

U.S. Department of Labor
Bureau of Labor Statistics

NLSY97 Round 2 Data Release

The round 2 NLSY97 main file data are now available to interested researchers. The National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997 cohort includes 8,984 respondents aged 12 to 16 as of December 31, 1996. Of these, 8,386 sample members (93.3 percent) were interviewed in round 2. Surveyed respondents included 6,279 members (93.0 percent) of the cross-sectional sample and 2,107 members (94.2 percent) of the supplemental sample of black and Hispanic youths.

This article briefly describes changes in the survey instruments between the round 1 and round 2 interviews. It then discusses key differences in content and provides information about the data and documentation available.

Round 2 survey instruments

The round 2 youth questionnaire, the main source of data in this round, was similar in structure and content to the round 1 instrument. The questionnaire asked the NLSY97 youths about a variety of topics, including education, employment, health, marriage, fertility, income, assets, and program participation. Both youth questionnaires also included a substantial self-administered section that collected information about substance use, relationships, and criminal activity.

Two round 1 instruments—the screener, household roster, and nonresident roster questionnaire and the parent questionnaire—were not used in the round 2 survey. Because the sample had already been selected, it was not necessary to administer the screener instrument in round 2. Further, the survey design did not require an interview of one of the youth's resident parents.

Some of the topics in these instruments were incorporated into the youth questionnaire for round 2. The round 1 screener,

household roster, and nonresident roster questionnaire asked about other members of the respondent's household and nonresident relatives of the youth. Demographic information about household residents was updated in the household information section of the round 2 youth questionnaire. In general, nonresident relative information was not collected in round 2; the only questions on this topic appearing in the youth questionnaire relate to biological parents living elsewhere.

The round 1 parent questionnaire included questions about the experiences, behaviors, and attitudes of the responding resident parent and his or her spouse or partner. In addition, this instrument collected data about the youth's residential and educational history and asked an extensive series of questions about the youth's past and present health conditions. Topics from this instrument included in the round 2 youth questionnaire are the youth's residential and educational history since the date of the last interview.

The round 2 interview also included a new instrument. The household income update, a one-page questionnaire completed by one of the youth's parents, gathered basic income information about the respondent's parent and his or her spouse or partner. This new instrument captures some data collected in the round 1 parent questionnaire.

The remainder of this article focuses on the youth instruments from rounds 1 and 2.

Round 2 questionnaire content

The round 2 youth questionnaire repeated many core modules from the round 1 instrument. The sections on the youth's employment, training, marriage, and fertility were very similar to those in round 1; the main changes involved the addition of questions verifying the round 1 information. The self-administered portion of the questionnaire underwent comparable modifications to permit verification of round 1 information. The round

2 program participation section was similar to that used for round 1, but with a shortened list of programs asked about individually. Finally, the PIAT math assessment was repeated, although the universe of eligible respondents was limited to those who were 12 years old on December 31, 1996, and who had been in 9th grade or lower in round 1.

More significant changes were made to the following sections: schooling, time use, health, and income. Rather than focusing only on the current school, the schooling section was expanded to ask about all schools attended since the round 1 interview date, using an event history format. These changes are described in detail in issue 101 of the *NLS News* and in the *NLSY97 User's Guide*.

The time use section was significantly shortened for round 2. In round 1, the time use module contained a series of questions for younger respondents about the time they spent during a typical week doing homework (if enrolled), taking extra classes or lessons, watching TV, and reading for pleasure. These questions were not included in round 2. Retained for round 2 was the series of questions about how older respondents who were not enrolled in school or employed spent their time in a typical week.

Similarly, a number of questions in the health section were eliminated from the round 2 questionnaire. Dropped questions include the source of the youth's health insurance (asked only of youths not living with a parent or guardian in round 1) and the youth's health-related beliefs and behaviors (asked only of respondents aged 13 as of December 31, 1996). The three health questions that remain ask about the youth's general health status, height, and weight.

Finally, the round 1 income section was divided for the round 2 survey, so that questions about income were located in a section separate from those on assets. Most of the content in the two divided sections was

similar to that of the combined round 1 section. More information about the assets questions can be found in a separate article in this newsletter.

One module was entirely new to the youth interview in round 2. The household information section, the first section of the questionnaire, was similar to the round 1 household roster and asked the youth to update data on his or her household members.

To compensate for the additional time needed for the longer schooling section and the new household interview section, several round 1 modules were dropped in round 2. Among these were the current labor force status (CPS), expectations, and peers sections.

NLSY97 data and documentation

The NLSY97 main file data are available to researchers on a CD-ROM. In addition to the data, each CD-ROM contains documentation and search and retrieval software. The NLSY97 CD includes the data collected in the round 2 survey, as well as a number of created variables. This file also contains all data and created variables from round 1, so that researchers can easily examine the longitudinal record of a respondent.

Supplemental documents, such as questionnaires and interviewer reference manuals, are distributed with each CD-ROM. Also available to researchers is the 2000 edition of the *NLSY97 User's Guide*. This guide explains the selection of the NLSY79 sample, describes the contents of the data set, and provides helpful information for researchers using the data. The 2000 edition updates the previous NLSY97 guide with information about the round 2 survey, and includes new information on effectively using this complex data set.

Researchers interested in obtaining the main file data, *NLSY97 User's Guide*, or any accompanying documentation should contact NLS User Services. (See the back of this newsletter for contact information.) □

Asset and Debt Questions in the NLSY97

The accumulation of assets and the accrual of debts are important research topics, with effects on many areas of the economy. Although the wealth holdings of NLSY97 youths are not large because the cohort is fairly young, the survey includes detailed

questions about assets and debts so that researchers will have an accurate picture of changes over time.

This article describes the assets questions in the NLSY97 youth questionnaire for rounds 1 and 2. While many questions are similar, there are also some important differences of which researchers should be aware. Examined first are changes in the overall structure of the section; the article then discusses specific asset and debt questions and differences across rounds.

In both rounds, the asset and debt questions were addressed only to independent youths: those who have had a child, are enrolled in a 4-year college, have ever been married or are in a marriage-like relationship at the time of the survey, are no longer enrolled in school, are not living with any parents or parent-figures, or are at least 18 years old by the survey date. This universe restriction meant that 429 respondents were eligible to answer assets questions in round 1 and 1,835 went through the section in round 2.

Questions in both rounds referred to the respondent and his or her spouse or partner. Assets held or debts owed by other household members are not reported. If the youth was living with a parent at the time of the round 1 survey and a parent interview was completed, these respondent-specific data can be supplemented with asset data provided by the responding parent. Parent data are not described in this article; interested researchers should consult the *NLSY97 User's Guide* for details.

Structural changes

Users should first note that the asset and debt questions were moved into their own section in round 2, rather than constituting part of the income section as in round 1. This primarily means that the question names begin with "YAST" in round 2, instead of "YINC," as in round 1; the actual content and structure of the section is still much like round 1. To simplify the explanation, this article refers to the series of asset questions in both rounds as the assets section.

In addition, the collection of information about the value of an asset or the amount of a debt was modified to improve the precision of the reports. In round 1, respondents were first asked to state the value of an asset or debt; if they did not know or refused to answer, they were given a card with a list of predetermined ranges and asked to select the appropriate range. This procedure was modi-

fied in round 2. Respondents who did not provide an actual amount for a given asset or debt were then asked to specify their own range for the value. They were asked to select a range from a predetermined list only if they were unable either to provide an actual value or to specify their own range.

Finally, the round 2 questionnaire contained a number of new questions intended to capture changes in the youth's situation since the round 1 interview. For example, if the youth had owned his or her residence at the time of the last interview but did not own the residence at the round 2 interview date, the survey asked for information about the date on which the residence was sold and the amount of money received from the sale. These new questions are described later in this article.

Asset data

Residence information. An important focus of the assets section is ownership of the respondent's residence. These questions were split into three groups, depending on whether the respondent lives on a farm, in a mobile home, or in another type of dwelling such as a house or apartment.

Respondents in each of these universes then answered a set of questions tailored to their particular situation. For those living on farms, the data collection included the present value of the entire farm, the percentage of the farm owned by the respondent and his or her spouse or partner, and the present value of just that portion. If respondents lived in mobile homes, they first reported whether they owned both the home and the lot, the home only, or the lot only. The survey then asked for the present value of the part owned by the respondent. Finally, the questions for respondents in other types of residences, including houses or apartments, asked whether the residence was part of a condominium or cooperative association, whether it was in a multi-unit building, whether the respondent owned the entire building or just the residential unit, and the present value of whatever portion the respondent owned.

In round 2, the specific questions for each type of residence were followed by a series for respondents who had experienced a change in their ownership situation, such as buying or selling a portion of the farm, buying or selling the entire property, or receiving all or part of the property as a gift or inheritance. These respondents reported the

amount received from the sale, the amount spent for the purchase, or the value of the property when it was received as a gift.

Respondents who owned their residences answered a series of questions about mortgages or loans for the property; these data are described in the section on debts below. These respondents also stated whether they had improved or remodeled the property since the date of the last interview or the date on which they assumed ownership. If so, the respondent estimated the amount of money spent on improvements. Finally, respondents owning their residence stated how much they paid in property taxes in the previous calendar year and how much they paid for utilities in an average month.

If the respondent rented the residence, the survey asked him or her to report the amount of rent paid each month. Like homeowners, these respondents also stated how much they spent on utilities in an average month.

Users should note that, in the round 2 questionnaire, there are a number of question paths within each of these categories for different universes of respondents. Respondents are generally categorized based on their residence status at the time of the round 1 interview and changes in that status for round 2. Researchers may need to combine several questions to get information about, for example, the present value of all mobile homes owned by respondents or the purchase price of houses bought since the previous interview.

Other assets. After collecting these extensive data about the respondents' residences, the questionnaires for both rounds 1 and 2 moved on to other assets held by respondents and their spouses or partners. For each of the following types of assets, respondents reported the present value of the asset or the amount of money in the account:

- business or professional practice
- other real estate
- pension or retirement account
- checking account, savings account, or money market fund
- certificates of deposit (CDs), bonds, or bills
- stock or mutual fund shares
- vehicles
- household furnishings (respondent chose range from a predetermined list)
- other assets

The round 2 questionnaire included a number of additional questions aimed at determining changes in asset values since the previous interview. If the respondent owned a business or professional practice, a follow-up question asked whether he or she had invested more money in the business or sold part of the business since the last interview. In either case, the respondent was asked to state the amount of the investment or sale. Similar questions asked about the value of additional real estate that had been bought or sold. Further, respondents were asked to report changes in the amount of money in pension or retirement accounts; checking, savings, or money market accounts; certificates of deposit, bonds, or bills; stocks or mutual fund holdings; and other assets.

A pair of questions new to the round 2 survey asked specifically about assets held by the respondent's spouse or partner. The first question was addressed only to respondents who had started the relationship since the round 1 interview date. In response to this question, the respondent stated the value of all of the spouse's or partner's assets at the time their relationship began. The second question, addressed to all respondents, asked the respondent to estimate the value of any assets held solely by the spouse or partner (assets in which the respondent had no interest).

Although a large number of questions are included in the survey, researchers should keep in mind that the NLSY97 respondents are still fairly young, and most have not yet accumulated significant asset holdings. Table 1 provides researchers with an indication of the amount of information available for several major asset categories. Because asset data will continue to be collected as the cohort ages, researchers will be able to track the acquisition of assets over time.

Information about debts

As with assets, much of the data on respondents' debts focused on residences. Respondents who owned their residences answered a series of questions about loans owed on the farm, mobile home, house, or apartment. Separate questions asked about the amount owed on a mortgage or land contract, a loan from a friend or family member to purchase or remodel the residence, and any other loan using the property as collateral, such as a second mortgage or home equity line of credit. Those who had received a loan from a friend or family member also reported their relationship to that person and the initial amount of the loan.

In the section on automobiles, respondents reported the total amount still owed on all of their vehicles. The survey next asked respondents about any loans of at least \$200 from family and friends. If a respondent reported such a loan, follow-up questions determined the relationship of the lender to the respondent, the amount loaned, and the amount still owed. This information was collected for up to five loans. Finally, the respondent provided the total amount of any other debts, including bank loans, margin loans, other installment loans, or credit cards not paid off in full each month.

For more information

Researchers who want additional details about the asset data collection are encouraged to read the description in the *NLSY97 User's Guide* and to examine the questionnaires. Asset questions for both rounds 1 and 2 can be easily located on the CD-ROM by searching for the "Assets & Debts" area of interest. To obtain the user's guide, questionnaires, or CD-ROM, interested researchers should contact NLS User Services at the address on the back of this newsletter. □

Table 1. NLSY97 respondents reporting asset ownership

Assets	Round 1	Round 2
Total respondents eligible to answer assets section	429	1,835
Respondent or spouse/partner:		
Owns house, apartment, or mobile home	88	68
Has checking, savings, or money market accounts	69	526
Has savings bonds, bills, or CDs	21	95
Has stock or mutual funds	6	29
Owns vehicle	51	420

NLSY79 Reciprocity Data

As politicians implement welfare reform and researchers evaluate the effects of the changes, receipt of public assistance has become an important issue for both academics and the general public. Recognizing this growing interest, investigators for the NLSY79 have taken steps to improve the collection of public assistance data and to make these data more accessible to researchers. This article first reviews the information collected in the various NLSY79 surveys and then discusses a series of created variables that provide researchers with a complete history of a respondent's participation in government assistance programs.

Interview data

Every NLSY79 interview has collected information about the receipt of government assistance. These questions can be divided into two basic categories: those asked in paper-and-pencil interview (PAPI) years—1979 through 1992—and those included in the computer-assisted personal interviews (CAPI), conducted in 1993–98. Each survey asked detailed questions about money received by the respondent and his or her spouse and more general questions about other members of the household.

1979–92 interviews. The basic information gathered in these surveys focused on receipt of five types of assistance: Unemployment compensation, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Supplemental Security Insurance (SSI), Food Stamps, and other government assistance. The unemployment compensation data were collected separately for the respondent and his or her spouse. If either had received unemployment benefits in the calendar year before the survey, the respondent reported the months in which payments were received, the total number of weeks for which benefits were received, and the average amount received per week. For example, the 1979 survey asked about calendar year 1978 and the 1980 survey collected information about benefits received during calendar year 1979.

For the remaining assistance programs, respondents reported benefits received by themselves and their spouses together; the series of questions was not asked separately. Respondents first stated whether they had received any AFDC benefits in the previous calendar year. If so, the survey asked about

which months they received benefits and the average amount of money received per month. This series of questions was repeated for Food Stamps and SSI. In 1979 and 1985–92, the SSI questions also asked about income from other public assistance programs; in 1980–84, SSI and other programs were separated into two series.

After answering detailed questions about benefits that they and their spouses had received, respondents provided general information about benefit receipt by other family members. In every survey, respondents answered a series of yes/no questions about whether any family member living in the same household had received assistance in the previous calendar year from AFDC, other public assistance, unemployment or worker's compensation, Social Security, or veteran's compensation. If any benefits had been received from any of these sources, the respondent then stated the total amount received by adult family members from all sources. In 1979–84 and 1990–92, a similar series of yes/no questions recorded the sources from which the respondent's opposite-sex partner had received payments.

Finally, every survey asked whether the respondent, his or her spouse, or any family member in the household lived in public housing or received government rent subsidies during the previous calendar year. In 1979–84, public housing and rent subsidies were addressed in two separate questions; in all other surveys, they were addressed in a single question. The amount of assistance received through these programs was not collected.

1993–98 interviews. In 1993, the instruments began collecting public assistance information in an event history format, which captures spells of assistance since the respondent's last interview. In this format, the respondent does not list the months in the previous calendar year during which assistance was received, but instead provides the beginning and ending dates of each spell of assistance. This methodology reduces interview time and provides a more seamless record of reciprocity.

In addition, event history format reduces the amount of missing data. During the 1979–92 survey years, if a respondent missed a survey, information that would have been collected about the previous calendar year was never recovered. However, because the event history format refers to the period

since the respondent's last interview, there are no gaps in information due to missed interviews.

The actual assistance questions in the 1993–98 interviews remain fairly comparable to those in the prior data collections. In each survey, respondents answer questions about their own unemployment compensation, their spouses' unemployment compensation, and respondent and spouse AFDC benefits, SSI or other public assistance, and Food Stamps. Beginning in 1994, questions about spouses also apply to partners; there is no distinction between the two relationships in the income section.

Like the 1979–92 interviews, the 1993–98 surveys included the collection of general information about others in the respondent's family. The 1993–98 surveys contained the same series of questions as the earlier surveys about receipt of benefits by family members. The 1993–98 interviews then asked, in a single question, whether the respondent or his or her family lived in public housing or received government rent subsidies. In 1998, a follow-up question asked about the source of the subsidy. Users should note that all family member questions continue the prior pattern of referring to the previous calendar year, rather than to the period since the date of the previous interview.

The 1993 survey also repeated the series of questions from the prior interviews referring to the respondent's opposite-sex partner. As mentioned above, partner information collected after 1993 used the same series of questions as spouse information, so this separate set was no longer necessary.

A second key shift in public assistance questions occurred in 1998. After Congress enacted welfare reform, it was necessary to redesign some questions so that they would continue to reflect respondents' situations. AFDC questions were changed to ask about not only AFDC but also other general cash assistance, including Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). A new series of questions then asked whether the respondent, his or her spouse, or dependent children had received any targeted cash benefits.

In 1998, an additional set of questions was included to solicit information on the effects of welfare reform on respondents' assistance-seeking behavior and on actions taken to retain assistance. Respondents reporting AFDC or SSI/other public assistance were asked whether they had sought work,

enrolled in training or school, or performed community service in response to changing requirements. Respondents not reporting these types of assistance, but reporting an income of 125 percent of the poverty level or less, were asked whether they had applied for assistance, why they had not received any, and if and how the welfare reform changes had affected them.

Created reciprocity history

To simplify use of the public assistance variables, survey staff have created a history of participation in government programs for each respondent. These created variables, which capture respondents' public assistance participation from January 1978 forward, were first included on the 1996 data release and are present in each subsequent release. For each respondent, a series of variables details the following types of program participation:

- Unemployment compensation received by the respondent
- Unemployment compensation received by the spouse
- AFDC/TANF received by the respondent/spouse
- SSI or other public assistance received by the respondent/spouse
- Food Stamps received by the respondent/spouse

For each of these five categories, the first variable indicates the amount of money received each month beginning in January 1978. (For unemployment compensation, this variable reports the average weekly amount received in that month.) A set of cumulative variables reports the total amount of each type of assistance received during each calendar year. Finally, a second group of cumulative variables totals the benefits received in each year from AFDC/TANF, Food Stamps, SSI, and other public assistance combined.

For example, a respondent may have received unemployment compensation during the first half of 1978 and then received AFDC benefits and Food Stamps during the second half of the year. Six variables, one for each month from January through June 1978, would capture the average weekly amount of unemployment compensation received in each of those months. Comparable variables for AFDC and Food Stamps would have a value of -4, or valid skip, because the

respondent did not receive these benefits in January through June. (A value of 0 indicates that the respondent reported receiving the benefits but then stated the amount received as zero dollars.) For July through December, six monthly variables would provide the amount of AFDC received, and six more would report the value of Food Stamps received each month. The unemployment compensation variables for this period would have a value of -4. All spouse unemployment variables and SSI/other public assistance variables for 1978 would also have a value of -4, because the respondent did not report these benefits. Finally, cumulative yearly variables would indicate the total amount of unemployment compensation received, the total amount of AFDC benefits received, the total value of Food Stamps received, and the total value of AFDC benefits and Food Stamps combined. Similar variables would report receipt or nonreceipt in each subsequent year.

The switch from a monthly to event history format has important implications for the reciprocity history variables. In the 1979-92 surveys, respondents were asked to report only benefits received from government programs during the calendar year prior to the survey. If a respondent skipped an interview, the data for the previous calendar year would be missing. Because the event history format involves the collection of information back to the date of the last interview, respondents who miss one or more of the post-1992 interview years and are later reinterviewed will still have complete information available. Therefore, complete created reciprocity histories are available for respondents who were interviewed in every year from 1979-92 and in the most recent survey.

Finally, users should be aware that survey staff performed some editing of responses during the creation of the reciprocity history variables. Edits performed on a given variable are reported in the data set through a series of edit flags. Similarly, fill flags indicate the year in which the data for a given variable were collected. The meanings of the various flags are described in detail in appendix 15 of the *NLSY79 Codebook Supplement*, available from NLS User Services.

For more information

Interested researchers can obtain further details about public assistance data by reading the "Poverty Status and Public Assis-

tance Support Sources" section of the *NLSY79 User's Guide* and appendix 15 in the *NLSY79 Codebook Supplement*. Users are also encouraged to examine the exact questions in each survey's questionnaire and to browse through the data on the CD-ROM. Most public assistance data collected during the interviews are located in the "Income" area of interest, although some variables are found in the "MXXVAR" areas of interest (where "XX" indicates a given survey year). The "Recip_Month" and "Recip_Year" areas of interest contain the created event history variables.

The NLSY79 data CD-ROM and the documentation items mentioned above can be obtained from NLS User Services. Contact information is provided on the back of this newsletter. □

Frequently Asked Questions

NLS User Services encourages researchers to contact them with questions and problems they have encountered while accessing and using NLS data and/or documentation. Every effort is made to answer these inquiries. Some recently asked questions that may be of general interest to NLS users are listed below, with their answers.

Q1: Does the variable for the total amount of welfare received in 1979 (R01699.14) refer to the entire household or only to the respondent?

A1: Like most income data, this variable is for the respondent and his or her spouse, and it does not include the other household members. Because detailed data were collected only for the respondent and his or her spouse in most survey years, most created variables include income from only those two people. The major exception is "Total Net Family Income," which includes the respondent, spouse, and other family members.

For each created income variable, researchers can determine whose information is used by looking at the text of the questions used in creating the variable. For example, the variable indicating the total amount of welfare received in 1978 is based on a series of variables such as "Average Monthly Income from AFDC Received by R/Spouse in Past Calendar Year 79" (R01608.). The question for this variable reads, "During 1978, how much did you (or your (husband/

wife)) receive per month on the average from AFDC,” indicating that information for the respondent and his or her spouse is used and other household members are excluded.

Q2: I'm working with NLSY79 income variables, and I notice that, in many cases, there seem to be an unusual number of people with the maximum value. For example, the 1998 variable "Total Income from Wages and Salary in Past Calendar Year (Trunc)" (R63646.) lists 120 respondents with an income of \$163,158, the maximum value for that variable. Is there a simple explanation for this grouping at the maximum?

A2: Because the NLS surveys collect so much detailed information, we topcode high income values to prevent identification of individual respondents. For many income variables, all values over a certain cutoff point each year are assigned the same maximum value. Prior to 1989, the truncation value was set to a predetermined limit. This means, for example, that if the set maximum value was \$100,000, every respondent with a higher income would have \$100,000 substituted for his or her actual income. Starting in 1989, a mean truncation value was computed using the values from all cases that exceeded the maximum limit. For example, the maximum of \$163,158 in the 1998 variable mentioned above is the average income of the 120 respondents whose incomes were topcoded. This new method allows the overall mean for the entire cohort to be accurately reported while still protecting respondents' privacy.

Q3: My understanding is that, at some point in the early 1990s, the NLSY79 surveys stopped asking questions about fertility and collected information only about births. Is this correct, and when did the change occur? We're interested in information for every pregnancy of all women: when it started, when it ended, how it ended, and prenatal care obtained.

A3: The pregnancy history questions changed in 1992. Prior to 1992, female respondents were asked to report about each pregnancy since the last fertility questions were asked. These questions included prenatal care, sonograms or amniocentesis, substance use, and how the pregnancy ended. Beginning in 1992, female respondents were asked detailed questions only about pregnancies that

ended in a live birth. For other pregnancies, only the total number and the date and month of pregnancy when the first one ended are collected. Although the total number of pregnancies can be determined, the outcome of a pregnancy is not recorded if it ended in other than a live birth. However, in each survey, female respondents fill out a brief, self-administered questionnaire that asks for the date of each abortion since the last interview. This information cannot be linked to a specific pregnancy reported in the main section of the questionnaire, but researchers may be able to infer the outcomes of a respondent's pregnancies using this abortion information.

Researchers should also note that there is a series of created variables in the FERTILE area of interest that counts the number of children, number of miscarriages or stillbirths, and number of abortions since the last interview. The fertility section of the NLSY79 User's Guide contains more information about these data.

Q4: One variable we are using is "# of Own Children in the Household," a variable created for most surveys of the NLSY79. There is no such variable created for 1993, so we would like to create our own from the household roster. So that our variable is comparable, could you tell us what relationships are included in this variable?

A4: If you want to construct an analogous variable for the NLSY79 in 1993, the relationship codes to use are 2 (son), 3 (daughter), 20 (step- or adopted son), and 21 (step- or adopted daughter). When we construct this variable for each round, we do check the out-of-range cases and hand edit if necessary. (This variable was not created in 1993 due to changes in the fertility section of the survey.)

In 1998, we changed this title for all survey years to make the definition of this variable clearer; the new title is "Number of Bio/Step/Adopted Children in HH."

Q5: I am using some young adult variables from the 1996 Children of the NLSY79 young adult survey. These variables should have only codes 0 and 1, but there also are cases with code 96. Is this a valid value?

A5: You are looking at variables from the young adult self-report booklet, which most

respondents complete without assistance from the interviewer. Survey staff make every effort to represent the answers exactly as they are provided by respondents, even if the responses are out of the expected range or are confusing in some way. The 96 codes on these variables mean that both the "yes" and "no" responses to a given question were circled; -3 would mean that no response was given. □

Completed NLS Research

The following is a listing of recent research based on data from the NLS cohorts that has not appeared in its current form in a previous issue of the *NLS News*. See the online NLS Annotated Bibliography at <http://www.nlsbibliography.org> for a comprehensive listing.

Arum, R. and Beattie, I.R. "High School Experience and the Risk of Adult Incarceration." *Criminology* Vol. 37, No. 3, pp. 515-39, August 1999. [NLSY79]

Augurzky, Boris. "What Are College Degrees Worth? Evidence from the NLSY79 Using Matching Methods." Discussion Paper No. 299, Department of Economics, University of Heidelberg (Germany), August 1999. [NLSY79]

Bullers, Susan. "Selection Effects in the Relationship between Women's Work/Family Status and Perceived Control." *Family Relations* Vol. 48, No. 2, pp. 181-88, April 1999. [Young Women]

Caputo, Richard K. "Age-Condensed and Age-Gapped Families: Coresidency with Elderly Parents and Relatives in a Mature Women's Cohort, 1967-1995." *Marriage and Family Review* Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 77-95, Spring 1999. [Mature Women]

Dougherty, Christopher. "Occupational Breaks, Their Incidence and Implications for Training Provision Case-Study: Evidence from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth." *International Journal of Manpower* Vol. 20, No. 5, pp. 309-23, 1999. [NLSY79]

Dynarski, Susan M. "Does Aid Matter? Measuring the Effect of Student Aid on College Attendance and Completion." NBER Working Paper No. 7422, National Bureau

- of Economic Research, November 1999. [NLSY79]
- Ewing, Bradley T. and Payne, James E. "The Trade-Off between Supervision and Wages: Evidence of Efficiency Wages from the NLSY." *Southern Economic Journal* Vol. 66, No. 2, pp. 424-32, October 1999. [NLSY79]
- Ginther, Donna K. "Alternative Estimates of the Effect of Schooling on Earnings." *Review of Economics and Statistics* Vol. 82, No. 1, pp. 103-16, February 2000. [NLSY79]
- Glaeser, Edward L. and Sacerdote, Bruce. "Why Is There More Crime in Cities?" *Journal of Political Economy* Vol. 107, No. 6, Part 2, pp. S225-S258, December 1999. [NLSY79]
- Hamermesh, Daniel S. "The Changing Distribution of Job Satisfaction." NBER Working Paper No. 7332, National Bureau of Economic Research, September 1999. [Young Men, NLSY79]
- Hart, Daniel; Atkins, Robert; and Ford, Debra. "Family Influences on the Formation of Moral Identity in Adolescence: Longitudinal Analyses." *Journal of Moral Education* Vol. 28, No. 3, pp. 375-86, September 1999. [NLSY79 Children]
- Haveman, Robert and Knight, Brian. "Youth Living Arrangements, Economic Independence, and the Role of Labor Market Changes: A Cohort Analysis from the Early 1970s to the Late 1980s." Discussion Paper No. 1201-99, Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin-Madison, November 1999. [Young Men, Young Women, NLSY79]
- Keith, Kristen and McWilliams, Abigail. "The Returns to Mobility and Job Search by Gender." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* Vol. 52, No. 3, pp. 460-77, April 1999. [NLSY79]
- Levine, Phillip B. and Zimmerman, David J. "An Empirical Analysis of the Welfare Mag-
- net Debate Using the NLSY." *Journal of Population Economics* Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 391-409, August 1999. [NLSY79]
- Mitra, Aparna. "The Allocation of Blacks in Large Firms and Establishments and Black-White Wage Inequality in the U.S. Economy." *Sociological Inquiry* Vol. 69, No. 3, pp. 382-403, August 1999. [NLSY79]
- Morrison, Donna Ruane and Coiro, Mary Jo. "Parental Conflict and Marital Disruption: Do Children Benefit When High-Conflict Marriages Are Dissolved?" *Journal of Marriage and the Family* Vol. 61, No. 3, pp. 626-37, August 1999. [NLSY79 Children]
- Mulligan, Casey B. "Galton versus the Human Capital Approach to Inheritance." *Journal of Political Economy* Vol. 107, No. 6, Part 2, pp. S184-S224, December 1999. [NLSY79]
- Murnane, Richard J.; Willett, John B.; and Boudett, Kathryn Parker. "Do Male Dropouts Benefit from Obtaining a GED, Postsecondary Education, and Training?" *Evaluation Review* Vol. 23, No. 5, pp. 475-503, October 1999. [NLSY79]
- Parent, Daniel. "Methods of Pay and Earnings: A Longitudinal Analysis." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* Vol. 53, No. 1, pp. 71-86, October 1999. [NLSY79]
- Pergamit, Michael R. and Veum, Jonathan R. "What Is a Promotion?" *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* Vol. 52, No. 4, pp. 581-601, July 1999. [NLSY79]
- Ribar, David C. "The Socioeconomic Consequences of Young Women's Childbearing: Reconciling Disparate Evidence." *Journal of Population Economics* Vol. 12, No. 4, pp. 547-65, November 1999. [NLSY79]
- Rich, Lauren M. and Kim, Sun-Bin. "Patterns of Later Life Education among Teenage Mothers." *Gender & Society* Vol. 13, No. 6, pp. 798-817, December 1999. [NLSY79]
- Rosenzweig, Mark R. "Welfare, Marital Prospects, and Nonmarital Childbearing." *Journal of Political Economy* Vol. 107, No. 6, Part 2, pp. S3-S32, December 1999. [NLSY79]
- Rowe, David C.; Vesterdal, Wendy J.; and Rodgers, Joseph L. "Hernstein's Syllogism: Genetic and Shared Environmental Influences on IQ, Education, and Income." *Intelligence* Vol. 26, No. 4, pp. 405-23, 1999. [NLSY79]
- Sandefur, Gary D. and Wells, Thomas. "Does Family Structure Really Influence Educational Attainment?" *Social Science Research* Vol. 28, No. 4, pp. 331-57, December 1999. [NLSY79]
- Strauss, Richard S. "Childhood Obesity and Self-Esteem." *Pediatrics* Vol. 105, No. 1, pp. N1-N5, January 2000. [NLSY79 Children]
- Taniguchi, Hiromi. "The Timing of Childbearing and Women's Wages." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* Vol. 61, No. 4, pp. 1008-19, November 1999. [Young Women]
- Tanner, Julian; Davies, Scott; and O'Grady, Bill. "Whatever Happened to Yesterday's Rebels? Longitudinal Effects of Youth Delinquency on Education and Employment." *Social Problems* Vol. 46, No. 2, pp. 250-74, May 1999. [NLSY79]
- Valentine, Sean. "Locus of Control as a Dispositional Determinant of Men's Traditional Sex-Role Attitudes." *Psychological Reports* Vol. 85, No. 3, pp. 1041-44, December 1999. [NLSY79]
- Yankow, Jeffrey J. "The Wage Dynamics of Internal Migration within the United States." *Eastern Economic Journal* Vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 265-78, Summer 1999. [NLSY79]
- Yates, Julie A. and Rothstein, Donna S. "The Newest National Longitudinal Survey: The National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, 1997." *Industrial Relations* Vol. 38, No. 4, pp. 604-10, October 1999. [NLSY97] □

FIRST CLASS MAIL
Postage and Fees Paid
U.S. Department of Labor
Permit No. G-738

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Bureau of Labor Statistics
Postal Square Building, Rm 2850
2 Massachusetts Ave., NE
Washington, DC 20212-0001

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use, \$300
Address Service Requested



NLS Contact Information

NLS News is published quarterly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It is distributed both nationwide and abroad without charge to researchers using NLS data, as well as to other interested persons.

NLS User Services:	Center for Human Resource Research The Ohio State University 921 Chatham Lane, Suite 100 Columbus, Ohio 43221-2418 usersvc@postoffice.chrr.ohio-state.edu (614) 442-7366 (614) 442-7329 (Fax)	NLS documentation, data, and data updates:	usersvc@postoffice.chrr.ohio- state.edu
		NLS web site:	http://stats.bls.gov/nlshome.htm
		BLS-NLS publications:	Jain_Rita@bls.gov (202) 691-7405
NLS Program Office:	National Longitudinal Surveys 2 Massachusetts Avenue, NE Room 4945 Washington, DC 20212-0001 Attention: Rita Jain NLS_INFO@bls.gov (202) 691-7405 (202) 691-6425 (Fax)	NLS News Editor:	Donna S. Rothstein Rothstein_D@bls.gov
		NLS Program Director and Media Contact:	Michael W. Horrigan Horrigan_M@bls.gov (202) 691-7386