# National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health

# Wave III Education Data Academic Networks Codebook

Chandra Muller, Jennifer Pearson, Catherine Riegle-Crumb, Jennifer Harris Requejo, Kenneth A. Frank, Kathryn S. Schiller, R. Kelly Raley, Amy G. Langenkamp, Sarah Crissey, Anna Strassmann Mueller, Rebecca Callahan, Lindsey Wilkinson, and Samuel Field



Carolina Population Center University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

March 2007

This research was funded by a grant from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development under grant R01 HD40428-02 to the Population Research Center, University of Texas at Austin; Chandra Muller (PI) and the National Science Foundation grant number REC-0126167, Chandra Muller (PI). Persons interested in obtaining data files from Add Health should contact Add Health, Carolina Population Center, 123 W. Franklin Street, Chapel Hill, NC 27516-2524 (addhealth@unc.edu).

# WAVE III EDUCATION DATA ACADEMIC NETWORKS COMPONENT

#### I. INTRODUCTION

# A. Component Description

The large within-school samples of Add Health allow for the construction of social network measures based on student course-taking patterns. The AHAA website, <a href="http://www.prc.utexas.edu/ahaa/">http://www.prc.utexas.edu/ahaa/</a>, provides up-to-date information about the types of AHAA Academic Networks component data files. This website also lists background materials concerning social network theory and its application to education research, as well as recent publications based on Academic Networks and other types of AHAA data.

# B. Summary of Indicators

# 1. Course Overlap

One set of Academic Networks variables consists of course-overlap measures, which are currently available in the **educov94** and **educov95** data files and are documented below. The course-overlap measures characterize the extent of common courses taken by a pair of students.

Course-overlap indicators are named and labeled to indicate the year of the data from which they were constructed. While school years generally run from the fall of one year to the spring of the following year, for shorthand purposes the variable names correspond to the year of the fall semester. For example, course-overlap variable names ending in 4 refer to the school year 1994-1995, and those ending in 5 indicate the school year 1995-1996. This standardized year specification also facilitates analyses using both AHAA and Add Health data. (See the analytic advice page on the AHAA website for more information about issues of temporal order that analysts must consider when combining AHAA and Add Health data.)

#### 2. Local Positions

The second set of Academic Networks variables, local positions, found in the **edunet** data file, define sets of students within a school who participate in uniquely identifying sets of courses. Thus the local position file includes an indicator for the local position to which a student was assigned by a clustering algorithm applied to the set of transcripts for the Add Health students in a given school (e.g. student 3204 was assigned to local position 6 based on the courses that appeared on her transcript in 1994-1995). These local positions are non-overlapping in that for a given indicator, students were assigned to a maximum of one local position. Importantly, the information in this file can be used in multilevel models, for example, with students nested within local positions nested within schools.

The variable names in the local position file do not designate the year. Instead, year is designated with a separate variable, taking a value of *94* if the local position applies to the courses on a transcript during 1994-1995 and a value of *95* if the local position applies to the courses on a transcript during 1995-1996.

# C. Organization of Document

This Academic Networks document is organized into several sections. Subsection D, below, describes common definitions of the sample of schools and courses. Section II then provides documentation about the course-overlap indicators developed for the academic years 1994-1995 and 1995-1996. This documentation entails descriptions of the indicators and includes information about how they were constructed. Section III expands on the local position indicators. The last sections outline the conventions used to name these variables and list the contents of associated data files.

# D. Common Definitions

# 1. Sample of Schools

Course overlap and local positions are defined for 78 of the original 80 Add Health schools. The two Add Health high schools for which course-overlap data were not generated are special education schools excluded from the AHAA study because they do not keep transcript records.

## 2. Definition of a Course

A student was considered to have taken a course if that course appeared on the student's transcript. Because local positions and course overlap are intended to measure the social experiences of academic networks, rather than exposure to or mastery of material, students who failed a course were still considered to have been engaged in the course as a social experience and therefore were counted as participating with minimum credit (typically .25 Carnegie units), while those who passed the course were counted for the credit they received.

# II. COURSE OVERLAP

#### A. Data File Structure

Two separate data files were produced, one containing course-overlap measures for the academic calendar year 1994-1995 (<u>educov94</u>), and one containing course-overlap measures for the academic calendar year 1995-1996 (<u>educov95</u>). Note that only students with transcript information for 1994-1995 are included in <u>educov94</u>, and only students with transcript information for 1995-1996 are included in <u>educov95</u>. (The student-level disposition file, <u>edustd1</u>, discussed in the Primary component codebook, provides information about which students have course-overlap information for 1994-1995 and/or 1995-1996.)

For example, an entry in the 1994-1995 course-overlap file might look like this (**AID** is a student identifier):

**AID** ENAIDA4 ENCOU4 (overlap) 3204 3233 3

This entry indicates that students 3204 and 3233 overlapped three courses, or took three courses in common in 1994-1995.

# B. Description of Indicators

The course-overlap indicators identify each respondent's coursemates, and more specifically, capture information about the extent of course-overlap between two students. These measures complement the Add Health friendship data in that they capture dyadic ties between two individuals. Importantly, unlike the Add Health friendship data, course-overlap measures are based upon transcript rather than self-reported information. Furthermore, because course-overlap indicators refer to coursemates, they have the added advantage of measuring each respondent's exposure to a broad grouping of fellow students, typically a larger sample than nominated friends.

In some cases, AID will equal ENAIDA4, and similarly, AID will equal ENAIDA5. These cases are the diagonal elements of the matrix, the student matched to himself/herself. The unweighted number is the count of the number of courses taken by the student that were used in the calculations of course overlap in the school for each year. The weighted number represents the maximum possible weighted value for each student.

#### C. Using Weights to Reflect Expected Exposure Through Course-Taking

The course-overlap measures facilitate examination of how adolescents are influenced through their exposure to coursemates. However, the amount of interaction between coursemates varies depending upon (1) the number of Carnegie units for which a student took a course (a Carnegie unit is a standardized measure equating one unit to the completion of a course that meets one period per day for one year); and (2) the number of classes per course (assuming 30 students represent the average class size<sup>1</sup>). These factors are taken into account in the measure of expected exposure:

expected exposure = min. # of Carnegie units taken by either member of the pair of students
# of classes per course

The total amount of course-overlap between a pair of students is the sum of expected exposures across all courses.

<sup>1</sup> The National Center for Education Statistics (1998) reports that the average class size for secondary schools in 1993-1994, was approximately 24, but this includes only teachers in departmental courses, which tend to be smaller than general courses that might appear on a transcript, such as physical education and driver's education. Even if our estimate of class size of 30 is variable, our measure still weights small courses more heavily to reflect the likely rates of interaction.

The following example illustrates more fully the rationale underlying the production of weighted course-overlap measures, and their refinement over unweighted measures:

Assume two students take course A for .5 Carnegie units and course B for 1 Carnegie unit. Furthermore, assume course A contains 60 students and course B contains 90 students (as estimated based on the sample from Add Health and extrapolated using the sample weights). The unweighted course-overlap value assigned to these students is 2. However, the weighted course-overlap measure takes into consideration course duration and course size: From equation (1):

Course A: Expected Exposure = .5/(60/30) = 1/4Course B: Expected Exposure = 1/(90/30) = 1/3Weighted Course Overlap = 1/4 + 1/3 = 7/12.

There are 316 respondents with at least one record, when paired with another student, who have ENCOW94 greater than their own maximum possible weighted value. For ENCOW95, there are 190 respondents for whom this is the case. While it is true that the unweighted course overlap is the maximum value for a student because it represents the count of courses that the student took, the weighted course overlap also takes into account number of classes per course and can be larger. Looking at the equation for expected exposure on page 3 in this guide, one can see how the overlap of a student with another student could be larger than the student with self if the denominator for the former (i.e. student with another student) is smaller relative to the numerator than the student's own ratio.

Analysts can then insert the weighted course-overlap value into the general equation below to calculate the mean behavior (as determined from the Add Health surveys) of the coursemates (i') of a respondent (i):

Mean behavior<sub>i</sub> =  $[\sum_{i}(course-overlap_{ii} * behavior of i')]/number of coursemates$ 

This mean behavior of coursemates could be used as a predictor of an attribute of respondent (i) as in a regression. For examples in empirical research, see <a href="http://www.prc.utexas.edu/ahaa/">http://www.prc.utexas.edu/ahaa/</a>.

# D. Course-Overlap Indicators

#### ENAIDA4 and ENAIDA5

The identification number assigned to each respondent's potential coursemates in the years 1994-1995 and 1995-1996 respectively.

### **ENSCLID4** and **ENSCLID5**

The identification number of the school where the potentially shared course(s) was (were) taken by the students.

#### ENCOU4 and ENCOU5

The unweighted course-overlap measures assigned to students for the school years 1994-1995 and 1995-1996.

Some students have a value of zero because the courses that they took were either not for credit or they failed the course and did not receive credit.

#### **ENCOW4** and **ENCOW5**

The weighted course-overlap measures assigned to respondents for the school years 1994-1995 and 1995-1996.

Some students have a value of zero because the courses that they took were either not for credit or they failed the course and did not receive credit.

# III. LOCAL POSITIONS

#### A. Data File Structure

Indicators of local positions are contained in a single file. Local positions for the different years are designated by a "year" variable, which takes a value of *94* for a student's 1994-1995 local position and a value of *95* for a student's 1995-1996 local position.

For example, two entries might look like this:

AID	<b>ENYRLP</b>	<b>ENCLUSTW</b>
3204	94	6
3204	95	8

This would indicate that student 3204 was assigned to weighted local position 6 as indicated by the variable ENCLUSTW based on the courses that appeared on her transcript in 1994-1995 (ENYRLP), and to weighted local position 8 based on the courses that appeared on her transcript in 1995-1996.

By implication, a student who entered high school in 1995-1996 will not have a local position in 1994-1995 and a student who graduated in 1994-1995 will not have a local position for 1995-1996. (The student-level disposition file, **edustd1**, discussed in the Primary component codebook, provides information about which students have course information for 1994-1995 and/or 1995-1996.)

#### B. Description of Indicators

The local position designates to which local position a respondent was assigned by a clustering algorithm applied to the transcript data. Thus ten students might be assigned to a local position because they took Band and Latin 3, an unusual combination within their school. The clustering algorithm used to identify local positions can be applied to any

type of data representing people and the events in which they participated (in the social network literature this is known as two-mode data). In the most basic sense, local positions were identified from transcript data by applying the algorithm to a set of transcripts from each school. For a full description of the algorithm, see Field, S.; Frank, K.A.; Schiller, K.; Riegle-Crumb, C.; and Muller, C. (2006). "Identifying Social Contexts in Affiliation Networks: Preserving the Duality of People and Events." *Social Networks* 28:97-123.

# C. Weighting for Expected Exposure

Similar to course overlap, weights representing expected exposure were used to identify one set of local positions. Courses were weighted based on expected exposure between two adolescents in the course, expected exposure is defined as:

expected exposure = <u>number of Carnegie units for which a student took a given course</u>
# of classes per course

Note that the "number of Carnegie units for which a student took a given course" appears in the numerator instead of the "minimum number of Carnegie units taken by either member of the pair of students" as in defining expected exposure for the course-overlap constructs.

This transformation to expected exposure effectively applies weights to the indicators that describe the courses a student took. These weights were then used to define the objective function maximized by the clustering algorithm used to identify local positions. The assumption is that the weights are measured on a ratio scale that is consistent with the definition of expected unit of exposure (e.g. a weight of 2 is twice more than a weight of 1).

Note that the unweighted local positions were based on data that did not apply these weights.

## D. The Sample Within Each School

The sample within each school consisted of each student's transcript from 1994-1995 and from 1995-1996. Thus, many students contributed data from two years. For such students, the 1994-1995 data were treated as a separate set of observations from the 1995-1996 data, resulting in a local position for the student in 1994-1995 and a local position for the student in 1995-1996.

While including data from a given student for two years may violate an assumption of independence, the primary function of local positions is to describe social context, and thus violations of assumptions of independence that might affect statistical inference are not critical. Using information from both 1994-1995 and 1995-1996 added stability and depth to the analysis, as many schools did not have enough information from a single year to identify local positions more detailed than distinctions based merely on track and grade. An important assumption of this sampling framework is that the courses defining local positions were relatively stable from 1994-1995 to 1995-1996. For

example, consider a school that contains a local position focused on Band and Latin 3; the local position is assumed to occur in both 1994-1995 and 1995-1996.

# E. Algorithm Used to Identify Local Positions

A clustering algorithm developed for one-mode network data (e.g. who talks to whom) was adapted to identify local positions in the two-mode data represented by the students and the courses they took within each school. The algorithm was applied separately within each Add Health school to identify local positions within that school. The number of local positions within each school was determined by the algorithm, which has been shown to effectively recover optimal subgroups in simulated data. This allowed uniform application of the algorithm to each school rather than requiring preassignment or post-hoc interpretation of different numbers of clusters, which could be subjective.

# F. Assignment of Students to Local Positions

When the clustering algorithms converged, each student and each course were effectively assigned to a single weighted local position and a single unweighted local position. These original assignments are included in the local positions data file (as variable **ENCLUSTW** and **ENCLUSTU** – the original assignments). Student-years assigned to local positions with one or no other students were reassigned to an existing local position, **ENCOMBCW** and **ENCOMBCU**, to which they had the highest classification probability of being assigned based on their coursework (provided that at least one of the top five alternative local positions already had more than one member). A classification probability is a probability of being assigned to a group for a new observation that was not used to generate the groups<sup>2</sup>, in this case, the probability that a student would be assigned to a particular local position given the courses s/he took.

Classification probabilities were produced even for some students whose courses were not used to produce the local positions. Some transfer students' transcripts did not distinguish courses taken in Add Health schools from those taken in another school, yet other information indicated that the courses were taken in the Add Health school. Though these courses were not included in the data to which the clustering algorithm was applied, the students and their courses were subsequently assigned to local positions (ENCOMBCW and ENCOMBCU) based on their classification probabilities. Local positions reflecting reassignments are indicated in the variables ENCOMBCW and ENCOMBCU, with ENREASNW and ENREASNU taking a value of 1 or 2 if the student had been reassigned.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The procedure for calculating classification probabilities was verified using Latent Gold -- see Vermunt, Jeroen K., and Magidson, Jay (2002). "Latent class models for classification." *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, v.41 n.3-4, p.531-537.

#### G. Local Positions Indicators

#### **AID**

Respondent identifier.

#### **ENCLUSTW** and **ENCLUSTU**

The original weighted and unweighted local position assignments (without any reassignment of students).

# **ENCOMBCW** and **ENCOMBCU**

The weighted and unweighted local position assignment with reassignment of students whose original local position contained one or no other students and transfer students who were missing an original local position.

# **ENREASNW** and **ENREASNU**

An indicator of reassignment for variable **ENCOMBCW** and **ENCOMBCU**. These variables have a value of 0 if the student was not reassigned, a value of 1 if a student was reassigned to a new local position based on classification probabilities, and a value of 2 if the student was a transfer student whose courses were not included in the original data (and was therefore assigned to a local position under **ENCOMBCW** or **ENCOMBCU** based on classification probabilities).

#### **ENPCLUSW** and **ENPCLUSU**

The probability of being classified in the original local position (**ENCLUSTW** or **ENCLUSTU**).

# **ENPCOMBW** and **ENPCOMBW**

The probability of being classified in the local position reflecting reassignments (**ENCOMBCW** or **ENCOMBCU**).

#### **ENYRLP**

The year in which the courses were taken. This indicator has a value of 94 if the local position is based on courses taken during the school year 1994-1995 and a value of 95 if the local position is based on courses taken in 1995-1996.

## **ENSCLID**

The identification number of the school where the students took the courses that define their local position. This identification number is negative for transfer students whose courses were not included in the original data (and were therefore assigned to a local position under **ENCOMBCW** based on classification probabilities).

#### IV. NAMING CONVENTIONS

#### A. Variable Names and Labels

Academic Networks variables were named and labeled according to a standard format:

- **1.** Each variable consists of up to but not exceeding eight upper-case characters.
- **2.** The initial character of all variables is **E**, serving as a reference to the educational component of Add Health (AHAA).
- **3.** The second character of all variables, letter **N** representing "network," specifies that each of these variables belongs to the Academic Networks component of AHAA.
- **4.** The next two to five characters describe the content information captured by the variable. For example, the characters **SCLID** in **ENSCLID** are used to represent the "identification number of the school where a course was taken."
- **5.** When applicable, a **W** or **U** in the fifth through eighth characters of Academic Networks variable names indicates whether the variable relates to weighted or unweighted information.
- **6.** The last character of the course-overlap variable names specifies the particular academic year to which the variable refers. The names of indicators corresponding to the 1994-1995 academic year end with the number **4**, and the names of the indicators linked to the 1995-1996 academic year end with the number **5**.
- 7. While the variable names consist of eight or fewer characters, the variable labels assigned to each Academic Networks variable can contain up to 40 characters including spaces.

#### B. Data File Names

Academic Networks data file names begin with the prefix <u>edu</u>, a reference to AHAA, the educational component of Add Health. The data file names also specify whether the file contains indicators related to 1994-1995 (94) or 1995-1996 (95).

# V. Missing Codes

## A. Description of Missing Codes

- 1. 9993: Transfer student whose transcript does not distinguish courses taken in the Add Health school from courses taken in another school. These students are not assigned to an original local position because their courses were not included in the data to which the clustering algorithm was applied.
- **2.** *9994*: A probability of being assigned to the local position could not be produced.
- **3.** 9995: Student could not be reassigned to a new local position. Student retained his/her original position for **ENCOMBCU** and **ENCOMBCW** and has a missing classification probability.

#### VI. DATA FILE INVENTORY

Only students with course-overlap information for the school year 1994-1995 are included in the **educov94** data file. Likewise, only students with course-overlap information for the school year 1995-1996 are included in the **educov95** data file.

- A. <u>educov94</u> this data file contains three measures (in addition to respondent **AID** and alter's respondent **AID**) corresponding to the 1994-1995 academic year: an unweighted course-overlap indicator, a weighted course-overlap indicator, and an indicator conveying the school where coursework was taken.
- **B.** <u>educov95</u> this data file contains three measures (in addition to respondent **AID** and alter's respondent **AID**) corresponding to the 1995-1996 academic year: an unweighted course-overlap indicator, a weighted course-overlap indicator, and an indicator conveying the school where coursework was taken.
- C. edunet this data file contains the local positions indicators for both 1994-1995 and 1995-1996 school years. It includes position assignments as well as the probabilities of those assignments.

# VII. QUICK REFERENCE GUIDE

A. Course Overlap for 1994-1995

AID Identification number assigned to respondent.

**ENAIDA4** Identification number assigned to each respondent's potential coursemates

**ENSCLID4** Identification number assigned to the school where the course(s)

was(were) taken by the respondent.

**ENCOU4** Unweighted course-overlap (extent of common courses taken by a

pair of students) for 1994-1995.

**ENCOW4** Weighted course-overlap (extent of common courses taken by a

pair of students) for 1994-1995.

# B. Course Overlap for 1995-1996

**AID** Identification number assigned to respondent.

**ENAIDA5** Identification number assigned to each respondent's potential

coursemates.

**ENSCLID5** Identification number assigned to the school where the course(s)

was(were) taken by the respondent.

**ENCOU5** Unweighted course-overlap (extent of common courses taken by a

pair of students) for 1995-1996.

**ENCOW5** Weighted course-overlap (extent of common courses taken by a

pair of students) for 1995-1996.

## C. Local Positions

**AID** Identification number assigned to respondent.

**ENCLUSTW** Original weighted local position assignments (without any

reassignments of students).

**ENCOMBCW** Modified weighted local position assignments (with reassignments

of students).

**ENPCLUSW** Probability of being classified in the original weighted local

position (ENCLUSTW).

**ENPCOMBW** Probability of being classified in the modified weighted local

position (ENCOMBCW).

**ENREASNW** Flag for students whose local position was reassigned.

**ENCLUSTU** Original unweighted local position assignments (without any

reassignments of students).

**ENCOMBCU** Modified unweighted local position assignments (with

reassignments of students).

**ENPCLUSU** Probability of being classified in the original unweighted local

position (ENCLUSTU).

**ENPCOMBU** Probability of being classified in the modified unweighted local

position (ENCOMBCU).

**ENREASNU** Flag for students whose local position was reassigned.

**ENSCLID** Identification number assigned to the school where the courses

were taken by the respondent.

**ENYRLP** This indicator has a value of 94 if the local position is based on

courses taken during the school year 1994-1995 and a value of 95

if the local position is based on courses taken in 1995-1996.

# **Education Data - Network - Course Overlap 94**

Education Data - Network - Course Overlap 94

aid		Str 8	RESPONDENT IDENTIFIER NOTE: Smallest 5 and largest 5 values are displayed.
Frequency	Percent	Value	Label
81	0.0%	10316654	
81	0.0%	11316958	
102	0.0%	11715820	
94	0.0%	13715895	
81	0.0%	14316051	
1708245	99.9%	15578543-99678877	NOTE: Range of values omitted from display
119	0.0%	99678879	
119	0.0%	99678974	
119	0.0%	99678978	
63	0.0%	99711172	
66	0.0%	99715358	

enaida4		Str 8	Alternate Respondent AID 1994-1995 NOTE: Smallest 5 and largest 5 values are displayed.
Frequency	Percent	Value	Label
81	0.0%	10316654	
81	0.0%	11316958	
102	0.0%	11715820	
94	0.0%	13715895	
81	0.0%	14316051	
1708245	99.9%	15578543-99678877	NOTE: Range of values omitted from display
119	0.0%	99678879	
119	0.0%	99678974	
119	0.0%	99678978	
63	0.0%	99711172	
66	0.0%	99715358	

ensclid4		Str 3	School Where Course Was Taken in 1994-1995 NOTE: Smallest 5 and largest 5 values are displayed.
Frequency	Percent	Value	Label
576	0.0%	002	
1444	0.1%	003	
5329	0.3%	006	
3249	0.2%	007	
2025	0.1%	008	
1645652	96.3%	009-094	NOTE: Range of values omitted from display
6084	0.4%	203	
14161	0.8%	259	
8464	0.5%	269	
15625	0.9%	270	
6561	0.4%	271	

encou4		Num 2	Unweighted Course Overlap 1994-1995
Frequency	Percent	Value	Label
781856	45.7%	0	Number of courses overlapping
427723	25.0%	1	Number of courses overlapping
214732	12.6%	2	Number of courses overlapping
119445	7.0%	3	Number of courses overlapping
72928	4.3%	4	Number of courses overlapping
44785	2.6%	5	Number of courses overlapping
26815	1.6%	6	Number of courses overlapping
13896	0.8%	7	Number of courses overlapping
4421	0.3%	8	Number of courses overlapping
1470	0.1%	9	Number of courses overlapping
653	0.0%	10	Number of courses overlapping
295	0.0%	11	Number of courses overlapping
103	0.0%	12	Number of courses overlapping
23	0.0%	13	Number of courses overlapping
12	0.0%	14	Number of courses overlapping
8	0.0%	15	Number of courses overlapping
3	0.0%	16	Number of courses overlapping
1	0.0%	17	Number of courses overlapping
1	0.0%	18	Number of courses overlapping

encow4		Num 8	Weighted Course Overlap 1994-1995 NOTE: Smallest 5 and largest 5 values are displayed.
Frequency	Percent	Value	Label
781856	45.7%	0	
28	0.0%	.00719015384108	
8	0.0%	.00923811772705	
2	0.0%	.00935457636729	
2	0.0%	.00986707881352	
927269	54.3%	.00987753559801-275.442281506795	NOTE: Range of values omitted from display
1	0.0%	288.447580861635	
1	0.0%	334.914761565066	
1	0.0%	386.944035713038	
1	0.0%	473.940436893677	
1	0.0%	628.322838967056	

# **Education Data - Network - Course Overlap 95**

Education Data - Network - Course Overlap 95

aid		Str 8	RESPONDENT IDENTIFIER NOTE: Smallest 5 and largest 5 values are displayed.
Frequency	Percent	Value	Label
69	0.0%	10316654	
69	0.0%	11316958	
447	0.1%	15578543	
50	0.0%	17716987	
98	0.0%	18676822	
871940	99.9%	20503705-99713392	NOTE: Range of values omitted from display
83	0.0%	99716232	
83	0.0%	99716235	
46	0.0%	99716974	
61	0.0%	99719930	
61	0.0%	99719937	

enaida5		Str 8	Alternate Respondent AID 1994-1995 NOTE: Smallest 5 and largest 5 values are displayed.
Frequency	Percent	Value	Label
69	0.0%	10316654	
69	0.0%	11316958	
447	0.1%	15578543	
50	0.0%	17716987	
98	0.0%	18676822	
871940	99.9%	20503705-99713392	NOTE: Range of values omitted from display
83	0.0%	99716232	
83	0.0%	99716235	
46	0.0%	99716974	
61	0.0%	99719930	
61	0.0%	99719937	

ensclid5		Str 3	School Where Course Was Taken in 1994-1995 NOTE: Smallest 5 and largest 5 values are displayed.
Frequency	Percent	Value	Label
256	0.0%	002	
729	0.1%	003	
3721	0.4%	006	
1444	0.2%	007	
961	0.1%	008	
832538	95.4%	009-094	NOTE: Range of values omitted from display
4489	0.5%	203	
9604	1.1%	259	
4900	0.6%	269	
9604	1.1%	270	
4761	0.5%	271	

encou5		Num 2	Unweighted Course Overlap 1994-1995	
Frequency	Percent	Value	Label	
385461	44.2%	0	Number of courses overlapping	
223425	25.6%	1	Number of courses overlapping	
126459	14.5%	2	Number of courses overlapping	
72423	8.3%	3	Number of courses overlapping	
36985	4.2%	4	Number of courses overlapping	
16245	1.9%	5	Number of courses overlapping	
6113	0.7%	6	Number of courses overlapping	
2713	0.3%	7	Number of courses overlapping	
1602	0.2%	8	Number of courses overlapping	
799	0.1%	9	Number of courses overlapping	
370	0.0%	10	Number of courses overlapping	
186	0.0%	11	Number of courses overlapping	
119	0.0%	12	Number of courses overlapping	
64	0.0%	13	Number of courses overlapping	
33	0.0%	14	Number of courses overlapping	
6	0.0%	15	Number of courses overlapping	
3	0.0%	16	Number of courses overlapping	
1	0.0%	18	Number of courses overlapping	

encow5		Num 8	Weighted Course Overlap 1994-1995 NOTE: Smallest 5 and largest 5 values are displayed.
Frequency	Percent	Value	Label
385461	44.2%	0	
6	0.0%	.01032852961092	
142	0.0%	.01045387699635	
6	0.0%	.01069988167885	
84	0.0%	.01095914007331	
487300	55.8%	.01115868177457-297.795684660672	NOTE: Range of values omitted from display
1	0.0%	353.382485981208	
1	0.0%	396.742408360886	
4	0.0%	465.831246180223	
1	0.0%	600.18846613648	
1	0.0%	643.8225166884851	

# **Education Data - Network - Local Positions**

Education Data - Network - Local Positions

aid		Str 8	Respondent Identifier NOTE: Smallest 5 and largest 5 values are displayed.
Frequency	Percent	Value	Label
2	0.0%	10316654	
2	0.0%	11316958	
1	0.0%	11574211	
1	0.0%	11715820	
1	0.0%	13715895	
13844	99.9%	14316051-99715358	NOTE: Range of values omitted from display
1	0.0%	99716232	
1	0.0%	99716235	
1	0.0%	99716974	
1	0.0%	99719930	
1	0.0%	99719937	

enclustw		Num 4	Weighted Local Position: Original NOTE: Smallest 5 and largest 5 values are displayed.
Frequency	Percent	Value	Label
347	2.5%	1	1
407	2.9%	2	2
388	2.8%	3	3
362	2.6%	4	4
370	2.7%	5	5
11465	82.7%	6-1173	NOTE: Range of values omitted from display
1	0.0%	1174	1174
1	0.0%	1175	1175
1	0.0%	1176	1176
1	0.0%	1177	1177
513	3.7%	9993	Transfer student

encombcw		Num 4	Weighted Local Position: Reassigned NOTE: Smallest 5 and largest 5 values are displayed.
Frequency	Percent	Value	Label
326	2.4%	1	
484	3.5%	2	
525	3.8%	3	
443	3.2%	4	
484	3.5%	5	
11584	83.6%	6-883	NOTE: Range of values omitted from display
1	0.0%	906	
1	0.0%	991	
6	0.0%	1018	
1	0.0%	1139	
1	0.0%	1150	

enpclusw		Num 8	Weighted Classification Probability: Original NOTE: Smallest 5 and largest 5 values are displayed.
Frequency	Percent	Value	Label
578	4.2%	0	0
118	0.9%	1.0000000000e-07	1.00000000000e-07
58	0.4%	2.0000000000e-07	2.00000000000e-07
27	0.2%	3.0000000000e-07	3.00000000000e-07
28	0.2%	4.0000000000e-07	4.00000000000e-07
11106	80.2%	5.00000000000e-079999997	NOTE: Range of values omitted from display
5	0.0%	.9999998	.9999998
8	0.1%	.999999000000001	.999999000000001
9	0.1%	1	1
513	3.7%	9993	Transfer student
1406	10.1%	9994	Probability could not be produced

enpcombw		Num 8	Weighted Classification Probability: Reassigned NOTE: Smallest 5 and largest 5 values are displayed.
Frequency	Percent	Value	Label
91	0.7%	0	0
28	0.2%	1.0000000000e-07	1.00000000000e-07
14	0.1%	2.0000000000e-07	2.0000000000e-07
5	0.0%	3.0000000000e-07	3.00000000000e-07
4	0.0%	4.0000000000e-07	4.00000000000e-07
13662	98.6%	5.00000000000e-079999996	NOTE: Range of values omitted from display
5	0.0%	.9999997	.9999997
5	0.0%	.9999998	.9999998
8	0.1%	.999999000000001	.999999000000001
10	0.1%	1	1
24	0.2%	9995	Could not be reassigned

enreasnw		Num 1	Student Reassigned Weighted Position
Frequency	Percent	Value	Label
7674	55.4%	0	Not reassigned
5669	40.9%	1	Reassigned
513	3.7%	2	Transfer student

enclustu		Num 4	Unweighted Local Position: Original NOTE: Smallest 5 and largest 5 values are displayed.
Frequency	Percent	Value	Label
2656	19.2%	1	1
2677	19.3%	2	2
1582	11.4%	3	3
1477	10.7%	4	4
1016	7.3%	5	5
3929	28.4%	6-48	NOTE: Range of values omitted from display
2	0.0%	49	49
2	0.0%	50	50
1	0.0%	51	51
1	0.0%	52	52
513	3.7%	9993	Transfer student

encombcu		Num 2	Unweighted Local Position: Reassigned NOTE: Smallest 5 and largest 5 values are displayed.
Frequency	Percent	Value	Label
2956	21.3%	1	
2800	20.2%	2	
1981	14.3%	3	
1632	11.8%	4	
1120	8.1%	5	
3243	23.4%	6-21	NOTE: Range of values omitted from display
9	0.1%	22	
10	0.1%	23	
80	0.6%	24	
24	0.2%	25	
1	0.0%	26	

enpclusu		Num 8	Unweighted Classification Probability: Original NOTE: Smallest 5 and largest 5 values are displayed.
Frequency	Percent	Value	Label
1	0.0%	3.38909296482e-31	3.38909296482e-31
1	0.0%	6.11263395244e-28	6.11263395244e-28
1	0.0%	3.49618466398e-27	3.49618466398e-27
1	0.0%	8.62148374302e-27	8.62148374302e-27
1	0.0%	9.05441414542e-27	9.05441414542e-27
13323	96.2%	1.25533709879e-259999999999999	NOTE: Range of values omitted from display
5	0.0%	.999999999999	.999999999998
6	0.0%	.9999999999999	.999999999999
1	0.0%	1	1
513	3.7%	9993	Transfer student
3	0.0%	9994	Probability could not be produced

enpcombu		Num 8	Unweighted Classificatn Probability: Reassigned NOTE: Smallest 5 and largest 5 values are displayed.
Frequency	Percent	Value	Label
1	0.0%	3.38909296482e-31	3.38909296482e-31
1	0.0%	8.62148374302e-27	8.62148374302e-27
1	0.0%	9.05441414542e-27	9.05441414542e-27
1	0.0%	1.25533709879e-25	1.25533709879e-25
1	0.0%	2.39531736876e-25	2.39531736876e-25
13835	99.8%	5.13087876173e-2599999999999999	NOTE: Range of values omitted from display
2	0.0%	.999999999999	.999999999999
5	0.0%	.9999999999998	.999999999998
6	0.0%	.9999999999999	.999999999999
1	0.0%	1	1
2	0.0%	9995	Could not be reassigned

enreasnu		Num 1	Student Reassigned Unweighted Position
Frequency	Percent	Value	Label
10181	73.5%	0	Not reassigned
3162	22.8%	1	Reassigned
513	3.7%	2	Transfer student

ensclid		Str 4	School Where Courses Were Taken NOTE: Smallest 5 and largest 5 values are displayed.
Frequency	Percent	Value	Label
3	0.0%	-002	
10	0.1%	-003	
3	0.0%	-006	
5	0.0%	-007	
8	0.1%	-008	
12930	93.3%	-009-094	NOTE: Range of values omitted from display
145	1.0%	203	
217	1.6%	259	
162	1.2%	269	
223	1.6%	270	
150	1.1%	271	

enyrlp		Num 2	Year of Local Position
Frequency	Percent	Value	Label
7885	56.9%	94	1994-1995
5971	43.1%	95	1995-1994