break rules regularly. (-)
 Q34o I support long-established rules and traditions.
 Q34p Even if I knew how to get around the rule without breaking them, I would not do it.

Virtue Facet (Q34q-Q34t)

- Q34q If I could get away with it, I would not pay taxes. (-)
 Q34r I could be insincere and dishonest if the situation required me to do so. (-)
 Q34s If the cashier forgot to charge me for an item, I would tell him/her.
 Q34t When I was in school, I would rather get a bad grade than copy someone else's homework.

Responsibility Facet (Q34u-Q34x)

- Q34u I carry out my obligations to the best of my ability.
 Q34v I go out of my way to keep my promises.
 Q34w Sometimes it is too much of a bother to do exactly what is promised. (-)
 Q34x If I am running late for an appointment, I may decide not to go at all. (-)

Coding: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Somewhat disagree, 3=Slightly disagree,
 4=Slightly agree, 5=Somewhat agree, 6=Strongly agree

Scaling: Reverse code the negatively phrased items (-) and then average the scores across items to create an index of conscientiousness for each facet with a high score indicating high conscientiousness. Set the final score to missing for each facet if there are more than two items with missing values.

Psychometrics: Self-Control: 2010 Alpha = .52 (2008 Alpha = .52)
 Traditionalism: 2010 Alpha = .44 (2008 Alpha = .44)
 Order: 2010 Alpha = .45 (2008 Alpha = .48)

Virtue: 2010 Alpha = .51 (2008 Alpha = .49)
Industriousness: 2010 Alpha = .63 (2008 Alpha = .63)
Responsibility: 2010 Alpha = .54 (2008 Alpha = .53)

Overall Alpha (items from all 6 dimensions combined) = .78 (2008 Alpha = .78)

Background:

Bogg, T., & Roberts, B.W. (2004). Conscientiousness and health-related behaviors: A meta-analysis of the leading behavioral contributors to mortality. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130, 887-919.

Self-Control/ Impulsiveness (MPQ) (Q34y-Q34z_5)

These items were selected from the Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire (MPQ) developed by Tellegen. They were added in 2010.

Source

http://www.upress.umn.edu/tests/mpq_scales.html#broad

Items:

Q34x_2 I keep close track of where my money goes.
Q34x_3 I often stop one thing before completing it and start another. (-)
Q34x_4 I often act without thinking. (-)
Q34x_5 Before I get into a new situation, I like to find out what to expect from it.
Q34x_6 I am often not as cautious as I should be. (-)
Q34x_7 I often prefer to “play things by ear” rather than to plan ahead. (-)

Coding:

1=Strongly disagree, 2=Somewhat disagree, 3=Slightly disagree,
4=Slightly agree, 5=Somewhat agree, 6=Strongly agree

Scaling:

Reverse code the negatively phrased items (-) and then average the scores across items to create an index of conscientiousness for each facet with a high score indicating high conscientiousness. Set the final score to missing for each facet if there are more than two items with missing values.

Psychometrics:

Self-Control/Impulsiveness: 2010 Alpha = .63

Background

Caspi, A., Begg, D., Dickson, N., Harrington, H., Langley, J., Moffitt, T.E. & Silva, P.A. (1997). Personality differences predict health-risk behaviors in young adulthood: Evidence from a longitudinal study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 1052 – 1063.

Q34a. Need for Cognition

(Not included in 2006 or 2008)

These items are selected from the "Need for Cognition" scale based on extensive psychometric analyses in the CogUSA project (Willis, McArdle). In that study, two dimensions were determined: Cognitive Enjoyment (Positive Items 34a_a, b, and c) and Cognitive Effort (Reverse-coded Items 34a_d, e, and f) and these subscales were associated with cognitive performance.

Source

Cacioppo, J. T., & Petty, R. E. (1982). The need for cognition, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 116-131.

Items:

- Q34a_a I like to have the responsibility of handling a situation that requires a lot of thinking.
Q34a_b I really enjoy a task that involves coming up with new solutions to problems.
Q34a_c The notion of thinking abstractly is appealing to me.
Q34a_d I would rather do something that requires little thought than something that is sure to challenge my thinking abilities. (-)
Q34a_e I try to anticipate and avoid situations where there is likely a chance I will have to think in depth about something. (-)
Q34a_f I only think as hard as I have to. (-)

Coding:

1=Not at all like me, 2=Somewhat like me, 3=Uncertain,
4=Somewhat like me, 5=Very much like me

Psychometrics:

Cognitive Enjoyment: 2010 Alpha = .80
Cognitive Effort: 2010 Alpha = .80

Q35. Psychological Well-Being_-Purpose in Life (2006, 2008, & 2010)

(2006 included two additional subscales)

These items come from the Ryff Measures of Psychological Well-being (1989). Seven items evaluate one dimension of well-being (the original measure assesses 6 dimensions of well-being): Purpose in Life. The Personal Growth and Self-Acceptance dimensions from the 2006 questionnaire were not included in the 2008 or 2010 questionnaires. They are in Appendix A.

Sources:

Keyes, C. L. M., Shmotkin, D., & Ryff, C. D. (2002). Optimizing well-being: The empirical encounter of two traditions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(6), 1007-1022.

Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(4), 719-727.

Items: 7 items (Q35a-Q35g)

(Please read the statements below and decide the extent to which each statement describes you.)

Purpose in Life Dimension (Q35a-Q35g)

- Q35a I enjoy making plans for the future and working to make them a reality.
Q35b My daily activities often seem trivial and unimportant to me.
Q35c I am an active person in carrying out the plans I set for myself.
Q35d I don't have a good sense of what it is I'm trying to accomplish in life.
Q35e I sometimes feel as if I've done all there is to do in life.
Q35f I live life one day at a time and don't really think about the future.
Q35g I have a sense of direction and purpose in my life.

Coding: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Somewhat disagree, 3=Slightly disagree, 4=Slightly agree, 5=Somewhat agree, 6=Strongly agree

Scaling: Reverse-code items 35 b, d, e, and f and then average the scores across items to create an index of well-being (ranging from 1-6), with a high score indicating positive well-being. Set the final score to missing if there are more than three items with missing values.

Psychometrics: 2010 Alpha = .78 (2008 Alpha = .76, 2006 Alpha = .74)

Background:

Ryff, C. D. (1995). Psychological well-being in adult life. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 4, 99-104.

Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. (1998). The contours of positive human health. *Psychological Inquiry*, 9(1), 1-28.

Q. 36 Major Experiences of Lifetime Discrimination (2006, 2008, & 2010)

These 7 items capture major experiences of unfair treatment. The 2006 questionnaire consisted of six items. Q. 36g was added to the 2008 questionnaire.

Sources:

Williams, D. R., Yu, Y., Jackson, J. S., & Anderson, N. B. (1997). Racial differences in physical and mental health: socio-economic status, stress and discrimination. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 2, 335-351.

Items: 7 items (Q36a-Q36g)

(For each of the following events, please indicate whether the event occurred **AT ANY POINT IN YOUR LIFE**. If the event did happen, please indicate the year in which it happened most recently.)

- Q36a At any time in your life, have you ever been unfairly dismissed from a job?
Q36b For unfair reasons, have you ever not been hired for a job?
Q36c Have you ever been unfairly denied a promotion?
Q36d Have you ever been unfairly prevented from moving into a neighborhood because the landlord or a realtor refused to sell or rent you a house or apartment?
Q36e Have you ever been unfairly denied a bank loan?
Q36f Have you ever been unfairly stopped, searched, questioned, physically threatened or abused by the police?
Q36g Have you ever been unfairly denied health care or treatment?

Coding: 1=Yes, 5=No

Scaling: A measure of major discrimination is constructed by summing the number of affirmative responses.

Background:

Kessler, R. C., Mickelson, K. D., & Williams, D. R. (1999). The prevalence, distribution, and mental health correlates of perceived discrimination in the United States. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 40(3), 208-230.

Q37a. Lifetime Traumas (2008 & 2010)

(Q. 37 in 2006)

These 7 items come from an ongoing longitudinal study of the health consequences of trauma in older adults (Krause, et al., 2004), which developed the checklist from several sources.

The 2006 Lifetime Traumas measure is equivalent to the 2010 Q. 37a through 37g, and 37k, 37m, and 37n from Q. 37c (Lifetime Traumas Before the Age of 18).

Sources:

Krause, N., Shaw, B. A., & Cairney, J. (2004). A descriptive epidemiology of lifetime trauma and the physical health status of older adults. *Psychology and Aging, 19*(4), 637-648.

Items: 7 items (Q37a-Q37g)

(For each of the following events, please indicate whether the event occurred AT ANY POINT IN YOUR LIFE. If the event did happen, please indicate the year in which it happened most recently.)

- Q37a Has a child of yours ever died?
- Q37b Have you ever been in a major fire, flood, earthquake, or other natural disaster?
- Q37c Have you ever fired a weapon in combat or been fired upon in combat?
- Q37d Has your spouse, partner, or child ever been addicted to drugs or alcohol?
- Q37e Were you the victim of a serious physical attack or assault in your life?
- Q37f Did you ever have a life-threatening illness or accident?
- Q37g Did your spouse or a child of yours ever have a life-threatening illness or accident?

Coding: 1=Yes, 5=No

Scaling: The measure can be scored by calculating a simple unweighted sum of all traumatic events across the life course. A second set of measures can be derived by focusing on trauma arising during developmental age periods (Krause, et al., 2004).

Background:

Turner, J. R., & Lloyd, D. A. (1995). Lifetime traumas and mental health: The significance of cumulative adversity. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 36*(4), 360-376.

Q37b. Quality of Relationship with Mother Early in Life (2008 and 2010)

(Not included in 2006)

These 3 items tap into the quality of relationships with mothers early in life. A modified version also appears in MIDUS.

Source:

Rossi, A.S. (2001). *Caring and doing for others: Social responsibility in the domains of family, work, and community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Ch. 7. Developmental Roots of Adult Social Responsibility.

Items: 3 items (Q37h-Q37j)

(For this next set of events, please think about your childhood growing up, BEFORE YOU WERE 18 YEARS OLD.)

Q37h How much time and attention did your mother give you when you needed it?

Q37i How much effort did your mother put into watching over you and making sure you had a good upbringing?

Q37j How much did your mother teach you about life?

Coding: 1=A lot, 2=Some, 3=A little, 4=Not at all

Scaling: Reverse-code all items and average the scores across all items to get a measure of the quality of relationship. Set the final score to missing if more than one item has a missing value.

Psychometrics: 2010 Alpha = .90 (2008 Alpha= .88)

Q37c. Lifetime Traumas Before the Age of 18 (2008 and 2010)

(Q. 37 in 2006)

These 4 items come from an ongoing longitudinal study of the health consequences of trauma in older adults (Krause, et al., 2004), which developed the checklist from several sources. The 2006 Lifetime Traumas measure is equivalent to Q. 37a through g, above, and Q. 37k, m, and n, below. Q. 37l was added for the 2008 and 2010 questionnaires.

Sources:

Krause, N., Shaw, B. A., & Cairney, J. (2004). A descriptive epidemiology of lifetime trauma and the physical health status of older adults. *Psychology and Aging, 19*(4), 637-648.

Items: 4 items (Q37k-Q37n)

(For the next set of events, please think about your childhood growing up, BEFORE YOU WERE 18 YEARS OLD.)

Q37k Before you were 18 years old, did you have to do a year of school over again?

Q37l Before you were 18 years old, were you ever in trouble with the police?

- Q37m Before you were 18 years old, did either of your parents drink or use drugs so often that it caused problems in the family?
- Q37n Before you were 18 years old, were you ever physically abused by either of your parents?

Coding: 1=Yes, 5=No

Scaling: The measure can be scored by calculating a simple unweighted sum of all traumatic events across the life course. A second set of measures can be derived by focusing on trauma arising during developmental age periods (Krause, et al., 2004).

Background:

Turner, J. R., & Lloyd, D. A. (1995). Lifetime traumas and mental health: The significance of cumulative adversity. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 36(4), 360-376.

Q38. Recent Stressful Life Events (2006, 2008, & 2010)

These 6 items tap major stressful life events. The 2008 and 2010 measures of Stressful Life Events include an additional item from the 2006 measure: Q. 38f.

Source:

Turner, R. J., Wheaton, B., & Lloyd, D. A. (1995). The epidemiology of social stress. *American Sociological Review*, 60(1), 104-125.

Items: 6 items (Q38a-Q38f)

(Now please think about the LAST 5 YEARS and indicate whether each of the events below occurred. If "Yes," indicate a year).

- Q38a Have you involuntarily lost a job for reasons other than retirement at any point in the past five years?
- Q38b Have you been unemployed and looking for work for longer than 3 months at some point in the past five years?
- Q38c Was anyone else in your household unemployed and looking for work for longer than 3 months in the past five years?
- Q38d Have you moved to a worse residence or neighborhood in the past five years?
- Q38e Were you robbed or did you have your home burglarized in the past five years?
- Q38f Have you been the victim of fraud in the past five years?

Coding: 1=Yes, 5=No

Scaling: An index can be created by summing the number of positive responses to the items.

Q39. Satisfaction with Domains of Life (2008 & 2010)

(Most not included in 2006)

These 7 items tap life satisfaction in different domains (housing, city, non-work, family life, financial situation, health, and overall life satisfaction).

Source:

Campbell, A., Converse, P.E., & Rodgers, W. (1976). *The quality of American life: Perceptions, evaluations, and satisfactions*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Items: 7 items (Q39a-Q39g)

(Please think about your life and situation RIGHT NOW. HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU WITH...?)

Q39a The condition of the place where you live (house or apartment)? (2008 & 2010)

Q39b The city or town you live in? (2008 & 2010)

Q39c Your daily life and leisure activities? (2008 & 2010)

Q39d Your family life? (2008 & 2010)

Q39e Your present financial situation? (2008 & 2010; in 2006 as Q39a)

Q39f The total income of your household (2010 only)

Q39g Your health? (in 2010; Q39f in 2008)

Q39h Your life as a whole these days? (in 2010; Q39g in 2008)

Coding: 1=Completely satisfied, 2=Very satisfied, 3=Somewhat satisfied, 4=Not very satisfied, 5=Not at all satisfied

Scaling: Reverse score each item so that a higher score corresponds to more satisfaction in each domain (housing Q39a, city Q39b, nonwork Q39c, family life Q39d, financial situation Q39e, health Q39f, overall life satisfaction Q39g).
NOTE: Q39a in 2006 should not be reversed scored.

Q40. Experience of Financial Strain (2008 & 2010)

(Q39b in 2006)

Source:

Campbell A., Converse, P. E., & Rodgers, W. L. (1976). *The quality of American life: Perceptions, evaluations, and satisfactions*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation

Item:

Q40 How difficult is it for (you/your family) to meet monthly payments on (your /your family's) bills?

Coding: 1=Not at all difficult, 2=Not very difficult, 3=Somewhat difficult, 4=Very difficult, 5=Completely difficult

Background:

Pearlin, L. I., Menaghan, E. G., Lieberman, M. A., & Mullan, J. T. (1981). The stress process. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 22(4), 337-356.

Q40a. Ongoing Chronic Stressors

(Q. 40 in 2006; not included in 2008)

These 8 items were also in the 2004 Pilot SAQ. They capture chronic stressors. (Alpha reliability=.71 in 2004 SAQ.)

Source:

Troxel, W. M., Matthews, K. A., Bromberger, J. T., & Sutton-Tyrrell, K. (2003). Chronic stress burden, discrimination, and subclinical carotid artery disease in African American and Caucasian women. *Health Psychology*, 22(3), 300-309.

Items: 8 items (Q40a-Q40h)

(Please read the list below and indicate whether or not any of these are current and ongoing problems that have lasted twelve months or longer. If the problem is happening to you, indicate how upsetting it has been. Check the answer that is most like your current situation.)

- Q40a Ongoing health problems (in yourself)
- Q40b Ongoing physical or emotional problems (in spouse or child)
- Q40c Ongoing problems with alcohol or drug use in family member
- Q40d Ongoing difficulties at work
- Q40e Ongoing financial strain
- Q40f Ongoing housing problems
- Q40g Ongoing problems in a close relationship
- Q40h Helping at least one sick, limited, or frail family member or friend on a regular basis

Coding: 1=No, didn't happen, 2=Yes, but not upsetting, 3=Yes, somewhat upsetting, 4=Yes, very upsetting

Scaling: The measure can be scored by calculating a simple unweighted sum of all ongoing problems.

Psychometrics: 2010 Alpha = .64 (2006 Alpha = .67, although these items are not necessarily intended to have a high degree of internal consistency.)

Background:

Pearlin, L. I., Menaghan, E. G., Lieberman, M. A., & Mullan, J. T. (1981). The stress process. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 22(4), 337-356.

Pearlin, L. I. (2010) The life course and the stress process: Some conceptual comparisons. *Journals of Gerontology: Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 65B, 207-215.

Q41. Anxiety (2006, 2008 & 2010)

Five items were selected from the widely used Beck Anxiety Inventory (BAI). The Beck Inventory has been shown to distinguish symptoms of anxiety from depression and to be valid for use in older populations.

Sources:

Beck, A. T., Epstein, N., Brown, G., & Steer, R. A. (1988). An inventory for measuring clinical anxiety: Psychometric properties. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 56(6), 893-897.

Wetherell, J. L., & Areán, P. A. (1997). Psychometric evaluation of the Beck Anxiety Inventory with older medical patients. *Psychological Assessment*, 9(2), 136-144.

Items: 5 items (Q41a-Q41e)

(Please read the statements below. How often did you feel that way DURING THE PAST WEEK. The best answer is usually the one that comes to your mind first.)

Q41a I had fear of the worst happening.

Q41b I was nervous.

Q41c I felt my hands trembling.

Q41d I had a fear of dying.

Q41e I felt faint.

Coding: 1= Never, 2= Hardly ever, 3=Some of the time, 4=Most of the time

Scaling: Responses to the 5 items are averaged to produce an index of anxiety ranging from 1-4. Set the final score to missing if more than two of the items have missing values.

Psychometrics: 2010 Alpha = .82 (2008 Alpha = .82, 2006 Alpha = .81)

Background:

Brenes, G. A., Guralnik, J. M., Williamson, J., Fried, L. P., & Penninx, B. W. J. H. (2005). Correlates of anxiety symptoms in physically disabled older women. *American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, 13(1), 15-22.

Q42 Anger (2006, 2008 & 2010)

The Spielberger Anger Expression Scale (STAX) measures anger along two dimensions: state anger and trait anger. Trait anger (anger-in) refers to a more stable predisposition to respond to a range of situations with an angry response; while state anger (anger-out) represents a more temporary angry reaction usually expressed through behavior.

Source:

Forgays, D. K., Spielberger, C. D., Ottaway, S. A., & Forgays, D. G. (1998). Factor structure of the state-trait anger expression inventory for middle-aged men and women. *Assessment*, 5, 141-155.

Items: 4 items for the Anger-In scale (items 42a-42d), 7 items for the Anger-Out scale (items 42e-42k)

(Here are some statements that describe how people react or behave when they are feeling angry or mad. Thinking of the times you feel angry, for each statement please indicate how often you react or behave this way. Respond quickly to these without thinking much, as your first impulse is usually the best answer.)

- Q42a When I am feeling angry or mad, I keep things in.
- Q42b When I am feeling angry or mad, I withdraw from people.
- Q42c When I am feeling angry or mad, I am irritated more than people are aware.
- Q42d When I am feeling angry or mad, I am angrier than I am willing to admit.
- Q42e When I am feeling angry or mad, I argue with others.
- Q42f When I am feeling angry or mad, I strike out at whatever infuriates me.
- Q42g When I am feeling angry or mad, I say nasty things.
- Q42h When I am feeling angry or mad, I lose my temper.
- Q42i I am quick tempered.
- Q42j I have a fiery temper.
- Q42k I fly off the handle.

Coding: 1=Almost never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 4=Almost always

Scaling: Create an index of Anger-In by averaged the scores for items 42a-42d (range 1-4). Set the final score to missing if more than two of the items have missing values.
Create an index of Anger-Out by averaged the scores for items 42e-42k (range 1-4). Set the final score to missing if more than three of the items have missing values.

Psychometrics: Anger In: 2010 Alpha = .79 (2008 Alpha = .78, 2006 Alpha = .78)
Anger Out: 2010 Alpha = .87 (2008 Alpha = .87, 2006 Alpha = .88)

Background:

Eckhardt, C., Norlander, B., & Deffenbacher, J. (2004). The assessment of anger and hostility: A critical review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 9*, 17-43.

Matthews, K. A., Owens, J. F., Edmundowicz, D., Lee, L., & Kuller, L. H. (2006). Positive and negative attributes and risk for coronary and aortic calcification in healthy women. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 68*, 355-361.

Q43- Q44. Subjective Social Status (Ladder) (2006, 2008 & 2010)

The ladder is designed to measure how respondents perceive their social statuses. This also appears in ELSA.

Q43 Please mark an X on the rung on the ladder where you would place yourself.

Q44 Has your position on the ladder changed within the last two years?

Source:

Cantril, H. (1965). *The pattern of human concerns*. New Brunswick, NJ. Rutgers University Press.

MacArthur Scale of Subjective Social Status. (1999). Retrieved from <http://www.macses.ucsf.edu/Research/Psychosocial/notebook/subjective.html>

Scoring: Continuous measure (1-10)

Background:

Andrews, F.M., & Withey, S.B. (1974). Developing measures of perceived life quality: Results from several national surveys. *Social Indicators Research, 1*, 1-26.

Andrews, F.M., & Crandall, R. (1976). The validity of measures of self-reported well-being. *Social Indicators Research, 3*, 1-19.

Ghaed, S.G., & Gallo, L.C. (2007). Subjective social status, objective socioeconomic Status, and cardiovascular risk in women. *Health Psychology, 26*, 668-674.

Singh-Manoux, A., Adler, N.E., & Marmot, M.G. (2003). Subjective social status: Its determinants and its association with measures of ill-health in the Whitehall II study. *Social Science & Medicine, 56*, 1321-1333.

Q45. Currently Working (2006, 2008, 2010)

This item is used to filter participants into or out of the series of questions about work experiences.

Item: Are you currently working?

Coding: 1=Yes, 5=no

Q46. Job Lock (2008 & 2010)

(Not included in 2006)

Asked only to participants who are currently working, these two items tap into the reasons behind working, and are designed to help identify individuals who work because they have to in order to earn money or obtain health insurance coverage. These items were developed in consultation with Glenn Pransky of Liberty Mutual and Jim Grosch at the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.

Items: 2 items (Q46a-Q46b)

(Right now, would you like to leave work altogether, but plan to keep working because...?)

Q46a You need the money?

Q46b You need health insurance?

Coding: 1=Yes, 5=No

Q47. Perceived Ability to Work (2008 & 2010)

(Not included in 2006)

This set of questions are only asked of participants who are currently working. The 4 items tap into the perceived ability to work with respect to a job's physical, mental, and interpersonal demands.

Items: 4 items (Q47a-Q47d)

(For the following questions, please think about your work on YOUR CURRENT MAIN JOB. Assume that your work ability at its best has a value of 10 points. How many points would you give your CURRENT ABILITY TO WORK? (0 means that you cannot currently work at all; 10 means your work ability is currently at its lifetime best))

Q47a How many points would you give your current ability to work?

Q47b Thinking about the *physical demands* of your job, how do you rate your current ability to meet those demands?

Q47c Thinking about the *mental demands* of your job, how do you rate your current ability to meet those demands?

Q47d Thinking about the *interpersonal demands* of your job, how do you rate your current ability to meet those demands?

Scoring: 11 point, continuous measure (0-10).

Scaling: Sum the items to create an index of work ability.

Psychometrics: 2010 Alpha = .96 (2008 Alpha = .96)

Background:

Ilmarinen, J., & Rantanen, J. (1999). Promotion of Work Ability During Ageing. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 1, 21-23.

Q48. Work/Non-work Interference and Enhancement (2006, 2008 & 2010)

Asked only among respondents who are currently working, this set of items assesses the extent to which work has a positive and negative effect on one's personal life and vice-versa.

Source:

MacDermid, SM, Barnett, R, Crosby, F, Greenhaus, J, Koblenz, M, Marks, S, Perry-Jenkins, M, Voydanoff, P, Wethington, E, Sabbatini-Bunch, L. (2000). The measurement of work/life tension: Recommendations of a virtual think tank. Boston, MA: Alfred P Sloan Foundation.

Items: 12 items (Q48a-Q48l)

(Please use the scale below to answer the next set of questions.)

- Q48a My work schedule makes it difficult to fulfill personal responsibilities.
- Q48b Because of my job, I don't have the energy to do things with my family or other important people in my life.
- Q48c Job worries or problems distract me when I am not at work.
- Q48d My home life keeps me from getting work done on time on my job.
- Q48e My family or personal life drains me of the energy I need to do my job.
- Q48f I am preoccupied with personal responsibilities while I am at work.
- Q48g My work leaves me enough time to attend to my personal responsibilities.
- Q48h My work gives me energy to do things with my family and other important people in my life.
- Q48i Because of my job, I am in a better mood at home.
- Q48j My personal responsibilities leave me enough time to do my job.
- Q48k My family or personal life gives me energy to do my job.
- Q48l I am in a better mood at work because of my family or personal life.

Coding: 1=Rarely, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 4=Most of the time

Scaling: There are four separate dimensions to assess the work/non-work interface: Items should be averaged for each of the four dimensions by combining items as follows:

- Work interference with personal life (Q48a, Q48b, Q48c),
- Personal life interference with work (Q48d, Q48e, Q48f)
- Work enhancement of personal life (Q48g, Q48h, Q48i)

Personal life enhancement with work (Q48j, Q48k, Q48l).

Psychometrics:

Work → Personal Life Interference/Conflict	2010 Alpha=.70 (2008 Alpha=.75; 2006 Alpha=.70)
Personal Life → Work Interference/Conflict	2010 Alpha=.77 (2008 Alpha=.74; 2006 Alpha=.68)
Work → Personal Life Facilitation	2010 Alpha=.78 (2008 Alpha=.78; 2006 Alpha=.78)
Personal Life → Work Facilitation	2010 Alpha=.85 (2008 Alpha=.84; 2006 Alpha=.81)

Q49. Chronic Work Discrimination (2006, 2008 & 2010)

These items are designed to assess chronic discrimination experienced at work. These questions are only asked of respondents who are currently working.

Source:

Williams, D. R., Yu, Y., Jackson, J. S., & Anderson, N. B. (1997). Racial differences in physical and mental health: socio-economic status, stress and discrimination. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 2, 335-351.

Items: 6 items (Q49a-Q49f)

(Here are some situations that can arise at work. Please tell me how often you have experienced them during the LAST 12 MONTHS.)

- Q49a How often are you UNFAIRLY given the tasks at work that no one else wants to do?
- Q49b How often are you watched more closely than others?
- Q49c How often are you bothered by your supervisor or coworkers making slurs or jokes about women or racial or ethnic groups?
- Q49d How often do you feel that you have to work twice as hard as others at work?
- Q49e How often do you feel that you are ignored or not taken seriously by your boss?
- Q49f How often have you been unfairly humiliated in front of others at work?

Coding: 1=Never, 2=Less than once a year, 3=A few times a year, 4=A few times a month, 5=At least once a week, 6=Almost every day

Scaling: Create an index of perceived work discrimination by averaging the scores across all items (range 1-6). Set the final score to missing if more than three of the items have missing values.

Psychometrics: 2010 Alpha = .83 (2008 Alpha= .83, 2006 Alpha =.81)

Background:

Harrell, S. P. (2000). A multidimensional conceptualization of racism-related stress: Implications for the well-being of people of color. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 70(1), 42-57.

Williams, D. R., Neighbors, H. W., & Jackson, J. S. (2003). Racial/ethnic discrimination and health: Findings from community studies. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93(2), 200-208.

Q50a – Q50o. Job Stressors and Job Satisfaction (2006, 2008 & 2010)

These 15 items capture job stress and job satisfaction. These questions are only asked of respondents who are currently working. Based on the demand/control model of stress (Karasek, 1979) and items like those contained in the Quinn and Staines Quality of Employment Survey (1977), items were chosen and adapted to assess multiple facets of job satisfaction and multiple work stressors. Psychometric analysis of data on these items in the 2004 pilot study indicated that these items do show two factors: job satisfaction and job stressors.

Source:

Karasek, R. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job re-design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 285-306.

Quinn, R. P. & Staines, G. L. The 1977 quality of employment survey. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Items: 15 items (Q50a-Q50o)

(Please say how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements)

- Q50a All things considered I am satisfied with my job.
- Q50b My job is physically demanding.
- Q50c I receive the recognition I deserve for my work.
- Q50d My salary is adequate.
- Q50e My job promotion prospects are poor.
- Q50f My job security is poor.
- Q50g I am under constant time pressure due to a heavy workload.
- Q50h I have very little freedom to decide how I do my work.
- Q50i I have the opportunity to develop new skills.
- Q50j I receive adequate support in difficult situations.
- Q50k At work, I feel I have control over what happens in most situations.
- Q50l Considering the things I have to do at work, I have to work very fast.
- Q50m I often feel bothered or upset in my work.
- Q50n In my work I am free from conflicting demands that others make.
- Q50o The demands of my job interfere with my personal life.

Coding: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Agree, 4=Strongly agree, 5=Does not apply
(This response was added to the 2010 version for items a-n. It was already a response in 2008 for all other items in Q50.)

Scaling: Items are scored on a 4 point scale and averaged to produce an index ranging from 1-4 for job satisfaction (items Q50a, Q50c, Q50d, Q50e, Q50f, Q50i, Q50j, Q50k, Q50n, reverse coding items Q50e and Q50f) and job stress (items Q50b, Q50g, Q50h, Q50l, Q50m, Q50o).

Psychometrics: 2010 Job satisfaction: Alpha = .80 (2008 Alpha = .80, 2006 Alpha = .80)
2010 Job Stress: Alpha = .74 (2008 Alpha = .70, 2006 Alpha = .75)

Q50p – Q50t. Work Environment (2008 & 2010)

Not included in 2006

These 5 items are intended to provide additional data concerning the working environment of the respondent. These items are taken from the 2002 General Social Survey, conducted by the National Opinion Research Center.

Items: 5 items (Q50p-Q50t)

(Please say how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements)

Q50p I have too much work to do everything well.

Q50q I have a lot to say about what happens on my job.

Q50r Promotions are handled fairly.

Q50s I have the training opportunities I need to perform my job safely and competently.

Q50t The people I work with can be relied on when I need help.

Coding: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Agree, 4=Strongly agree 5= Does not apply

Scaling: Reverse code item 50p (1=4, 2=3, 3=2, 4=1, 5=missing) and then average the scores across all items to obtain an overall rating of the work environment. It is suggested to recode all '5' responses as missing. Set the final score to missing if there are three or more items with missing values.

Psychometrics: 2010 Alpha = .69 (2008 Alpha = .70)

Q50u- Q50w. Coworker Support (2008 & 2010)

(Not included in 2006)

These 3 items are intended to measure the support that respondents receive from their coworkers.

Source:

Haynes, C.E., Wall, T.D., Bolden, R.I., Stride, C., & Rick, J.E. (1999). Measures of perceived work characteristics for health services research: Test of a measurement model and normative data. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 4, 257-275.

Items: 3 items (Q50u-Q50w)

(Please say how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements)

Q50u My coworkers listen to me when I need to talk about work-related problems.

Q50v My coworkers help me with difficult tasks.

Q50w My coworkers help me in crisis situations at work.

Coding: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Agree, 4=Strongly agree, 5=Does not apply

Scaling: Average the scores across all items. It is suggested to recode all of the '5' responses as missing. Set the final score to missing if there are one or more items with missing values.

Psychometrics: 2010 Alpha = .91 (2008 Alpha = .90)

Q50x – Q50za. Supervisor Support (2008 & 2010; Not included in 2006)

These 4 items are intended to measure the support that respondents receive from their work supervisors.

Source:

Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I. L., & Rhoades, L. (2002). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 565-573.

Items: 4 items (Q50x-Q50za)

(Please say how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements)

Q50x My supervisor is helpful to me in getting the job done.

Q50y My supervisor is willing to extend himself/herself to help me perform my job.

Q50z My supervisor takes pride in my accomplishments at work.

Q50za My supervisor tries to make my job as interesting as possible.

Coding: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Agree, 4=Strongly agree, 5=Does not apply

Scaling: Average the scores across all items. It is suggested to recode all '5' responses as missing. Set the final score to missing if there are two or more items with missing values.

Psychometrics: 2010 Alpha = .93 (2008 Alpha = .93)

2006 Scales or Specific Items Not Included in 2010 or 2008 Survey Content

Q2. Community Meeting Attendance

This question captures the degree of embeddedness in social networks (clubs, groups, etc.) in terms of the frequency of social interaction within this network.

Item: 1 item (Q02)

(Not including attendance at religious services, how often do you attend meetings or programs of groups, clubs, or organizations that you belong to?)

Coding: 1=More than once a week, 2=Once a week, 3=2 or 3 times a month, 4=About once a month, 5=Less than once a month, 6=Never. (Note that unless you recode the scale, higher values will correspond to less social integration.)

Q29. Frequency of Prayer

(This is in question 1 in 2008 and 2010, but the scales have changed)

Item: How often do you pray privately in places other than at church or synagogue?

Coding: 1=More than once a day, 2=Once a day, 3=A few times a week, 4=Once a week, 5=A few times a month, 6=Once a month, 7=Less than once a month, 8=Never

Scaling: Reverse-code the score to create a measure of the frequency of prayer.

Q35 Psychological Well-Being (2006)

Q6. (items f-i) (2004)

These items come from the Ryff Measures of Psychological Well-being (1989). Items tap each of the dimensions of well-being: Personal Growth, and Self Acceptance.

Sources:

Keyes, C. L. M., Shmotkin, D., & Ryff, C. D. (2002). Optimizing well-being: The empirical encounter of two traditions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(6), 1007-1022.

Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*(4), 719-727.
Items: 21 items (Q35a-Q35u)

Ryff, C. D. (1995). Psychological well-being in adult life. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 4*, 99-104.

Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. (1998). The contours of positive human health. *Psychological Inquiry, 9*(1), 1-28.

(Please read the statements below and decide the extent to which each statement describes you.)

Personal Growth Dimension (Q35h-Q35n)

- Q35h I am not interested in activities that will expand my horizons. (-)
Q35i I think it is important to have new experiences that challenge how I think about myself and the world.
Q35j When I think about it, I haven't really improved much as a person over the years(-)
Q35k I have the sense that I have developed a lot as a person over time.
Q35l I do not enjoy being in new situations that require me to change my old familiar ways of doing things. (-)
Q35m I gave up trying to make big improvements in my life a long time ago. (-)
Q35n For me, life has been a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth.

Self Acceptance Dimension (Q35o-Q35u)

- Q35o I feel like many of the people I know have gotten more out of life than I have. (-)
Q35p In general, I feel confident and positive about myself.
Q35q When I compare myself to friends and acquaintances, it makes me feel good about who I am.
Q35r My attitude about myself is probably not as positive as most people feel about themselves. (-)
Q35s In many ways, I feel disappointed about my achievements in life. (-)
Q35t When I look at the story of my life, I am pleased with how things have turned out.
Q35u I like most parts of my personality

Coding: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Somewhat disagree, 3=Slightly disagree, 4=Slightly agree, 5=Somewhat agree, 6=Strongly agree

Scaling: Reverse-code the negatively phrased items (-) and then average the scores across items to create an index of well-being for each dimension (ranging from 1-6), with a high score indicating positive well-being. Set the final score for each dimension to missing if there are more than three items with missing values within each dimension.

Psychometrics:

Personal Growth: 2006 Alpha = .76
Self Acceptance: 2006 Alpha = .81

Q46-47. Work/Family Priorities

Asked only among respondents who are currently working, these questions tap the balance between work and family.

Source: Families and Work Institute. 2002 National Study of the Changing Workforce. <http://www.familiesandwork.org/site/work/workforce/2002nscw.html>

Q.46 How often do you feel that you put your JOB before your FAMILY?

Q.47 How often do you feel that you put your FAMILY before your JOB?

Coding: 1=Very often, 2=Sometimes, 3=Rarely, 4=Never

Background:

Bond, J. T., Thompson, C., Galinsky, E., & Prttas, D. (2003). *Highlights of the National Study of the Changing Workforce*. New York: Families and Work Institute.

Additional HRS Documentation for Psychosocial Data

Additional information about the HRS psychosocial data is available in the Data Descriptions and Codebooks:

HRS 2004 Data Description:

<http://hrsonline.isr.umich.edu/meta/2004/core/desc/h04dd.pdf>

(See section 8K on page 19)

HRS 2004 Codebook:

http://hrsonline.isr.umich.edu/meta/2004/core/codebook/h04lb_ri.htm

(Note: the 2004 data section includes data for both the disability vignettes and psychosocial questionnaire.)

HRS 2006 Data Description:

<http://hrsonline.isr.umich.edu/meta/2006/core/desc/h06dd.pdf>

HRS 2006 Codebook:

http://hrsonline.isr.umich.edu/meta/2006/core/codebook/h06_00.html

HRS 2008 Data Description:

<http://hrsonline.isr.umich.edu/modules/meta/2008/core/desc/h08dd.pdf>

HRS 2008 Codebook:

http://hrsonline.isr.umich.edu/modules/meta/2008/core/codebook/h08lb_ri.htm

HRS User Guide for 2004-2006 Psychosocial questionnaire

Clarke et al.....

Other Related Studies

English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (ELSA)

<http://www.ifs.org.uk/elsa>

The English Longitudinal Study of Ageing is an interdisciplinary data resource on health, economic position and quality of life as people age.

Survey of Health, Ageing, and Retirement in Europe (SHARE)

<http://www.share-project.org/>

The Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE) is a multidisciplinary and cross-national database of micro data on health, socio-economic status and social and family networks of individuals aged 50 or over. Thus far, eleven countries have contributed data to the 2004 SHARE baseline study. SHARE is coordinated centrally at the [Mannheim Research Institute for the Economics of Aging](#). It has been designed after the role models of the [U.S. Health and Retirement Study](#) (HRS) and the [English Longitudinal Study of Ageing](#) (ELSA).

Appendix A: Psychosocial Measure Concordance among 2006, 2008, and 2010 Questionnaires

Topic	2010	2008	2006	Notes
Social, Cognitive, and Physical Activities [Social Participation]	Q.1 Changed to 7-pt Likert scale by Adding Never/Not Relevant option	Q.1 Changed scale to 6-pt Likert from Daily to Not in the last month	Q.1 Yes / No	2010 added items Q.1b and Q.1j. This shifted the numbering for all other items (see Q.1 in documentation) 2008 expands 2006: items (Q.1 h, i, p) are from 2006, but different scales also used
Social Integration	Q.1- item g	Q.1- item f	Q.2	
Retrospective Social Participation	Q.2	Q.2	-	
Life Satisfaction	Q.3	Q.3	Q.3	2008-2010 are 7-point scales to be consistent with ELSA and original Diener SWLS.
Social Network	Q.4 – Q.18	Q.4 – Q.18	Q.4 – Q.18	
Cynical Hostility	Q.19 (a-e)	Q.19 (a-e)	Q.19 (a-e)	
Optimism/ Pessimism	Q.19 (f-k)	Q.19 (f-k)	Q.19 (f-k)	
Hopelessness	Q.19 (l-o)	Q.19 (l-o)	Q.19 (l-o)	
Loneliness	Q.20	Q.20	Q.20	Added 8 items in 2008-2010
Neighborhood Disorder/ Neighborhood Social Cohesion	Q.21	Q.21	Q.21	Sides for statement poles switched in 2008-2010 (Q.21 b, d, h)
Sense of Control	Q.22 – Q.23	Q.22 – Q.23	Q.22 – Q.23	
Domain Specific Control	Q.24 – Q.26	Q.24 – Q.26	Q.24 – Q.26	2008-2010: Q.25 asks about Social life 2006: Q.25 asks about work
Perceived Change in Control over Financial Situation in the Last Year	Q.26a	-	-	
Positive and Negative Affect	Q.27	Q.27	Q.27	Different items in 2008-2010:

				Q.27 r, s) same as 2006
Religiosity/ Spirituality	Q. 28	Q. 28	Q. 28	
Prayer Frequency	Q. 1h	Q. 1g	Q. 29	Note: The scale used in 2008 and 2010 is different from the 2006 scale.
Self-perceptions of Aging	Q. 29	Q. 29	-	
Everyday Discrimination	Q. 30	Q. 30	Q. 30	Added item in 2008-2010 “How often do you receive poorer service or treatment than other people from doctors or hospitals?”
Attributions of Everyday Discrimination	Q. 31	Q. 31	Q. 31	2008-2010 adds items on financial status and religion
Balance/Reciprocity	Q.32	Q.32	Q. 32	
Quality of Relationships with Parents Early in Life	Q.32a	Q.32a	-	
Personality (MIDUS)	Q.33	Q.33	Q.33	5 items added to conscientiousness scale in 2010. This shifted the numbering for all other items (see Q.33 in documentation)
Conscientiousness (Roberts)	Q.34	Q.34	Q.34 (ELSA)	Roberts C Subfacets tried in 2008 6 additional items were added to the 2008 version in 2010
Need for Cognition	Q34a	-	-	
Psychological Well-Being (Ryff)	Q.35	Q.35	Q.35	2008-2010 includes only the Purpose in Life dimension of well-being
Major Experiences of Lifetime Discrimination	Q. 36	Q. 36	Q. 36	Additional item in 2008-2010 “Have you ever been unfairly denied health care or treatment?”

Lifetime Traumas	Q. 37a, Q.37c	Q. 37a, Q.37c	Q. 37	Additional item in 2008-2010 (Q 37c item b)
Quality of Relationship with Mother Early in Life	Q. 37b	Q. 37b	-	
Stressful Life Events	Q.38	Q.38	Q.38	Additional item in 2008-2010 (Q38 f) "Have you been the victim of fraud in the past five years?"
Domains of Life Satisfaction	Q.39	Q.39	-	
Financial Strain	Q.40	Q.40	Q.39b	
Chronic Stressors	Q.40	-	Q.40	
Anxiety	Q.41	Q.41	Q.41	
Anger	Q.42	Q.42	Q.42	
Ladder	Q.43 – Q.44	Q.43 – Q.44	Q.43 – Q.44	
Work status	Q.45	Q.45	Q.45	
Work/Family Priorities	-	-	Q.46 – Q.47	
Decision to Work	Q.46	Q.46	-	
Perceived Ability to Work	Q.47	Q.47	-	
Work/Non-work Interference and Enhancement	Q.48	Q.48	Q.48	
Chronic Work Discrimination	Q.49	Q.49	Q.49	
Work Organization	Q.50	Q.50	Q.50	Additional items in 2008-2010 (Q50 p-aa)
Who Completed the Questionnaire?	Q.51	Q.51	Q.51	Additional response item in 2008-2010 (Q51 b) "Yes, the person whose name is on the front cover answered the questions, but someone else assisted by writing in the answers for that person."