USING THE FRAGILE FAMILIES AND CHILD WELLBEING STUDY DATA TO STUDY MARRIAGE AND FAMILY
Fragile Families & Child Wellbeing Study

- Principal Investigators:
  - Sara McLanahan and Irv Garfinkel (Core study)
  - Jeanne Brooks-Gunn (Child care provider)
  - Christina Paxson (In-home)
  - Kathy Edin and Paula England (TLC3)
  - Julien Teitler and Nancy Reichman (Medical records)
Funders of the Fragile Families Study

Today’s Presentation

- Overview of FF study (broadly)
- Research design, response rates, attrition, weighting of core FF study
- Key information re: variables/documentation
- Using FF core study for
  - Studying union status & HH structure
  - Studying union history
  - Studying relationship quality
  - Studying fertility
OVERVIEW OF STUDY
Study Features

- Birth cohort – follow cohort of children from birth through age 9

- Multi-method (surveys, observational assessments, height/weight measurements, qualitative interviews, medical records, neighborhood data)

- Couple data
  - Interviews with both parents of focal child
  - Data on “missing fathers” from mother reports and other waves
What are “fragile families”?

- Unmarried parents and their children
  - Families because biological ties between parents and children
  - Fragile because risk of poverty, family dissolution, and poor child outcomes
  - Note: study includes comparison sample of married families

- Dramatic growth: one of three births in U.S.
- Large social class disparities
Original aims of core study

- What are the capabilities of unmarried parents, especially fathers?
- What is the nature of parental relationships, and how stable are relationships?
- How do children fare and how does family structure and stability affect child wellbeing?
- How do social policies affect family dynamics and child wellbeing?
Studies incorporated into FF

- Core telephone survey
- Add on studies
  - In-home study
  - Child care/kindergarten teacher study
  - Medical records
  - TLC3 study (qualitative interviews)
Core FF data

- Mother/father interviews at time of child’s birth and one, three, and five years later
- At birth, in-person interview; follow-ups generally by phone
- Topics covered...
  - Couple relationships (focal parents and with new partners)
  - Parent-child relationships (and with new partner)
  - Child care and child support
  - Income, hardship, public assistance, social support
  - Health
3 & 5 year in-home data

- Combination of a telephone survey and observation/assessment data from home visit
- Includes most of the child outcomes (other than some basic health outcomes available in core)
- Includes more detailed self-reported information on parenting and home environment than core; includes observations of parenting and home environment
Child care provider study

- At three- and five-year follow-ups, child care provider/kindergarten teacher surveys and observations
- Subset of full sample
Medical records

- Data abstracted from birth hospitalization records
  - Includes information on the pregnancy and hospitalization
  - Includes medical and psychosocial information (e.g., results from drug tests)
- Available for 3,684 births
In-depth, semi-structured qualitative interviews with 75 romantically involved couples.

Interviews began two to three months after the baby's birth, with follow-up waves when child was approximately 12 months, 24 months, and 48-50 months of age.

Topics include parents' relationship with their partners (child’s father or a new partner), division of household labor, and ideals and norms about marriage and fatherhood.

Interviews with both members of the couple.
Contextual data

- Census tract composition data for first three waves
- Variables include composition on education, race, and income; employment; housing conditions
- Neighborhood data from 2000 Census files.
- Data is available for 4,725 mothers (96% of baseline respondents) and 4,069 fathers (83%)
- 47 variables on demographic composition, education, employment, income, poverty, public assistance, housing conditions, rent
Currently Available Data

- Publicly available
  - Core telephone surveys for mothers and fathers from baseline, one-year, and three-year
  - 3-year in-home data
  - Contract data: contextual data, city/state identifiers, stratum/psu, and medical records

- Restricted use contract data requires IRB approval, $250 fee, data protection plan, faculty sponsor (if grad student/post-doc)
  - See http://www.fragilefamilies.princeton.edu/restricted.asp
Future Data Releases

- 5-year core data (August 2008)
- Child care & emp. calendars (3 & 5 yr) (Fall 2008)
- 5-year in-home data (planned for Dec 2008)
- Qualitative data – TLC3 (2008 by ICPSR)
- 3-year child care data (2009?)
- 9-year survey:
  - Phone interview and in-home and teacher survey
  - Public use data released about one year following complete data file (2010 or 2011)
  - DNA data for gene markers
RESEARCH DESIGN, RESPONSE RATES, ATTRITION, AND WEIGHTING
Research Design in Brief

- Probability sample of 4,898 recent births
  - 20 U.S. cities (populations of 200,000 or more)
  - 75 hospitals
  - Roughly 3,700 non-marital births; 1,200 marital births
- Oversample of non-marital births
- When weighted (with national weights), data are representative of births in large U.S. cities (populations of 200,000 or more)
- Review sample design paper - Reichman et al. 2001 available on our website
Core Study Field Periods

- **Baseline:**
  - February 1998 to September 2000

- **1 year:**
  - June 1999 to March 2002

- **3 year:**
  - April 2001 to December 2003

- **5 year:**
  - July 2003 to February 2006
Some key information

- At baseline, interview with mother in the hospital just after the baby’s birth (in-person); father interviewed in hospital or elsewhere (phone and in-person)
- Largely phone interviews at later waves
- (Potential) gap between mother and father interviews (see cm*tdiff variables)
- Interviews conducted in English and Spanish
- Teens only interviewed in about 1/3 of hospitals (when parental permission was not required)
## Baseline Sample Sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mothers (births)</th>
<th>Fathers</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>2,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>3,712</td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>6,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4,898</td>
<td>3,830</td>
<td>8,728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sampling

- Multistage stratified probability sample of births in 16 large US cities, + 4 extra cities
  - Step 1: Stratified 77 cities with population >200K by strength of labor market, generosity of welfare policies, and strictness of child support enforcement (high, med, low)
  - Step 2: 1 city sampled (PPS) from each of 8 extreme cells, designated as large sample city (N=325)
  - Step 3: 8 cities samples from all non-extreme cells, designated as small sample city (N=100)
  - Added 4 cities of interest to funders
# Fragile Families Cities by Policy Regime

## Table: Labor Market and Child Support Enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welfare Generosity</th>
<th>Child Support Enforcement</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Benefits</td>
<td>Strict</td>
<td>Boston*</td>
<td>Pittsburgh*</td>
<td>Toledo*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAN JOSE*</td>
<td>OAKLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MILWAUKEE</td>
<td>DETROIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Benefits</td>
<td>Strict</td>
<td>Norfolk*</td>
<td>PHILADELPHIA*</td>
<td>NEWARK</td>
<td>Jacksonville*</td>
<td>BALTIMORE*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chicago*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Benefits</td>
<td>Strict</td>
<td>INDIANA-POlis*</td>
<td>RICHMOND*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nashville*</td>
<td>AUSTIN*</td>
<td>San Antonio*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CORPUS CHRISTI*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bold:** Cities with "extreme" policies

**UPPER CASE:** Large sample cities (325 births)

**Lower case:** Small sample cities (100 births)

*= City is in national sample

---

Multistage stratified probability sample of births in 16 large US cities, + 4

- Step 4: Selected hospitals within each city
  - All in 5 cities
  - Most in 13 cities (75% inclusion criterion)
  - Sample in 2 cities (Chicago and New York)

- Step 5: Randomly sampled births within each hospital
Design Effects and Representativeness

- Sampling scheme introduces design effects
  - Hospitals not selected at random in most cities
    - Could be under-representing high SES population
  - Mothers < 18 included in only 1/3 hospitals
- Weights are available to account for design
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Father</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 year</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 year</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Father #s and mother #s for years 1 to 5 are percent of eligible baseline mothers.
Baseline Father Response Rates by Relationship Status
Completion rates for in-home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mother - 20 cities</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mother - national sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Married at birth</td>
<td>Unmarried at birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-year core</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone or home</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phone or home/assessments as percentage of three-year core respondents**
Missing Data

- Missing data considerations necessary re:
  - Fathers (non-response and attrition)
    - 25% missing at baseline (not random)
    - Attrition at other waves, but find 5% new dads at each wave (roughly); 86% of unmarried fathers at least once
  - In-home (attrition)
    - Lose between 20-40% of sample depending on measures
  - Item non-response (income, earnings, two-cities not asked, father characteristics reported by mom)
  - Longitudinal (attrition)
Approaches to missing data

- In addition to traditional statistical methods, you should consider
  - Using alternate variable, for example
    - Medicaid/welfare rather than baseline income
    - Mother reports for father’s missing data
- Multiple imputation (e.g. Percheski & Wildeman, 2008; Meadows et al 2007)
  - Have data from other waves to inform imputation
- Weighting to compensate for loss of one city in national sample
  - If a question isn’t asked in one of the cities (-5s in data), can use alternate set of weights for 15 cities
  - See p. 37 of constructing weights documentation
Weighting the FF data

- Sample design complex (e.g.)
  - Stratified random sample (national cities)
  - Sampling of births (and hospitals)
  - Clustering
  - Oversample of non-marital births
  - Underrepresentation of teen births

- Weights account for design (selection of births, hospitals, cities), nonresponse at baseline, and attrition at each wave
Weight up to two populations

- Weighting with national sample/weights makes the data from the 16 randomly selected cities representative of births occurring in large U.S. cities (the 77 U.S. cities with populations over 200,000 in 1994) between 1998 and 2000.

- Weighting with city-level sample/weights makes the data from all 20 cities in the sample representative of births in their particular city in year in which the baseline data collection took place for that city.
Weights on the public files

- Base weight and replicate weights for each sample/population/wave
  - National (16 cities) OR full sample (20 cities)
    - Mothers, fathers, couples
    - Baseline, one-, three-, and five-year

- Basic weight is a sampling weight
  - Implies number of people in the population represented by the sampled individual
  - Set using the pweight option in Stata
## Weighting variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>National level weights</th>
<th>City level weights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic weight</td>
<td>Replicate weights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>m1natwt</td>
<td>m1natwt_rep1-m1natwt_rep33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f1natwt</td>
<td>f1natwt_rep1-f1natwt_rep33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Year</td>
<td>m2natwt</td>
<td>m2natwt_rep1-m2natwt_rep33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f2natwt</td>
<td>f2natwt_rep1-f2natwt_rep33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-year</td>
<td>m3natwt</td>
<td>m3natwt_rep1-m3natwt_rep33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f3natwt</td>
<td>f3natwt_rep1-f3natwt_rep33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-year</td>
<td>m4natwt</td>
<td>m4natwt_rep1-m4natwt_rep33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f4natwt</td>
<td>f4natwt_rep1-f4natwt_rep33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Couple weights are also available on the files. Begin with “c”.
Flag variables

- Each weight has comparable flag variable
  - Indicates whether the person is in that sample and has a completed interview (e.g. cm3natsm indicates mother three-year national sample or cc4citsm indicates couples both interviewed in five-year all 20 cities)

- Use for Ns, to compare weighted/unweighted results, in subpop command, etc...
Variance estimation

- Two different approaches to variance estimation
  - Employing replicate weights (public and contract data)
  - Specifying Stratum/PSU and Taylor Series methods (for restricted use contract data only)
    - Will not discuss today

- Applying weight without replicate weights or stratum/psu will get you correct point estimates, but incorrect standard errors
Replicate weights

- Used in place of stratum and psu
- Mask location of respondents, while still allowing for estimation of variance
- Require using jackknife estimation of standard errors
Stata syntax for replicate weights

```
svyset [pweight=BASICWEIGHT], jkrw(REPLICATES, multiplier(1)) vce(jack) mse
```

For an analysis of baseline mother data for the national sample, set the weight by entering...

```
svyset [pweight=m1natwt], jkrw(m1natwt_rep*, multiplier(1)) vce(jack) mse
```

Then add “svy:” before relevant commands...
Marrieds versus unmarrieds

```
. tab cm1marf

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-9 Not in wave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 No</td>
<td>3,710</td>
<td>75.75</td>
<td>75.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Yes</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>24.23</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,898</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

. svy: tab cm1marf
(running tabulate on estimation sample)

Number of strata = 1
Number of obs = 3442
Population size = 1131308.4
Replications = 33
Design df = 32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructed - Is respondent married?</th>
<th>proportions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 No</td>
<td>.3983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Yes</td>
<td>.6017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: proportions = cell proportions
```
Other comments re: weights

- No longitudinal weights
  - Suggest using weight of wave with largest N
- No weights for in-home or child care
  - But questionable whether would even be prudent to weight given attrition
- Review weights documentation (both products)
KEY INFORMATION RE: VARIABLES/DOCUMENTATION
Key documentation

- Documentation page

- Questionnaires
  - Questionnaire maps on website provides key to sections by wave
  - Mother/father not necessarily same question numbers
  - Variable names essentially line up with question numbers

- Guide to the public use file
  - Highly encourage you to read. Most answers are found there. Also FAQs on website.

- Core scales documentation
- Weights documentation and design paper
- Codebook (tabulations of all variables)
- In-home user’s guide
Key identifiers

- All files include a family id number (idnum) which can be used to merge mothers to fathers, across waves, and to collaborative data files.
- Also files also include IDs for mothers (mothid*) and fathers (fathid*) that can be used for merging across waves and to check other merges.
Variable naming

- All of the core raw variables (questions in the survey) are named with
  - m/f – depending on whether mother or father reported on it
  - 1,2,3,4 – wave indicator (1=baseline, 2=one-year, 3=three-year, 4=five-year)
  - question # – the number/letter of Q in the survey instrument
  - e.g., m1a12 = mother baseline question a12

- Constructed variables start with a “c”, then have an m/f for mother/father, a wave indicator, then a mnemonic for what variable is (e.g., cm1age or cf2fint)

- In-home variables are just question number

- Contextual variables are tmXvar where X = wave and var=mneumonic
Important values

-9 -- not in wave (non-respondent in that wave)
  - no mothers were non-respondents at baseline
-8 -- out of range (rare)
-7 (also -10/-14) – did not apply
-6 -- skipped the question (b/c it did not apply to them OR we effectively know the answer b/c of prior information we obtained)
-5 – not asked in the version of the survey they received (most often this is b/c the question was added after the survey was already fielded in the first 2 cities)
  - 18-cities only; 2 cities not asked
-3 – missing (rare)
-2 – don’t know
-1 -- refused
‘Raw’ Variable Example

M1B3: “Which of the following statements best describes your current relationship with [baby’s father]?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-6 Skip</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>24.81</td>
<td>24.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3 Missng</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>24.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1 Refuse</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>24.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Steady</td>
<td>2,577</td>
<td>52.61</td>
<td>77.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 on-off</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>87.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Friend</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>93.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hardly</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>96.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Never</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4,898</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Constructed variables

- **Demographics**
  - Age, age at first birth, age at marriage, child sex, child low birth weight, number of children

- **Relationship status**
  - Mom/dad relationship status at each wave with biological parent of focal child and new partners (c*rel*; c*mar*)

- **Household composition**
  - Number of adults/children
  - Grandparent of focal child in household

- **Sample flags**
  - Whether mom/dad was interviewed (c*int) & if not, why (c*samp)
  - Spanish interview
  - Participated in in-home study

- **Other**
  - HH income, depression/anxiety
### Constructed Variable Example

**CM1RELF: Household relationship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructed -</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 married</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>24.23</td>
<td>24.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 cohab</td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td>36.42</td>
<td>60.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 visiting</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>26.01</td>
<td>86.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 friends</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>92.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 hardly talk</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>96.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 never talk</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>99.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 fath unknwn</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 4,898 | 100.00 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample composition/notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>Married (%)</th>
<th>Unmarried (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First birth</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom multipartner fertility</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad multipartner fertility</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either multipartner fertility</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other race</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living w/ gmom–baseline</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohab-live w/ gmom</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living w/ gmom–3-year</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USING FF DATA TO STUDY UNION STATUS
Overview of union status

- For marriage, cohabitation, & relationship status
  - Key source variables (not exhaustive)
  - Constructed variables
  - Rates
- Issues and things to consider
### Current marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Focal child’s father/mother</th>
<th>New partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>cm1marf/cf2marm</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-year</td>
<td>cm2marf/cf2marm</td>
<td>cm2marp/cf2marp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-year</td>
<td>cm3marf/cf3marm</td>
<td>cm3marp/cf3marp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-year</td>
<td>cm4marf/cf4marm</td>
<td>cm4marp/cf4marp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- At all follow-ups, these are constructed from questions in Section A (focal parent)/E (new partner).
- At baseline, two questions ascertained marital status (a13 and b2). Chose b2 (with some minor recoding) b/c skip patterns were based off response to b2.
- Household roster may conflict with responses to these Qs on occasion.
- Couple don’t always agree.
## Marriage rates at each wave

### Among unmarrieds at child’s birth (76%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cm*marf</th>
<th>cf*marm</th>
<th>cm*marp</th>
<th>cf*marp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-year</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-year</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-year</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Among marrieds at child’s birth (24%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cm*marf</th>
<th>cf*marm</th>
<th>cm*marp</th>
<th>cf*marp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-year</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-year</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-year</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted, 20 cities
Cohabitation: An elusive concept

- Much less straightforward than marriage
- The GOOD: One of FF foci is parent relationships, so asked many questions about living arrangements, to each parent, at each wave
- The BAD: Reports of cohabitation vary somewhat by how, when, and who we ask
- The UNFORTUNATE: No cohabitation calendar. Only asked at status/dates at each wave. Need to be careful drawing inferences about status between survey waves.
How we ask about cohabitation

- Direct questions (section A):
  - From baseline: Are you and [BABY’S FATHER] living together now? YES/NO
  - From follow-up surveys: Are you and (FATHER) currently living together: All or most of the time, Some of the time, Rarely, or Never?
  - *Note: at one-year also ask this question retrospectively about status at time of birth
  - Current part.: Do you & CP live together most of time?

- Indirect questions (all waves):
  - Who will/does (CHILD) (usually) live with? (sect A)
  - Household roster
  - How many nights a week do you and (FATHER) usually spend the night together? (follow-ups only) (sect A)
Current cohabitation status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Focal child’s father/mother</th>
<th>New partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>cm1cohf/cf2cohm</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-year</td>
<td>cm2cohf/cf2cohm</td>
<td>cm2cohp/cf2cohp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-year</td>
<td>cm3cohf/cf3cohm</td>
<td>cm3cohp/cf3cohp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-year</td>
<td>cm4cohf/cf4cohm</td>
<td>cm4cohp/cf4cohp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
• Cohabiting and not married
• Cohabiting all/most of the time (only have yes/no at baseline)
• Household roster may conflict with responses to these Qs
• Couples don’t always agree
Cohabitation rates at each wave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Among unmarrieds at child’s birth</th>
<th>cm*cohf</th>
<th>cf*cohm</th>
<th>cm*cohp</th>
<th>cf*cohp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-year</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-year</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-year</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>74%*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*among dad’s interviewed at baseline
Some inconsistencies at baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Reporting</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic White</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic Blacks</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living Together</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Will Live with Both Parents</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father on Household Roster</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Together and Baby Will Live with Both Parents</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Together and Father on Household Roster</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Together, Baby Will Live with Both Parents and Father on Household Roster</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>3695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What does “cohabiting” mean?

### Table 3

**Prevalence of Cohabitation at Birth**

**Based on Who is Reporting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Are you and (baby's father) living together now?</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responded &quot;yes&quot;</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Are you and (baby's father) living together now?</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responded &quot;yes&quot;</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both report cohabiting</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother reports cohabiting, father reports not cohabiting</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father reports cohabiting, mother reports not cohabiting</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither reports cohabiting</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

Sample includes mothers and fathers interviewed at baseline and one-year follow-ups of the Fragile Families Study. Includes only those couples in which mothers and fathers were interviewed within one month of each other at baseline (N = 1,825).
## Table 2
Prevalence of Cohabitation at Birth
Based on *When* Question is Asked

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current report</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Are you and (baby's father) living together now?</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responded &quot;yes&quot;</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retrospective report</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>When did you and (baby's father) start living together?</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date preceded focal child's birth</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, both waves</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, current; No, retrospective</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, current; Yes, retrospective</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, both waves</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Sample includes mothers interviewed at baseline and one-year follow-ups (N=3,260) in the Fragile Families Study.
- Three percent of mothers now report being married at the child's birth, including as not cohabiting.

How consequential is it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Union Formation (Among Baseline Noncohabitors)</th>
<th>Union Dissolution (Among Baseline Cohabitors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contemporaneous</td>
<td>22.3 – 28.6</td>
<td>25.5 – 29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrospective</td>
<td>12.6 – 12.8</td>
<td>25.8 – 26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategies for addressing “extra” data

- Be aware of limitations when drawing conclusions from data
- Assess robustness of findings to different definitions of cohabitation
- Use inconsistencies in measures as information about strength and stability of relationships
- Remember that strengths of FF data are what allow us to uncover complexities in relationships. Thinking about how to measure and interpret these complexities is one way to advance field
Relationship status with bio dad

At follow up waves, questions are worded as…

A7. What is your relationship with (FATHER) now? Are you:

- Married, ..............................................1
- Romantically involved, ............................2
- Separated/Divorced, ..................................3
- Just friends, or ......................................4
- Not in any kind of a relationship? .............5
- FATHER NOT KNOWN .............................-13
- VOLUNTEERED, FATHER DIED ...............-14
- REFUSED ............................................-1

Baseline slightly different

B3. Which of the following statements best describes your relationship with [BABY'S FATHER]? (HAND CARD 1)

- We are romantically involved on a steady basis..........................1
- We are involved in an on-again and off-again relationship...............2
- We are just friends. ........................................3
- We hardly ever talk to each other .......................4
- We never talk to each other ................................5

B8. Are you and [BABY'S FATHER] living together now?

- YES ......................................................1
- NO .......................................................2

A7A. Are you and (FATHER) currently living together...

- All or most of the time, .........................1
- Some of the time, .................................2
- Rarely, or ..............................................3
- Never? ...............................................4
Relationship status with bio dad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>Constructed variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>cm1relf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-year</td>
<td>cm2relf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-year</td>
<td>cm3relf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-year</td>
<td>cm4relf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Categories change across waves
- Don’t have equivalent variable for subsequent partner(s)
## Couple relationships at birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cm1relf</th>
<th>Full sample (%)</th>
<th>Unmarrieds only (%)</th>
<th>Codes for waves 2-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-9 not in wave</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3 missing</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 married</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-9 not in wave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 cohabiting</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>-3 missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 visiting</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>1 married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 friends</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2 cohabiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 hardly talk</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3 rom some visiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 never talk</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4 rom no visiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 father unknown</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5 sep/div/wid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimates are unweighted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories that change are in italics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 no relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 father unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 father unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dating new partner

Section E at every follow-up wave

E2. Are you currently involved in a romantic relationship with (FATHER)?

YES .......................................................................................... 1

NO ............................................................................................ 2 ➔

REFUSED .................................................................................. -2 ➔
Current partner warning

- Current partner – between 1 and 3 year cannot tell if mother is talking about same partner as previous wave
  - Can match on age/education
  - Can use date started living together
    - But some inconsistencies between dates and prior wave answer to current partner question
Unmarried relationships five years later

Weighted, national sample

Relationships are not static

LD is lives with dad (married or cohabiting)  LNP is with new partner
Other items of from baseline survey

- Plans to marry
- Why not planning to marry (or living together)?
- Why not currently living together (or married) ?
- What are chances you will marry father in future?
- What are chances you will marry someone in future?
Household structure

- HH roster available for moms and dads at each wave
- Age, relationship status, and employment status of each member of HH

Notes:

- Relationship status codes change across waves
- Not necessarily sorted in order of oldest to youngest
- Cannot separate bio/non-bio kids or other relatives at baseline
USING FF DATA TO STUDY UNION HISTORY
Marital history/duration

- Five year gets marital history with other partners
  - Need to get focal parent marr dates from relevant wave
- All follow-up surveys
  - Each follow-up survey includes dates of marriage and separated/divorced that occur between the waves (focal partner and new partner – sections A/E)
  - One-year asks retrospective question about date of marriage if married at baseline or one-year (may miss short-term marriages or ones that dissolved before child’s birth)
  - Three-year asks ever married to someone other than child’s father but only in 18-cities (also re-asked at five-year)
## Marriage Dates

- Sometimes missing or out of range
- 30-months:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cum %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>7.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>8.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>10.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>11.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>12.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>19.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>27.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>37.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31.87</td>
<td>69.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>26.29</td>
<td>95.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Five-year marital history

A11.  WERE MOTHER AND CHILD'S FATHER EVER MARRIED?  
(CHECK MARRIAGE HISTORY ON CONTACT SHEET AND A4)  
YES ............................................................................1  
NO ............................................................................2  ➔ GO TO A11B

A11A. Were you ever married to someone other than (FATHER)?  
YES ............................................................................1  ➔ GO TO A11C  
NO ............................................................................2  ➔ GO TO A12E

A11B. Were you ever married?  
YES ............................................................................1  
NO ............................................................................2  ➔ GO TO A12E

A11C. In total, how many times have you been married?  
ONCE ............................................................................ 1

Note: need to get focal parents’ marriage date from five-year (if recently married) or earlier wave.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A12A.</th>
<th>WHAT WAS THE DATE OF YOUR (FIRST/SECOND/THIRD) MARRIAGE (TO SOMEONE OTHER THAN [FATHER])?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IF MORE THAN THREE MARRIAGES, LIST THE THREE MOST RECENT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTH</td>
<td>DAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A12A1A)</td>
<td>(A12A1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A12A2A)</td>
<td>(A12A2B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A12A3A)</td>
<td>(A12A3B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A12B.</th>
<th>DID YOU DIVORCE THIS MAN?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| YES ...........................................1  
NO ............(GO TO A12C)....2 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A12C.</th>
<th>ON WHAT DATE DID YOU DIVORCE FROM THIS MAN?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MONTH</td>
<td>DAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A12C1A)</td>
<td>(A12C1B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A12C2A)</td>
<td>(A12C2B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A12C3A)</td>
<td>(A12C3B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A12D.</th>
<th>CHECK A12A NEXT COLUMN. IS THERE ANOTHER MARRIAGE TO ASK ABOUT?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| YES .......(GO TO A12B MARRIAGE 02).....1  
NO ............(GO TO A12E)....2  | ➔ GO TO A12E  
YES .......(GO TO A12B MARRIAGE 03).....1  
NO ............(GO TO A12E)....2  |
Cohabitation History with Focal Partner

- Measured like marriage, but without the five-year history
- Difficult to create cohabitation calendar (have date started living together and date romantic relationship ended, but not date moved out)
  - Only asked of those who indicated cohabiting at an interview. Short-term cohabitations not captured.
- Some dates are missing and out of range
- Some people are asked who shouldn’t be
- Consider using methodology that allows for censoring
Cohabitation/partnership history prior to focal birth

From three-year follow-up

A13. Before you were involved with (FATHER), about how many romantic relationships did you have that lasted for at least one month?

- RELATIONSHIPS ➔ GO TO A14
  - ONLY WITH FATHER .............................................. 0 ➔ GO TO A16
  - DON'T KNOW .................................................. -2
  - REFUSED ....................................................... -1 ➔ GO TO A16

A13A. I just need to have a range. Can you tell me if it was . . .

- 1-5 relationships, ............................................. 1
- 6-10 relationships, ............................................ 2
- 11-15 relationships, or ....................................... 3
- More than 15 relationships? .............................. 4
- DON'T KNOW .................................................. -2

A14. Did you ever live together with (this partner/any of your partners) in (this relationship/these relationships) for one month or more?

- YES ................................................................. 1
- NO ................................................................. 2

A15. Did you ever get pregnant in (this relationship/any of these relationships)?

- YES ................................................................. 1
- NO ................................................................. 2
- DON'T KNOW .................................................. -2
- REFUSED ....................................................... -1
Cohabitation/partnership history after focal child’s birth

From five-year follow-up

A13. (Since [DATE OF LAST INTERVIEW]/During the last two years), about how many romantic relationships have you had that lasted for at least one month?
- None .................................................. 0 ➔ GO TO A16
- Only with father ...................................-10 ➔ GO TO A16
- Don’t know ......................................... -2
- Refused .............................................-1 ➔ GO TO A16

A13A. I just need to have a range. Can you tell me if it was . . .
- One or two relationships, ................................ 1
- Three or four relationships, ............................. 2
- Four to six relationships, ................................ 3
- More than six relationships? ............................. 4
- Don’t know .............................................-2

A14. (Since [DATE OF LAST INTERVIEW]/During the last two years), have you lived together with (this partner/any of your partners) in (this relationship/the relationships) for one month or more?
- Yes ......................................................... 1
- No ........................................................... 2 ➔ GO TO A15

A14A. (Since [DATE OF LAST INTERVIEW]/During the last two years), how many different partners have you lived with for one month or more?
- None ...................................................... 1

A15. Did you ever get pregnant in (this relationship/any of these relationships)?
- Yes ......................................................... 1
- No ........................................................... 2
- Don’t know .............................................-2
- Refused .................................................-1
USING FF DATA TO STUDY RELATIONSHIPS
Overall relationship quality

- Biological parents only (all, not just romantically involved)
- Both mother and father reports
- 1, 3, & 5 years:
  - “In general, would you say that your relationship with [her/him] is…”
  - Range 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)
- Note: not available for 2 cities at one-year
Relationship conflict

- Both mother and father reports
- Baseline
  - Frequency of conflict about: money, spending time together, the pregnancy, drug use, being faithful
  - Range 1 (never) to 3 (often)
- 1 and 3 years
  - Frequency of arguing (single Q)
  - Range 1 (never) to 5 (always)
- 5 years – none
Other indicators of conflict

- Hit/slap and other domestic violence indicators available at every wave (father and current partner)
  - One-year asks retrospectively about prior to child’s birth (during pregnancy, before pregnancy)
  - Note: reports of domestic violence during pregnancy are much higher at one-year than at baseline

- Controlling behaviors (focal dad & new partner)
  - 1, 3 and 5 year
  - Items like he tries to keep you from friends and family; withheld money, etc.
Relationship fidelity and commitment

- Fidelity
  - Can be ascertained at early waves via why broke up measures; also a gender distrust variable
  - At five-year, explicitly ask about cheating in relationship with other focal parent
    - Own cheating
    - Perception of partner’s fidelity

- Commitment
  - Five-year, scale from work of Stanley and Markman and others. Documented in five-year scales documentation (forthcoming)
Relationship “supportiveness”

- Predictive of future relationship status
- Both mother and father reports
- Baseline
  - 4 items: fair & willing to compromise, shows affection/love, insults/criticizes (inverse), encourages/helps
  - Range 1 (never) to 3 (often)
- 1, 3, & 5 year
  - Same 4 items plus 2: listens when you need someone to talk to, really understands your hurts and joys
- Items hang together well (high alphas) but not tested on external samples/split sample
- Note: for couples who broke up, ask about last month of relationship
Strengths, limitations, and issues

- FF provides information about rel quality not typically available in national surveys; both for focal couple and new resident partners over time
- Both mother and father reports
  - Think about how to use/model this information
- Less strong on negative measures and resolution of conflict then on some (new) positive measures
- Be careful about who is asked particular Qs (based on relationship type) and skip patterns
Other “family” relationship measures

- Social and financial support
- Relationships with (grand)parents currently
- Relationships with (grand)parents growing up
- Did father have “social” father growing up
USING FF DATA TO STUDY FERTILITY
Mother’s children at baseline

- **Method 1:** Use M1A12A – How many other biological children do you have? (add one to include focal child)
  - Note: only biological children (so underestimate)
- **Method 2:** Use Household roster (add one to include focal child)
  - Note: Baseline does not include Qs afterward asking about children not living with the mother so underestimate of total number of children
  - Note: Can’t distinguish biological children only at baseline
    - M1E1B* – Relationship of person in household
      - Child, Stepchild, Foster child (5)
      - Other Child (6)
Mother’s children at other waves

- **Method 1 (one- and three-year): Sum**
  - How many biological children mother has with father
  - How many children mother has with someone other than father (doesn’t say bio only)
  - Add variables together to get total number of children
  - (Also asks about children with current partner)

- **Method 1 (five-year):** Q available (section A) asks for total number of children
  - Does not specify biological children only

- **Method 2:** Sum household roster plus Qs that follow re: bio kids outside home
  - Note: codes change (can limit to bio children)
  - Bio/adopted child (5), Stepchild (6), Foster child (7)
  - Note: codes change at five-year
Recent births/pregnancies

- **One-Year**
  - Asks mother if she had another child or is pregnant now since focal child was born (M2F6)

- **Three-Year**
  - Asks mother if she had another child, adopted a child, or is pregnant now since date of last interview (M3A10)
  - History: Asks mother if she ever got pregnant in any previous relationships prior to focal birth (M3A15)

- **Five-Year**
  - Only asks mother if she ever got pregnant in any relationships since last interview (M4A15)
Issues with reports of mother’s children

- Consistency across waves
  - 90 percent of mother reports agree between baseline and one-year (accounting for new births)

- Consistency within waves
  - Section A/HH roster (bio only*) + outside hh agreement for 86 percent of baseline mothers and 90 percent of one-year mothers
    - At baseline cannot limit HH roster to bio only

- FYI: Father reports on mother’s other children at five-year
Bio Father’s children

- Not as precise for fathers
  - Baseline Qs and household roster are the same as mother
  - Roughly same method to calculate total fertility at follow-up waves, but question numbers differ
    - Note: fathers aren’t asked about bio children living outside of hh after hh roster
- Can also examine mother’s report of father’s other children from follow-up interviews
## Mean father fertility by reporter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporter &amp; sample</th>
<th>One-year</th>
<th>Three-year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mom – all dads</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom – dads with interviews</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dads (with interviews)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multipartner fertility

- What is MPF
  - Person has child with more than one partner
- No constructed variables but can be constructed using mother and father reports
  - Using five-year as starting point is easiest.
  - Can take one-year (first reported) as history/pre-birth and then examine new births over the waves.
  - Mother’s report on father’s fertility as well.
    - Likely more reliable before birth than after broken up...
Rates of MPF for mothers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Unmarried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-year</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For more information

- Website
  http://www.fragilefamilies.princeton.edu
- Email
  ffdatahelp@opr.princeton.edu