

Table of Contents

Document Purpose	2
Major Differences between 2019 and 2020	3
Measures	4
Key Procedures	5
Recruitment	5
Participant Incentives	

Document Purpose

The purpose of this document is to describe the methodology used in Fall 2020 to administer the Wellbeing Assessment condition the data and "core dimension" with outcome item. Information about the validity and reliability of the Assessment Factor "core" can be found in the [Spring 2017 Technical Report](#).

Major Differences between 2017 and 2020

Although we might normally focus only on differences between survey technical features, the

2. Social unrest in reaction to systemic racism

- a. Although deaths in the U.S. of African American people (particularly men) due to police interaction have a long history of being disproportionately higher relative to the deaths of people who hold other racial and ethnic identities, a trend of the more violent police-related deaths caught public attention and social media during the late spring and

meanin %purpo"e%ci*ic *alue" B moral%an# ci*ic *alue" B political. The mo#elin.2606426(W)-3.289(B)-11.28768139(r

On#i*#ual "chool" pro*i#e# participation incenti*e

17 the 61 participatin "chool" in the U.S.\$

- G +u9lic/pri*ate\$ 18 2ere pri*ate%1C 2ere pu9lic
- G Si.e\$ 1? "chool" ha# un#er ra#uate FT4 enrollment" o7 H10%000@16 ha# enrollment" o7 I 10%000
- G Re ion\$
 - o North\$ 2 "chool"
 - o South\$ 1C "chool"
 - o , i#2e"\$? "chool"
 - o We"\$ 8 "chool"

Data Conditioning

For the *aria9le" u"e# to enerate the 7actor "core" in the 15 #imen"ion" all participant" recei*e#%unplanne# mi""in #ata rate" ran e 7rom 0.10F to 1; .>2F. 07 you are rea#in thi" report in preparation 7or con#uctin analy"e" 2ith #ata 2e ha*e pro*i#e# you%2e "tron ly recommen# you e*aluate rate" o7 mi""in #ata 7or the *aria9le" in your "tu#y.

For the *aria9le" u"e# to enerate the 7actor "core"%2e te"te# 7or , /AR u"in Jittle:" '1; ??(, /AR te"t u"in the Te"t, /ARNormality 7unction in the , i"" , ech pac)a e 'kam"hi#ian et al.%2018(in RStu#io 6.51 'RStu#io Team%201>(, /AR 2a" not re3ecte# 'L²M 1C2>C.82%h7etdsmh" tsmo" Shg6724

Some items were more reliable than others. The mean reliability was 0.62 and the median reliability was 0.51. The reliability range was from 0.40 to 0.80. In all our models, the maximum likelihood estimator, JRE, generated standard errors that were robust to non-normality in the item distribution.

Factor Scores

enerate factor "core" that could be compared across the year. We fit two "et" of measurement invariance test (a "et" with 15 dimensions) 90th year has in common (a "et" with all 15 dimensions) in which Friedman's chi-square test, overall chi-square + political were treated as missing for fall 2020.

We started with a 15-dimension model because all items in the 15 common dimension were administered across two years. The full information maximum likelihood (FIML) estimator was used to reduce bias in parameter estimation caused by missing data. Then we conducted a series of measurement invariance analysis with a 15-dimension model using a multiple imputation method to deal with missingness on items that were not administered in fall 2020. Multiple imputation allowed for the uncertainty about the missing data by creating several different plausible imputed data sets and appropriately combining results from each of them.

15 dimension Measurement Invariance

We conducted the measurement invariance analysis for the 15 common dimension of the two surveys administered in 2011 and 2020 with the following procedure. For the model we used FIML to reduce bias in parameter estimation with missingness under an AR(1) model completely at random (or an AR(1) model at random mechanism).

Following previous literature (Anderson & Jancey 2000) we first established a general model of measurement invariance in which the model structure are the same across two years while all parameters are freely estimated for two different groups. Next we constrained the intercept of the measurement model for each race group to be equal and fit a metric-invariant model through an application of a confirmatory analysis (CFA). Finally we constrained 90th intercept and loading of the measurement model to be equal for each group and fit a "scalar-invariant" model. For each step we examine fit indices including χ^2/df , SRMR, SRMR, RMSEA, and CFI. The latter is an "entropy" of chi-square values that change in response to fit of CFA (Bollen 1989) and determine whether we achieve measurement invariance for each step. Specifically when the change of CFA and

$R, S4A$ is less than 0.01 and the chance of SR, R is less than 0.025% determine the measurement invariance in the latent variable when the measurement model is re-estimated. [Table 6](#) summarizes the results.

1! dimension measurement invariance with multiple imputations

The `mirt` function (Buuren & Groothuis-Oudshoorn, 2011) in R was used to conduct multiple imputation for the latent variable. Since we have complete missingness on items that were not administered in 2020 we used a multiple imputation method to generate the imputed data. The computational limitations of the `mirt` function led us to use a normal estimation method to conduct measurement invariance analysis after imputation. The `lavaan` function from the `lavaan` package in R was used to test the measurement invariance for the 1? latent variable. The results indicate that the metric loading and scalar measurement invariance was achieved for the 1? latent variable with imputed data. Specifically, the chance of $F0$ is 0.000 and the chance of $R, S4A$ is 0.006% which are both smaller than the criteria. [Table 8](#) summarizes the results.

1. * (aminations of items of the Acti'ity +engagement dimension

##\$T%_1 ##\$T%_& items

We changed the Acti'ity latent variable in the 2020 fall administration to capture all forms of respondent: acti'ity latent variable because on campus environment was highly restricted due to the coronavirus pandemic. [Table 1](#) in the Appendix (Appendix 1) displays the principal components for the fall 2020 environment.

- A. Test of partial measurement invariance in the 15 common dimension across the
"print 201; an# fall 2020 "ample" treatment the A/T2A1/A/T2A2 an# A/T2A6 item" a"
though it 2a" the "same item in 90th year".
- B. Comparison of item and "core" contribution across the "print 201; an# fall 2020
"ample" within the 15 common dimension".

To conduct the analysis with the 15-dimension F0, J model from Step 2. We use this approach rather than attempting multiple imputation with all 17 dimensions because imputing all data for three dimensions (Friendship, oral, political) in fall 2020 would be unreliable. A factor analysis to this approach is that we were unable to examine the effect of the transition within the original 17-dimension framework).

Partial measurement invariance testing

Partial measurement invariance testing evaluate the impact of constraining a latent model parameter of a certain type in terms of all the parameters of that type. A test of the item-factor loading and intercepts (The purpose of this test is to evaluate the extent to which particular items might contribute to the overall fit of the model).

Typically, partial measurement invariance testing is conducted by starting with the most constrained model and then releasing parameter estimates until acceptable model fit is achieved. The item measurement model

Figure 5: Response distributions for 2020 scores extracted with 2019 model parameter estimates and parameter estimates recalibrated to the 2020 data*

* Concurrent calibration and factor score calculations

We first extracted factor "core" for the Fall 2020 data using an item-factor concurrent calibration model with the joint data set (i.e., print 2019; and Fall 2020). We chose this method to estimate the Fall 2020 "core" because the analysis in "step 2" ($\lambda = 1.0554$) ($\lambda = 2.60$) ($\lambda = 2.60295$) ($\lambda = 8.19173$) ($\lambda = 91.285$)

not present at the item for Friendships and moral and political are specific and meaningful in the concurrent calibration.

When concurrent calibration is used for the operational item in both the net and the old form are estimated simultaneously in the calibration run. Because the net and old form have items in common, the resulting item parameters for all items in the concurrent calibration run are on the same scale.

After we have the estimated parameters, we calculate the uncalibrated factor scores for the joint dataset with the `lavPredict` function in the `lavaan` R package.

. * /based score scaling and linking

Although factor extraction theoretically results in factors that are normally distributed on a latent trait continuum ranging from -6 to 6 with a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1, in practice the factors are on different scales, the mean and standard deviation of the continuum range may be different from the values listed above, and the difference may vary across the scales (Stebano & Nunnally, 2005). To make meaningful comparisons between factors calculated with the concurrent calibration method and the factors generated in 2012, we conducted the following linking procedure.

First, we conducted a linking procedure to transform all the factor variables to the joint dataset of 2012; and all 2020 factors calculated using the concurrent calibration method to a scale with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. At this point, it should be noted that because the original 2012 factors also were scaled to have a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10, no further changes to the 2012 participant data were necessary. We can use the Nappin dimension core as an example. The Nappin dimension: original 2012 mean is 50 with a standard deviation of 10. From the

concurrent calibration model with the joint data the "print; Nappine" #imention:" mean and
"tan#ar# #e*iation are 52.C? an# ;.C. The "print; participant": responses #i# not chan e%9ut
9ecau"e the overall #i"tri9ution of 7actor "core" chan e# 2hen 2e com9ine# the "print; an# 7all
2020 #ata%the "print; "core": relati*e mean and "tan#ar# #e*iation *alue" chan e#.

To get the "core" 9ac) into the "ame "cale a" the ori inal "print; "core" 'i.e.%mean 50%
"tan#ar# #e*iation of 10(%2e u"e# a linear lin)in an# e=uatn proce#ure 'Oolen et al.%2018%p61(. The
7ir"t "tep in thi" proce#ure i" to #e*elop a 7ormula that lin)" 'a(the "print; "core" calculate# 7rom
the concurrent calibration to '9(the ori inal "print; "core". The linear lin)in an# e=uatn
proce#ure i" #e7ine# 9y "ettin "tan#ar# #e*iation "core" '.<"core"(on the t2o 7orm" to 9e e=ual. A7ter
"ome al e9ra%the re"ultant 7ormula i" a linear re re""ion in 2hich 2e "ol*e 7or y\$

On thi" 7ormula% 'or (i" the con*erte# "core" 2e nee#%an# i" the "core" 7rom the
concurrent calibration model. U"in the Nappine" #imention a" an e5ample% i" the "print;
Nappine" "core" a7ter they ha*e 9een con*erte# 7rom the concurrent calibration model "corin '
"core"%mean M 52.C(to the ori inal "print; "cale 'y "core"%mean M 50(. The "lope 'a(7or thi"
7ormula i" —%an# the intercept '9(i" — . 07 2e "u9"titute tho"e *alue" into our re re""ion

Continued with our Nappine™ #imen"ion e5ample%Nappine™ #imen"ion "core" for all 201;
participant" calculate# 7from the concurrent cali9ration mo#el ha*e a mean o7 52.C? ' (an# a
"tan#ar# #e*iation o7 ; .?C '

References

Buuren%\$. *an%& Proothui"<1u#"hoorn%0. '2011(. mice\$, uli*ariate 0mputation 9y /haine# 4=uation"

in R. !ournal of Statistical Soft" are%#\$'1(%1B>C. http"\$//#oi.or /10.1?>6C/3"".*085.i06

/hen%F.%/urran%+. K.%Bollen%0. A.%0ir9y%K.%& +a5ton%+. '200?(. An empirical e*aluation o7 the u"e o7

Tables

Table 5. Content differences for items in the Activity Engagement dimension

ACT23	Spring 2011;	I am involved in at least one activity at my school that I enjoy.
	Fall 2020	I am involved in at least one activity that I enjoy.
ACT232	Spring 2011;	I am involved in at least one activity at my school that has expanded my skills.
	Fall 2020	I am involved in at least one activity that has expanded my skills
ACT23,	Spring 2011;	I am involved in at least one activity at my school that is meaningful to me.
	Fall 2020	I am involved in at least one activity that is meaningful to me.

- A"ian M A"ian%not Ni"panic
-

Table . Correlations between the scores extracted from the model generated with the spring 2020 parameters and the model that was recalibrated to the fall 2020 data

	happiness	anxiety	depression	loneliness	social anxiety	life satisfaction	self-esteem	optimism	perseverance	activity	academic	religion	meaning	purpose	coping
--	-----------	---------	------------	------------	----------------	-------------------	-------------	----------	--------------	----------	----------	----------	---------	---------	--------

Appendix

2020 Fall Administration Score /o#e

UUU+repare #ata

V/1+0NPA1V%/1+0NPA2V%/1+0NPA6V%
VTR0, AWTSV(
#atAconcuA201; H<#atA201; W% arAli"t201; X
#atAconcuA201; YyearH-pa"te'V201; V(
#atAconcuA2020H<#atA2020W% arAli"t2020A15#imenX
#atAconcuA2020YyearH-pa"te'V2020V(
#im'#atAconcuA2020(
UUUchan e #atAconcuA2020 colname" the "ame a" #atAconcuA201;
colname""#atAconcuA2020(H<c'VNA++RA1V%VNA++RA2V%VNA++RA6V%VNA++RA5V
%V ANXA1V%V ANXA2V%V ANXA6V%V ANXA5V
%V -4+A1V%V -4+A2V%V -4+A6V%V -4+A>V%V -4+ACV
%V J1N4A1V%V J1N4A2V%V J1N4A6V%V J1N4A8V%V J1N4A5V
%V S1/ANXA1V%V S1/ANXA2V%V S1/ANXA6V
%V J0F4SATA1V%V J0F4SATA2V%V J0F4SATA8V
%V S4JF4STA1V%V S4JF4STA6V%V S4JF4STA8V
%V 1+TA2V%V 1+TA6V%V 1+TA5V
%V +4RSA1V%V +4RSA2V%V +4RSA6V
%V A/T2A1V%V A/T2A2V%V A/T2A6V
%V A/A4NPA1V%V A/A4NPA2V%V A/A4NPA6V
%V B4J1NPA1V%V B4J1NPA2V%V B4J1NPA6V
%V , 4AN0NPA1V%V , 4AN0NPA2V%V , 4AN0NPA6V
%V +UR+A1V%V +UR+A2V%V +UR+A6V%
V/1+0NPA1V%/1+0NPA2V%/1+0NPA6V%
VTR0, AWTSV%yearV(
UUUU## 9ac) 10 item" in 7rien#"hip ci*i1 ci*ic2 #imen"ion" 9ac)%
-2.69869866VJA-182.028 -15.48 TdA[() -2.69869866VJA-182.028 -15.48 TdA[() -2.698698669867

#atA"coreA3ointH<r9in#' #atA201;Anon ra#Atem%#atA2020Anon ra#Atem(

7itAne22ei ht"concuH<c7a'mo#el201;%mi""in M[7iml[%
#ataM#ata"coreA3oint%amplin .2ei ht"MVTR0, AWTSV%
e"timatorMV, JRV%t#.l*MTRU4 (
"coreAconcuH<la*+re#ict'7itAne22ei ht"concu%metho#MVBartlettV(
^

UUUJinear e=uat in to the ori inal "cale# 201; "core"
UUFir"t "calin t2o "core" to a "cale 2ith a mean o7 50 an# a "tan#ar# #e*iation o7 10
"coreAconcuH<a".#ata.7rame""coreAconcu(
7or 'i in '1\$1?((\
"core201; %XH<"cale""core201; %X%"caleMTRU4(]10050
"coreAconcu%XH<"cale""coreAconcu%X%"caleMTRU4(]10050
^

UUUA#3u"te# "cale" "o that the "core" calculate# 7rom concurrent cali9ration" coul# 9e compara9le to
the ori inal 201; "core"
"coreAconcuA201; "caleH<"coreAconcuA201;
7or 'i in '1\$1?((\
"coreAconcuA201; "cale%XH<"cale""coreAconcuA201; %X%"caleMTRU4(]10050
^

UUput 2020 "core" 'calculate# 7rom concurrent cali9ration to ori inal 201; "core "cale(
"coreAconcuA2020H<"coreAconcuM1; 22\$22?21%
"coreAconcuA2020"caleH<'coreAconcuA2020
7or 'i in '1\$1?((\
7or '3 in '1\$10; 00(\
"coreAconcuA2020"cale%XH<"coreAconcuA2020%XH<
mean""coreAconcuA201; %X%na.rmMTRU4(("/#"coreAconcuA201; %X%na.rm M TRU4(]10050
^
^

UUU/han e "core name" to V55.FSV
colname""core2020A201; parameter"A1?#imen"ion(H<
0?AN1485f(s)(uA28X(s))%1498-2(u)-21470510313.A4845(c)9.16485(o)-6.6257(n)]TJA253.806 0 TdA(c)-1.3.806 06er

#atA2020A"core"H<c9in#'#atA2020%"coreAconcuA2020"caleW6'1\$15(X(
UU"a*e the file 2020 fall "core" calculation"
2rite.c"*'#atA2020A"core"%20207allA7actor"core"Aori inal#ati"29aA7allA2020Apo2erA9iA#ummyA*2no
7rie#nci*ic1&2Ane2 "calin .c"*V%o2.name" M FAJS4)