

**Antisocial Behavior among Children in Poverty:
Understanding Environmental Effects in Daily Life**

Authors: Michael A. Russell, M.A., Candice L. Odgers, Ph.D.

Affiliations: *Russell:* Department of Psychology and Social Behavior, University of California, Irvine; *Odgers:* Center for Child and Family Policy & Sanford School of Public Policy, Duke University

Address: *Russell:* 4201 Social and Behavioral Sciences Gateway, Department of Psychology and Social Behavior, University of California, Irvine, 92697; *Odgers:* 218 Rubenstein Hall, Duke University Box 90312, Durham, NC 27708-0312

Email: m.a.russell@uci.edu (Russell); candice.odgers@duke.edu (Odgers)

Intended for Pietz, C. A., & Mattson, C. A. (eds.). *Violent Offenders: Understanding and Assessment*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press

Abstract

Children living in poverty are at increased risk for antisocial behavior, and a large portion of this risk appears to operate through chronic exposure to stressful events in daily life. The difficulty of measuring daily stressors in-the-moment, however, presents a challenge for researchers attempting to characterize low-income children's daily environments and their effects on antisocial behavior. In this chapter, we review research and theory supporting the idea that everyday environments may play a causal role in low-income children's antisocial development. Then, we discuss how mobile technologies may help researchers achieve a better understanding of (a) the everyday environments experienced by low-income children, (b) the effects of these environments on their behavior and well-being, and (c) whether some children are more sensitive to their environments than others, as suggested by theories of person-by-environment interaction. We conclude with a discussion of future directions that emerge from our review.

Keywords: antisocial behavior, environmental effects, mobile technologies, diary methods, daily stressors, differential susceptibility

Antisocial Behavior among Children in Poverty: Understanding Environmental Effects in Daily Life

Children who grow up in poverty are more likely to engage in antisocial behavior – such as aggression, rule-breaking behavior, and delinquency – than children who grow up in better off circumstances (see reviews by Bradley & Corwyn, 2002; Brooks-Gunn & Duncan, 1997; McLoyd, 1998). The strength and consistency of this relationship has led many to question whether poverty *causes* antisocial development in children, or whether the relationship is better explained by pre-existing characteristics shared among children and families who live in poverty (e.g. family history of aggression, personality features, or genetic liability; see Jaffee, Strait, & Odgers, 2012 for a discussion). Answering this question is important for a number of reasons. First, childhood poverty has been shown to predict antisocial behavior at multiple points in the life course. Children from low-socioeconomic status (SES) backgrounds are more likely to show chronic aggression during the first 4 years of life (Tremblay et al., 2004), are more likely to engage in serious crime and violence during adolescence (Bjerk, 2007; Elliott & Ageton, 1980; Jarjoura, Triplett, & Brinker, 2002), and are more likely to continue their involvement in antisocial behavior as adults (Fergusson & Horwood, 2002; Lahey et al., 2006; Odgers et al., 2008). Second, child and adolescent antisocial behavior is known to predict a broad range of poor adult outcomes, including physical health problems (Odgers et al., 2007), broad spectrum psychiatric disorder (Kim-Cohen et al., 2003), economic/occupational difficulties (Moffitt, Caspi, Harrington, & Milne, 2002; Odgers et al., 2008), and involvement in crime and violence (Farrington, 1989; Moffitt, Caspi, Rutter, & Silva, 2001; Theobald & Farrington, 2012). Third, the societal costs associated with antisocial behavior are staggering, as estimates place the aggregate burden of crime in the United States (US) between \$1 and \$2 trillion dollars *per year* (Anderson, 1999; Ludwig, 2006, 2010).

Taken together, this evidence makes it clear that childhood poverty is a powerful risk factor for the development of antisocial behavior, an important and pressing societal problem.

But how does living in poverty increase children's risk for developing antisocial behavior?

Theory and research suggest that poverty may be bad for children because low-income youth are embedded in home, school, and neighborhood environments where they are chronically exposed to stressful events in daily life. These stressors include harsh parenting, family turmoil, exposure to violence, poor quality living conditions, and family chaos, to name just a few (Evans, 2004). Exposure to chronic stressors in everyday life results in prolonged activation of the stress response systems, which is thought to impair children's development of self-regulation abilities (e.g., attention and impulse control, delay of gratification, and working memory; Blair & Raver, 2012; Evans & Kim, 2013). Additionally, chronic exposure to aggressive, hostile, or coercive "role" models may train children to engage in aggression themselves via social modeling processes (Patterson, 1982; Patterson, Reid, & Dishion, 1992).

As such, the environment of childhood poverty – particularly the quality of children's everyday experiences – may be a principal source of risk for antisocial development. However, it is challenging to examine the causal effects of poverty on children's antisocial development because obtaining accurate "fly-on-the-wall" measurements of everyday events has been difficult with traditional assessment methods. Thus, there is little evidence on which of these events is most prominent in low-income children's daily lives, which types of stressful events have the most deleterious effects "in-the-moment", and which children may be the most susceptible to the effects of daily stressors. Given the structural barriers to lifting children out of impoverished conditions, it is imperative that researchers begin to identify factors that could protect children from the adverse effects of poverty-related daily stressors. By doing so, these efforts could have a reasonable shot at improving low-income children's life chances. In this chapter, we discuss how mobile technology can be leveraged to help us characterize the environments of children¹ in poverty, and better understand the effects that these environments

¹ Throughout, we use the term *children* to refer to both childhood and adolescence, and distinguish between the two developmental periods when necessary.

may have on the development of antisocial behavior. Because mobile technologies (such as smartphones, tablets, and iPads) provide researchers with enhanced capabilities for assessing social and physical environments, mood, self-regulation, and behavior as people live their everyday lives, these tools seem naturally suited to studying how exposure to relatively minor, yet meaningful stressors in everyday life may increase risk for antisocial behavior among children in poverty.

The chapter is organized into the following sections. In the first section, we discuss the concept of “environment” in children’s development, and follow with a review of evidence for how the environment of childhood poverty may lead to antisocial behavior problems in children. We focus primarily on the social environment, as the majority of environmental conditions associated with both poverty and antisocial behavior are social in nature (e.g. parental conflict, low parental support, deviant peer affiliation, exposure to violence; cf. Dodge, Coie, & Lynam, 2006; Evans, 2004). Next, we discuss how mobile technologies may help researchers meet the challenges of measuring children’s everyday environments and understanding the effects of these environments for children’s antisocial behavior. Then, given that not all children exposed to negative environments will develop antisocial behavior, we discuss theory and research suggesting that some children may be more sensitive to their environmental surroundings than others, such that they are at greatest risk when environments are bad, but at lowest risk when environments are good (Ellis, Boyce, Belsky, Bakermans-Kranenburg, & van Ijzendoorn, 2011). We conclude with a discussion of future research directions that emerge from our review.

What is the Environment of Childhood Poverty?

Imagine a child living in poverty. His home feels crowded; he has little privacy and he feels as though family members are always intruding into his space. His parents are exhausted and short-tempered from working long hours, leading to frequent bouts of conflict at home. His school is underfunded and understaffed; his teachers seem constantly stressed and overburdened. He feels pressured to do bad things – like smoking and stealing – by kids at his

school. He feels unsafe in his neighborhood, as high levels of crime and disorder characterize the streets surrounding his home. Continuous exposure to these stressful conditions takes its toll over time, as he struggles to keep his focus at school, soothe his seemingly constant anxiety and irritation amidst the chaos at home and on the streets, and somehow plan for a future that becomes increasingly uncertain with each passing year.

As the above vignette illustrates, the daily lives of children in poverty, are in a word, stressful. Not only do low-income children experience a greater number of major stressful life events (such as parental divorce or residential instability; Attar, Guerra, & Tolan, 1994; Gad & Johnson, 1980; Pryor-Brown, Cowen, Hightower, & Lotyczewski, 1986), but their everyday lives are simply more risky. Their homes, schools, and neighborhoods are more chaotic, unsafe, and conflictual than those of children from middle- to upper-class backgrounds (Evans, 2004). Their daily lives are more likely to be characterized by greater levels of family turmoil, exposure to violence, harsh parenting, low levels of social support, and crowded, chaotic living conditions compared to not-poor children (Evans, Gonnella, Marcynyszyn, Gentile, & Salpekar, 2005; Grant et al., 2003; Repetti, Taylor, & Seeman, 2002). While an impressive body of research shows that major stressful life events have profound effects on health and antisocial behavior (see e.g. Attar et al., 1994; Danese et al., 2009; Felitti et al., 1998; Whitfield, Anda, Dube, & Felitti, 2003), evidence from adults suggests that chronic, accumulating exposure to more “mundane” hassles or stressors in everyday life may have effects that are just as strong, if not *stronger* (Almeida, 2005; Kanner, Coyne, Schaefer, & Lazarus, 1981; see review by Odgers & Jaffee, 2013). When combined with evidence that exposure to negative social conditions explains *over 50%* of poverty’s effect on child antisocial behavior (Dodge, Pettit, & Bates, 1994), it seems likely that the everyday environment may be a principal source of risk for antisocial behavior in low-income children, as well as an important target for interventions.

How Can We Better Characterize and Understand Environmental Effects?

In order to obtain a better understanding of how everyday environments affect low-income children's development, it is necessary to start with a clear definition of what is meant by the environment. To this end, it is helpful to consider two complementary perspectives of what environment is. The first invokes the concept of environment as a *context* that consists of the structural and social characteristics of a person's surroundings. The environment-as-context perspective often serves a descriptive function, enhancing knowledge on environment by characterizing the specific exposures faced by individuals across different types of environmental settings, as well as how these exposures are associated with intellectual, behavioral, and physical outcomes. For example, studies that document the characteristics of low-income households (i.e. number of books on the shelf, cleanliness of the home; Bradley, Corwyn, McAdoo, & Coll, 2001), the specific types of daily stressors experienced by adolescents in poverty (Evans, Vermeulen, Barash, Lefkowitz, & Hutt, 2009) or the levels of aircraft noise in metropolitan neighborhoods (Cohen, Krantz, Evans, Stokols, & Kelly, 1981; Haines, Stansfeld, Head, & Job, 2002) provide a better understanding of environment as context.

The second perspective invokes the concept of the environment as a *causal agent*. The environment-as-agent perspective is rooted in behavioral genetics and developmental psychology, and focuses on determining the causal (read "non-genetic") effects of both measured and unmeasured environmental factors. Studies in this tradition aim to understand whether environments have any effects when children's genes or genetically influenced characteristics are effectively held constant, through natural experiments, twin or adoption designs, and randomized controlled interventions (Moffitt, 2005; Rutter, 2005). This is important to do because prior to Bell's (1968) seminal argument on how children affect their environments (rather than the reverse), few studies had tested the hypothesis that children's genetically influenced characteristics could in truth be the causal agents behind what appeared to be environmental effects. This was followed by convincing arguments, buttressed by behavioral

genetic research, that the effect of parental rearing environments were essentially null in that children's genetically influenced characteristics were believed to elicit or otherwise account for much of the observed parental rearing effects (Harris, 1995; Scarr, 1992). More recent evidence has shown that parental environments do have potentially causal effects on children's development after all (e.g., Caspi et al., 2004; Jaffee, Caspi, Moffitt, & Taylor, 2004), but the lesson learned here is that in order to determine with any confidence that an effect is environmentally driven, one must first address – and at least partially rule out – pre-existing characteristics of children and families that may serve as the primary source of the association between and environmental risk factor and children's behavior (Moffitt, 2005; Rutter, 2005; Rutter, Pickles, Murray, & Eaves, 2001).

Does Poverty Have an Environmental Effect on Children's Antisocial Behavior?

Jaffee, Strait, and Odgers (2012) reviewed evidence from experimental and quasi-experimental studies that could facilitate causal inferences – including natural experiments, randomized controlled intervention trials, and twin/adoption studies – and found evidence that poverty has effects on children's antisocial behavior that are above and beyond genetic liability or other pre-existing child and family characteristics. One of the studies they reviewed was a natural experiment that occurred during an ongoing longitudinal study of the development of psychiatric illness in children (Costello, Compton, Keeler, & Angold, 2003). Four years after the start of the study, a casino opened on a Native American reservation and provided all families in the study with a recurring income supplement that increased in value each year. For some of these families (14%), the income supplements moved them out of poverty, whereas 53% of families remained in poverty despite the supplements and 32% were never poor. Children in families who moved out of poverty showed significant decreases in antisocial behavior during the four years following the casino opening. The reduction was so pronounced that, after four years of income supplements, children whose families moved out of poverty had levels of antisocial behavior resembling those of the youth who were never poor. Conversely, American

Indian children whose families remained poor despite the income supplements did not decrease their antisocial behavior. Because income supplements were delivered to an entire community of Native American families, this study provides a strong natural control for any pre-existing characteristics of children and families that may confound the relationship between family income and children's antisocial behavior. As such, this study provides strong evidence that poverty plays a potentially causal role in the development of children's antisocial behavior.

Other studies reviewed by Jaffee and colleagues (2012) relied on quasi-experimental methods to identify whether poverty has environmental effects on children's antisocial behavior. For example, a study by Strohschein (2005) compared children to themselves across time, and showed that children engaged in more antisocial behavior when family income decreased, and less antisocial behavior when family income increased. Because this study compares each child's antisocial behavior to that of him/herself at different points in time, it provides evidence that the effect of poverty on antisocial behavior cannot be explained by factors that remain unchanged, such as sex, ethnicity, and genetic makeup (Allison, 2005). In another quasi-experimental study of over 2000 twin pairs (50% of twin pairs were monozygotic), Caspi, Taylor, Moffitt, and Plomin (2000) showed that children in socioeconomically deprived neighborhoods had greater emotional and behavioral problems than children living in relatively advantaged neighborhoods, and that neighborhood deprivation had effects on children that were above and beyond the effects of genetic liability—thus evincing an environmentally mediated effect.

How Poverty Affects Children: The Role of Everyday Experience

Taken together, the above studies provide evidence that the effect of poverty on children's antisocial behavior is partly explained by environmental factors. These studies have answered the question of *whether* the environment of poverty affects children's antisocial behavior—the next step, therefore, is to determine *how*. In many of the explanations for how poverty affects children's antisocial behavior, the everyday environment takes center stage. In their *risky families model*, Repetti et al. (2002) suggest that everyday family interactions

characterized as cold, unsupportive, and neglectful represent an important pathway through which poverty can affect child and adolescent well-being. Similarly, Hertzman and Boyce (2010, p. 331) argue that it is the “mundane, rather than [the] exceptional, exposures” that often have the largest effects by altering children’s developmental pathways and leaving lasting imprints on adult outcomes. Predictions such as these have been borne out in studies of adults, which have shown that everyday stressors or “hassles” have stronger effects on physical and mental health than major stressful life events (Almeida, 2005; DeLongis, Coyne, Dakof, Folkman, & Lazarus, 1982). Through their frequent, pervasive, and chronic nature, the effects of daily environmental conditions accumulate with continued exposure, sometimes leading to profound and long-lasting effects on well-being.

A striking example comes from the work of Hart and Risley (1995), who conducted monthly observational visits with 42 families, starting when children were 7-9 months old and ending at three years of age. In observed interactions with their parents, children from professional families (high SES) heard an average of 2153 words an hour, whereas children from working-class families heard 1251 and children from welfare families heard 616. This difference in language exposure was not inconsequential. By approximately age three, children from professional families had a vocabulary of around 1100 words, whereas children from welfare families had less than half; a vocabulary of around 500 words. From their data, Hart and Risley estimated that each year, children in professional families hear 11 million words whereas children in welfare families hear 3 million. One can clearly see that as the years go by, the gap in language exposure between high- and low-SES children will increase exponentially. Extrapolating to age four, Hart and Risley estimated that children from welfare families will have heard *32 million* fewer words than children from professional families, which they dubbed *the 30 million word gap* (see Hart & Risley, 2003, p. 8). This ever-increasing gap in language exposure may be expected to produce an ever-increasing gap in cumulative vocabulary and, with it, a substantial decrease in life chances for low-SES children.

The work of Hart and Risley (1995) provides a compelling example of how children's everyday conditions can produce meaningful differences in their developmental outcomes. The accumulating nature of everyday environmental exposures (exposure to language in the Hart and Risley study) may be expected to create ever-widening gaps in academic, behavioral, and physical outcomes for children across socioeconomic strata. In the same way that differential exposure to language led to ever-increasing vocabulary differences among children, it is likely that differential exposure to *stressful events* may produce ever-widening differences in antisocial behavior between low- and high-SES children, and thus suggest one reason why antisocial behavior problems are so much more common in low-income youth. The multiple stressors indigenous to poverty, and the reactions these stressors evoke, are central to numerous models describing how poverty affects children's development (McLoyd, 2011). Two prominent examples include family stress (Conger et al., 1992; Elder, 1974) and cumulative stress models (Evans, Kim, Ting, Teshler, & Shannis, 2007), both of which emphasize the damaging effects of repeated stressor exposure and the frequent psychological and physiological reactivity that results. We describe the relevance of these perspectives for low-income children's antisocial behavioral development below.

The Family Stress Model

The family stress model suggests that economic hardship increases children's risk for emotional and behavioral problems by increasing tension, conflict, and hostility in the daily interactions of parents and children. Stress associated with life in poverty compromises parents' ability to respond supportively to their children and often results in more harsh and punitive parenting and family conflict (Bradley et al., 2001; McLoyd, 2011). High levels of family conflict, tension, and hostility increase children's risk for antisocial behavior because the home effectively becomes a training ground in which aggressive, angry, and hostile behavior is modeled, learned, reinforced, and further elaborated (Patterson, 1982; Patterson et al., 1992). The family stress model was originally informed by the classic work of Elder and colleagues

(Elder, 1974; Elder, van Nguyen, & Caspi, 1985) following children of the Great Depression. Elder and his colleagues showed that economic hardship had negative effects on parents (primarily fathers) making them more rejecting, indifferent, and less supportive, which in turn had downstream negative effects on children's socioemotional development. Studies since have shown that negative parenting mediates the relationship between economic hardship and children's externalizing or antisocial behavior (Conger, Ge, Elder, Lorenz, & Simons, 1994; Grant et al., 2003).

The Cumulative Stress Model

The cumulative stress model suggests that frequent stressor exposure and prolonged stress reactivity play a key role in the development of socioemotional and behavioral difficulties among children in poverty. This view has been most strongly associated with the work of Gary Evans, who emphasizes the role of poverty-related stress in fostering difficulties in children's self-regulation and in promoting *allostatic load* (Evans & English, 2002; Evans et al., 2007), a physiological marker of wear-and-tear on bodily systems stemming from frequent activation of the stress response (McEwen, 1998; McEwen & Lasley, 2002). In a study of 8- to 10-year olds, Evans and English (2002) showed that low-income children experience a multitude of environmental stressors, including physical stressors such as higher levels of crowding, noise, and poorer housing quality; as well as psychosocial stressors including greater levels of family turmoil, family separation, and exposure to violence. For each of the stressors in this study, a child was classified as *exposed* if his or her score was greater than one standard deviation above the sample mean (with the exception of violence, for which any exposure was considered stressful). Not only was exposure to each of these stressors more common in the lives of low- versus middle-income children, but low-income children were also more likely to be exposed to multiple stressors in their lifetime. In fact, 54% of low-income children in the study were exposed to three or more of these stressors in their lifetimes, whereas this was true for only 14% of middle-income children. Multiple stressor exposure predicted poor psychological outcomes such

as impaired self-regulation and poor mental health (including higher conduct problems), as well as poor physiological outcomes such as higher resting blood pressure and higher overnight urinary stress hormone levels (cortisol and epinephrine). Moreover, multiple stressor exposure was shown to mediate the relationship between poverty and children's psychological and physiological outcomes, supporting the idea that exposure to multiple, accumulating stressors may be an important pathway through which poverty increases children's risk for poor psychological outcomes such as antisocial behavior.

Next Steps: Can Mobile Technologies Help Identify Environmental Effects on Antisocial Behavior?

Based on this evidence, it seems clear that highly stressful everyday environments play an important role in the development of antisocial behavior for low-income children. A promising strategy for improving the lives of low-income children may be to gain a better understanding of how stressful everyday environments affect low-income children's day-to-day adjustment and risk for antisocial behavior. In doing so, researchers could identify specific environmental factors likely to play a causal role in promoting low-income children's antisocial behavior, and thereby inform prevention and intervention efforts aimed at reducing their effects.

However, obtaining accurate and comprehensive measures of children's everyday environments remains a persistent methodological challenge. Although observational studies (e.g. Hart & Risley, 1995; Patterson, 1982; Patterson et al., 1992) provide enormous depth of observation and objectivity in measurement, they cannot well capture the *range* of exposures that a child has in a given day because observers cannot follow the child everywhere he or she goes. Moreover, observational methods by their nature are restricted to measuring observables (i.e. emotional expression, instances of behavior) and may not be well-suited toward measuring internal states such as affect and self-regulation, both of which (a) constitute important dimensions of how one reacts to experience and (b) may serve as momentary markers for

emotional and behavioral problems or disorders (Larson, Richards, Raffaelli, Ham, & Jewell, 1990; Silk, Steinberg, & Morris, 2003; Whalen, Jamner, Henker, & Delfino, 2001).

Diary methods, also known as experience sampling methodologies (ESM; Csikszentmihalyi, Larson, & Prescott, 1977) or ecological momentary assessment (EMA; Shiffman, Stone, & Hufford, 2008) strategies, may help researchers better meet the challenge of measuring everyday environments and their effects. Diary methods are assessment strategies that use pagers, handheld computers (Palm pilots), cellular phones, tablets such as the iPad, or paper-and-pencil entries to obtain repeated self-reports on individuals' contexts, social interactions, affect, motivations, self-regulation, and behavior at the tempo of daily life (Bolger, Davis, & Rafaeli, 2003). Because they allow near real-time measurement in people's natural environments, diary measures provide high levels of ecological validity and permit comprehensive reports of context, experience, and well-being. Moreover, diary methods have been effectively used across a wide range of age groups, demonstrating feasibility among children as young as 8 years (Whalen et al., 2009) to adults of oldest old age (Keller-Cohen, Fiori, Toler, & Bybee, 2006). As such, they may be fruitfully applied to measuring relationships between everyday environment and antisocial behavior among low-income children.

Of course, diary methods are not without their limitations. First, these methods often rely solely on self-reports of both exposure and outcome, which may create shared method variance and artificially inflate associations between study variables. Second, the low frequency of severely aggressive or antisocial behaviors may make it difficult to observe environmental effects in daily life. However, researchers may limit assessments to conceptually related but less severe antisocial behaviors, such as bullying, lying, stealing, or vandalism, which are more likely occur with sufficient frequency at the daily level. Third, because the intensive assessment procedures may become burdensome for children and adolescents, researchers may benefit from designing incentive strategies to keep youth engaged and responsive to diary assessments, especially if the assessments are particularly frequent or the duration of diary

data collection is long (see Conner Christensen, Barrett, Bliss-Moreau, Lebo, & Kaschub, 2003 for an excellent review of these and other practical considerations inherent in diary research).

Despite these limitations, however, we believe that diary methods have unique features to contribute to the study of environmental effects on low-income children's antisocial behavior and, as discussed later in this chapter, we believe these methods may be especially promising when combined with the enhanced technological features of mobile phones and other newly emerging technologies. Below, we discuss three potential contributions that diary methods may make in this area. First, by assessing experiences close to when they occur, diary methods allow researchers to better measure the *environment as experienced*, rather than the *environment as remembered*. Second, diary methods allow researchers to appreciate that every child is different. Through repeated measurement of experiences *within* a person, diary methods allow us to appreciate (and measure) the specific constellation of experiences, emotions, behaviors, as well as the unique interrelations between these constructs, *for each child*. Third, the intensive within-person measurement of diary measures allows examinations of within-person processes that may help identify environmental effects. We discuss each of these features in more detail below.

Feature 1: Diary Methods Can Measure the Environment *as Experienced*, Rather than *as Remembered*

The first feature offered by diary methods is the ability to measure the environment *as it is experienced*, because reports of environmental exposures can be obtained within minutes to hours of when the child experiences them. This type of assessment differs from the more typical mode of measurement, which focuses on the *environment as remembered*. Here participants are asked to recall "how much", "how often", or "whether" specific things have happened over a longer time frame, often over the past 6-12 months. The environment-as-remembered measurement strategy is less than ideal if the goal is to accurately measure the routine environmental conditions of a person's daily life. This is because routine experiences are not as

easily recalled over long time spans as are unusual events, leaving retrospective reports of daily events more susceptible to heuristic biases that may reduce reporting accuracy (Bradburn, Rips, & Shevell, 1987; Shiffman et al., 2008). This evidence suggests that as time passes, individuals may be increasingly likely to misremember or even forget routine stressful occurrences, leaving researchers with an incomplete understanding of how frequent and impairing these routine stressors can be. Other factors such as the participant's mood at the time of assessment can also affect the accuracy of recall (Shiffman et al., 2008). Diary methods may help researchers to minimize (but not eliminate) retrospective recall biases by shortening the window of recall to minutes or hours, a strategy that has been empirically shown to produce more accurate self-reports (see e.g. Shiffman, 2009).

One example among low-income children is provided by Evans et al. (2009). Evans and his colleagues used experience sampling methodology (ESM) to obtain hourly reports of daily hassles – minor stressors in everyday life – among both low- and middle-income rural adolescents. The hourly assessment strategy stands in marked contrast to prior research on children's self-reported stressful events, which has typically relied on recall periods ranging from a month to a year (see e.g. Attar et al., 1994; Compas, Davis, Forsythe, & Wagner, 1987; Kanner, Feldman, Weinberger, & Ford, 1987; Shahar, Henrich, Reiner, & Little, 2003), and because of this, was able to provide an unprecedented look at the frequency, domain, and content of the daily events that characterize the everyday lives of low- versus middle-income adolescents. For example, Evans and colleagues corroborated prior research findings (e.g., Attar et al., 1994; Gad & Johnson, 1980; Pryor-Brown et al., 1986) by showing that low-income adolescents experienced a greater number of stressful events compared to middle-income adolescents. However, Evans and colleagues provided a more nuanced picture by showing that the source of this difference was primarily in the family context, as negative social interactions (e.g. nagging and activity prohibition from parents), chaotic living conditions, and lack of privacy at home were especially salient stressors for adolescents living in poverty, whereas low- and

middle-income adolescents experienced a similar number of stressors in both school and peer domains. In short, the hourly assessment strategy used in this study was able to provide a richer picture of adolescents' daily contexts than had been achieved before, and allowed for a better understanding of both the similarities and the differences in the daily experiences of low- versus middle-income youths.

In addition to momentary self-reports, the experienced environment can also be measured more objectively through the recording (photo, video, and voice) and global positioning system (GPS) capabilities of the latest generation of mobile devices (i.e. smartphones and tablets). Using these objective features allows researchers to get closer to measuring the *exposome*: the full catalog of an individual's environmental exposures (Borrell, 2011). For example, voice and photo capture on mobile phones is being used to more objectively obtain dietary information from individuals in their everyday lives (see the Food Intake Visual and voice Recognizer or FIVR; Weiss, Stumbo, & Divakaran, 2010). Similarly, mobile phones' photo and video capture capabilities could be used to document the daily contexts and activities of children living in poverty. For example, as part of their daily assessments, youth could be asked to take pictures of "where they are right now" in addition to providing self-reported information about what they are doing. These images could be directly uploaded to the researchers' data files, circumventing privacy and confidentiality concerns. These photos could be coded on dimensions such as disorder (e.g. messiness of the home, quality of housing, vandalism present) and dangerousness (e.g. observer impressions of safety in the home, school, or neighborhood; see Odgers, Caspi, Bates, Sampson, & Moffitt, 2012 for an example of such coding using images from Google Street View). Combined with daily self-reports, these in-the-field photos of contexts could help researchers obtain a richer picture of the types of contexts that children in poverty actually experience in their daily lives.

Similarly, GPS now come standard on the majority of mobile technologies, and can provide researchers with another means of acquiring objective measures of children's

experienced environments. Using GPS, researchers can get a glimpse of the locations in which children spend their time, as well as the distances they travel in a given day around central locations (such as homes or schools). Wiehe and colleagues (2008) provided evidence that GPS-enabled mobile phones can accurately measure the travel patterns of adolescents in daily life, while at the same time allowing researchers to collect self-reports of adolescents' daily activities. Combined with objective information about the neighborhoods children frequent, researchers could derive a measure of each child's exposure to disordered or dangerous contexts over the course of a day.

Feature 2: Diary Methods Allow Us to Relax the Assumption that Everyone is the Same

Diary methods allow us to avoid what Conner, Barrett, Tugade, and Tennen (2007) have called the *nomothetic fallacy*: "assuming what is true for the 'average' person is also true for each and every person" (p. 81). The term *nomothetic* was first used by the philosopher Wilhelm Windelband (1894/1998), who broadly dichotomized academic disciplines into (a) those that sought to identify general laws and principles (e.g. natural sciences such as biology) and (b) those that focused on understanding the peculiarities and idiosyncrasies of specific individuals, events, or time periods (e.g. humanities such as history). The former he called *nomothetic*; the latter, *idiographic*. In his book *Personality: A Psychological Interpretation*, Gordon Allport (1937) introduced Windelband's dichotomy to psychologists. Allport suggested that with its nearly exclusive focus on discovering general laws that could apply to everyone, psychology was too entrenched in nomothetic inquiry, and should make a greater effort to integrate idiographic inquiry (i.e. case studies or biographies of individual people) into its methodological armamentarium. His argument was that by relying primarily on nomothetic methods to obtain general laws about people, what psychologists were getting in their results described a "hypothetical average" person that in one sense represented everyone, and yet in another sense represented no one.

Allport's urging for idiographic inquiry is highly relevant to research on how poverty-related stress influences children's development, because the majority of research in this area has been nomothetic in nature. Nomothetic designs are essentially between-subjects designs, seeking to uncover natural laws about how, for example, poverty-related stress increases risk for antisocial behavior among *all* low-income children. These studies sample large numbers of people, assess them on static measures, and calculate correlations. Thus, nomothetic designs can tell us that among a large sample of children living in poverty, those with higher-than-average daily stressor exposure also typically have higher-than-average levels of antisocial behavior. These designs *cannot* tell us, however, that stress and antisocial behavior are related *within* a person over time. That is, a finding that children with higher-than-average stressor exposure tend to have higher-than-average antisocial behavior (a *between-person effect*), is not the same as a finding that children are more likely to engage in antisocial behavior compared to themselves on high- versus low-stress days (a within-person effect; see Bolger & Laurenceau, 2013; Curran & Bauer, 2011; Nesselroade & Ram, 2004 for further discussion of between-versus within-person variability and effects).

In fact, for most psychological processes, between- and within-person effects are likely to be independent, a fact that can be supported on both conceptual and empirical grounds (Bolger & Laurenceau, 2013; Hoffman & Stawski, 2009; Molenaar, 2004; Nezlek, 2001). At a conceptual level, between- and within-person effects are separate entities that most likely result from separate causal processes (Molenaar, 2004; Molenaar & Campbell, 2009). Take aggression for example. Aggression can vary both between people (in terms of how aggressive each person is on average) and within a person over time (in terms of how much each person's aggression varies day-by-day). The causal processes explaining between-child differences in children's average levels of aggression are not likely to be the same as those explaining within-child differences in aggression from one day to the next. Why is this so? For one thing, stable factors that differ only between people, such as sex, ethnicity, family history, and genetic

makeup, cannot logically explain why a single child was more aggressive on Monday than he was on Tuesday (a within-person effect; see Allison, 2005; Bolger & Laurenceau, 2013). For another, it seems highly unlikely that a single negative event (such as an argument with a friend) could explain why a child shows a higher mean level of aggression than his peers, whereas this single negative event could easily explain why a single child was more aggressive on one day versus another. At an empirical level, the size, direction, and significance of between- versus within-person effects routinely differ, and may even suggest opposite conclusions (see Bolger & Laurenceau, 2013; Nezlek, 2001).

The conceptual and empirical independence of between- and within-person effects makes it clear that we need designs capable of capturing both. Through intensive measurement of children in their natural environments, diary methods represent a “modern idiographic approach” (Conner, Tennen, Fleeson, & Barrett, 2009, p. 292) allowing researchers to better understand both the constellation of environmental exposures as well as the specific environment-behavior relationships that together determine where and with whom each individual child is most likely to display antisocial or aggressive behavior. These methods are not strictly idiographic, however—aggregating these person-specific results to the group level allows researchers to draw valid group-level inferences that are directly informed by in-depth person-level information (see Nesselroade & Molenaar, 1999 for an example). As such, diary methods allow researchers to answer Allport’s call to idiographic arms while still allowing researchers to draw nomothetic inferences. Below, we discuss how diary methods may be applied to study both environments and environmental effects on low-income children’s antisocial behavior, in a way that is sensitive to the idiosyncracies of each individual child.

The Structure of Exposure. Although children in poverty, on average, are more likely to experience stressors of all types compared to children not in poverty, each child in poverty is likely to experience his or her own unique constellation of stressors in daily life. For example, some children in low-income circumstances may face stressors that predominantly relate to

chaos in their home environments. Others may face stressors relating primarily to neighborhood safety, family conflict, or school bullying. Still others will confront an array of stressors that elude researchers' a priori attempts to neatly categorize them. Combining the intensive time-series measurement of diary studies with empirically driven statistical clustering techniques (i.e. factor and latent class analysis) offers new ways forward for measuring the specific constellation of stressor experiences that characterize each child's daily life.

Cross-sectional research by Seidman et al. (1999) provides an empirical foundation for identifying the constellation of stress exposures unique to each child. Using survey responses, Seidman and colleagues (1999) applied empirical clustering techniques (k-means and hierarchical clustering methods, see Hartigan, 1975; Rapkin & Luke, 1993) to identify different constellations of family and peer social interactions among adolescents in poverty. In both family and peer domains, they identified six clusters of social experience in family and peer groups. Example clusters from the family domain included *dysfunctional* (high hassles, low support, low involvement), *hassling* (high hassles, near average support and involvement), and *enmeshing* (high hassles, low support, high involvement); examples from the peer domain included *rejecting* (high hassles, low acceptance, low involvement and support), *entangling* (high hassles, high involvement and support), and *antisocial-engaging* (high antisocial peer values, high involvement and support). Importantly, membership in these clusters was associated with antisocial behavior in adolescents. In the family domain, adolescents in either the dysfunctional, hassling or enmeshing clusters showed the highest levels of antisocial behavior. In the peer domain, adolescents in the antisocial-engaging cluster showed the most antisocial behavior.

The clusters identified by Seidman and colleagues (1999) are a grouping of youths who share similar experiences on average. They are not, however, a clustering of *experiences* within each youth. The difference is subtle, but important. Empirical clustering of at the *group level* provides the profile, constellation, or factor structure of experiences that best explains the

regularities of experiential reports for a group of individuals. It does *not* provide the specific constellation of experiences unique to each *person*. Instead, it takes what may be called a top-down approach, assuming that the group-level solution explains the regularities of experience for each group member. In contrast, by collecting repeated measurements of experience from each person, researchers can employ a *bottom-up* approach, obtaining a profile of experiences unique to each child in the study and then generalizing to the group-level by identifying individuals who share similar profiles of experiences. Mapping the regularities of experience for each child in poverty would lead researchers to identify natural clusters of children who can be empirically shown (rather than assumed) to have the same constellation of experiences, and would lead to stronger group-level inferences regarding the specific constellation of experiences that an actual child in poverty might encounter (see Molenaar & Campbell, 2009; Nesselroade & Molenaar, 1999; Nesselroade & Ram, 2004 for discussion).

The usefulness of the person-based approach has been clearly shown in the emotion literature. For example, in a 90-day diary study, Barrett (1998) obtained university students' reports on their positive and negative emotions three times a day (morning, afternoon, and evening). She then factor analyzed each person's multiple emotion reports separately (a method known as P-technique factor analysis; see R.B. Cattell, Cattell, & Rhymer, 1947) and found that some individuals tended to report "clustered" emotional experiences. In other words, when these individuals reported happiness, they were also more likely to report other positive emotions such as joy and cheerfulness *at the same time* (the same was true for negative emotions). Others, however, showed greater differentiation in their real-time emotional reports, such that reports of happiness were less likely to be temporally coupled with other positive emotions (same for negatives as well). These results differ from those obtained using more traditional factor analytic approaches (R-technique; see R. B. Cattell, 1952), which would provide information regarding whether a person who reports more happiness on average also reports more joy on average—not whether people experience these emotions at the same time.

From this more person-centered approach, Barrett (1998) concluded that a single theory of emotion is unlikely to apply to everyone, as people differed substantially in the complexity of their moment-to-moment (rather than average) emotional experiences. Another study (Carstensen, Pasupathi, Mayr, & Nesselroade, 2000) showed that some adults had a greater tendency to report positive and negative emotions simultaneously in their daily lives than others (which they termed *poignancy*), and that the tendency to experience mixed emotional states was higher among older versus younger adults (age range of the study was 19 to 94 years). Importantly, the type of information gained in the Barrett (1998) and Carstensen et al. (2000) studies can only be obtained through intensive within-person measurement, such as what diary methods can offer (Conner et al., 2009). A similar approach could be fruitfully applied to obtain a more idiosyncratic understanding of the environmental experiences that characterize a day in the life of a child living in poverty.

Environment-Behavior Signatures. Suppose we find two children who are equal in age, gender, and ethnicity, both of whom have spent their entire lives living in impoverished homes and communities. Suppose we observe these children further and find that they both show high levels of antisocial behavior relative to their same-age peers. Given their similarities, should we assume that these children engage in antisocial behavior for the same reasons, and in the same situations? According to personality theorists Walter Mischel and Yuichi Shoda (1995), the answer to this question is “no”. It has been clearly shown that even between people who engage in similar levels of behavior on average (such as aggression), there will be important differences between them in terms of *where, with whom, and in which situations* each person will engage in aggression.

A classic example comes from a summer treatment camp study of children with self-regulatory and aggressive behavior problems (Shoda, Mischel, & Wright, 1994). Over 6 weeks, these children’s behaviors were observed and recorded across a variety of situations. Shoda and colleagues found that children’s levels of aggression were not constant across situations,

as trait theories of personality would predict. Instead, children's aggression varied greatly across situations. However, Shoda and colleagues found that some situations reliably predicted aggression for some children, but not for others. In other words, some children may reliably show aggression when teased by peers but show no such aggression when scolded by adults. Other children may show the reverse pattern, engaging in aggression when scolded by adults but not when teased by peers. The significance of this finding is perhaps best articulated by Mischel (2004):

Collectively, the results showed that when closely observed, individuals are characterized by stable, distinctive, and highly meaningful patterns of variability in their actions, thoughts, and feelings across different types of situations. These *if ... then ...* situation-behavior relationships provide a kind of 'behavioral signature of personality' that identifies the individual and maps on to the impressions formed by observers about what they are like (p. 8).

Evidence for predictable patterns of variability, or behavioral signatures, has been found across numerous independent investigations using a variety of methodologies (Leikas, Lonqvist, & Verkasalo, 2012; Smith, Shoda, Cumming, & Smoll, 2009; Vansteelandt & Van Mechelen, 1998) including studies using diary methods (e.g. Fournier, Moskowitz, & Zuroff, 2008), which seem naturally poised to answer such questions. Using such methods among children in poverty, researchers could examine the particular environmental exposures or situations that reliably predict antisocial behavior in some children versus others. Using diary measures and multilevel modeling statistical techniques (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002), a separate effect of each hassle (e.g. family conflict, chaotic home, school stressors) on momentary antisocial behavior can be obtained for each child. The strength of the association between daily hassles and antisocial behavior can be quantified as a regression coefficient for each child. This regression coefficient can then serve as an individual difference variable, characterizing each child's likelihood of engaging in various types of antisocial behaviors (e.g. verbal or physical

aggression, anger, and hostility) across these specific situations (see Fleeson, 2007 for an example of this type of approach with personality). As predicted, one may find a group of children who show a strong likelihood of engaging in antisocial behavior when peer hassles are experienced, whereas another group of children shows a strong likelihood of antisocial behavior when parent hassles occur. Using other child or family characteristics, such as the child's previous level of stressful life events, history of antisocial behavior, and parental monitoring, one can then attempt to characterize children who show aggression in response to peer versus parent hassles in daily life.

Feature 3: Diary Methods Allow the Study of Within-Person Processes, Facilitating Causal Inference and Discovery of Environmentally Mediated Effects

Perhaps one of the strongest features of diary methods is their ability to capture processes that occur within a person in response to changing environments. This approach allows the researcher to control for a whole host of characteristics that remain stable over time, measured or unmeasured, by using each person as his own control across a range of situations or stressors. This design feature of diary studies gets researchers a step closer to causal inferences about environmental effects because in this within-person framework, stable characteristics such as genetic makeup, biological sex, and ethnicity are effectively held constant (Allison, 2005; Bolger & Laurenceau, 2013).

This within-person focus provides a novel way to facilitate causal inferences regarding the role of stressor exposure in children's antisocial development in a non-experimental context. If it could be shown that change in stressor exposure correlates with change in antisocial outcomes *within the same child*, this could facilitate causal inferences regarding environmental effects because stable "selection" factors such as genetic makeup, sex, and ethnicity have been held constant. Causal inferences regarding the role of stressors can be further facilitated by adding statistical controls for other potential confounds that do vary over time, such as previous negative mood, sleep quality from the previous night, or even the passage of time itself.

Moreover, diary methods allow the estimation of temporal patterns, allowing researchers to test whether stress exposure predicts antisocial behaviors, or vice versa.

A recent example of this type of approach in daily life comes from work by Stadler, Snyder, Horn, Shrout, and Bolger (2012). Using daily diaries in the lives of male-female couples, they found that within-person increases in physical intimacy between partners predicted within-person decreases in self-reported physical symptoms (e.g. headache, upset stomach, back/muscle ache). Stadler and colleagues (2012) further strengthened this result by showing that *previous* increases in physical intimacy (from two days ago to yesterday) predicted *current* decreases in physical symptoms (from yesterday to today). They found no evidence for the reverse effect: previous symptom change did not significantly predict current change in intimacy. All of their models controlled for the effects of elapsed time, following the rationale this represents a proxy for unmeasured third variables (i.e. fatigue caused by duration of the study; a shared growth process that creates a spurious association between the two variables of interest; see Bolger & Laurenceau, 2013). Taken together, their results provide strong evidence for a causal effect of intimacy on physical symptoms because (a) their focus on within-person change ruled out stable selection factors, (b) they found no evidence for reverse causation, and (c) they statistically controlled for unmeasured time-varying processes that could confound the effects. Although they cannot completely rule out lurking selection effects because physical intimacy was not randomly assigned, the combined use of these methods in a daily life framework nonetheless provides a strong basis for facilitating causal inference.

This within-person process approach could be applied to the question of whether stressful events have environmentally mediated effects on low-income children's antisocial behavior. For instance, by using diary methods to test for the within-person effects of daily stressors on negative affect and aggressive behavior in daily life, each child is used as his or her own "control". If within-person effects are found, they cannot be explained by stable factors that differ between individuals but do not vary over time, such as sex, ethnicity, or genetic

makeup. Additionally, information obtained through diary methods can be paired with real-time physiological measures of stress reactivity, such as heart-rate variability, which can now be obtained in children's natural contexts through the newest generation of ambulatory sensors. One of these, the Zephyr Bioharness™ 3², allows real-time remote monitoring of parameters such as heart rate and breathing rate, and can wirelessly stream this information to mobile devices or to the researcher's desktop computer. By synching this information with children's diary reports of stressful events, researchers could obtain a more objective measure stress reactivity that does not rely exclusively on self-report. If daily stressors were found to predict within-person changes in negative affect, antisocial behavior, and physiological stress markers alike, this evidence would provide yet another step toward causal inferences because the effects cannot be explained away by shared method variance. By offering researchers the ability to examine the within-person effects of daily stressors on affect, behavior, and physiology, diary methods allow researchers to get closer to causality regarding whether everyday stressors affect children's antisocial behavior through environmental pathways.

In short, diary methods, delivered through the latest generation of mobile technologies, provide numerous opportunities to improve our current understanding of environmental effects on children's antisocial behavior, while allowing us to appreciate that not every child responds to adversity in the same way. Currently, we are in a unique position to pair the methodological advances offered by diary methods with exciting new theories about why some children may be more reactive to their daily events than others, and whether this increased reactivity can help explain their risk for poor outcomes (such as antisocial behavior) or their receptiveness to targeted intervention efforts. In the next section, we discuss how the within-person power of diary methods can provide novel ways to test theories of person-environment interaction, such as diathesis-stress (Monroe & Simons, 1991) and differential susceptibility (Ellis et al., 2011).

² <http://www.zephyranywhere.com/products/bioharness-3/>

Individual Differences in Environmental Effects: Why Are Some Children More Reactive to Experience than Others?

On average, children in poverty are more likely to engage in antisocial behavior than children from higher-income backgrounds. Not every child in poverty, however, will engage in antisocial behavior. This fact naturally leads to questions about why some children exposed to high poverty-related stress will develop antisocial behavior whereas others will not. An exciting idea known as differential susceptibility theory (DST; Ellis et al., 2011) suggests that some children may be, by nature, more sensitive to their environments, both positive and negative, than others. These “sensitive” children may be at greatest risk when environments are chronically stressful, but at lowest risk when environments are consistently supportive (Belsky, Bakermans-Kranenburg, & van Ijzendoorn, 2007; Ellis et al., 2011). “Sensitive” or “susceptible” children may be distinguished by genes, physiological parameters, and behavioral phenotypes thought to be under high genetic influence such as early temperaments (Belsky & Pluess, 2009). DST suggests that children with one or more of these sensitivity markers may be more likely to develop negative outcomes (such as antisocial behavior) when exposed to negative contexts (such as disadvantaged homes and neighborhoods), but may also be more likely to show positive developmental outcomes (i.e. good self-regulation, empathy, prosocial behavior) when exposed to positive contexts (such as supportive home environments and socially cohesive neighborhoods). This is an exciting possibility because it suggests that youth who were previously considered to be highly vulnerable may in fact be more validly considered highly *susceptible* to the good and the bad of whichever environments they are in. As a result, these vulnerable youth may be the ones who will benefit most from targeted interventions.

Here again, diary methods offer a novel and potentially powerful way to test the core assertion of differential susceptibility: that environmental effects are stronger for some children versus others. Differential susceptibility theory falls into a broader class of person-by-environment theories, such as the diathesis-stress model (Monroe & Simons, 1991). The

diathesis-stress model suggests that some children possess genetic or temperamental characteristics that make them more vulnerable to bad environments, but not more responsive to good environments as the differential susceptibility perspective suggests. The majority of research testing person-by-environment interaction theories has tested whether children with *both* an individual sensitivity marker and a negative environment have higher levels of antisocial behavior (for example) than children without the sensitivity marker, negative environment, or either (see for example Caspi et al., 2002; Lengua, Wolchik, Sandler, & West, 2000). This type of test is inherently between-people, because it compares children to each other on their average levels of antisocial behavior and tests whether children with the most antisocial behavior are more likely to have *both* an individual vulnerability and an environmental risk. Perhaps a more direct test of person-by-environment theories is to ask whether “sensitive” children are more *reactive* to changing environments. In other words, do sensitive children show more behavior problems in stressful situations compared to themselves in non-stressful situations? This is essentially a within-person question, one which diary methods are well suited to answer. Using a within-person perspective may be particularly important for research on the differential susceptibility theory, because this theory suggests that sensitive children should both be more reactive to negative events *and* more responsive to positive events.

Figure 1 illustrates that the use of within-person changes in environments and behaviors could provide strong evidence for whether differential susceptibility operates in the daily lives of youth. As children go through their daily lives, they experience both stressful and positive events. However, some children will be more sensitive to these events than others. Sensitive children (the dashed trajectory in Figure 1) will be more responsive to both stressful and positive events in daily life than non-sensitive children (the solid trajectory). As such, sensitive children are predicted to show greater increases in prosocial behavior (e.g., helping or supporting others) when experiencing positive events, *and* greater increases in antisocial behavior (e.g. verbal or physical aggression, noncompliance) following negative events, such as daily

stressors. Because diary methods allow us to (a) obtain true-to-life or ecologically valid reports of both positive and negative events in daily life, (b) test the effects of these events within each child, and (c) test whether within-person effects are stronger for youth with sensitivity markers, they allow a strong and direct test of the differential susceptibility model's key hypothesis that some children are more sensitive to their environments than others—for better *and* for worse (Belsky et al., 2007).

Which markers may help identify children who are differentially susceptible to environmental effects on behavior? To date, some of the strongest evidence points to the 7-repeat allele of the dopamine receptor D4 gene (*DRD4-7R*), a gene that has been previously associated with novelty/sensation seeking (Laucht, Becker, El-Faddagh, Hohm, & Schmidt, 2005), impulsivity (Congdon, Lesch, & Canli, 2008), anger and delinquency (Dmitrieva, Chen, Greenberger, Ogunseitan, & Ding, 2011), and ADHD (Faraone et al., 2005). Rather than being solely a risk allele, the *DRD4-7R* gene may function more like a “plasticity allele”, conferring increased sensitivity to whatever environment a child is in (Belsky et al., 2009). This increased sensitivity is thought to provide an evolutionary advantage when environments are positive, which may explain why genes and traits associated with risk have nonetheless been preserved in the human species (Belsky, 2005). In support of this, a recent meta-analysis showed that children with “risky” dopamine genes such as the 7R allele showed *the most* externalizing (or antisocial) behavior in negative rearing environments, but children with these genes in positive rearing environments showed *the least* externalizing behavior (Bakermans-Kranenburg & van Ijzendoorn, 2011).

Particularly compelling support for the *DRD4-7R* gene comes from two experimental studies showing that an intervention designed to promote parent-child attachment was more effective in reducing externalizing behavior problems for children with versus without *DRD4-7R* (Bakermans-Kranenburg, van Ijzendoorn, Mesman, Alink, & Juffer, 2008; Bakermans-Kranenburg, van Ijzendoorn, Pijlman, Mesman, & Juffer, 2008). By conferring increased

susceptibility to environmental influence, the *DRD4-7R* gene may identify children who are most sensitive to positive and negative events in their everyday lives. This hypothesis could be tested using diary methods that allow researchers to examine whether daily events have stronger within-person effects on behavior—for better and for worse—among low-income children with versus without the *DRD4-7R* gene. If low-income children with this gene are more sensitive to both positive *and* negative daily events, this evidence may suggest that these children, although at higher risk in their current environments, may be more likely to benefit from intervention strategies targeting the link between daily stressors and antisocial behavior.

Future Directions

Diary methods provide tremendous flexibility in the measurement of daily experiences, and their effects, on low-income youth. The most exciting future directions for these methods may lie in their combination with more “traditional” research designs, as well as interventions of known efficacy.

Diary Measurement Bursts: Combining Diary Methods and Longitudinal Designs

Antisocial behavior is a developmental phenomenon. Because of this, longitudinal study designs that follow children over key developmental periods (such as childhood and the transition to adolescence) are necessary in order to truly understand its causes. Although traditional longitudinal designs have provided us with much valuable information about how antisocial behavior develops over years (see e.g., Moffitt et al., 2001; NICHD Early Child Care Research Network, 2004; Sampson & Laub, 2005; Thornberry & Krohn, 2003; Tremblay, 2010), these designs may miss the micro-level processes that affect whether or not a child will engage in antisocial behavior on one day versus another – such as a provocation from a peer or a nagging request from a parent (Dodge, 2006; Patterson et al., 1992). Diary methods are especially useful for understanding this type of micro-level change and may be powerfully combined with traditional longitudinal studies to better understand the interaction between short-term and long-term processes in the development of antisocial behavior.

Measurement burst studies embed daily-life measurement bursts into more traditional longitudinal studies that follow people over years (Nesselroade, 1991; Sliwinski, 2008). Despite their potential, these designs have not yet been applied to the study of antisocial behavior. These powerful designs could allow researchers to examine the interplay between short-term processes and long-term changes, and thereby improve our understanding of the causal pathways through which environmental conditions affect antisocial development. For example, measurement burst designs could provide investigators with a means for (a) examining how the relationship between stressor exposure and antisocial behavior changes over time and (b) learning how changes in these micro-level processes feed into developmental “turning points” (Sampson & Laub, 2005), such as desistence or escalation in antisocial behavior during key developmental transitions (such as early adolescence). Moreover, these designs could offer better insight into the *timescale* of environmental effects. For example, with regard to the differential susceptibility hypothesis mentioned above, there is debate regarding whether “sensitive” children (such as youth with *DRD4-7R*) will be more responsive to environments *in-the-moment*, or whether this sensitivity will only manifest itself over years. In other words, should we expect that a single day of high support will predict less antisocial behavior the next day among youth with the *DRD4-7R* gene? Or does this relationship take years to manifest, such that we will only see larger decreases in antisocial behavior among youth with versus without *DRD4-7R* if they experience a home environment that remains supportive over longer time spans? Through their ability to empirically separate both short- and long-term processes of change, measurement burst designs could provide powerful and unique information regarding the role of environment in low-income children’s antisocial development.

Interventions at the Right Time, In the Right Place

Mobile technologies are also providing researchers and health professionals with new opportunities for assessment and intervention among previously hard-to-access high-risk groups, such as children living in poverty. The movement toward using mobile technologies to

administer assessments and deliver intervention has been dubbed *mobile health* (or mHealth) by the National Institutes of Health (National Institutes of Health, 2013), and includes diary measurement techniques such as those described above. Among children living in poverty, diary methods could be used to test – and eventually disseminate – message-based interventions focused on fostering positive coping strategies, triggered when youth report experiencing a stressful event. These approaches may offer promise, as evidence suggests that youth who use active coping strategies, such as problem solving, emotion regulation, and positive thinking may be less likely to display emotional, behavioral, and physical health problems than youth who rely on avoidant coping strategies (Chen & Miller, 2012; Wadsworth, 2012). For example, mobile phone delivery of intervention content could be used as a supplement to cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT; Beck, 1991), an intervention of known efficacy among youth with antisocial behavior (McCart, Priester, Davies, & Azen, 2006). Mobile devices could be used to reinforce intervention content by sending coping intervention-related messages, reminding children to use positive coping strategies when stressful events occur. In this way, mobile messaging may help clinical professionals with the daunting task of delivering time-tested interventions to high-risk groups, at the times and places they are needed most.

Summary

Children growing up in poverty are at risk for developing antisocial behavior, a significant and costly societal problem. Evidence suggests that the association between poverty and antisocial behavior is consistent with a causal interpretation, and emerging theoretical perspectives argue that the effect of poverty on antisocial development may be driven by the chronically stressful conditions of low-income children's everyday environments. However, accurate measurement of daily events remains a persistent methodological challenge, which limits the field's understanding of causal processes. Diary methods may help by allowing researchers to measure children's everyday experiences, emotion, self-regulation, and behavior as they go through their daily lives, in their natural environments, and in a way that is sensitive

to the idiosyncrasies of each individual child. The latest generation of mobile technologies, through their ability to measure within-person change and capture more objective measures of context and physiology, provide added flexibility and can get researchers one step closer to a causal understanding of environmental effects on children's antisocial behavior. Moreover, these mobile technologies are opening up exciting possibilities for the delivery of intervention to high-risk populations, at the times and places they are needed most. In sum, the stage is set for mobile methods to improve our understanding of environmental effects on children's antisocial behavior, and to open up new opportunities for interventions aimed at improving the lives of low-income children and their families.

References

- Allison, P. D. (2005). *Fixed effects regressions for longitudinal data using SAS*. Cary, NC: SAS Institute, Inc.
- Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Almeida, D. M. (2005). Resilience and vulnerability to daily stressors assessed via diary methods. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *14*, 64-68. doi: 10.1111/j.0963-7214.2005.00336.x
- Anderson, D. A. (1999). The aggregate burden of crime. *Journal of Law & Economics*, *42*, 611-642. doi: 10.1086/467436
- Attar, B. K., Guerra, N. G., & Tolan, P. H. (1994). Neighborhood disadvantage, stressful life events, and adjustment in urban elementary-school-children. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, *23*, 391-400. doi: 10.1207/s15374424jccp2304_5
- Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & van Ijzendoorn, M. H. (2011). Differential susceptibility to rearing environment depending on dopamine-related genes: New evidence and a meta-analysis. *Development and Psychopathology*, *23*, 39-52. doi: 10.1017/s0954579410000635
- Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., van Ijzendoorn, M. H., Mesman, J., Alink, L. R. A., & Juffer, F. (2008). Effects of an attachment-based intervention on daily cortisol moderated by dopamine receptor D4: A randomized control trial on 1-to 3-year-olds screened for externalizing behavior. *Development and Psychopathology*, *20*, 805-820. doi: 10.1017/s0954579408000382
- Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., van Ijzendoorn, M. H., Pijlman, F. T. A., Mesman, J., & Juffer, F. (2008). Experimental evidence for differential susceptibility: Dopamine D4 receptor polymorphism (DRD4 VNTR) moderates intervention effects on toddlers' externalizing behavior in a randomized controlled trial. *Developmental Psychology*, *44*, 293-300. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.44.1.293

- Barrett, L. F. (1998). Discrete emotions or dimensions? The role of valence focus and arousal focus. *Cognition & Emotion, 12*, 579-599. doi: 10.1080/026999398379574
- Beck, A. T. (1991). Cognitive therapy: A 30-year retrospective. *American Psychologist, 46*, 368-375. doi: 10.1037//0003-066x.46.4.368
- Bell, R. Q. (1968). A reinterpretation of the direction of effects in studies of socialization. *Psychological Review, 75*, 81-95. doi: 10.1037/h0025583
- Belsky, J. (2005). Differential susceptibility to rearing influence: An evolutionary hypothesis and some evidence. In B. J. Ellis & D. F. Bjorklund (Eds.), *Origins of the social mind: Evolutionary psychology and child development* (pp. 139-163). New York: Guilford Press.
- Belsky, J., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & van Ijzendoorn, M. H. (2007). For better and for worse: Differential susceptibility to environmental influences. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 16*, 300-304. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00525.x
- Belsky, J., Jonassaint, C., Pluess, M., Stanton, M., Brummett, B., & Williams, R. (2009). Vulnerability genes or plasticity genes? *Molecular Psychiatry, 14*, 746-754. doi: 10.1038/mp.2009.44
- Belsky, J., & Pluess, M. (2009). Beyond diathesis stress: Differential susceptibility to environmental influences. *Psychological Bulletin, 135*, 885-908. doi: 10.1037/a0017376
- Bjerk, D. J. (2007). Measuring the relationship between youth criminal participation and household economic resources. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 23*, 23-39. doi: 10.1007/s10940-006-9017-8
- Blair, C., & Raver, C. C. (2012). Child development in the context of adversity: experiential canalization of brain and behavior. *American Psychologist, 67*, 309-318. doi: 10.1037/a0027493
- Bolger, N., Davis, A., & Rafaeli, E. (2003). Diary methods: Capturing life as it is lived. *Annual Review of Psychology, 54*, 579-616. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145030

- Bolger, N., & Laurenceau, J.-P. (2013). *Intensive longitudinal methods: An introduction to diary and experience sampling research*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Borrell, B. (2011). Every bite you take. *Nature*, *470*, 320-322.
- Bradburn, N. M., Rips, L. J., & Shevell, S. K. (1987). Answering autobiographical questions: The impact of memory and inference on surveys. *Science*, *236*, 157-161. doi: 10.1126/science.3563494
- Bradley, R. H., & Corwyn, R. F. (2002). Socioeconomic status and child development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *53*, 371-399. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135233
- Bradley, R. H., Corwyn, R. F., McAdoo, H. P., & Coll, C. G. (2001). The home environments of children in the United States part I: Variations by age, ethnicity, and poverty status. *Child Development*, *72*, 1844-1867. doi: 10.1111/1467-8624.t01-1-00382
- Brooks-Gunn, J., & Duncan, G. J. (1997). The effects of poverty on children. *The Future of Children*, *7*, 55-71.
- 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*, 644-655. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.79.4.644
- Caspi, A., McClay, J., Moffitt, T. E., Mill, J., Martin, J., Craig, I. W., . . . Poulton, R. (2002). Role of genotype in the cycle of violence in maltreated children. *Science*, *297*, 851-854.
- Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., Morgan, J., Rutter, M., Taylor, A., Arseneault, L., . . . Polo-Tomas, M. (2004). Maternal expressed emotion predicts children's antisocial behavior problems: Using monozygotic-twin differences to identify environmental effects on behavioral development. *Developmental Psychology*, *40*, 149-161. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.40.2.149
- Caspi, A., Taylor, A., Moffitt, T. E., & Plomin, R. (2000). Neighborhood deprivation affects children's mental health: Environmental risks identified in a genetic design. *Psychological Science*, *11*, 338-342. doi: 10.1111/1467-9280.00267

- Cattell, R. B. (1952). The 3 basic factor-analytic research designs: Their interrelations and derivatives. *Psychological Bulletin*, *49*, 499-520. doi: 10.1037/h0054245
- Cattell, R. B., Cattell, A. K. S., & Rhymer, R. M. (1947). P-technique demonstrated in determining psychophysiological source traits in a normal individual. *Psychometrika*, *12*, 267-288.
- Chen, E., & Miller, G. E. (2012). "Shift-and-persist" strategies: Why low socioeconomic status isn't always bad for health. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *7*, 135-158. doi: 10.1177/1745691612436694
- Cohen, S., Krantz, D. S., Evans, G. W., Stokols, D., & Kelly, S. (1981). Aircraft noise and children: Longitudinal and cross-sectional evidence on adaptation to noise and the effectiveness of noise abatement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *40*, 331-345. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.40.2.331
- Compas, B. E., Davis, G. E., Forsythe, C. J., & Wagner, B. M. (1987). Assessment of major and daily stressful events during adolescence - the adolescent perceived events scale. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *55*, 534-541. doi: 10.1037//0022-006x.55.4.534
- Congdon, E., Lesch, K. P., & Canli, T. (2008). Analysis of DRD4 and DAT polymorphisms and behavioral inhibition in healthy adults: Implications for impulsivity. *American Journal of Medical Genetics Part B-Neuropsychiatric Genetics*, *147B*, 27-32. doi: 10.1002/ajmg.b.30557
- Conger, R. D., Conger, K. J., Elder, G. H., Lorenz, F. O., Simons, R. L., & Whitbeck, L. B. (1992). A family process model of economic hardship and adjustment of early adolescent boys. *Child Development*, *63*, 526-541. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.1992.tb01644.x

- Conger, R. D., Ge, X. J., Elder, G. H., Lorenz, F. O., & Simons, R. L. (1994). Economic-stress, coercive family process, and developmental problems of adolescents. *Child Development, 65*, 541-561. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.1994.tb00768.x
- Conner Christensen, T., Barrett, L. F., Bliss-Moreau, E., Lebo, K., & Kaschub, C. (2003). A practical guide to experience-sampling procedures. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 4*, 53-78. doi: 10.1023/A:1023609306024
- Conner, T. S., Barrett, L. F., Tugade, M. M., & Tennen, H. (2007). Idiographic personality: The theory and practice of experience sampling. In R. W. Robins, R. C. Fraley & R. F. Krueger (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in personality psychology* (pp. 79-96). New York: Guilford Press.
- Conner, T. S., Tennen, H., Fleeson, W., & Barrett, L. F. (2009). Experience sampling methods: A modern idiographic approach to personality research. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 3*, 292-313. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2009.00170.x
- Costello, E. J., Compton, S. N., Keeler, G., & Angold, A. (2003). Relationships between poverty and psychopathology: A natural experiment. *JAMA-Journal of the American Medical Association, 290*, 2023-2029. doi: 10.1001/jama.290.15.2023
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., Larson, R., & Prescott, S. (1977). Ecology of adolescent activity and experience. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 6*, 281-294. doi: 10.1007/bf02138940
- Curran, P. J., & Bauer, D. J. (2011). The disaggregation of within-person and between-person effects in longitudinal models of change. *Annual Review of Psychology, 62*, 583-619. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.100356
- Danese, A., Moffitt, T. E., Harrington, H., Milne, B. J., Polanczyk, G., Pariante, C. M., . . . Caspi, A. (2009). Adverse childhood experiences and adult risk factors for age-related disease depression, inflammation, and clustering of metabolic risk markers. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine, 163*, 1135-1143.

- DeLongis, A., Coyne, J. C., Dakof, G., Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1982). Relationship of daily hassles, uplifts, and major life events to health status. *Health Psychology, 1*, 119-136. doi: 10.1037/0278-6133.1.2.119
- Dmitrieva, J., Chen, C. S., Greenberger, E., Ogunseitan, O., & Ding, Y. C. (2011). Gender-specific expression of the DRD4 gene on adolescent delinquency, anger and thrill seeking. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience, 6*, 82-89. doi: 10.1093/scan/nsq020
- Dodge, K. A. (2006). Translational science in action: Hostile attributional style and the development of aggressive behavior problems. *Development and Psychopathology, 18*, 791-814. doi: 10.1017/s0954579406060391
- Dodge, K. A., Coie, J. D., & Lynam, D. (2006). Aggression and antisocial behavior in youth *Handbook of child psychology* (pp. 719-786): John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Dodge, K. A., Pettit, G. S., & Bates, J. E. (1994). Socialization mediators of the relation between socioeconomic-status and child conduct problems. *Child Development, 65*, 649-665. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.1994.tb00774.x
- Elder, G. H. (1974). *Children of the great depression*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Elder, G. H., van Nguyen, T., & Caspi, A. (1985). Linking family hardship to childrens lives. *Child Development, 56*, 361-375. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.1985.tb00112.x
- Elliott, D. S., & Ageton, S. S. (1980). Reconciling race and class-differences in self-reported and official estimates of delinquency. *American Sociological Review, 45*, 95-110. doi: 10.2307/2095245
- Ellis, B. J., Boyce, W. T., Belsky, J., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & van Ijzendoorn, M. H. (2011). Differential susceptibility to the environment: An evolutionary-neurodevelopmental theory. *Development and Psychopathology, 23*, 7-28. doi: 10.1017/s0954579410000611

- Evans, G. W. (2004). The environment of childhood poverty. *American Psychologist, 59*, 77-92. doi: 10.1037/0003-066x.59.2.77
- Evans, G. W., & English, K. (2002). The environment of poverty: Multiple stressor exposure, psychophysiological stress, and socioemotional adjustment. *Child Development, 73*, 1238-1248. doi: Unsp 0009-3920/2002/7304-001710.1111/1467-8624.00469
- Evans, G. W., Gonnella, C., Marcynyszyn, L. A., Gentile, L., & Salpekar, N. (2005). The role of chaos in poverty and children's socioemotional adjustment. *Psychological Science, 16*, 560-565. doi: 10.1111/j.0956-7976.2005.01575.x
- Evans, G. W., & Kim, P. (2013). Childhood poverty, chronic stress, self-regulation, and coping. *Child Development Perspectives, 7*, 43-48. doi: 10.1111/cdep.12013
- Evans, G. W., Kim, P., Ting, A. H., Teshler, H. B., & Shannis, D. (2007). Cumulative risk, maternal responsiveness, and allostatic load among young adolescents. *Developmental Psychology, 43*, 341-351. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.43.2.341
- Evans, G. W., Vermeylen, F. M., Barash, A., Lefkowitz, E. G., & Hutt, R. L. (2009). The experience of stressors and hassles among rural adolescents from low- and middle-income households in the USA. *Children, Youth, and Environments, 19*, 164-175.
- Faraone, S. V., Perlis, R. H., Doyle, A. E., Smoller, J. W., Goralnick, J. J., Holmgren, M. A., & Sklar, P. (2005). Molecular genetics of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Biological Psychiatry, 57*, 1313-1323. doi: 10.1016/j.biopsych.2004.11.024
- Farrington, D. P. (1989). Early predictors of adolescent aggression and adult violence. *Violence and Victims, 4*, 79-100.
- Felitti, V. J., Anda, R. F., Nordenberg, D., Williamson, D. F., Spitz, A. M., Edwards, V., . . . Marks, J. S. (1998). Relationship of childhood abuse and household dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults: The adverse childhood experiences (ACE) study. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 14*, 245-258. doi: 10.1016/s0749-3797(98)00017-8

- Fergusson, D. M., & Horwood, L. J. (2002). Male and female offending trajectories. *Development and Psychopathology, 14*, 159-177.
- Fleeson, W. (2007). Situation-based contingencies underlying trait-content manifestation in behavior. *Journal of Personality, 75*, 825-861. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2007.00458.x
- Fournier, M. A., Moskowitz, D. S., & Zuroff, D. C. (2008). Integrating dispositions, signatures, and the interpersonal domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94*, 531-545. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.94.3.531
- Gad, M. T., & Johnson, J. H. (1980). Correlates of adolescent life stress as related to race, sex, and levels of perceived social support. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 9*, 13-16.
- Grant, K. E., Compas, B. E., Stuhlmacher, A. F., Thurm, A. E., McMahon, S. D., & Halpert, J. A. (2003). Stressors and child and adolescent psychopathology: Moving from markers to mechanisms of risk. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*, 447-466. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.129.3.447
- Haines, M. M., Stansfeld, S. A., Head, J., & Job, R. F. S. (2002). Multilevel modelling of aircraft noise on performance tests in schools around Heathrow airport London. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 56*, 139-144. doi: 10.1136/jech.56.2.139
- Harris, J. R. (1995). Where is the child's environment? A group socialization theory of development. *Psychological Review, 102*, 458-489. doi: 10.1037/0033-295x.102.3.458
- Hart, B., & Risley, T. R. (1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experiences of young american children*. Baltimore: Brookes.
- Hart, B., & Risley, T. R. (2003). The early catastrophe: The 30 million word gap by age 3. *American Educator, 27*, 4-9.
- Hartigan, J. (1975). *Clustering algorithms*. New York: Wiley.
- Hertzman, C., & Boyce, T. (2010). How experience gets under the skin to create gradients in developmental health. *Annual Review of Public Health, 31*, 329-347. doi: 10.1146/annurev.publhealth.012809.103538

- Hoffman, L., & Stawski, R. S. (2009). Persons as contexts: Evaluating between-person and within-person effects in longitudinal analysis. *Research in Human Development, 6*, 97-120. doi: 10.1080/15427600902911189
- Jaffee, S. R., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., & Taylor, A. (2004). Physical maltreatment victim to antisocial child: Evidence of an environmentally mediated process. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 113*, 44-55. doi: 10.1037/0021-843x.113.1.44
- Jaffee, S. R., Strait, L. B., & Odgers, C. L. (2012). From correlates to causes: Can quasi-experimental studies and statistical innovations bring us closer to identifying the causes of antisocial behavior? *Psychological Bulletin, 138*, 272-295. doi: 10.1037/a0026020
- Jarjoura, G. R., Triplett, R. A., & Brinker, G. P. (2002). Growing up poor: Examining the link between persistent childhood poverty and delinquency. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 18*, 159-187. doi: 10.1023/a:1015206715838
- Kanner, A. D., Coyne, J. C., Schaefer, C., & Lazarus, R. S. (1981). Comparison of 2 modes of stress measurement daily hassles and uplifts vs. Major life events. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 4*, 1-40.
- Kanner, A. D., Feldman, S. S., Weinberger, D. A., & Ford, M. E. (1987). Uplifts, hassles, and adaptational outcomes in early adolescents. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 7*, 371-394. doi: 10.1177/0272431687074002
- Keller-Cohen, D., Fiori, K., Toler, A., & Bybee, D. (2006). Social relations, language and cognition in the 'oldest old'. *Ageing & Society, 26*, 585-605. doi: 10.1017/S0144686X06004910
- Kim-Cohen, J., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., Harrington, H., Milne, B. J., & Poulton, R. (2003). Prior juvenile diagnoses in adults with mental disorder: Developmental follow-back of a prospective-longitudinal cohort. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 60*, 709-717. doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.60.7.709

- Lahey, B. B., Van Hulle, C. A., Waldman, I. D., Rodgers, J. L., D'Onofrio, B. M., Pedlow, S., . . . Keenan, K. (2006). Testing descriptive hypotheses regarding sex differences in the development of conduct problems and delinquency. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 34*, 737-755. doi: DOI 10.1007/s10802-006-9064-5
- Larson, R. W., Richards, M. H., Raffaelli, M., Ham, M., & Jewell, L. (1990). Ecology of depression in late childhood and early adolescence: A profile of daily states and activities. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 99*, 92-102. doi: 10.1037/0021-843x.99.1.92
- Laucht, M., Becker, K., El-Faddagh, M., Hohm, E., & Schmidt, M. H. (2005). Association of the DRD4 exon III polymorphism with smoking in fifteen-year-olds: A mediating role for novelty seeking? *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 44*, 477-484.
- Leikas, S., Lonqvist, J.-E., & Verkasalo, M. (2012). Persons, situations, and behaviors: Consistency and variability of different behaviors in four interpersonal situations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 103*, 1007-1022. doi: 10.1037/a0030385
- Lengua, L. J., Wolchik, S. A., Sandler, I. N., & West, S. G. (2000). The additive and interactive effects of parenting and temperament in predicting adjustment problems of children of divorce. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 29*, 232 - 244.
- Ludwig, J. (2006, September 19). The cost of crime: Understanding the financial and human impact of criminal activity. *Testimony to the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee*. May 3, 2013, from <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-109shrg42938/html/CHRG-109shrg42938.htm>
- Ludwig, J. (2010). The costs of crime. *Criminology & Public Policy, 9*, 307-311. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-9133.2010.00628.x
- McCart, M. R., Priester, P. E., Davies, W. H., & Azen, R. (2006). Differential effectiveness of behavioral parent-training and cognitive-behavioral therapy for antisocial youth: A meta-

- analysis. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 34, 527-543. doi: 10.1007/s10802-006-9031-1
- McEwen, B. S. (1998). Protective and damaging effects of stress mediators. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 338, 171-179.
- McEwen, B. S., & Lasley, E. N. (2002). *The end of stress as we know it*. Washington DC: John Henry Press.
- McLoyd, V. C. (1998). Socioeconomic disadvantage and child development. *American Psychologist*, 53, 185-204. doi: 10.1037/0003-066x.53.2.185
- McLoyd, V. C. (2011). How money matters for children's socioemotional adjustment: Family processes and parental investment. In G. Carlo, L. J. Crockett & M. A. Carranza (Eds.), *Health disparities in youth and families: Research and applications* (Vol. 57, pp. 33-72).
- Mischel, W. (2004). Toward an integrative science of the person. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55, 1-22. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.55.042902.130709
- Mischel, W., & Shoda, Y. (1995). A cognitive-affective system-theory of personality - reconceptualizing situations, dispositions, dynamics, and invariance in personality structure. *Psychological Review*, 102, 246-268. doi: 10.1037/0033-295x.102.2.246
- Moffitt, T. E. (2005). The new look of behavioral genetics in developmental psychopathology: Gene-environment interplay in antisocial behaviors. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131, 533-554. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.131.4.533
- Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Harrington, H., & Milne, B. J. (2002). Males on the life-course-persistent and adolescence-limited antisocial pathways: Follow-up at age 26 years. *Development and Psychopathology*, 14, 179-207. doi: 10.1017/s0954579402001104
- Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Rutter, M., & Silva, P. A. (2001). *Sex differences in antisocial behavior*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Molenaar, P. C. M. (2004). A manifesto on psychology as idiographic science: Bringing the person back into scientific psychology, this time forever. *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research and Perspectives*, 2, 201-218. doi: 10.1207/s15366359mea0204_1
- Molenaar, P. C. M., & Campbell, C. G. (2009). The new person-specific paradigm in psychology. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 18, 112-117. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8721.2009.01619.x
- Monroe, S. M., & Simons, A. D. (1991). Diathesis stress theories in the context of life stress research - implications for the depressive-disorders. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110, 406-425.
- National Institutes of Health. (2013). mHealth: Mobile health technologies. Retrieved April 18, 2013, from http://obssr.od.nih.gov/scientific_areas/methodology/mhealth/
- Nesselroade, J. R. (1991). The warp and woof of the developmental fabric. In R. Downs, L. Liben & D. Palermo (Eds.), *Visions of development, the environment, and aesthetics: The legacy of joachim f. Wohlwill* (pp. 213-240). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Nesselroade, J. R., & Molenaar, P. C. M. (1999). Pooling lagged covariance structures based on short, multivariate time series for dynamic factor analysis. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Statistical strategies for small sample research* (pp. 223-250). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Nesselroade, J. R., & Ram, N. (2004). Studying intraindividual variability: What we have learned that will help us understand lives in context. *Research in Human Development*, 1, 9-29.
- Nezlek, J. B. (2001). Multilevel random coefficient analyses of event- and interval-contingent data in social and personality psychology research. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 771-785. doi: 10.1177/0146167201277001
- NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (2004). Trajectories of physical aggression from toddlerhood to middle childhood: Predictors, correlates, and outcomes *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*. Boston, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

- Odgers, C. L., Caspi, A., Bates, C. J., Sampson, R. J., & Moffitt, T. E. (2012). Systematic social observation of children's neighborhoods using google street view: A reliable and cost-effective method. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *53*, 1009-1017. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2012.02565.x
- Odgers, C. L., Caspi, A., Broadbent, J. M., Dickson, N., Hancox, R. J., Harrington, H., . . . Moffitt, T. E. (2007). Prediction of differential adult health burden by conduct problem subtypes in males. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *64*, 476-484. doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.64.4.476
- Odgers, C. L., & Jaffee, S. R. (2013). Routine versus catastrophic influences on the developing child. *Annual Review of Public Health*, *34*, 29-48. doi: doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031912-114447
- Odgers, C. L., Moffitt, T. E., Broadbent, J. M., Dickson, N., Hancox, R. J., Harrington, H., . . . Caspi, A. (2008). Female and male antisocial trajectories: From childhood origins to adult outcomes. *Development and Psychopathology*, *20*, 673-716. doi: 10.1017/s0954579408000333
- Patterson, G. R. (1982). *Coercive family process*. Eugene, OR: Castalia.
- Patterson, G. R., Reid, J. B., & Dishion, T. J. (1992). *Antisocial boys*. Eugene, OR: Castalia.
- Pryor-Brown, L., Cowen, E. L., Hightower, A. D., & Lotyczewski, B. S. (1986). Demographic differences among children in judging and experiencing specific stressful life events. *The Journal of Special Education*, *20*, 339-346. doi: 10.1177/002246698602000307
- Rapkin, B. D., & Luke, D. A. (1993). Cluster-analysis in community research: Epistemology and practice. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *21*, 247-277. doi: 10.1007/bf00941623
- Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Repetti, R. L., Taylor, S. E., & Seeman, T. E. (2002). Risky families: Family social environments and the mental and physical health of offspring. *Psychological Bulletin*, *128*, 330-366. doi: 10.1037//0033-2909.128.2.330
- Rutter, M. (2005). Environmentally mediated risks for psychopathology: Research strategies and findings. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, *44*, 3-18. doi: 10.1097/01.chi.0000145374.45992.c9
- Rutter, M., Pickles, A., Murray, R., & Eaves, L. (2001). Testing hypotheses on specific environmental causal effects on behavior. *Psychological Bulletin*, *127*, 291-324. doi: 10.1037//0033-2909.127.3.291
- Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (2005). A life-course view of the development of crime. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *602*, 12-45. doi: 10.1177/0002716205280075
- Scarr, S. (1992). Developmental theories for the 1990s: Development and individual-differences. *Child Development*, *63*, 1-19. doi: 10.2307/1130897
- Seidman, E., Chesir-Teran, D., Friedman, J. L., Yoshikawa, H., Allen, L., Roberts, A., & Aber, J. L. (1999). The risk and protective functions of perceived family and peer microsystems among urban adolescents in poverty. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *27*, 211-237. doi: 10.1023/a:1022835717964
- Shahar, G., Henrich, C. C., Reiner, I. C., & Little, T. D. (2003). Development and initial validation of the brief adolescent life event scale (BALES). *Anxiety Stress and Coping*, *16*, 119-128. doi: 10.1080/1061580021000057077
- Shiffman, S. (2009). How many cigarettes did you smoke? Assessing cigarette consumption by global report, time-line follow-back, and ecological momentary assessment. *Health Psychology*, *28*, 519-526. doi: 10.1037/a0015197
- Shiffman, S., Stone, A. A., & Hufford, M. R. (2008). Ecological momentary assessment. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *4*, 1-32. doi: 10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.3.022806.091415

- Shoda, Y., Mischel, W., & Wright, J. C. (1994). Intraindividual stability in the organization and patterning of behavior - incorporating psychological situations into the idiographic analysis of personality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 674-687. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.67.4.674
- Silk, J. S., Steinberg, L., & Morris, A. S. (2003). Adolescents' emotion regulation in daily life: Links to depressive symptoms and problem behavior. *Child Development, 74*, 1869-1880. doi: 10.1046/j.1467-8624.2003.00643.x
- Sliwinski, M. J. (2008). Measurement-burst designs for social health research. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2*, 245-261. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00043.x
- Smith, R. E., Shoda, Y., Cumming, S. P., & Smoll, F. L. (2009). Behavioral signatures at the ballpark: Intraindividual consistency of adults' situation-behavior patterns and their interpersonal consequences. *Journal of Research in Personality, 43*, 187-195. doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2008.12.006
- Stadler, G., Snyder, K. A., Horn, A. B., Shrout, P. E., & Bolger, N. P. (2012). Close relationships and health in daily life: A review and empirical data on intimacy and somatic symptoms. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 74*, 398-409. doi: 10.1097/PSY.0b013e31825473b8
- Strohschein, L. (2005). Household income histories and child mental health trajectories. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 46*, 359-375.
- Theobald, D., & Farrington, D. P. (2012). Child and adolescent predictors of male intimate partner violence. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 53*, 1242-1249. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2012.02577.x
- Thornberry, T. P., & Krohn, M. D. (Eds.). (2003). *Taking stock of delinquency: An overview of findings from contemporary longitudinal studies*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

- Tremblay, R. E. (2010). Developmental origins of disruptive behaviour problems: The 'original sin' hypothesis, epigenetics and their consequences for prevention. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 51*, 341-367. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2010.02211.x
- Tremblay, R. E., Nagin, D. S., Seguin, J. R., Zoccolillo, M., Zelazo, P. D., Boivin, M., . . . Japel, C. (2004). Physical aggression during early childhood: Trajectories and predictors. *Pediatrics, 114*, e43-e50.
- Vansteelandt, K., & Van Mechelen, I. (1998). Individual differences in situation-behavior profiles: A triple typology model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 751-765. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.75.3.751
- Wadsworth, M. (2012). Working with low-income families: Lessons learned from basic and applied research on coping with poverty-related stress. *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy, 42*, 17-25. doi: 10.1007/s10879-011-9192-2
- Weiss, R., Stumbo, P. J., & Divakaran, A. (2010). Automatic food documentation and volume computation using digital imaging and electronic transmission. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association, 110*, 42-44. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jada.2009.10.011>
- Whalen, C. K., Henker, B., Ishikawa, S. S., Floro, J. N., Emmerson, N. A., Johnston, J. A., & Swindle, R. (2009). ADHD and anger contexts: Electronic diary mood reports from mothers and children. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology, 34*, 940-953. doi: 10.1093/jpepsy/jsn138
- Whalen, C. K., Jamner, L. D., Henker, B., & Delfino, R. J. (2001). Smoking and moods in adolescents with depressive and aggressive dispositions: Evidence from surveys and electronic diaries. *Health Psychology, 20*, 99-111. doi: 10.1037//0278-6133.20.2.99
- Whitfield, C. L., Anda, R. F., Dube, S. R., & Felitti, V. J. (2003). Violent childhood experiences and the risk of intimate partner violence in adults - assessment in a large health maintenance organization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18*, 166-185. doi: 10.1177/0886260502238733

- Wiehe, S. E., Carroll, A. E., Liu, G. C., Haberkorn, K. L., Hoch, S. C., Wilson, J. S., & Fortenberry, J. D. (2008). Using GPS-enabled cell phones to track the travel patterns of adolescents. *International Journal of Health Geographics, 7*. doi: 10.1186/1476-072x-7-22
- Windelband, W. (1894/1998). History and natural science [reprinted]. *Theory & Psychology, 8*, 5-22. doi: 10.1177/0959354398081001




Figure 1. A hypothetical illustration of differential susceptibility to the environment in daily life.