**NOTES**

1. Staff from WestEd’s Health and Human Development Program (HHDP) originally developed the resilience and youth development module between 1998 and 2000. Within WestEd, HHDP is a distinct program from REL West. The authors of this report were not involved in the development of the module.

2. The secondary school module was originally designed to measure 11 environmental and 6 internal resilience assets. REL West’s analyses suggested that some of the environmental asset measures could be combined to make more general measures, reducing the measures assessed from 11 to 8. In addition, two of the original six measures of internal resilience assets were dropped because of inadequate psychometric properties.

3. In 2001 a school connectedness scale, derived from the National Adolescent Health Survey, was added to the module because it was found to be predictive of low risk behavior and positive educational outcomes. The administration of the part of the instrument that includes this measure has been required since 2003. This measure was not included in the analysis, however, because it was not part of the original RYDM framework.


5. Analyses of the secondary school environmental asset items revealed that the instrument measures 8 of the 11 assets that the instrument was originally designed to measure. Within the school, community, and home domains, the items designed to measure adult high expectations messages and caring relationships with adults actually measure a single dimension—supportive relationships. Combining the high expectations and caring relationships items reduces the number of constructs assessed from 11 to 8. Moreover, of the six internal asset constructs that the module was designed to measure, only four could be measured validly.

6. These numerical discrepancies came about because the school and community asset sections of the RYDM are required, while the other sections of the RYDM are not.

7. Muthén’s WLSMV estimator was used to obtain model estimates. This estimator uses the diagonal of the weight matrix to obtain parameter estimates and the full weight matrix to obtain standard errors and measures of model fit (Muthén, duToit, & Spisic, 1997).

8. The model assumes invariant-factor loadings, measurement intercepts, and residual variances/covariance.

9. Please see appendix C for more details on the EFA model selection process.

10. See tables E14, E20, E26, E32, E38, E44, E50, E56, and E62 in appendix E.

11. See appendix C for a description of the CFA model selection process.

12. The factor loadings and factor correlations estimated from the main and validation samples were nearly identical.

13. EFA goodness-of-fit information for analyses of demographic subgroups is presented in appendix tables E1–E3.


15. The fit indices for models 3a and 3b differ because the latter model includes covariates for student grade, gender, and race/ethnicity.

16. The elementary survey does not include questions about student race/ethnicity, nor is it administered to students in more than one grade.

17. These 40 assets are assessed from 92 of the questions on the inventory.

18. The breadth of domain coverage of the RYDM in combination with its brevity is its weakness. With few items per scale, reliability may be compromised.


