



The Child Development Supplement
The Institute for Social Research
426 Thompson Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48106
Tel: 734-763-5166
Email: PSIDHelp@umich.edu
<http://psidonline.org/CDS>

The Panel Study of Income Dynamics Child Development Supplement User Guide Supplement for CDS-I

July 30, 2010

List of CDS-I User Guide Revisions/Additions

7/30/10 – Added Media Guide Documentation

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1 – AN INTRODUCTION TO USER GUIDE SUPPLEMENT	1
CHAPTER 2 – CONSTRUCTED MEASURES IN THE DEMOGRAPHIC FILE.....	3
PSID FAMILY VARIABLES: NEW LOCATION	3
PCG AND OCG RELATIONSHIP VARIABLES.....	5
NEW FAMILY VARIABLES.....	6
CHAPTER 3 – CONSTRUCTED MEASURES IN THE PRIMARY CAREGIVER INTERVIEWS... 8	8
HEIGHT AND WEIGHT MEASURES.....	8
BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS INDEX.....	9
THE POSITIVE BEHAVIORS SCALE	11
PARENTAL WARMTH	11
PARENTAL DISAGREEMENT.....	12
AGGRAVATION IN PARENTING	13
ROSENBERG SELF-ESTEEM FOR PRIMARY CAREGIVERS.....	13
PEARLIN SELF-EFFICACY SCALE FOR PRIMARY CAREGIVERS	14
MEASURE OF NON-SPECIFIC PSYCHOLOGICAL DISTRESS FOR PRIMARY CAREGIVERS	15
FOOD SECURITY STATUS	16
CHAPTER 4 – CONSTRUCTED MEASURES IN THE CHILD INTERVIEW	20
ABILITY SELF-CONCEPTS.....	20
GLOBAL SELF CONCEPT SCALE	21
CHAPTER 5 – TIME DIARY FILES.....	22
CODING	22
DATA FILES	24
CHAPTER 6 – COMMON CORE OF DATA FILE	27
END NOTES.....	29

(This page intentionally left blank)

Chapter 1 – An Introduction to User Guide Supplement

The Child Development Supplement (CDS) is one research component of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID), a longitudinal study of a representative sample of U.S. individuals and the families in which they reside. Since 1968, the PSID has collected data on family composition changes, housing and food expenditures, marriage and fertility histories, employment, income, health, consumption, wealth, and more.

While the PSID has always collected some information about children (see the PSID bibliography for research papers on child development¹), in 1997, PSID supplemented its main data collection with additional data on 0-12 year-old children and their parents. The objective was to provide researchers with a comprehensive, nationally representative, and longitudinal database of children and their families with which to study the dynamic process of early human capital formation. The CDS-I successfully completed interviews with 2,380 families (88%), providing information on 3,563 children. The CDS-I User Guide, located at URL: <http://psidonline/CDS/usergd.html> provides an overview of the CDS-I sample, survey design, and specific measures in the interviews with children, parents, and teachers. This supplement was written to provide details on the scales and other generated measures more recently developed for the CDS-I data archive. The guide is organized by interview. The newly constructed variables are:

Table 1.1. Generated Variables in the CDS-I

Descriptor	File Location
Family Relationship of PCG to Child	Demographic File
Family Relationship of OCG to Child	Demographic File
Number of siblings living with child in FU in 1997	Demographic File
Whether biological parents live with child in FU in 1997	Demographic File
Whether biological grandparents live with child in FU in 1997	Demographic File
Behavior Problems Index	PCG-Child File
Positive Behavior Scale	PCG-Child File
Parental Warmth	PCG-Child File
Rosenberg Self-Esteem	PCG-Child File
Pearlin Self-Efficacy	PCG-Child File
Non-Specific Psychological Distress	PCG-Child File
Aggravation in Parenting	PCG-Child File
Parent Disagreement	PCG-Child File
Body Mass Index (BMI)	PCG-Child File
Body Weight Percentile	PCG-Child File
HOME Scale	PCG-Child File
Family Conflict	PCG-Child File
Ability Self-Concepts of Children	Child Interview
Subscale Global Self Concept	Child Interview
Time Use Measures	Time Diary Aggregates
School Environment	Common Core of Data

This page is intentionally left blank.

Chapter 2 – Constructed Measures in the Demographic File

The Demographic File in CDS-I provides information about the child's background (birth month and year, sex, race, and relationship to the household head) as well as information about the child's parents, and head and wife of the family unit (often the parents) in which the child resides. In March of 2006, we updated all variables with system missing data in the CDS-I Demographic file with an INAP code value of "0". The purpose of conducting this coding was to align the data file structure with requirements of the PSID-CDS Data Center, which, in turn, allowed us to construct detailed codebook documentation for the data files, just as provided in the CDS-II and the PSID files. In addition to the INAP coding, we moved the family economic and demographic variables from the PSID 1997 to a new location and constructed several new variables. Each of these tasks are discussed below.

PSID Family Variables: New Location

The first release of the CDS-I Demographic Data File included a small number of selected demographic and economic variables from the main PSID interview in 1997 (hence the rationale for the file's name). These variables were originally included in the CDS data file as a way to provide some family background information before the PSID 1997 main interview data were released. Now the final versions of these variables are available in the PSID-CDS Data Center under PSID "Family", "Income Plus", and "Work Hours and Wages" data groupings.

Having duplicate versions of the same measures –the original version in the PSID files and a copy in the CDS files –is not an ideal approach for data users as it may cause some confusion over specificity of the variable and opens up the possibilities of inconsistency between the measures when updating occurs. We recognize, however, that having a small select group of family variables from the main PSID in an easily accessible convenient grouping may be of great service to new users of the PSID-CDS data archive. Now that the CDS and PSID data are housed in the same Data Center, we can use latest technology to achieve both aims of avoiding duplication of measures in the archive and offering convenient grouping of high-traffic PSID family variables. We have accomplished these goals by displaying the original PSID variable selection in a window along side the Demographic file. The variables in this grouping are actually views of the variables in the PSID data groupings, but can be selected for your data cart in the same way that you select any other variable. Using this "view approach" versus actually housing them in the Demographic data file ensures the most updated version of the PSID data can be downloaded, and no discrepancy will occur between measures housed in the CDS and PSID data groups. When you select Demographic File for 1997, you will see a convenient regrouping of PSID variables under the title "Selected Variables from the (1997) PSID Data Files", as shown below for CDS-I.

[Help on multiple variable selection](#) | [Help on CDS Demographic Variables](#)

1997 Demographic File - including weights: 3,563 observations	Selected Variables from The 1997 PSID Data Files
SEQNUM97 - 1997 SEQUENCE NUMBER	ER33403 - RELATION TO HEAD 97
AGECORE - AGE OF CHILD AT 1997 PSID CORE INTERVIEW	ER33405 - MONTH INDIVIDUAL BORN 97
CHRRACE - CHILD RACE (A6)	ER33406 - YEAR INDIVIDUAL BORN 97
BIRTHMON - CHILD'S BIRTH MONTH	ER32000 - SEX OF INDIVIDUAL
BIRTHYR - CHILD'S BIRTH YEAR	UPEDU97H - UPDATED: YEARS OF EDUCATION-HEAD
CHWMON - CHILD INTERVIEW- MONTH COMPLETED	UPEDU97W - UPDATED: YEARS OF EDUCATION-WIFE
CHWDAY - CHILD INTERVIEW- DAY COMPLETED	ER10008 - # IN FU
CHWYR - CHILD INTERVIEW- YEAR COMPLETED	ER10012 - # CHILDREN IN FU
AGEATCH - AGE AT CHILD INTERVIEW IN MONTHS	ER10010 - SEX OF HEAD
AGEATPCG - AGE AT PCG INTERVIEW IN MONTHS	ER10009 - AGE OF HEAD

The mapping of the variable names originally released in the CDS-I to the PSID variable names are, as shown below.

Table 2.1. Location of PSID 1997 Family Variables

Measure	Former CDS 1997 Variable	PSID 1997 Variable
1997 Interview Number	INTID97	ER33401
1997 Sequence Number	SEQNUM97:	ER33402
Relationship to Head	RELHD	ER33403
Age of child at 1997 PSID core interview	AGECORE	ER33404
Sex of Child	SEXCH:	ER32000
Child's Birth Month	BIRTHMON	ER33405
Child's Birth Year	BIRTHYR	ER33406
Household Type	FUTYPE	ER10017
Number of Persons in Family Unit (FU)	FUSIZE	ER10008
Number of Kids under 18 in the FU	CHILDCNT	ER10012
Total Family Income	INCFAM	FAMINC97
Sex of Head	SEXHD	ER10010
Head Race (core)	HRACE	ER11848-ER11851
Age of Head	HEADAGE	ER10009
Age of Wife	WIFEAGE	ER10011
Education of Head	FINEDHD	UPEDU97H
Education of Wife	FINEDWF	UPEDU97W
Current Employment Status of Head	HDCUEMP	ER33411*
Current Employment Status of Wife	WFCUEMP	ER33411*
Head Labor Income- 1996	HDLAB97	HDEARN97
Wife Labor Income- 1996	WFLAB97	WFEARN97
Head Average Weekly Work Hours-1996	HDAVG97	HDAVG97
Wife Average Weekly Work Hours-1996	WFAVG97	WFAVG97

*Individual level.

As a reminder, the selection is limited, including employment status, age, sex, race, and education of the household head, number of children in the family unit, total family income, work hours and labor income of the household head and wife, and census annual needs standards. Other family demographic and economic measures are included in the PSID data files. Use the “search and browse” function to locate measures of interest, or browse the CDS-II User Guide Chapter 12

“PSID Data Resources” that describes the scope and depth of measures in the PSID about the child’s family and parents.

PCG and OCG Relationship Variables

The Primary Caregiver Child Interview (“PCG-Child”) is the anchor to all other CDS modules and required for a target child to be considered “response” in the study. We considered it the “anchor” since it contained key developmental measures for the study, including almost all of the HOME SF scale items and other family environment measures, the Behavior Problem Index, parent-report on schooling and education activities, extra curricular activities, health, and child expenditures and savings.

In CDS (both waves), the PCG, by definition, must have lived with the child to be considered a primary caregiver. In most cases, the PCG was the child’s biological mother. If the biological mother was not living with the child, the appropriate respondent was the first person living with the child on the list of relationships below:

- Stepmother, adoptive mother, or foster mother
- Other female legal guardian (must be at least 18 years of age; oftentimes the grandmother)
- Father (biological, adoptive, step, or foster)
- Male legal guardian of the target child
- An adult who lives with the child and takes primary responsibility for caring for him/her. This does not include someone who is paid to take care of the child (i.e., not a babysitter or nanny).

In the CDS-I Demographic File, there are two variables that define a relationship of the PCG and OCG with the child, as specified by the PCG: role relationship as collected through the CDS interview, and recently released family relationship, as constructed using the PSID family demographic data. In CDS-II, we asked for specific family relationships for the PCG and OCG, coded in a similar way as the PSID variable “Relationship to Head”. We recently constructed these variables for the CDS-I: RELPCG97 and RELOCG97. Their code values are provided in Table 2.2 below. Both sets of variables that define the PCG and OCG (role relationship and family relationship) are provided on the 1997 data file.

Table 2.2. RELPCG97 / RELOCG97 Code Descriptors

Code	Label	Code	Label
1	Biological Mother	11	Aunt
2	Stepmother	12	Uncle
3	Adoptive Mother	13	Sister
4	Biological Father	14	Brother
5	Stepfather	15	Other Relative
6	Adoptive Father	16	Legal Guardian
7	Grandmother	17	Foster Mother
8	Grandfather	18	Foster Father
9	Female Partner of the other caregiver	19	Non-Relative
10	Male Partner of the other caregiver		

New Family Variables

There are three new variables on the 1997 CDS Demographic File (same variables are also available on the 2002/2003 CDS Demographic File: (a) number of siblings living with the child, (b) whether child lives with in a single or dual parent home, and (c) whether child lives with a grandparent.

Number of Siblings Living with the Child

Variable SIBNUM97 represents the number of biological siblings residing in the same family unit as the CDS child during the PSID 1997 data collection. The variable was constructed in the following way. The Parent Identification File was used in the first step to identify the biological parents of CDS children and all their biological children. In the second step, we used the 1997 interview number of the family (PSID variable ER33401) to identify the biological siblings residing in the same family unit (FU) as the CDS child. In the third step, the individual's status with regard to the FU (PSID variable ER33402) residency status of CDS children and their biological siblings was compared leading to the following results:

Table 2.3. Siblings Residing with Child: Code Descriptors

Code	Label
1-9	Number of biological siblings living with child in FU
10	Biological sibling(s) defined in the PSID as part of the FU but away at an institution (e.g., college, military, jail) at the time of the PSID 1997 interview
96	Child has biological siblings but none residing in the same FU as the CDS child
0	INAP: no biological siblings/no information about biological siblings/no data on biological siblings in 1997

Whether Child Lives with in a Single or Dual Parent Home

Variable BIOPR97 describes whether the child lived in a single or dual parent home during the 1997 PSID data collection. First, using the Parent Identification File, the biological parents of CDS children were identified. Next, using the 1997 interview number or “family identification number” (PSID variable ER33401) and the individual's status with regard to the Family Unit (PSID variable ER33402) residency status of CDS children and their biological parents was compared leading to the following results:

Table 2.4. Single vs. Dual Parent Home: Code Descriptors

Code	Label
1	CDS child resided with biological mother and biological father at time of PSID 1997 interview
2	CDS child resided with biological mother only at time of PSID 1997 interview
3	CDS child resided with biological father only at time of PSID 1997 interview
4	No biological parent(s) living in the child's FU at time of PSID 1997 interview
5	CDS child's biological parent(s) defined in the PSID as part of the FU but away at an institution (e.g., college, military, jail) at time of PSID 1997 interview
0	INAP: no info biological parents/ no data on biological parents at time of PSID 1997 interview

Whether Child Lives with a Grandparent

Variable BIOGPR97 provides information about co-resident biological grandparent(s) at the time of the 1997 PSID data collection. First, using the Parent Identification File, the biological grandparents of CDS children were identified. Next, using the 1997 interview number of the family (PSID variable ER33401) and the individual's status with regard to the FU (PSID variable ER33402) residency status of CDS children and their biological grandparents was compared leading to the following results:

Table 2.5. Resident Grandparent: Code Descriptors

Code	Label
0	INAP: no info biological grandparents/no data on biological grandparents in 1997
1	Biological grandparent(s) living in FU
2	No biological grandparent(s) living in FU
3	Biological grandparents at institution (e.g., nursing home, jail)

Chapter 3 – Constructed Measures in the Primary Caregiver Interviews

In March of 2006, we released a number of constructed measures that assess psychological wellbeing of the child and of the primary caregiver, overweight status for the child, and food security for the family unit. We additionally updated all variables with system missing data in the CDS-I Primary Caregiver (PCG) Interviews with an INAP code value of “0”. This coding brings the data up to the same requirements as the other files in the PSID-CDS data archive and allowed us to construct detailed codebook documentation. This chapter describes the newly constructed variables for the CDS-I PCG interviews.

Height and Weight Measures

In CDS-I, we gathered data about the child’s height and weight at the time of the interview. The Primary Caregiver reported the weight of the child, and the interviewer measured his/her height, using a rafter square and tape measure (see Section A of the CDS-I Primary Caregiver-Child interview). Procedures to measure the children’s height were, as follows: first, the interviewer asked the children to take off their shoes and stand against a wall or door. The interviewer placed a Post-it note on the wall right above the child’s height, and then positioned a rafter’s square against the wall directly over the child’s head. A mark was placed on the Post-it note at the child’s height. When the child moved away from the wall, the interviewer positioned the tape measure under a door jam or her foot and measured from the floor to the mark. If the interviewer was unable to obtain measured height, parent-reported height was recorded.

Body Mass Index (BMI) and percentile rank were calculated for all children aged 5 years and older with valid height and weight data. BMI was calculated using pounds and inches with this equation:

Weight in Pounds

$$\text{BMI} = () \times 703$$

(Height in inches) x (Height in inches)

Overweight status was calculated based on the CDC growth charts, which take into account age and gender of the child. Each of the CDC BMI-for-age gender specific charts contains a series of curved lines indicating specific percentiles. The percentile cutoff points identifying underweight and overweight status in children are as follows:

- a) less than 5percentile for “underweight”
- b) 85to 95percentile for “at risk for overweight”
- c) over 95percentile for “overweight”

You can obtain more information on the CDC Growth Charts for children and teens 2 – 20 years of age at: <http://www.cdc.gov/growthcharts/>. On the CDS-I PCG-Child file, the WTIND97 provides information about whether child is underweight or overweight. Table 3.1 details the WTIND97 code values.

Table 3.1. WTIND97 Code Values for Body Weight Status

Code	Label
1	Underweight: BMI-for-age < 5th percentile
2	Normal: BMI-for-age 5th percentile up to 85th percentile
3	At risk of overweight: BMI-for-age 85th percentile to < 95th percentile
4	Overweight: BMI-for-age > 95th percentile
9	Not ascertained

We acknowledge that researchers will use different methods for identifying outliers in the height and weight data, and will make different assumptions about the cause of such outliers (e.g., result of interviewer measurement error or data entry error; true reflection of extreme growth compared to an average child of same sex and age). The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) provide one method for identification of outliers, which we have adapted and calculated for the CDS-I data file for your discretionary use. This method essentially defines an “outlier” as being a minimum of four z-score deviations from the mean. More specifics can be found on the CDC webpage: <http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dnpa/growthcharts/00binaries/BIV-cutoffs.pdf>. In the CDS-I data, we used the programs provided by the CDC webpage and labeled the variable as “BIV97”. We are not endorsing use of this variable, but providing it to the user community as an option.

Behavior Problems Index

As described in the CDS-I User Guide, the Behavior Problem Index was originally developed by James Petersonⁱⁱ and Nicholas Zill from the Achenbach Behavior Problems Checklist (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1981ⁱⁱⁱ) to measure in a survey setting the incidence and severity of child behavior problems (Peterson & Zill, 1986). The same set of items used in the NLSY was used in the PSID-CDS primary caregiver interview in order to maximize comparability between the two data sets. The BPI was additionally included in the Other Caregiver Interview, Teacher Interview, and the Absent Father Interview.

The BPI was based on responses by the primary caregiver for children three years and older as to whether a set of 30 problem behaviors was often, sometimes, or never true of the target child. Behaviors included having sudden mood changes, anxiousness, meanness towards others, and obsessiveness (see Table 3.2 for the full list of items and specific question wording). When the CDS-I data were released in 1999, BPI scores were constructed for the two subscales and overall scale by taking the mean of the items. In CDS-II, we constructed the measure using the protocols outlined by the reference material and in the NLSY. We have constructed parallel measures for CDS-I as well. Procedures are described below. The two items for school-age children to the 30-item scale were not included in the construction of the scales.

We performed a confirmatory factor analysis on our two expected subscales. The results showed that the items grouped into these two factors quite well, with three variables not loading at all. We constructed an overall or total BPI score, using the 27 items that loaded, as well as separate scores for each of the two subscales, internal or withdrawn and external or aggressive behaviors. The Externalizing Behaviors Scale included 15 items and the Internalizing Behaviors Scale included 13 items. Table 3.2 shows how the items map onto the external and internal subscales in the CDS-I data.

Before scoring, the individual items were recoded such that a score of “1” became “0” and a score of “2” or “3” became a “1”. Scores for the total BPI and Externalizing and Internalizing are sum

scores. Higher scores on these measures imply a greater level of behavior problems. Cases were included if they had valid data on all of the variables contributing to the BPI Index: For the Externalizing Behaviors Scale, 97 cases did not meet the inclusion criterion, leaving 2,718 valid cases. The mean score was 5.66, with a standard deviation of 3.84 and a range of 0-15. Cronbach's alpha was .87. For the Internalizing Behaviors Scale, 83 cases did not meet the inclusion criterion, leaving 2,732 valid cases. The mean score was 2.49, with a standard deviation of 2.68 and a range of 0-13. Cronbach's alpha was .82. For the Total BPI Index, 2,680 cases met this criterion for inclusion. The mean score on the Total BPI Index was 7.96, with a standard deviation of 5.69 and a range of 0-27. Cronbach's alpha was .90.

Table 3.2. Survey Items in the Behavior Problems Index

G23. For the next set of statements, decide whether they are not true, sometimes true, or often true, of (CHILD)'s behavior.	External	Internal	Total
a. (He/She) has sudden changes in mood or feeling.	.46		
b. (He/She) feels or complains that no one loves him/her.		.39	
c. (He/She) is rather high strung and nervous.	.34		
d. (He/She) cheats or tells lies.	.49		
e. (He/She) is too fearful or anxious.		.35	
f. (He/She) argues too much	.58		
g. (He/She) has difficulty concentrating, cannot pay attention for long.	.44		
h. (He/She) is easily confused, seems to be in a fog.		.36	
i. (He/She) bullies or is cruel or mean to others.	.54		
j. (He/She) is disobedient.	.65		
k. (He/She) does not seem to feel sorry after (he/she) misbehaves.	.45		
l. (He/She) has trouble getting along with other children	.32	.31	
m. (He/She) is impulsive, or acts without thinking.	.58		
n. (He/She) feels worthless or inferior.		.70	
o. (He/She) is not liked by other children.		.42	
p. (He/She) has difficulty getting (his/her) mind off certain thoughts.		.39	
q. (He/She) is restless or overly active, cannot sit still	.62		
r. (He/She) is stubborn, sullen, or irritable.	.66		
s. (He/She) has a very strong temper and loses it easily.	.66		
t. (He/She) is unhappy, sad or depressed.		.67	
u. (He/She) is withdrawn, does not get involved with others.		.51	
v. (He/She) breaks things on purpose or deliberately destroys things.	.44		
w. (He/She) clings to adults.			
x. (He/She) cries too much.			
y. (He/She) demands a lot of attention.	.47		
z. (He/She) is too dependant on others.		.34	
aa. (He/She) feels others are out to get (him/her).		.59	
bb. (He/She) hangs around with kids who get into trouble.			
cc. (He/She) is secretive, keeps things to (himself/ herself).		.33	
dd. (He/She) worries too much.		.59	

Number of Items	15	13	27
Cronbach's alpha	.87	.82	.90
Unweighted N	2,718	2,732	2,680

The Positive Behaviors Scale

The Positive Behavior Scale (G24a-j), originally developed for the New Chance Evaluation (Polit, 1998^{iv}), measures childhood emotional/social competence. As described in the CDS-I User Guide, the original scale consisted of 25 items for children three years and older evaluated on a 10-point scale, from “Not At All Like My Child” to “Very Much Like My Child”. The scale used in the CDS consisted of 10 items that reads: “Please tell me how much each statement applies to (CHILD) on a scale from 1-5, where one means “not at all like your child,” and five means “totally like your child,” and two, three and four are somewhere in between.”

We constructed an overall Positive Behavior Scale. Cases were included if they had valid data on approximately 75% of the variables contributing to the Positive Behavior Scale. Thirty-eight cases did not meet this inclusion criterion and were dropped from the analysis, leaving a total of 2,777 cases. The (unweighted) mean score on the Positive Behavior Scale (Variable “POSBEH97” in the Data Center) was 4.23, with a range of 1 to 5, and a standard deviation of .56. Cronbach's alpha was .79.

Table 3.3 Factor Loadings for Positive Behavior Scale

G24: Please tell me how much each statement applies to (CHILD) on a scale from 1-5, where one means “not at all like your child,” and five means “totally like your child,” and two, three and four are somewhere in between.	Factor Loadings
a. Is cheerful, happy.	.55
b. Waits (his/her) turn in games and other activities.	.50
c. Does neat, careful work.	.43
d. Is curious and exploring, likes new experiences.	.30
e. Thinks before (he/she) acts, is not impulsive.	.48
f. Gets along well with other people (his/her) age.	.76
g. Usually does what you tell (him/her) to do.	.56
h. Can get over being upset quickly.	.51
i. Is admired and well-liked by other people (his/her) age.	.75
j. Tries to do things for (himself/ herself), is self-reliant.	.50
Number of Items	10
Mean	4.23
Cronbach's alpha	.79
Unweighted N	2,777

Parental Warmth

The Parental Warmth Scale measures the warmth of the relationship between the child and parent. The scale was constructed as an average score of the six items included in the PCG interview (G37a-f) if there were valid data on at least 75% of scale items. In CDS-I, 38 cases did

not meet this inclusion criteria and were dropped from the scale construction, leaving 3,525 cases. Exploratory factor analysis produced one factor (Parental Warmth), with strong correlations to each item. The overall scale mean was 4.49 and the standard deviation was .60. Cronbach's alpha was .82.

Table 3.4. Factor Loadings for Parental Warmth Scale

Question Item G37	6-Item
a. Shown Physical Affection	.68
b. Said I Love You	.71
c. Participate in Activities	.66
d. Joked or Played	.66
e. Talk about Interests	.64
f. Spoken Appreciatively	.65
Number of Items	6
Cronbach's alpha	.82
Unweighted N	3,525

Parental Disagreement

The Parental Disagreement Scale measure the extent of agreement between parents on daily activities. The individual question items were included in the PCG-Household Interview at A40a-I and administered to PCGs living with a spouse or partner. The scale was constructed as a mean score where valid data were available for at least 75% of the nine items. Prior to scale construction, some items were reversed scored. At the second wave of CDS, the scale was shortened to five items. For comparison purposes with CDS-II, the short five-item version of the scale was constructed as well.

For the full scale of nine items, 67 cases were dropped due to missing data on three or more items, resulting in 1,683 valid cases. We conducted a confirmatory factor analysis, forcing one factor and this produced a strong positive correlation for all items on this factor (labeled Parent Disagreement). The overall scale mean was 2.0, with a range of 1 to 4 and standard deviation of .61. Cronbach's alpha was .86. For the shortened scale version, we dropped 69 cases due to missing data on two or more items, leaving 1,681 cases for inclusion in the short-form scale. The overall mean was 1.88, with a range of 1 to 4 and standard deviation of .63. Cronbach's alpha was .75.

Table 3.5. Factor Loadings on Parental Disagreement Full and Short-Form Scales

Question Item A40	Factor Loadings	
	9-Item Scale	5-Item Scale
a. His/Her Completion of Household Duties	.50	
b. How Children Are Raised	.74	.69
c. Disciplining Children	.70	
d. How You Spend Money on Children	.79	.67
e. How He/She Spends Money on Children	.81	
f. Amount of Time He/She Spends w/ Children	.62	.69
g. Friends He/She Spends Time with	.54	.62

	Factor Loadings	
h. His/Her Use of Alcohol or Drugs	.32	.38
i. Leisure Time Activities You Do Together	.56	
Number of Items	9	5
Cronbach's alpha	.86	.75
Unweighted N	1,683	1,681

Aggravation in Parenting

The Aggravation in Parenting Scale (PCG-Child Interview: items B11a-e and PCG-Household Interview: items A29a-d) provides a measure of parenting stress. The scale is constructed as an average score of the individual items for cases with valid data on at least 75% of the items. We constructed a scale with all nine items, and a scale with the seven items used at CDS-II, for comparison purposes. The average score was 2.00 with a standard deviation of .66, a range of 1-4, and Cronbach's Alpha of .73. For the seven-item version, 36 cases were dropped due to missing data on two or more items, leaving 2,197 for inclusion in the scale. The overall short version scale mean was 2.21, with a standard deviation of .76, range of 1-4.86, and Cronbach's alpha of .71.

Table 3.6. Factor Loadings for the Aggravation in Parenting Scales: Full and Short Forms

Question Item	Factor Loadings	
	9-Item Scale	7-Item Scale
B11A Harder than Most Children	.52	
B11B Bothersome	.62	.51
B11C Giving up More of Life	.52	.48
B11D Feel Angry	.62	.52
B11E Do Better Without	.26	
A29A Being Parent Is Hard	.42	.49
A29B Feel Trapped by Responsibility	.49	.56
A29C Taking Care of Children is Work	.44	.52
A29D Feel Tired from Raising Family	.47	.57
Number of Items used	9	7
Mean score	2.00	2.21
Cronbach's alpha	.73	.71
Unweighted N	2,200	2,197

Rosenberg Self-Esteem for Primary Caregivers

Primary Caregivers reported on a series of 10 self-esteem items at A14a-j, using response scale of 1-4, where 1 indicates "Strongly Disagree" and 4 indicates "Strongly Agree". Prior to scoring, some items were reverse scored so that a higher score designates higher self-esteem. The scale is constructed as a mean score. Cases were included if they had valid response on approximately 75% of the items. There were 2,202 cases that resulted with a PCG self-esteem score. The mean score on the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Variable "SLFEST97" in the Data Center) was 3.44, with a range of 1.6 to 4, and a standard deviation of .45. Cronbach's alpha = .83. Factor loadings from the confirmatory factor analysis are provided in Table 3.7 (note that factor analyses were done prior to reverse coding).

Table 3.7. Factor Loadings for the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale

Question Item	Factor Loading
Person of Worth	.55
Good Qualities	.59
Feel Like a Failure	-.54
Do Things Well	.56
Not Much to be Proud Of	-.43
Positive Attitude	.72
Satisfied With Self	.66
Want More Respect For Self	-.54
Feel Useless At Times	-.64
Think I'm No Good	-.65
Number of Items	10
Mean Score	3.44
Cronbach's Alpha	.83
Unweighted N	2,202

Pearlin Self-Efficacy Scale for Primary Caregivers

The Pearlin Self-Efficacy Scale assesses the extent to which people see themselves as having control over aspects of their lives. This measure consisted of the original seven Pearlin items (PCG-HH A20a-g) which were answered on a 4-point response scale (“Strongly Agree”, “Agree”, “Disagree”, “Strongly Disagree”). In CDS-II only four-item scale was constructed. For the CDS-I data files, we constructed scales for both the original version and the shortened version.

Items are averaged to produce an overall score, and cases are included if they have valid data on at least 75% of the items. Factor loadings from the confirmatory factor analyses are provided in Table 3.8 (note that factor analyses were done prior to reverse coding). For the seven-item scale, 29 cases were dropped due to missing data on more than one item, leaving 2,204 for inclusion in the scale. The mean score on the 7-Item Pearlin Self-Efficacy Scale (variable PERLN97F) was 3.14, with the standard deviation of .49, a range of 1.17 to 4, and Cronbach's alpha of .75. For the shortened scale, we dropped 19 cases due to missing data on more than one item, leaving 2,214 cases for inclusion in the scale. The mean score on the 4-Item Pearlin Self-Efficacy Scale (Variable “PEARLN97S” in the Data Center) was 3.04, with the standard deviation of .62, a range of 1 to 4, and Cronbach's alpha of .76.

Table 3.8. Factor Loadings for the Pearlin Self-Efficacy Scale

Question Item	Factor Loadings	
	7-Item Scale	4-Item Scale
A20a Can't Solve Problems	.61	.61
A20b Pushed Around	.60	.66
A20c Little Control	.74	.69
A20d Do Anything Set Mind to	-.28	
A20e Feel Helpless	.69	.72
A20f Future Depends on Me	-.25	
A20g Can't Change Important Things	.61	

Question Item	Factor Loadings	
	7-Item Scale	4-Item Scale
Number of Items	7	4
Mean Score	3.06	3.04
Cronbach's Alpha	.75	.76
Unweighted N	2,204	2,214

Measure of Non-Specific Psychological Distress for Primary Caregivers

The K-10 Non-Specific Psychological Distress Scale was developed by Ronald Kessler at Harvard Medical School. As described in more detail in Kessler et al. (2003^v), the K-10 Non-Specific Psychological Distress Scale was designed to discriminate cases of serious mental illness from non-cases in a general population survey. The K-10 includes 10 items that ask the primary caregivers about how they have been feeling during the prior four weeks. There is also six-item version (K-6) that was used in the CDS-II. For both scales, response items were based on of 1-5 range, where 1 indicated "All of the Time" and 5 indicated "None of the Time". The items are rescored, following the coding in the table on the next page, and summed. Factor loadings from the confirmatory factor analyses are provided in Table 3.9. For the K-10, 94 cases were dropped due to missing data on two or more items, leaving 2,139 for inclusion in the scale. The average summed score was 6.55 with a standard deviation of 5.89 and a range of 0-39. For the K-6, 73 cases were dropped due to missing data on one or more items, leaving 2,160 for inclusion in the scale. The average summed score was 3.72, with a standard deviation of 3.69 and a range of 0-24. Cut-points for determining distress are provided on Dr. Kessler's website: http://www.hcp.med.harvard.edu/ncs/k6_scales.php.

Table 3.9. Recoding of the K-10 / K-6 Scales

In the last 4 weeks, about how often did you feel...	All	Most	Some	A Little	None
	of the time				
a. Tired out for no good reason	4	3	2	1	0
b. Nervous	4	3	2	1	0
c. So nervous that nothing could calm you down	4	3	2	1	0
d. Hopeless	4	3	2	1	0
e. Restless or fidgety	4	3	2	1	0
f. So restless you could not sit still	4	3	2	1	0
g. Depressed	4	3	2	1	0
h. Everything was an effort	4	3	2	1	0
i. So sad that nothing could cheer you up	4	3	2	1	0
j. Worthless	4	3	2	1	0

The K-10 and K-6 included not only the six Likert scale questions in the scales, but additional questions about persistence and impairment that result from the symptoms. These additional questions are not required to score the K-10 and K-6.

Table 3.10. Factor Loadings for the K-10 / K-6 Scales

Question Item	Factor Loadings	
	K-10 Scale	K-6 Scale
a. tired out for no good reason	.54	
b. nervous	.63	.56
c. so nervous that nothing could calm you down	.68	
d. hopeless	.76	.77
e. restless or fidgety	.65	.59
f. so restless you could not sit still	.60	
g. depressed	.77	
h. everything was an effort	.56	.54
i. so sad that nothing could cheer you up	.79	.81
j. worthless	.75	.81
Number of Items	10	6
Mean Score	6.55	3.72
Cronbach's Alpha	.88	.82
Unweighted N	2,139	2,160

Food Security Status

In the March, 2006 release of the CDS-I PCG Child File, we incorporated the three food security variables that USDA constructed for the CDS-I. The individual items that make up the food security scale were asked in the PCG Child Interview and are provided on this file as well. To avoid duplication, the food security file is no longer provided in a separate data file on the PSID-CDS Data Center. Also note, when we moved the variables over to the PCG Child File, we corrected a format error on the FS Scale measure. The following text is an adaptation from the USDA documentation provided on the PSID-CDS webpage:

<ftp://ftp.isr.umich.edu/pub/src/psid/cds/>

and is intended to give you background on the measures and construction of the generated variables.

Construction of the Food Security Measures

In November of 2000, the USDA Economic Research Service constructed food security measures for CDS based on responses to the 18 food security questions (the food security core module), collected in the CDS-I PCG-Child Interview, K1-K15. The information provided below was written by Mark Nord in year 2000. The original document is located at: <ftp://ftp.isr.umich.edu/pub/src/psid/cds/>.

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) defines households as food secure if “they had access, at all times, to enough food for an active, healthy life for all household members.” Food insecure households are defined as “uncertain of having, or unable to acquire, enough food to meet the needs of all their members because they had insufficient money or other resources”.

Food insecure households are further defined as those with hunger or those without hunger. Households without hunger are those who “obtained enough food to avoid hunger, using a variety of coping strategies such as eating less varied diets, participating in Federal food assistance programs, or getting emergency food from community food pantries”. See URL: <http://www.ers.usda.gov/briefing/foodsecurity/> for more information on food security, its measurement, and recent prevalence rates as measured by the Current Population Survey.

Families with More than One Child

The 3,563 children in the PSID 1997 Primary Caregiver Data File lived in 2,380 families at the time of the interview in 1997. Of these families, 1,183 had two children included in the study and 1,197 had only one child in the study. In most families that had two children in the study, the same primary caregiver was identified both children. For these families, only one of the children’s records has valid food security data in the PSID 1997 Primary Caregiver -Child -Data File. The variable Q1K0 in the 1997 PSID Primary Caregiver -Child -Data File indicates whether or not food security data had already been collected for the family. A value of 2 on variable Q1K0 indicates that the food security section had not been completed previously. Food security items for these children have valid data. A value of 1 on variable Q1K0 indicates that the section was previously completed. Food security items in the Primary Caregiver file are missing for these children, and the food security information for the other child in the family is assumed to be applicable. As in the PCG-Household file, the values of the food security variables from the record with valid data are assigned to the record of the other child in the family. This is appropriate since the same primary caregiver responded for both children and the food security questions ask about conditions in the family, not about the specific child.

In 71 of the families with two children in the study, however, different primary caregivers were interviewed for the two children. In these families, both children’s records have valid food security data, and the food security variables in the Food Security Status File are based on the data from the respective child’s record. Of these 71 families, 54 had identical responses to every food security question. Of the remaining 17 families, 12 differed as to food security scale score, but only 5 as to food security status category. This reflects different perceptions by two people of conditions in the same family. For analysis at the family level, the researcher will have to decide how to reflect the different food security status recorded for the two children in the few cases where these vary. Family is defined by the PSID variable “Interview Number” or “Family ID”. See the CDS-II User Guide for more information about this variable.

Twelve cases did not have any valid answers to any question in the food security scale. The food security status of these families is unknown, and the food security status variables for them are coded missing (9).

Food Security Status Variables

Food security status variables were calculated based on the 18 core items in the food security module, Q1K3A through Q1K15 (excluding Q1K4, Q1K4A, and Q1K11, which specify screener calculations). Calculations were carried out in accordance with the standard methods described in “Measuring Household Food Security” (<http://www.fns.usda.gov/oane/>). Assessment of the food security items using Rasch measurement model methods indicated that relative item severities were very nearly identical to those in the 1998 Current Population Survey Food Security Supplement, so the use of the standard benchmark household scores as described in Measuring Household Food Security was appropriate. No imputation was carried out for missing responses. Excluding the cases that had no valid responses, and considering as valid those responses to questions that were skipped because of screening, only 16 cases (0.7% of those interviewed) had

any items missing. Analysis of those cases revealed that the raw score of only one case would be changed by following the imputation procedures specified in Measuring Household Food Security. In that case, the raw score would have increase from 14 to 15, and the food security status category would have remained unchanged. Three food security status variables are provided as follows:

FSRAW is the food security raw score, a simple count of the number of food security items affirmed by the household respondent.

FSSCALE is the food security scale score. This is a measure of the severity of food insecurity or hunger experienced in the household in the previous 12 months. It is a continuous, interval-level measure based on the Rasch measurement model and is appropriate for associative analyses such as correlation, regression, or analysis of variance. It is on the standard computational metric described in Measuring Household Food Security. Valid values range from 1.428 to 13.026, with higher values indicating more severe food deprivation. Technically, the scale score is undefined for households that affirmed no items. These households are food secure, but the appropriate size of the interval between their score and the score of households that affirmed one item is not known and varies from household to household. The variable is coded -6 for households that affirmed no items (or were screened out and deemed to be food secure) to remind users that these cases require special consideration in analyses.

FSSTATUS is a categorical measure of food security status that identifies households as food secure (coded as “1”), food insecure without hunger (coded as “2”), food insecure with moderate hunger (coded as “3”), and food insecure with severe hunger ((coded as “4”). This variable is appropriate for comparing prevalence rates of food insecurity and hunger across subpopulations. There were few cases in the most severe category, and for most prevalence reporting purposes, the two categories of food insecure with hunger should be collapsed and reported as a single category.

This page is intentionally left blank.

Chapter 4 – Constructed Measures in the Child Interview

In the CDS-I, children aged three years and older were eligible to participate in the Woodcock-Johnson Revised Tests of Achievement (WJ-R) and the Memory for Digit Span test from the WISC-III. The CDS-I User Guide provides detailed information on these assessments and their administration. Children aged eight years and older additionally participated in a brief interview that gathered measures of several dimensions of self-esteem. For the March 2006 release, we constructed three scales from these measures: the Eccles task perception in reading and math scales (Eccles, Wigfield, Harold & Blumenfeld, 1993^{vi}) and global self-concept scale, as measured by the Marsh Self-Description Questionnaire. We additionally updated all variables with system missing data in the Child Interview with an INAP code. This coding brings the data up to the same requirements as the other files in the PSID-CDS data archive and allowed us to construct detailed codebook documentation for the Child File. This chapter describes the newly constructed variables for the CDS-I PCG interviews.

Ability Self-Concepts

We created summary variables for reading and math by first reverse scoring C6 and C16 so that the scores ranged from low to high, as other items. A confirmatory FA forced the analysis to two factors and generated a clear delineation: all of the reading items loaded on the Reading Self-Concept factor (Factor 1 on the table below), while the entire math items loaded on the Math Self-Concept factor (Factor 2). We then constructed an average score for each scale, and included a case if it had valid data on about 75% of the variables. 15 cases did not meet the scaling criteria for Reading and 14 cases for Math scales and were dropped, leaving a total of 1,072 included cases for Reading and 1,073 for Math. The scores ranged from 1 to 6.7 on the Reading Self-Concept Scale, with a mean of 5.17 and a standard deviation of .89. On Math Self-Concept Scale, the scores ranged from 1.3 to 6.7, with a mean of 4.93 and standard deviation of .89.

Table 4.1. Factor Loadings for the Reading and Math Self-Concept Scales

Item	Reading Self-Concept	Math Self-Concept
C11 Reading Skill Gen Rate	.79	
C12 Reading Skill in Context Peers	.69	
C13 Reading Compared to Other Skills	.73	
C14 Achieve in Reading this Yr	.64	
C15 Learning Something New in Reading	.56	
C16 How Hard Is Reading	.46	
C17 How Useful Is Reading	.36	
C18 Importance of Reading	.42	
C19 Interest in Reading	.59	
C20 How Much Like Reading	.60	
C1 Math Skill Gen Rate		.62
C2 Math Skill in Context Peers		.58
C3 Math Compared to Other Skills		.63
C4 Achieve in Math This Yr		.58

Item		Reading Self-Concept	Math Self-Concept
C5	Learning Something New in Math		.38
C6	How Hard Is Math		.34
C7	How Useful Is Math		.28
C8	Importance of Math		.41
C9	Interest in Math		.67
C10	How Much Like Math		.75
N		1,072	1,073
Mean Score		5.17	4.93
Alpha		.78	.74

Global Self Concept Scale

We created a summary variable for the Global Self Concept Scale by taking the mean of items C21-C28 if the case had valid data on a minimum of five out of the six items. Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted; factor loadings are shown in Table 4.2 below. The scale included 1,074 cases – 13 did not meet inclusion criterion and were dropped. The scale scores ranged from 1 to 7, with an overall scale mean was 5.59 and standard deviation of 0.86. Cronbach's alpha was 0.74.

Table 4.2 Factor Loadings for the Global Self Concept Scale

Items	Factor Loading
Do important things	.37
Like being myself	.34
Proud	.52
Do things as well as others	.61
Good things about me	.61
Good as others	.63
Others think i am good	.48
Do things well	.57
N	1,074
Mean Score	5.59
Alpha	0.74

Chapter 5 – Time Diary Files

The time diary is a unique feature of the CDS design and provides detailed information about activity patterns and time spent with parents, peers, and other individuals. The time diaries provide detailed accounting of the type, number, duration, and location of activities during sampled 24-hour days, beginning at midnight for one randomly sampled weekday and one randomly sampled weekend day. The time diaries additionally collect information on the social context of the activity by specifying with whom the child was doing the activity and who else was present, but not engaging. With child-based weights, the time diaries give a representative national sample of children's activities which are known to provide less biased estimates of time amounts than do self reports of time in particular activities (Juster, Ono and Stafford, 2003Vii). By nature of the CDS design, the rich time diary data can be used with the detailed information in the other CDS modules as a way to examine influences on key developmental outcomes and achievement patterns, and can also be used with PSID data to parcel out the ways in which family characteristics tie into children's activity choices and developmental outcomes.

Just over 2,900 children in CDS-I completed a set of weekday and weekend time diaries, yielding a response rate of 82% in 1997. The PCG completed the diary for the very young children; older child were expected to complete the time diaries with the assistance of the PCG as needed. More information about the time diary data collection can be found in the CDS-I and CDS-II User Guides. The table below gives a brief design summary.

Table 5.1. Summary of the CDS Time Diary Design

Design Features	Description
Sample	CDS sample aged 0-12 in 1997; 5-18 years in 2002/2003
Number of interviews	2,904 children in CDS-I 2,569 children in CDS-II
Response rate	82% in CDS-I 88% in CDS-II
Diary day assignment	One randomly selected weekday and weekend day, beginning at midnight.
Substitution of diary day?	No substitution of days.
Contact Effort	Targeted diary day is fixed; Day of the interview is scheduled at respondent's convenience.
Mode	Diary mailed ahead with interviewer review in person or by tele.
Avg. number of activities	22 activities per diary day, on average in CDS-I 20 activities per diary day, on average in CDS-II

Coding

We utilized the same interviewing procedures and coding protocols for the time use module in both waves of the CDS. For CDS-I, the documentation for the coding procedures and detailed activity codes is available at: <http://psidonline.isr.umich.edu/CDS/questionnaires/codingman.pdf>.

In addition to these variables, the CDS Media Files were made public in 2008. These include data for both CDS-I and CDS-II. The Center for Research on Interactive Technology, Television and Children (CRITC) at the University of Texas at Austin coded the television programs that were reported in the 1997 and 2002 CDS Time Diaries. There are eight variables generated by the media coding project:

- (1) Format (TD97M09, TD02M09);
- (2) Intended Audience (TD97M10, TD02M10);
- (3) Character Age (TD97M11, TD02M11);
- (4) Genre (TD97M12, TD02M12);
- (5) Comedy (TD97M13, TD02M13);
- (6) Science Fiction, Fantasy or Supernatural/Paranormal (SF/F/SP) (TD97M14, TD02M14);
- (7) Curriculum (TD97M15, TD02M15); and
- (8) Violence (TD97M16, TD02M16) of each television program.

The television coding manual and the data files are now available. This document describes the data structure and coding procedures. For more information on the Media Files please see Appendix E of the CDS-II User Guide.

Data Files

The CDS time diary data files are posted on the PSID-CDS Data Center (<http://simba.isr.umich.edu/>), freely accessible to researchers worldwide who are interested in using the data. The data are available at the activity level and aggregate level for both CDS-I and CDS-II.

Time Diary Activity-Level Files

The Time Diary Activity data file is structured at the activity level, meaning one data record per activity (131,060 total activities, for an average of 22 activities per diary). There are three important identifiers in this file: (1) the ID68 (ER30001)-PN (ER30002) combination to identify the child for whom the activity belongs, (2) the “WDAYWEND” to identify if the activity belongs to a weekday or a weekend diary (we reviewed earlier that each child had up to two diaries taken – one for a randomly selected weekday and one for a randomly selected weekend. “T1” specifies the actual day of the week), and (3) the start time of the activity, variable “COLB”. Start and end time are represented in seconds past midnight. The duration of the activities are recorded as amount of time in seconds that the activity took place. The other variables in the data file are few in number – each one representing a column in the time diary grid. For an example of the instrument, see <http://psidonline.isr.umich.edu/CDS/questionnaires/cds-i/english/Tdiary.pdf>. You can print out just a codebook of the file through the Data Center. To do this, simply select the variables through the Data Center, but at the very last step, select “codebook only”. Since the activity codes for columns A and J are so extensive, they are provided in a separate document: <http://psidonline.isr.umich.edu/CDS/questionnaires/codingman.pdf>.

To give a better understanding of how the time diary activity file is structured, take a look at the example data file on the next page. The first 32 rows are activities that span two diaries T1=7 (Sunday) and T1=2 (Tuesday) for child “0004”-“039”. COLA specifies the activity and COLB and COLC specify the start and end time of the activity, respectively. There are 11 activity records for the Sunday diary and 22 activity records for the Tuesday diary. The first data record on the Tuesday diary, for example, shows that child “0004”-“039” was sleeping (activity code 459) from midnight (start time in seconds past midnight=0) to 7:00 AM (end time in seconds past midnight =25200 seconds). The child was not watching television so the variable COLD, activity type, is coded as INAP (0). The child was at home during this activity (COLF=10). Variable COLG_A is coded as INAP (blank) since we did not collect information about with whom the child was engaged in the activity for activities under the personal care category. There are more variables in the data file, but this illustration should get you on the way to understanding the file structure of the Activity file.

Time Diary Data Records for One Sample ID:

TD9768D	TD97PN	T1	COLA	COLB	COLC	COLD	COLF	COLG_A	COLG_B
4	39	2	459	0:00	7:00	0	10	.	.
4	39	2	407	7:00	7:05	0	10	.	.
4	39	2	409	7:05	7:10	0	10	.	.
4	39	2	409	7:10	7:15	0	10	.	.
4	39	2	439	7:15	7:30	0	10	1	0
4	39	2	409	7:30	7:35	0	10	.	.
4	39	2	597	7:35	7:40	0	20	0	0
4	39	2	509	7:40	12:00	0	80	0	0
4	39	2	509	12:00	15:15	0	80	0	0
4	39	2	599	15:15	15:45	0	20	0	0
4	39	2	487	15:45	16:30	0	40	1	0
4	39	2	499	16:30	16:40	0	20	1	0
4	39	2	889	16:40	17:00	0	10	1	0
4	39	2	801	17:00	17:30	0	10	0	0
4	39	2	488	17:30	18:00	0	10	0	0
4	39	2	799	18:00	18:10	0	20	0	0
4	39	2	769	18:10	18:57	0	60	0	0
4	39	2	769	18:57	19:45	0	60	0	0
4	39	2	769	19:45	20:30	0	60	0	0
4	39	2	799	20:30	20:40	0	20	0	0
4	39	2	408	20:40	20:50	0	10	.	.
4	39	2	459	20:50	24:00	0	10	.	.
4	39	7	459	0:00	7:30	0	45	.	.
4	39	7	877	7:30	9:00	0	45	0	1
4	39	7	448	9:00	9:15	0	45	1	0
4	39	7	919	9:15	11:15	1	45	0	1
4	39	7	876	11:15	12:00	0	45	0	0
4	39	7	481	12:00	12:15	0	0	0	0
4	39	7	448	12:15	12:30	0	45	0	1
4	39	7	499	12:30	12:50	0	20	0	1
4	39	7	989	12:50	13:30	0	10	1	0
4	39	7	817	13:30	14:30	0	20	0	1
4	39	7	866	14:30	15:45	0	40	0	0
4	39	7	899	15:45	15:55	0	20	0	1
4	39	7	877	15:55	16:47	0	10	1	0
4	39	7	939	16:47	17:39	0	10	1	0
4	39	7	962	17:39	18:30	0	10	1	0
4	39	7	070	18:30	18:45	0	10	0	0
4	39	7	439	18:45	19:00	0	10	1	0
4	39	7	919	19:00	20:00	2	10	0	0
4	39	7	408	20:00	20:30	0	10	.	.
4	39	7	877	20:30	21:00	0	10	1	0
4	39	7	459	21:00	24:00	0	10	.	.

Time Diary Aggregate Files

In addition to the activity-level file, there is child-level time diary files which “roll-up” individual activities in several ways: at the three-digit code levels, which take all of the time spent in each of the activities and sum them across the diary day and at the two-digit level, which aggregate time per diary day by 39 activity categories. These aggregate files are posted at the child-level, facilitating their use with developmental data from the other CDS modules, including (but not limited to) achievement measures, physical and emotional health assessments, and family environment measures, or with PSID family economic and demographic data.

In the aggregate file, there is one record per child and a variable that will tell you if that child has weekday diary data and another variable that will tell you if the child has weekend diary data. The labeling convention is, as follows:

Variables that begin with “WD” indicate that it is a “weekday” activity; variables that begin with “WE” indicate that it is a “weekend” activity. For CDS-I, the next two components of the variable name is “97”, meaning, data collection year for CDS-I. For the variables that aggregated at the three-digit level, the next four components of the variable name are an underscore (“_”) and the three digit code for the activity. For the variables that roll up the activities at the two-digit level, the next four components of the variable name are “39”, representing 39 categories and the two-digit code for the activity. For example, let’s take a look at our previous example about homework time.

The three-digit aggregate is the sum of all of the specialized homework codes and for weekday, is represented as “WD97_549”: WD97_549 is equal to SUM (of WD975490, WD975491, WD975492, WD975493, WD975494).

The two-digit aggregate that includes homework time is “EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL TRAINING”, code WD973913.

As in the Time Diary Activity-Level file, the duration of the activities are given seconds.

Chapter 6 – Common Core of Data File

The CDS provides information about the schools in which the target children and youth attend in several ways. As described in the CDS-I and CDS-II User Guides, the primary caregivers reported on the target child's current school enrollment, type of school (public or private; home-schooled), tuition and other school-related costs; grade in school, age began kindergarten, program enrollment for gifted youth or for special education, and if child ever repeated a grade or ever dropped out of school. They additionally reported on their involvement in their children's schools and own family processes that encourage academic interests and achievements.

In the Elementary School Teacher interview, the target child's teachers provided some information about the school environment for the elementary-school aged children, including teacher-child relationships, social processes in classrooms, and target children's classroom behaviors.

In 1997, CDS-I included surveys of school administrators to gather more information about the schools that the CDS children attend. In these surveys, we asked school administrators to provide data about school enrollment, staffing, special programs, general climate, revenues and expenditures. About one-third of elementary school administrators responded to the survey. To supplement these administrator interviews, we drew upon school characteristic data collected by the U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD). This approach provides more comprehensive data on the school environment and the school district, helping to minimize missing data points resulting from non-response on the administrator survey, and to provide additional information not collected in the administrator survey.

What is the "CCD"? The CCD is a national database of all public elementary and secondary schools and school districts in the United States. Data are available on the U.S. Department of Education's website. The CCD survey annually collects data about all public elementary and secondary schools, all local education agencies, and all state education agencies throughout the United States. CCD contains three categories of information: general descriptive information on schools and school districts; data on students and staff; and fiscal data.

When we constructed school -identifier linkages between CDS and CCD for CDS-II, we developed a special data collection form to gather all of the information needed to make a proper match with the CCD school listing. Once we had constructed this file, we decided to go back to CDS-I and construct the linkages based on the school contact information available on these children in 1997, although CDS-I project did not intend, at that point, on making linkages to other data sets. Linkages are available for 1,474 CDS-I children out of 1,692 CDSI children in grades K-8 and in public schools (87%).

For CDS, we selected a small sampling of CCD variables of potential interest to the CDS user community, and ones that mapped back to similar measures in the CDS-I administrator interview. These data were selected from the 1996-1997 and 1997-1998 school years for CDS-I (school years were split across CDS-I since data collection began in the spring and finished in the fall of 1997). The variables were extracted from the NCES CCD school universe, school district universe, and financial interviews. Currently, the data for these selected variables are available in the PSID-CDS data center, under the "CDS" grouping.

Table 6.1. NCES CCD Variables available for CDS-I in the PSID-CDS Data Center

CCD Variables	Variable Descriptor
TYPE97	School: Type Code
LOCALE97	School: Locale Code
GSLO97	School: Low Grade Offered
GSHI97	School: High Grade Offered
FTE97	School: Classroom Tchrs Full-Time Equiv
PUPTCH97	School: Pupil Teacher Ratio
FLE97	School: #Free Lunch Elig Students
MEMBER97	School: #Students - Reported Membership
IND97	School: #Amer Indian/Alaskan Students
ASIAN97	School: #Asian/Pacific Islander Students
HISP97	School: #Hispanic Students
BLACK97	School: #Black Non-Hispanic Students
WHITE97	School: #White Non-Hispanic Students
TOTDPL97	Schl Dist: Tot Diploma Recipients (Calc)
OTHCOM97	Schl Dist: Tot Other HS Completers
DSTMEM97	Schl Dist: Tot Student Membership (Calc)
DRP1297	Schl Dist: Tot 12th Grd Dropout Rate
DRP71297	Schl Dist: Tot 7-12th Grd Dropout Rate
DRP91297	Schl Dist: Tot 9-12th Grd Dropout Rate
NCES_YR	CDS Constructed: NCES data: 1=96/97;2=97/98

We additionally have an “ID Map” under sensitive data contract whereby users can extract additional CCD information for the CDS sample. This map provides the CDS identifiers along with the NCES CCD school and school district identifiers for the school that the CDS child or youth attended during the CDS-I and CDS-II interview.

End Notes

ⁱ <http://psidonline.isr.umich.edu/Publications/Bibliography>

ⁱⁱ Achenbach, T., & Edelbrock, C. (1981). Behavioral problems and competencies reported by parents of normal and disturbed children aged four through sixteen. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 46(1), No. 188. pp. 82.

ⁱⁱⁱ Peterson, J. L., & Zill, N. (1986). Marital disruption, parent-child relationships, and behavioral problems in children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48(2), 295-307.

^{iv} Polit, D. (1998). *The Positive Behavior Scale*. Saratoga Springs, NY: Humanalysis.

^v Kessler, R.C., Barker, P.R., Colpe, L.J., Epstein, J.F., Gfroerer, J.C., Hiripi, E., Howes, M.J., Normand, S-L., T., Manderscheid, R. W., Walters, E.E., Zaslavsky, A.M. (2003). Screening for serious mental illness in the general population. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 60(2), 184-189.

^{vi} Eccles, J., Wigfield, A., Harold, R.D., & Blumfield, P., (1993). Age and gender difference in children's self-and task perceptions during elementary school. *Child Development*, 64, 830-847.