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Increased body weight is associated with decreased cognitive function in school-aged children. The role of self-efficacy in shaping the connection between children’s educational achievement and obesity-related comorbidities has not been examined to date. Evidence of the predictive ability of self-efficacy in children is demonstrated in cognitive tasks, including math achievement scores. This study examined the relationship between self-efficacy and math achievement in normal weight, overweight, and obese children. I hypothesized that overweight and obese children with higher self-efficacy will be less affected in math achievement than otherwise comparable children with lower self-efficacy. I tested this prediction with multilevel growth modeling techniques using the ECLS-K 1998-1999 survey data, a nationally representative sample of children. Increased self-efficacy moderates the link between body weight and children’s math achievement by buffering the risks that increased weight status poses to children’s cognitive function. My findings indicate that self-efficacy moderates math outcomes in overweight, but not obese, children.
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THE MODERATING EFFECT OF SELF-EFFICACY ON NORMAL-WEIGHT, OVERWEIGHT, AND OBESE CHILDREN’S MATH ACHIEVEMENT: A LONGITUDINAL ANALYSIS

The number of American children classified as obese has sharply risen in recent years (Ogden et al. 2014; Wang and Beydoun 2007). Approximately 17% of children aged 2 to 19 years-old are classified as obese [i.e., have a body mass index (BMI) above 30 kg m⁻²; (Ogden et al. 2014)]. There are, however, large disparities in childhood obesity prevalence between racial and ethnic minority groups, and by geographic location, with the highest incidence among Hispanic children (Ogden et al. 2014) and in children residing in the southeast region of the United States (Gopal et al. 2010). One population at risk is low-income elementary-aged children (Kopelman 2007), an already vulnerable group whose rates of obesity have steadily increased across all races except Asians/Pacific Islanders, irrespective of gender (Kopelman 2013). Socioeconomic inequality is associated with geographically concentrated childhood obesity among low-income groups that may lead to an accumulation of disadvantage for children throughout their life course (Giskes et al. 2008; Power, Manor, and Matthews 2003; Woolf and Aron 2013, p. 233).

The consequences of poor physiological and psychological health extend to the academic domain. An overweight or obese child may succumb to anxiety and depression as a result of social marginalization and/ or peer discrimination due to the stigma associated with being overweight, and, consequently, her math performance may suffer. For example, overweight and obese adolescents are more socially isolated and have fewer friendships than those of normal weight (Strauss and Pollack 2003). This may then lead to devastating outcomes associated with psychological instability, and, in some cases, lowered academic performance (Robinson 2006).
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Increased body weight is associated with decreased cognitive function in school-aged children (Li, Dai, Jackson, and Zhang 2008). Researchers have shown that overweight and obesity in children is associated with deficits in executive function, which relies on proper functioning of the part of the brain responsible for planning and judgment (Cserjesi, Luminet, Molnar, and Lenard 2007; Braet, Claus, Verbeken, and Vlierghe 2007). Poor math performance, for example, could be due to ineffective planning or the inability to shift from one mental state to another, update working memory, or inhibit impulsive behavior (St Clair-Thompson and Gathercole 2006). Given that the pathophysiological process of weight-associated complications culminates in cognitive decline and is driven by neural, cardiovascular, endocrine, musculoskeletal, renal, gastrointestinal, and pulmonary system malfunction, in addition to psychosocial problems (Kamijo et al. 2014; Garver et al. 2013), childhood obesity trends have implications for children’s well-being in both the short and long term, including academic outcomes (Daniels et al. 2005; Freedman et al. 2007; see Taras and Potts-Datema 2009, for review). Importantly, academic outcomes are not driven solely by cognitive capacity (Bandura 1993), a limited pool of energy, resources, or fuel by which some cognitive processes are mobilized and maintained (Johnson and Heinz, 1978, p.422). Psychological resources such as optimism, personal control and a sense of meaning are protective for mental health (Frankl 1963; Taylor, 1989; Seligman 1998; Taylor et al. 2000), and these learned behaviors also assist children in educational achievement (Kolb 1984; Zimmerman 1989; Casey et al. 2005). Among these psychological resources, self-efficacy—typically conceptualized as perceived judgments of one’s capabilities to organize and execute courses of action to attain chosen goals (Bandura 1977)—has consequences for children’s psychological development, educational outcomes, and reproduction of stratification across generations (see Multon et al. 1991 for review; Schunk
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1995; Schunk and Pajares 2004). The role of self-efficacy in shaping the connection between children’s math achievement and obesity-related comorbidities has not been examined to date.

Perceived self-efficacy is the foundation of human motivation (Bandura 1993, 1994, 2006). At the individual level, symbolic processes through which knowledge is formed may be analyzed as contributing to the production of individual differences in development (Dannefer 1984). For example, the expectations communicated to, and interpreted by, a child, contribute to self-definition and to her plan of action. Bandura, and other social psychologists, suggest that individual action is driven by the core belief that we can produce desired results through our behavior. Self-efficacy moderates the effect of gender and prior experience on self-concept and mathematical problem solving (Pajares and Miller 1994). It is also becoming evident that self-efficacy may be an important mechanism in the treatment of obesity (Clark et al. 1991; Linde et al. 2006). In the present study, I examined the relationship between self-efficacy and math achievement in normal weight, overweight, and obese children.

As a measure of cognitive function, I used math achievement, and not literacy, scores from kindergarten to eighth grade, because past research indicates that stress associated with variations in physical appearance can decrease math performance in adults (Fredrickson et al. 1998; Gable et al. 2012). Also, self-efficacy has been shown to predict math performance for undergraduate college students (Siegel et al. 1985). I hypothesized that children with consistently heightened BMI scores will have lower math achievement, compared to those of children with lower BMI (Gable et al. 2012).

Further, self-efficacy has previously been shown to serve as a moderator of weight management (Bandura 2000), life stressors (Bandura 1994), and scholastic aptitude (Brown et al. 1989). Because self-efficacy engenders a wide range of capacities and skills that children may
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draw upon to support their math achievement—and potentially buffer the effects of increased
weight on learning—I expected self-efficacy to factor into this linkage by moderating the extent
to which children’s increased weight status will affect their math achievement. Thus, I
hypothesized that, compared to overweight and obese children with lower self-efficacy, those
who are overweight and obese but have higher self-efficacy, would score better on math
achievement assessments. I tested these hypotheses by applying multilevel growth modeling
techniques (Singer and Willet 2003) to data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study—

BACKGROUND

LINKING OBESITY AND MATH ACHIEVEMENT TO SELF-EFFICACY

Early childhood health influences later life outcomes (Currie 2009; Almond and Currie
2010, 2011). The current study is predicated on the notion that weight-related comorbidities are
associated with cognitive dysfunction. The negative association between obesity and cognitive
function is well documented (Li et al. 2008; Shore et al. 2008; McLaren 2007), as is the positive
association between self-efficacy and academic outcomes (Zimmerman 2000; Cowen et al.
1991; Bandura 1997). However, the direct association between self-efficacy and math outcomes
among normal weight, overweight, and obese children in the United States has never been examined.

There is no consensus on the causal effect of childhood obesity on standardized test
scores and academic outcomes. Cross-sectional and longitudinal studies examining the
association between academic achievement and obesity are inconsistent. Researchers have found
no association (Kaetner et al. 2009), a negative association (Averett and Stifel 2010), a
mediation between obesity and self-esteem (Tershakovec et al. 1994), obesity and externalizing
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behavioral problems (Crosnoe 2007), and obesity and interpersonal skills (Klinitzke et al. 2013) in poor academic performance. Nonetheless, there is ample theoretical and empirical evidence indicating a likely connection. Thus, my conceptual model is that overweight and obesity in children affects cognitive function and is linked to learning, which in turn affects math academic outcomes.

Self-efficacy has emerged as an effective predictor of students’ motivation and scholarship. Self-efficacious students contribute more in the classroom, work more assiduously, persevere longer, and have fewer disadvantageous reactions when faced with challenges (Bandura 1997). Furthermore, measures of self-efficacy are highly correlated with achievement in academic work and persistence (Zimmerman 2000). Evidence of the predictive ability of self-efficacy in children is demonstrated in cognitive tasks, including math performance (Cowen et al. 1991). For example, Schnuck et al. (1985) found a positive association between perceived self-efficacy and rate of accurate arithmetic solutions. Thus, research to date clearly links self-efficacy and math achievement (Bandura 1997; Shnuck et al. 1985; Pajares and Kranzler 1995; Adeyinka et al. 2007). Increased self-efficacy may, then, condition the link between overweight or obesity and children’s achievement by buffering (or minimizing) the risks that increased weight status poses to children’s math performance.

DATA AND METHODS

Data and Sample

Analyses are based on the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study—Kindergarten class 1998-1999 (ECLS-K), a nationally representative sample of 21,260 children from kindergarten to eighth grade, conducted by the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), and designed to study the development of educational stratification among
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American school children (West, Denton, and Reaney 2000). Participants were selected using a multi-stage sampling design. For a more detailed description of the ECLS-K study design see, Tourangeau et al. (2009).

Inclusion Criteria

Because “missingness” increased over time due to attrition in the ECLS-K data, I estimated my models using full information maximum-likelihood method (FIML), which uses data from all observations in the data set. The FIML estimation method assumes data are missing at random (MAR), wherein the conditional covariates are not associated with the propensity for missing data on the outcome measure (i.e., math achievement). This approach maximizes the statistical power for differentiating between math developmental trajectories of children with missing data on the outcome at any wave. The final sample size was 5,034. I used multiple imputation to impute missing values for children who participated in a wave but did not provide a response for a specific independent variable. This method resulted in multiple complete data sets (Allison 2001). I imputed data using the MIM command, a multivariate imputation program in Stata 13.0 (Carlin, Golati, and Royston 2008). I averaged empirical results across ten imputation samples (Rubin 1987). The estimates presented here are statistically similar to findings from analyses where I handled missing data for the independent variables using listwise deletion, indicating that estimates are robust across different missing data specifications. All multivariate analyses were conducted using HLM 7.01.

At enrollment (kindergarten fall, T1), children (51% female) were identified by parents as 71% White, 5% African American, 15% Hispanic, 5% Asian, and 5% Other Race. In the analyses, ECLS-K data were weighted to account for the multistage probability sampling that oversampled Asians and Pacific Islanders. Weights are provided in the ECLS-K for cross-
sectional and longitudinal data analyses; weights were computed for children with complete data on the data points under investigation. Normalized child-level weights were used to produce representative estimates of the 1998–1999 kindergarten population of children.

**MEASURES**

*Time*

A variable based on average age at each direct assessment was created to represent time, as shown in Table 1. Time 1 (T1), kindergarten fall, is considered the baseline. At T1, average age was 5.71 (SD=0.36) years. At T2, kindergarten spring, average age was 6.23 years (SD=0.36), indicating the passage of about 6 months between T1 and T2. Beginning at T3, the time unit is defined in years, and children are about one year older, with an average age of 6.67 years (SD= 0.38). At T4, average age was 7.24 years (SD= 0.35). At T5, average age was 9.13 years (SD= 0.35). At T6, average age was 11.07 years (SD= 0.36). At T7, average age was 14.07 years (SD= 0.35).

*Weight Status*

ECLS-K staff assessed children’s height and weight during each assessment by using a portable digital scale and stadiometer (Shorr Products, Olney, Maryland). Both weight and height measurements were recorded twice, and the average of the two measures was used in the present analyses. The overall average unweighted BMI score was 18.36, with a standard deviation of 4.53. Table 1 displays the unweighted means and standard deviations for BMI scores by gender and wave.

Using the 2000 Center for Disease Control Growth Charts: United States (Kuczmarski et al. 2002), I created a categorical variable based on BMI (weight [kg/height [m]^2]), and classified children as underweight (<5^{th} percentile), normal weight (>5^{th} percentile and <85^{th} percentile),
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overweight (>85th percentile to <95th percentile), or obese (≥95th percentile). I subsequently
combined underweight and normal-weight categories into a single category due to the small
number of underweight children across all time points (0.02; SD=0.12). Overall, 58% (SD=0.49)
of male and 64% (SD=0.48) of female children were normal-weight. 21% (SD=0.21) of male
and 21% (SD=0.41) of female children were classified as overweight. And, 21% (SD=0.21) of
male and 15% (SD=0.36) of female children were classified as obese. Weight status was
included in my analytic model in several different ways. Dummy variables indicating a child’s
weight status category and a continuous measure of BMI were both included to imply that the
added decrement to children’s math achievement that accrued for an additional point in BMI
further decreased math achievement if the child moved from the normal weight to the overweight
or from the overweight to the obese category.

Self-Efficacy

An adaptation of the Self-Description Questionnaire (SDQ) II and The Self-Concept and
Locus of Control scales from the National Educational Study of 1988 (NELS:88) were
administered during the eighth grade assessment session to ascertain children’s socioemotional
development. Thirteen statements measuring children’s self-perceptions and amount of control
they possessed throughout their life were used to assess locus of control. Children scored the
items on a continuum from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree” for each item; values ranged
from -1.53 to 2.50, with higher scores indicating greater perception of control throughout their
life. I dichotomized the locus of control measure into low and high levels of self-efficacy, with
negative and positive values representing low and high levels of self efficacy, respectively. It is
well documented that locus of control and generalized self-efficacy are indicators of the same
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higher order concept (Judge et al. 2002; Adeyinka et al. 2011). Internal consistency of the locus of control measure is moderate at the Cronbach Alpha level of 0.68 (Tourangeau et al. 2009).

**Math Achievement**

At each assessment period, children were evaluated in a 50-minute to 70-minute session in kindergarten and 1st grade, and in a 90-minute session in 3rd, 5th, and 8th grade. The assessment was developed specifically for the ECLS-K, and children were tested on previously used instruments (Woodcock-McGrew-Werder 1996).

The ECLS-K math assessment focused on age-appropriate mathematical knowledge and skills such as knowledge of numbers and shapes, relative size, ordinality and sequence, addition and subtraction, multiplication and division, place value, rate and measurement, fractions, and area and volume (Tourangeau et al. 2009, pp 2-10). The assessments yielded number right scores, standardized scores, and latent trait scores from item response theory (IRT). I used IRT scores because this assessment placed children’s ability on a continuous scale by using the pattern of right, wrong, and omitted responses, and the pattern of difficulty, discriminating ability, and ability to correctly guess each item. Thus, the measure produced a score based on the items a child would have answered correctly if all the questions were answered for that particular assessment. Reliability math scores were high at Cronbach Alpha levels ranging from 0.89 to 0.94 (Tourangeau et al. 2009).

**Covariates**

Time-variant and time-invariant measures were included in the final models. Time-varying measure includes age in years and BMI. *Age* is centered on the earliest time children normally begin kindergarten (i.e., 5 years of age). *BMI* is a continuous measure of body mass index. BMI categories are indicator variables representing the child’s BMI percentile.
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classification at each time period, and includes normal weight, overweight, and obese, with
normal weight as the reference. Time invariant covariates that were included represent child and
family characteristics. Race is an indicator variable representing race and ethnicity, and is
categorized as White, African American, Hispanic, Asian, and Other Race, with White as the
reference category. Female is a dichotomous variable indicating whether the child is or is not
female. The family characteristic included is parent’s education level. Parent’s education level is
an indicator variable representing the highest level of education attained by either parent at any
assessment period, and was classified as high school dropout, high school graduate, attended
some college, college degree holder, and advanced degree holder, with high school dropout as
the reference category. I included parent’s education level instead of parental income because
ample evidence points to parental education as a stronger indicator of child’s achievement
(Dubow et al. 2010; see Desforges et al. 2003, for review). In the interaction model, Elementary
is a dichotomous variable indicating whether or not the child is in elementary school. Middle is a
dichotomous variable indicating whether or not the child is in middle school.

Table 1 about here.
Table 2 about here.

Analytic Strategy

I estimated the effect of BMI and self-efficacy on math achievement trajectories using
multilevel growth curve modeling techniques (Singer and Willet 2003). These models estimated
the effect of change in BMI on change in math achievement trajectories, and allowed me to
determine whether the changes in developmental trajectories coincide with BMI changes over
time, and also to simultaneously determine if there is a moderating effect of self-efficacy. The
estimated coefficients for BMI in these models show the change in math achievement trajectory
for children who experienced an increase in BMI. All models were estimated using sampling
Self-efficacy, Weight, and Children’s Math Achievement weights that adjust for the unequal probabilities of selection for children in the ECLS-K. In these models, time points are nested within children.

The level-1 model fits BMI as a function of age across the observations for each child, and the level-2 model fits the level-1 intercepts and coefficients across all individuals as a function of children’s fixed characteristics (gender, race / ethnicity, parent’s highest education level, and self-efficacy). Exploratory analyses indicated that children’s math achievement is most appropriately captured by a quadratic growth function due to the non-linear relationship between math and age. Consequently, I only present estimates from quadratic growth models. Model 1 summarized children’s math achievement trajectories between kindergarten and 8th grade; model 2 estimated the effect of increased weight status on children’s math achievement net of baseline growth trajectories; model 3 examined whether changes in weight trajectory coincide with changes in children’s math achievement scores and simultaneously tests whether self-efficacy acts as a moderator of the hypothesized decline in math achievement; model 4 examined interactions between weight category and age, sex, race, elementary/ middle school, or parent’s education level to assess whether their intersection is related to math achievement.

RESULTS

Model 1. Baseline Growth in Math Achievement

Level 1

\[ Math_{it} = \pi_{0i} + \pi_{1i} \text{Age}_{it} + \pi_{2i} \text{Age}^2 + \varepsilon_{it} \]

Level 2

\[ \pi_{0i} = \gamma_{00} + \delta_{0i} \]
\[ \pi_{1i} = \gamma_{10} + \delta_{0i} \]
\[ \pi_{2i} = \gamma_{20} + \delta_{2i} \]

\[ \pi_{0i} \] represents the estimated math score for a child who is five years of age and of normal weight \( \pi_{1i} \) represents the linear growth component for mathematics between kindergarten and
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eighth grade assessments, \( \pi_{2t} \) represents the quadratic growth component of the math achievement slope, \( \epsilon_{it} \) is a within child error term, \( \delta_{0i} \) represents random error term for the math achievement intercept, \( \delta_{1i} \) represents the random error term for the linear component of the math achievement slope, \( \delta_{2i} \) represents the error term for the quadratic component of the math achievement slope.

\[ \begin{align*} 
& \text{Table 3 about here.} \\
\end{align*} \]

**Estimates and Interpretation**

Model 1 estimates of the fixed and random effects are displayed in Table 3. The estimated coefficients for the fixed effects indicate that children’s learning rates increase during early middle childhood and level off during late middle childhood (see the upper portion of Table 3). At age 5, the estimated mean math score for children is 17.19. Between the ages of 5 and 9, the average child’s math score rapidly increases, evidenced by the large positive values for the linear component of the age slope for math (29.87) and the negative value for the quadratic component of the age slope for math (1.61). However, the rate of increase begins to slow by age 9, whereas by age 11, improvements in mathematics are much more modest than in early middle childhood.

The random effects indicate that patterns of growth vary significantly among children (see the lower portion of Table 3). Both initial levels of math achievement (\( \chi^2=10,257, \ p < 0.001 \)) and the linear (\( \chi^2=7,217, \ p < 0.001 \)) and quadratic components (\( \chi^2=5,692, \ p < 0.001 \)) of growth vary among children. Ranging from 0.27 for the quadratic components of the learning curves, to 0.36 for the linear component of the curve, estimated reliabilities for the math intercepts and linear and quadratic age slope components are, however, relatively low.
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Model 2. Effects of Weight Status

Mean unconditional math achievement trajectories for 5 year-old sampled children were captured in the baseline model. In this next set of models, I examined the effect of changes in BMI on math achievement, with the added complexity of allowing an additional effect of children crossing into one of the weight status categories (i.e., overweight, obese). I included both dummy variables indicating a child’s weight status category and a continuous measure of BMI because I hypothesized that the effect of BMI on math achievement is a complex non-linear function in which each one-point increase in BMI lowers children’s math achievement, but that moving from the normal weight to the overweight or from the overweight to the obese category potentially leads to an additional reduction in math achievement.

Specification.

I estimated the effects of weight on children’s development trajectories by including three covariates representing the continuous measure of BMI and categorical measures of BMI into the level-1 equation. I included both the continuous and discrete measures of BMI not to lose valid variation with discretization (Markon et al. 2011).

Level 1

\[
Math_{it} = \pi_{0i} + \pi_{1i}Age_{it} + \pi_{2i}Age_{it}^2 + \pi_{3i}BMI + \pi_{4i}Overweight + \pi_{5i}Obese + \epsilon
\]

Level 2

\[
\pi_{0i} = \gamma_{00} + \delta_{0i} \\
\pi_{1i} = \gamma_{10} + \delta_{1i} \\
\pi_{2i} = \gamma_{20} + \delta_{2i} \\
\pi_{3i} = \gamma_{30} + \delta_{3i} \\
\pi_{4i} = \gamma_{40} + \delta_{4i} \\
\pi_{5i} = \gamma_{50} + \delta_{5i}
\]

At level 1, \( \pi_{0i} \) represents the estimated math score for a child in the normal-weight category when age, overweight, and obese are 0. The interpretation of \( \pi_{1i} \) and \( \pi_{2i} \) changes somewhat in this model; \( \pi_{1i} \) and \( \pi_{2i} \) represent the linear and quadratic components of growth.
Self-efficacy, Weight, and Children’s Math Achievement controlling for weight status. $\pi_{3i}$, $\pi_{4i}$, and $\pi_{5i}$ now represent, respectively, the effect of BMI increasing, being classified as overweight or obese, while controlling for baseline growth trajectories. If $\pi_{3i}$ is negative, every point increase in BMI beyond normal weight gain tends to coincide with slower learning rates. If $\pi_{4i}$ or $\pi_{5i}$ is negative, overweight and obesity tend to coincide with a decline in children’s learning rates independent of the linear BMI variable.

Estimates and Interpretation

Table 4 about here.

The estimated coefficients from this model are displayed in Table 4. The time-independent effects of overweight and obesity on children’s development are negative. On average, every point increase in BMI beyond normal weight gain is associated with a decline of 0.0001 in children’s math achievement trajectory (p < 0.001). When a child is overweight, on average, their math achievement score is 5.77 points lower than we would expect if she was normal-weight at 5 years-old (p < 0.001), and 7.97 points lower if she was obese (p < 0.001). Given that math achievement rates increase by about 29 points annually, over most of the period, a 5.77 and 7.97 point reduction in math scores is comparable to 2 and 3 months of math learning, respectively.

As shown in the lower portion of Table 4, the random effects estimates indicate that the effect of gaining weight on children’s math trajectories varies significantly among children classified as overweight (var. = 0.33, $\chi^2 = 488.2$, p = 0.03) or obese (var. 0.21, $\chi^2 = 453.6$, p = 0.02). The effect of increased BMI also varies significantly among children (var. 0.25, $\chi^2 = 485.7$, p = 0.01). The reliability is low for all measures; 0.066, 0.017, and 0.032, respectively. Much of the variability among children in the effects of weight status on math achievement is
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due to sampling variability that cannot be explained by child characteristics, resulting in low
reliabilities for these coefficients.

Figure 1 about here.

Model 3. Self-efficacy as Potential Moderator

In this model, I tested my second hypothesis by examining how children’s level of self-
efficacy influences the estimated effect of weight status on math achievement. I included
indicators of children’s sex, race, and parental education level as controls at level 2 because of
the well-documented association between these characteristics and children’s math achievement,
and their potential association with children’s self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is also included at level
2 as a dichotomous variable indicating whether the child scored high or low in self-efficacy.
Because I was primarily interested in how self-efficacy affects math achievement scores in
children of varying weight statuses, I allowed only BMI, overweight, and obesity to vary as a
function of self-efficacy. Level 1 is the same as the previous model.

Level 1

\[ Math_{it} = \pi_{0i} + \pi_{1i} \text{Age} + \pi_{2i} \text{Age}^2 + \pi_{3i} \text{BMI} + \pi_{4i} \text{Overweight} + \pi_{5i} \text{Obese} + \epsilon \]

Level 2

\[ \pi_{1i} = \gamma_{10} + \gamma_{11} \text{Parent education} \]
\[ \pi_{2i} = \gamma_{20} + \gamma_{21} \text{Parent education} \]
\[ \pi_{3i} = \gamma_{30} + \gamma_{31} \text{Parent education} + \gamma_{32} \text{High Self-efficacy} \]
\[ \pi_{4i} = \gamma_{40} + \gamma_{41} \text{Parent education} + \gamma_{42} \text{High Self-efficacy} \]
\[ \pi_{5i} = \gamma_{50} + \gamma_{51} \text{Parent education} + \gamma_{52} \text{High Self-efficacy} \]

Child Characteristics

\[ \pi_{10i} = \gamma_{60} + \gamma_{61} \text{Male} \]
[\[ + \gamma_{62} \text{African American} \]
[\[ + \gamma_{63} \text{Latino} \]
[\[ + \gamma_{64} \text{Asian} \]
[\[ + \gamma_{65} \text{Other} \]

Because seven waves of data do not provide sufficient statistical power to reliably
estimate the time-varying random effects of weight status, I do not allow the weight effects in
this model to randomly vary. At level 1, \( \pi_{0i} \) still represents the estimated math score for a five-
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year old child in the normal-weight category. \( \pi_{1i} \) and \( \pi_{2i} \) represent the linear and quadratic components of growth controlling for BMI and BMI categories, respectively. \( \pi_{3i}, \pi_{4i}, \) and \( \pi_{5i} \) now represent the effect of BMI, overweight, and obesity controlling for baseline growth trajectories. \( \gamma_{11}, \gamma_{21}, \gamma_{31}, \gamma_{41}, \gamma_{51} \) indicate how the effects of BMI, overweight, and obesity differ by parental education level. \( \gamma_{32}, \gamma_{42}, \gamma_{52} \) reveal how the effects of being overweight or obese differ by self-efficacy in children’s math achievement. \( \gamma_{61} \) indicates how the effects of overweight and obesity differ by gender. \( \gamma_{62}, \gamma_{63}, \gamma_{64}, \gamma_{65} \) indicate how the effects of increased weight differs for racial and ethnic minority children from white children. In this model, if \( \gamma_{32}, \gamma_{42}, \) or \( \gamma_{52} \) are positive and significant, overweight and obese children’s math achievement trajectories will benefit from higher levels of self-efficacy.

Table 5 about here.

Estimates and Interpretation.

The estimates in Table 5 for this model show that the effects of overweight and obesity vary significantly among children. Partly consistent with hypothesis 2, overweight children’s math achievement trajectories benefit with high levels of self-efficacy. On average, the math trajectories of overweight children with high levels of self-efficacy increase by 3.62 points more than those of overweight children with low levels of self-efficacy (\( p < 0.005 \)). High self-efficacy, by contrast, is not significantly associated with improved math achievement trajectories in obese children (\( p = 0.73 \)). I calculated and graphed predicted probabilities of math achievement by age and self-efficacy level by weight status (Figure 1).

Figure 1 about here.

Racial and ethnic minority children differ significantly from white children in math achievement. African American children’s BMI effects on achievement, on average, are 0.00006
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more negative (p < 0.01) than those of white children. Hispanic children BMI effects are also
more negative than those of white children by about 0.00001 points, on average (p = 0.02).
Female children have a 0.00002 more negative BMI effects on math achievement compared to
male children (p < 0.001). Overweight racial and ethnic minority children do not differ
significantly from overweight white children in math achievement. Other Race children
classified as obese have math achievement scores that are 7.89 points lower than those of obese
white children (p = 0.02). The estimated effect of being overweight differs significantly from
normal-weight children based on parental education level. For overweight children whose
parents have attended some college, math achievement scores are 1.84 points lower than those of
overweight children whose parent’s dropped out of high school (p = 0.03). Children who are
classified as overweight and have a parent who is a college graduate are 8.23 points higher than
overweight children whose parents have dropped out of high school (p = 0.03). Overweight
children, on average, who have a parent that received an advanced degree are 9.13 points higher
than overweight children whose parents dropped out of high school (p < 0.005). Scores for
children classified as obese, by contrast, are not significantly associated with the expected
benefits of parental education level from math achievement.

**Model 4. Interaction Effects**

To test whether the intersection between weight category and age, sex, race, elementary
school, middle school, or parent’s education level is related to math achievement, I incorporated
multiplicative terms into model 2. At level 1, $\pi_{0i}$ represents the estimated math score for a child
in the normal-weight category when age, overweight, and obese are 0. $\pi_{1i}$ and $\pi_{2i}$ represent the
linear and quadratic components of growth controlling for weight status. $\pi_{3i}$, $\pi_{4i}$, and $\pi_{5i}$ now
represent, respectively, the effect of BMI increasing, being classified as overweight or obese,
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while controlling for baseline growth trajectories. \( \pi_{6i}, \pi_{7i}, \pi_{8i} \) represent the interaction effects of age (shown below), sex, race, elementary school, middle school, or parent’s education level on, respectively, increasing BMI, being classified as overweight, or as obese.

**Level 1**

\[
Math_{it} = \pi_{0i} + \pi_{1i}Age_{it} + \pi_{2i}Age^2 + \pi_{3i}BMI + \pi_{4i}Overweight + \pi_{5i}Obese + \pi_{6i}Age \times Overweight + \pi_{7i}Age \times Obese + \pi_{8i}Age \times BMI + e
\]

**Level 2**

\[
\begin{align*}
\pi_{0i} &= \gamma_{00} + \delta_{0i} \\
\pi_{1i} &= \gamma_{10} + \delta_{1i} \\
\pi_{2i} &= \gamma_{20} + \delta_{2i} \\
\pi_{3i} &= \gamma_{30} + \delta_{3i} \\
\pi_{4i} &= \gamma_{40} + \delta_{4i} \\
\pi_{5i} &= \gamma_{50} + \delta_{5i} \\
\pi_{6i} &= \gamma_{60} + \delta_{6i} \\
\pi_{7i} &= \gamma_{70} + \delta_{7i} \\
\pi_{8i} &= \gamma_{80} + \delta_{8i}
\end{align*}
\]

Significant interaction between obesity and age (\( p = 0.002 \)) indicates that the impact of obesity on math achievement is stronger as children age. In contrast, I found no significant differences between overweight and gender (\( p = 0.21 \)) or obesity and gender (\( p = 0.46 \)).

There were no significant differences between overweight and being an African American (\( p = 0.49 \)), Hispanic (\( p = 0.85 \)), Asian (\( p = 0.46 \)), or Other Race (\( p = 0.44 \)) child or obesity and African American (\( p = 0.81 \)), Hispanic (\( p = 0.13 \)), Asian (\( p = 0.13 \)), or Other Race (\( p = 0.69 \)) child. There were also no significant differences between children in elementary school and overweight (\( p = 0.10 \)) or obesity (\( p = 0.08 \)). There were no significant differences between middle school and overweight (0.09) or obesity (\( p = 0.12 \)). I found no significant differences between overweight and parent’s education level for high school graduates (\( p = 0.23 \)), some college (\( p = 0.38 \)), bachelor’s degree holders (\( p = 0.78 \)), or advanced degree holders (\( p = 0.09 \)). I also found no difference between obesity and parent’s education level for high school graduates.
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(p = 0.49), some college (p = 0.38), bachelor’s degree holders (p = 0.72), or advanced degree holders (p = 0.31).

DISCUSSION

The increasing number of overweight and obese children in the United States, coupled with the underperformance of our public education system (OECD 2013), warrants a better understanding of the mechanisms contributing to the health of children, as well as the cognitive dysfunction associated with increased weight, particularly in light of declining math achievement in the United States (OECD 2013). Overweight and obese children are more likely to suffer from low self-esteem, anxiety disorders, and other psychopathologies (see Zametkin et al. 2004, for review), which may lead to lowered math performance (Judge and Jahns 2007). However, the causality of this association has yet to be determined. It is possible that mental health problems associated with obesity predispose overweight or obese children to lower academic achievement (Taras and Potts-Datema 2009), or that obesity is a marker, rather than a cause of low achievement (Datar et al. 2004). A strong sense of self-efficacy engenders intrinsic interest and deep-seeded involvement in academic activities (Bandura 1994), and produces a sense of assurance that a child can exercise control over her life.

My findings indicate that, on average, overweight and obesity in children coincides with a few point reduction in math achievement, the equivalent of 2 to 3 months of learning. Overweight children’s math achievement trajectories benefit with high levels of self-efficacy, but, in contrast, high self-efficacy does not produce the same effect in obese children. Results further indicate that the effect of obesity on math achievement is stronger as children age, showing that obese children’s lowered math scores are lower relative to normal weight children at older ages than at younger ages. The effect of obesity on math achievement may increase as
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Children age due to extended periods of institutionalized discrimination and weight-related comorbidities that are progressively more pronounced as children age (Dietz 1998). Thus, in order for self-efficacy to act as a moderator on math achievement trajectories, the onset of obesity is critical. Given that the developmental detriments of overweight on math achievement learning trajectories are moderated by self-efficacy, a learned behavior, intervention timing is crucial.

Why are children most in need of the gains associated with self-efficacy the least likely to benefit? It is possible that the stigma, affective disorders, and social isolation associated with obesity have a stronger impact on obese children, and, thus, may impede the ability of self-efficacy to act as a moderator in the child’s math achievement. For example, the stresses associated with overweight are stronger for an obese child due to her higher weight status, and, thus, she may experience more social disadvantages, overwhelming the already more constrained child. In contrast, overweight children may experience less of these social disadvantages as a result of being closer to normal weight children in appearance, and are thus more likely to benefit from self-efficacy as a resource in adapting to the complexities and challenges of heightened BMI. It is also possible that because childhood obesity is stigmatized and obese children are viewed as unhealthy and lazy (Crandall and Schiffhauer 1998; Frisco et al. 2010), these children interpret and internalize the negative communications of others in their construction of self-definition, and lowered math achievement becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Although this is the first study to systematically examine self-efficacy as a moderator of math achievement in overweight and obese children, this study has limitations. First, because of data limitations, self-efficacy was measured at a single time point even though it may fluctuate
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due to varied and varying psychological and physiological factors that were not measured in this
data set. For example, differential sensitivity and tolerance to negative peer influences are
associated with varying psychological effects, with the most socially connected children being
the least negatively affected by their increased weight status (Gable et al. 2012). It has also been
shown that weight perceptions have a stronger association with depressive symptoms than actual
weight status in adolescents (Frisco et al. 2010). Second, only seven waves of data are available
in the ECLS-K 1998-1999 cohort, and therefore, power to identify complex nonlinear
relationships between overweight and obesity and child’s development is limited. Third,
estimated reliabilities for the weight coefficients in the individual-level equations are low.
Consequently, the ability to detect significant associations between child characteristics and the
estimated effects of overweight and obesity on children’s developmental trajectories is
attenuated. Fourth, there is no consensus on the causal effect of childhood obesity on
standardized test scores and math outcomes, but, there is a clear link between obesity and
cognitive function. As such, more research is necessary to find mechanisms underlying cognitive
decline associated with overweight and obesity. This knowledge may help elucidate the
relationship between increased weight status and lower math achievement in children. Fifth,
emphasis of my research is on the “normal” weight status in children, and any interpretation of
such an obscure socially constructed and variable pattern is limited in that its contribution is
inevitably a by-product of the social reality it describes. Thus, interpretations are always
vulnerable to overstating the importance of eventful change and to minimizing the complex
continuities of people’s lives. Finally, I have focused on child-level attributes as precursors for
math outcomes and learning trajectories. I did not, however, consider other relevant factors of
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children’s math outcomes such as parent-child and teacher-child relationships or educational context, despite that these factors likely influence children’s math achievement and self-efficacy.

Despite these limitations, current findings illuminate the importance of psychological resources, particularly self-efficacy, on math achievement trajectories in children. Previous research has shown self-efficacy to act as a moderator across a number of outcomes (Brown et al. 1989; Matsui and Onglatco 1992; Bandura 1994; Bandura 2000; Brown et al. 2001). The current study adds to the self-efficacy literature by showing that self-efficacy acts as a moderator of lowered math achievement in overweight children. Taken together, future research is needed to help improve intervention and treatment programs, and to help implement more effective social policies targeting childhood obesity and related comorbidities, such as lowered math outcomes.
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Table 1: Means and Standard Deviations for Time Varying Covariates, by Wave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
<th>Wave 2</th>
<th>Wave 3</th>
<th>Wave 4</th>
<th>Wave 5</th>
<th>Wave 6</th>
<th>Wave 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>14.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI of Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>16.45</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>20.35</td>
<td>22.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI of Females</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>18.34</td>
<td>20.06</td>
<td>22.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SD     | 2.11   | 2.23   | 2.56   | 2.69   | 3.67   | 4.46   | 7.30   

Source: Data are from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study Kindergarten Class 1998-1999.
## Table 2. Weighted Means and Standard Errors for Time Invariant Covariates, by Weight Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Normal-weight</th>
<th></th>
<th>Overweight</th>
<th></th>
<th>Obese</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M (SE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>M (SE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.52 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.53 (0.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.61 (0.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.48 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.47 (0.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.39 (0.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.75 (0.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.69 (0.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63 (0.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0.04 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0.15 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.19 (0.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.24 (0.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.03 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race</td>
<td>0.04 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-efficacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0.47 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.48 (0.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.53 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>0.53 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.52 (0.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.47 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highschool Dropout</td>
<td>0.03 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08 (0.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highschool Graduate</td>
<td>0.13 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.16 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.21 (0.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>0.05 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>0.26 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.21 (0.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Degree</td>
<td>0.27 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.21 (0.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15 (0.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td>3090</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source*: Data are for children from 1998-2007 ECLS-K

*Note*: SE indicates Standard Error
### Table 3. Estimated Coefficients for Quadratic Growth Model of Math Achievement Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed Effects</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept, $\pi_0i$</td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>116.75</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, $\pi_1i$</td>
<td>29.87</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>455.06</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age2, $\pi_2i$</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-266.32</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variance Corr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma^2_t$</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept, $\pi_0i$</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>4925</td>
<td>10,257.73</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, $\pi_1i$</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4925</td>
<td>7,217.56</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age2, $\pi_2i$</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>4925</td>
<td>5,692.63</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source*: Data are for children between 1998-2007, ECLS-K.

*Note*: SE indicates Standard Error
Table 4. Estimated Coefficients for Quadratic Growth Model of Math Achievement Scores with Time-varying Indicator of Weight Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed Effects</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept, ( \pi_0i )</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>58.41</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, ( \pi_1i )</td>
<td>29.74</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>449.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age2, ( \pi_2i )</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-262.54</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, ( \pi_3i )</td>
<td>-0.0001</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-26.41</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overweight, ( \pi_4i )</td>
<td>-5.77</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-8.46</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obesity, ( \pi_5i )</td>
<td>-7.97</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-11.59</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Random Effects</th>
<th>Variance Corr, df</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varepsilon_{it} )</td>
<td>35.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept, ( \pi_0i )</td>
<td>34.85</td>
<td>4925</td>
<td>7,907.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, ( \pi_1i )</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>4925</td>
<td>7,326.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age2, ( \pi_2i )</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>4925</td>
<td>5,781.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI, ( \pi_3i )</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>4925</td>
<td>485.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overweight, ( \pi_4i )</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>4925</td>
<td>488.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obesity, ( \pi_5i )</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>4925</td>
<td>453.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data are for children between 1998 - 2007, ECLS-K.

Note: SE indicates Standard Error
Table 5. Estimated Effects of Self-efficacy on Math Achievement for Overweight and Obese Children by Selected Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BMI</th>
<th>Overweight</th>
<th>Obese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-0.0002***</td>
<td>-6.61***</td>
<td>-7.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.00002***</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>-0.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>-0.000006***</td>
<td>-5.82</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-0.00001*</td>
<td>-2.90</td>
<td>-2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.00002</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.000007</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>3.62**</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Graduate</td>
<td>-0.00001</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td>-2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>-0.00002</td>
<td>-6.23**</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>0.00002***</td>
<td>3.79*</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Degree</td>
<td>0.00003***</td>
<td>4.68**</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Source: Data are from the ECLS-K (1998-1999).

Note: SE indicates Standard Error.

Note: * p < 0.05 ** p < 0.005 ***p < 0.001.
Figure 1: Effect of Age and High Self-efficacy on Math Achievement, by Weight Status
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