

# User's Guide for the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study Public Data, Year 1

November 2018

***Bendheim-Thoman***

***Center for Research on Child Wellbeing***

Wallace Hall  
Princeton University  
Princeton, NJ 08544

<https://crcw.princeton.edu/>

***Columbia Population Research Center***

1255 Amsterdam Avenue, Room 715  
Columbia University  
New York, NY 10027

<http://cupop.columbia.edu/>

Prepared by the staff at the Bendheim-Thoman Center for Research on Child Wellbeing (CRCW), Princeton University. For more information about FFCWS, please visit our website at <https://fragilefamilies.princeton.edu/> or email [ffdata@princeton.edu](mailto:ffdata@princeton.edu).

## Table of Contents

0.	Study Overview.....	6
0.1	The Core Study.....	6
	<i>Table 1: Timeline of the FFCWS Core Study</i> .....	7
0.1	Collaborative Studies.....	7
0.2	National Sample versus Full Sample.....	7
0.3	Data Availability.....	8
0.3.1.	Public data.....	8
0.3.2.	Contract data.....	8
0.5.	Documentation.....	8
1.	Year 1 Components.....	9
1.1.	Funders and Study Administration.....	9
1.2.	Surveys and Instruments.....	9
	<i>Table 2: Year 1 Components and their Sample Sizes</i> .....	9
2.	Eligibility.....	10
2.1.	Eligibility - Core Study (Mother and Father).....	10
3.	Data Collection Procedures.....	11
3.1.	Data collection Procedures - Core Study.....	11
4.	File Contents and Structure.....	12
4.1.	Variable Structure.....	12
	<i>Table 3: Variable name structure (survey variables and weights)</i> .....	12
4.2.	Constructed Variables.....	12
4.3.	Survey Variables.....	13
	<i>Table 4: Survey Instruments in Year 1</i> .....	13
4.4.	Key Identifier.....	13
4.5.	Variable Label.....	13
4.6.	Variable Response and Missing Data Codes.....	13
	<i>Table 5: Missing Data Codes</i> .....	13
4.7.	Open-Ended Response Codes.....	14
5.	Data Cleaning.....	15
6.	Weights.....	16
7.	Introduction to Topics from the Data.....	17

Table 6: Major topics in Year 1 by survey instrument .....	17
8. Paradata .....	18
8.1. Constructed Variables - Age .....	18
8.2. Constructed Variables - Sample Flags.....	18
8.2.1. Interview completion flags.....	18
8.2.2. Status flags.....	18
<i>Table 7: Constructed variables with administrative information:</i> .....	19
9. Finances.....	20
Table 8: Subtopics in Finances in Year 1 by survey instrument .....	20
9.1. Constructed Variables - Household Income .....	20
9.2. Constructed Variables - Household Income Imputation Flags .....	21
9.3. Constructed Variables - Poverty Measures.....	21
9.4. Scale - Material Hardship.....	22
9.4.1. Variables .....	22
9.4.2. Modifications.....	22
9.4.3. Scoring .....	22
Table 9: Variables on material hardship .....	23
10. Health and Health Behavior.....	24
Table 10: Subtopics in Health and Health Behavior in Year 1 by survey instrument.....	24
10.1. Concept - Height and Weight Measurements .....	24
10.2. Concept - Alcohol, Drug & Tobacco Use.....	25
10.2.1. Variables .....	25
10.3. Scale - Mental Health Depression (CIDI-SF).....	26
10.3.1. Variables .....	26
10.3.2. Modifications.....	27
10.3.3. Scoring Information .....	27
Table 11: Major Depression Liberal Caseness.....	29
Table 12: Major Depression Liberal Caseness.....	29
10.4. Scale - Mental Health for Generalized Anxiety Disorder (CIDI-SF) .....	30
10.4.1. Variables .....	30
10.4.2. Modifications.....	31
10.4.3. Scoring Information .....	31
Table 13: Generalized Anxiety Disorder Caseness .....	32

11.	Cognitive and Behavioral Assessments.....	33
	Table 14: Subtopics in Cognitive and Behavioral Assessments in Year 1 by survey instrument.....	33
11.1.	Scale - Impulsivity .....	34
11.1.1.	Variables .....	34
11.1.2.	Modifications.....	34
11.1.3.	Scoring Information .....	34
	Table 15: Dickman’s Factor Loadings and Corresponding Fragile Families Items.....	34
11.2.	Scale - Child’s Emotionality and Shyness.....	36
11.2.1.	Variables .....	36
11.2.2.	Modifications.....	36
	Table 16: Shyness and Emotionality Source Items .....	37
11.2.3.	Psychometrics .....	37
	Table 17: EAS Internal Consistency (Cronbach’s alpha): Full scale taken from Mathieson & Tambs .....	38
	Table 18: EAS Scale Correlations: Full scale taken from Mathieson & Tambs.....	38
	Table 19: Shyness and Emotionality Correlations among those with both mother and father interview at Year 1.....	38
11.2.4.	Scoring Information .....	39
12.	Employment .....	40
	Table 20: Subtopics in Employment in Year 1 by survey instrument .....	40
12.1.	Open Ended Response Codes - Occupations .....	40
13.	Childcare .....	42
	Table 21: Subtopics in Childcare in Year 1 by survey instrument .....	42
14.	Romantic Relationships.....	43
	Table 22: Subtopics in Romantic Relationships in Year 1 by survey instrument.....	43
14.1.	Constructed Variables - Mother’s relationship with child’s father .....	43
	<i>Table 23: Constructed variables about parent’s romantic relationships.....</i>	<i>44</i>
15.	Parenting .....	45
	Table 24: Subtopics in Parenting in Year 1 by survey instrument.....	45
15.1.	Scale - Aggravation in Parenting.....	46
15.1.1.	Variables .....	46
15.2.	Modifications.....	46
15.3.	Scoring Information .....	46

Table 25: Aggravation in Parenting Variables .....	47
16.    Legal System .....	48
Table 26: Subtopics in Legal System in Year 1 by survey instrument.....	48
16.1.    Constructed Variables - Father in Jail .....	48
17.    Housing and Neighborhood .....	49
Table 27: Subtopics in Housing and Neighborhood in Year 1 by survey instrument .....	49
Table 28: Constructed variables for household composition.....	49
18.    Education .....	50
Table 29: Subtopics in Education in Year 1 by survey instrument .....	50
18.1.    Constructed Variables - Parent’s Education.....	50
19.    Other Topics in Year 1 .....	51
Table 30: Other topics and subtopics in Year 1 by survey instrument.....	51

## 0. Study Overview

The Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (FFCWS) was initiated to address four questions of great interest to researchers and policy makers:

1. What are the conditions and capabilities of unmarried parents, especially fathers?
2. What is the nature of the relationships between unmarried parents?
3. How do children born into these families fare?
4. How do policies and environmental conditions affect families and children?

The FFCWS follows a cohort of 4,898 children born in the U.S. between 1998 and 2000 and includes an over-sample of non-marital births. The sample includes children born in twenty large, U.S. cities (defined as populations of 200,000 or more). Sixteen of the twenty cities were selected using a stratified random sample of U.S. cities with populations of 200,000 or more grouped according to their policy environments and labor market conditions. These cities comprise the nationally-representative sample. See the sample design paper (Reichman et al, "[The Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study: Sample and Design](#)" Children and Youth Services Review, 2001, Vol. 23, No. 4/5) for details on the selection of cities, hospitals, and births.

### 0.1 The Core Study

The Core Study consists of interviews with both mothers and fathers at the child's birth and again when children are ages one, three, five, and nine. A child interview and in-home observations and assessments are also included at age nine. The Core follow-up at age fifteen includes interviews with the teen and primary caregiver (PCG) as well as in-home observations and assessments.

The parent/PCG interviews collect information on attitudes, relationships, parenting behavior, demographic characteristics, health (mental and physical), economic and employment status, neighborhood characteristics, and program participation. Many measures overlap with those used in other large-scale studies such as the Infant Health and Development Program (IHDP), Early Head Start, the Teenage Parent Demonstration, and the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study—Birth Cohort 2000 (ECLS-B).

See [the FFCWS metadata website](#) to browse or search the full list of FFCWS variables. Table 1 below shows the dates of each wave of data collection.

For the remainder of this Guide, we will refer to the follow-up waves of data collection in reference to the child's age. For example, we will refer to the wave focused upon in this guide as "Year 1" (which is wave 2 in the data file).

Table 1: Timeline of the FFCWS Core Study

Wave	Age	Years
1 - Baseline	Birth	1998 - 2000
2	Age 1	1999 - 2001
3	Age 3	2001 - 2003
4	Age 5	2003 - 2006
5	Age 9	2007 - 2010
6	Age 15	2014 - 2017

### 0.1 Collaborative Studies

The Year 1 Wave did not include any collaborative studies. For further details on the collaborative studies included at other waves, see that wave's User Guide or find a [list of all current and completed collaborative studies](#) on our website.

### 0.2 National Sample versus Full Sample

There are 20 cities in the full Fragile Families sample. Sixteen of these cities were selected via a stratified random sample and comprise the "national" sample. For each wave of data and for each unit of analysis (mother, father, couple), users can weight the data up to two different populations – the national level<sup>1</sup> or the city level. Applying the national 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. Applying the city-level weights makes the data from all 20 cities in the sample<sup>2</sup> representative of births in their particular city in 1998, 1999, or 2000, depending on the year in which the baseline data collection took place for that city.

The public use data do not contain the geographic identifiers needed to construct the stratum and primary sampling unit (PSU) variables necessary for using a Taylor Series methodology to estimate variances (except through a restricted use contract)<sup>3</sup>. Therefore, the public use data files contain a basic weight and a set of replicate weights. The replicate weights are used in place of the stratum and PSU variables. The replicate weights mask the locations of respondents, while still allowing for estimation of variance. If you are using the public use datasets, you will need to use the replicate weights to get estimates of variance for the sample. Applying the basic weight without the replicate weights will give you comparable point estimates, but will yield incorrect variance estimates. A brief introduction to the weights available for the public data files is available in the documentation memo "[Fragile Families & Child Wellbeing Study](#):"

---

<sup>1</sup> In this memo, the term national refers to all 77 U.S. cities with 1994 populations of 200,000 or more

<sup>2</sup> There are 109 cases in the Baseline data that were not randomly selected for the core sample (some were randomly selected to be part of a separate study – the TLC3 study) and do not have national sample or city sample weights. Data users can identify and remove these cases using the weights sample flags (cm1citsm=0 for Baseline and cm2citsm=0 for Year 1).

<sup>3</sup> Please note that data users who have access to the geographic identifiers may still want to use the replicate weights for their estimates. Using the replicate weights will likely yield similar standard errors (at least for cross-sectional estimates) as the alternative method.

[A Brief Guide to Using the Weights for Waves 1-6.](#) For detailed information on the construction of the weights, see “[Fragile Families & Child Wellbeing Study: Methodology for Constructing Mother, Father, and Couple Weights for Core Telephone Surveys](#)”.

### 0.3 Data Availability

There are two types of data available to data users.

#### 0.3.1. *Public data*

Currently, Baseline, Year 1, Year 3, Year 5, Year 9 and Year 15 public data are available through the Princeton University [Office of Population Research \(OPR\) data archive](#). To access these data, researchers must complete a brief application and a 25-word abstract about their research project. These files are available in Stata, SPSS, or SAS format and can be downloaded as one combined file (ff\_allwaves\_2018) or in six separate files by wave, such as “ff\_wave2\_2018” for Year 1.

#### 0.3.2. *Contract data*

Contract data require a more formal application due to the sensitive nature of the items available. Contract data available includes files, such as a **geographic file** with variables for the focal child's birth city, mother's and father's state of residence at each interview, and stratum and PSU (note: replicate weights are available on the public file in lieu of these), a set of **contextual characteristics** of the census tract at each wave, **medical records data** for mothers and children from the birth hospitalization record, a **school characteristics file** based on National Center for Educational Statistics data, a **labor market and macroeconomic file** with data on local employment and national consumer confidence at each wave, and a **genetic data file** with candidate genes and telomere length.

For further detail regarding the content of the contract data and the application process for its access, please [visit our website](#).

### 0.5. Documentation

The remainder of this guide will provide a detailed overview of the **Year 1 Wave of the public FFCWS**.

For User Guides for other waves of the FFCWS and further documentation including questionnaires and codebooks for each interview or weights documentation, see the [Documentation page](#) on our website.



## 1. Year 1 Components

The Year 1 Wave of the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (FFCWS) contains components from one study:

1. The FFCWS Core Study [a.k.a. "Core Study"] (includes mother and father interview)

### 1.1. Funders and Study Administration

Funding for the Year 1 wave was provided through a grant from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD).<sup>4</sup> Since the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study began in 1998, a consortium of private foundations, non-profit organizations, and government agencies has provided additional support. Please see [our website for the full list](#) of these partners. Data collection for the Year 1 wave was administered by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. (MPR) in Princeton, NJ.

The FFCWS Core Study was a joint effort by Princeton University's Center for Research on Child Wellbeing (CRCW) and Center for Health and Wellbeing (CHW), the Columbia Population Research Center (CPRC) and the National Center for Children and Families (NCCF) at Columbia University.

### 1.2. Surveys and Instruments

There are two instruments, as listed in Table 2, for this wave – the mother and father core survey. For explanations of the variation in sample size, see the sections below on Eligibility and Data Collection Procedures.

*Table 2: Year 1 Components and their Sample Sizes*

<b>Study</b>	<b>Surveys and Instruments</b>	<b>N</b>
Core Study	Mother Survey	4,364
	Father Survey	3,379

---

<sup>4</sup> award numbers R01HD36916 (Core); R01HD039135 (In-Home); R01HD40421(Child Care)

## **2. Eligibility**

### **2.1. Eligibility - Core Study (Mother and Father)**

All respondents who completed a baseline interview were contacted for the Year 1 survey, as were non-respondent at baseline fathers whose partner (mother) had completed a baseline interview. A small portion of the original respondents were found to be ineligible at the time of the follow-up interviews. See the sample flags (c\*2samp) for counts at the Year 1 wave. Reasons for considering a case ineligible for further interview include: parent deceased, child deceased, child adopted, (and for fathers) DNA confirmation that the original respondent is not the child's father.

### **3. Data Collection Procedures**

#### **3.1. Data collection Procedures - Core Study**

The Year 1 wave of data collection took place from 1999 to 2001. These interviews were designed to be conducted by telephone using a Computer Assisted Telephone Instrument (CATI). All mothers who remained eligible were contacted for the Year 1 follow-up interview. All Year 1 mother interviews were first attempted by telephone using CATI. In cases in which we could not contact the mother by telephone, local field interviewers were assigned cases requiring field locating. The field interviewers were encouraged to have respondents call a 24-hour toll-free number at the Mathematica Policy Research (MPR) survey operations center to complete the interview on the CATI system. Field interviewers were also trained in administration of the survey instrument. Respondents completing the Year 1 interviews by telephone were provided with \$30 incentive payment. Those requiring a field visit to complete the core survey were provided with \$50 incentive payment.

Father follow-up interviews followed the same protocols and incentives as mothers. Some fathers were incarcerated at the time of data collection in their location. In these cases, MPR staff worked to obtain special clearance, including permission from the Federal Bureau of Prisons, to conduct interviews with incarcerated respondents. When possible for cost containment purposes, interviews with incarcerated respondents were attempted by telephone. However, some prisons do not permit telephone interviews. In those cases MPR field interviewers arranged for in-person visits.

About 89 percent of mothers and 88 percent of fathers from the original baseline sample were interviewed by phone at the Year 1 survey.

## 4. File Contents and Structure

### 4.1. Variable Structure

In the Year 1 data, each variable name is unique and uses certain characters, as well as a specific order that will help identify to whom and in which survey the question was asked. All variable names from Year 1 begin with an alphabetic character. If the variable name begins with the letter "c", the variable is constructed (see section 4.2 for more on constructed variables). If not, the variable corresponds to a question asked in a Year 1 survey and the first character in the variable name indicates to which instrument the variable corresponds. See Table 3 for a full list of Year 1 survey instruments and their prefix letters.

In Year 1 variable names, what follows the instrument is the number "2" to indicate the wave of data collection. Furthermore, when the variable name has an instrument as its prefix and is a variable directly associated with the questionnaire (is not constructed), the leaf or the end of the variable will indicate the section letter and the question number to which to variable corresponds to. Below is a deconstructed list of the variable names in Year 1:

Table 3: Variable name structure (survey variables and weights)

Variable Name			Survey
Prefix	Wave	Leaf	
m	2	[a-l]1-9	Mother Survey
m	2	natwt   citywt *	National/City Weights (for mother)
f	2	[a-l]1-9	Father Survey
f	2	natwt   citywt*	National/City Weights (for father)
q	2	natwt   citywt*	National/City Weights (for couple)

Note: an asterisk (\*) is used to indicate the existence of other characters in the variable name. To provide summaries of the variable names, we used asterisk instead of listing each individual case.

### 4.2. Constructed Variables

A number of variables were constructed and added to the data set by staff. Variables under this group begin with the letter "c". Some represent data not otherwise available to the public, and some are merely aggregations of existing data that we provided as a "shortcut" for researchers. Researchers may find these variables useful, but are free to construct them in other ways.

When constructing variables such as age, relationship status, and the household roster, the mother's report was generally used. However, there were a few cases in which the father's report was used to fill in missing information or to correct discrepancies in the mother's report.

Note: Raw yes/no questions are typically coded as 1=Yes and 2=No. Constructed yes/no variables are typically coded as 1=Yes and 0=No.

### 4.3. Survey Variables

Survey variables contain responses to questions asked during a survey and their variable names begin with a letter indicating to which survey they correspond. For a list of survey instruments and their corresponding prefixes in Year 1, please refer to Table 4. The survey instrument is named for the person answering the questions. Following the prefix and wave, survey variables were named as the item in the instrument. For example, variable m2a7 in the data set contains responses provided to item 2a7 (*What is your relationship with (FATHER) now? Are you...*) in the mother core survey questionnaire

Table 4: *Survey Instruments in Year 1*

instrument	instrument description
m	Mother Survey
f	Father Survey
q	Couple (used only as weights)

### 4.4. Key Identifier

The Family ID (**idnum**) is the key identifier on the file for merging and sorting. idnum is the random family case ID that links the biological parents of the child at baseline, and in each subsequent wave, links all survey components for each family sampled at Baseline. idnum is a string variable consisting of 4 characters. Because the idnum identifier remains fixed throughout the waves, it can be used to merge data from any wave of the study.

### 4.5. Variable Label

Variable labels in the data and codebook correspond as closely as possible to the question in the questionnaire; however, for formatting reasons some of the questions have been modified or abbreviated in the labels. Please see the questionnaire for official question wording and response categories.

### 4.6. Variable Response and Missing Data Codes

All variables have value labels describing valid and missing responses. In addition to the listed response categories in the questionnaire, each variable (including continuous variables) can have any of the following nine negative values that indicate missing data:

Table 5: *Missing Data Codes*

Code	Label
-1	Refuse
-2	Don't know
-3	Missing (due to technical error)
-4	Multiple answers
-5	Not asked (not in survey version)
-6	Logical Skip
-7	Not applicable
-8	Out-of-range
-9	Not in wave

Occasionally other codes were used (-10 to -16) to indicate the question did not apply to the respondent or the respondent had effectively provided a response via an earlier question. In some cases, the negative codes are valid responses (ex: z scores).

#### 4.7. Open-Ended Response Codes

Free response questions (open-ended questions) were coded by staff. Codes were assigned by two staff members working independently and these codes were reconciled by a third staff member.

When appropriate, open-ended responses were recoded into the existing response categories of the questions. Open-ended responses that did not fit into the existing response categories are recoded into new categories in the 100 range (101, 102, etc.) if there were 10 or more similar responses. Cases that indicate an "other" but were vague or unique remain coded simply as "Other (not specified)."

## **5. Data Cleaning**

For data derived from the phone surveys, limited data cleaning was performed on the files. Some values were recoded to -8 "out of range" and minor changes were made to earnings, income, household roster, ages, etc. if the decision was clear cut. If not, data was left for the user to decide how to code. Known inconsistencies across variables remain in the data for users to consider in their analysis.

## 6. Weights

The Fragile Families sample was selected using a complex sample design, where the sample members were not selected independently and were not selected with equal probabilities. For instance, non-marital births were oversampled. Therefore, Mathematica Policy Research has created a set of weights of Year 1 to adjust for the sample design (probability of selection), non-response at baseline, and attrition based on observed characteristics over the waves.

Public users, who do not have access to the stratum and PSU variables, can use a set of replicate weights to properly estimate variance for the sample. Contract data users can employ the replicate weights or Taylor Series method which incorporates strata and PSU.

A brief introduction to the weights available for the public data files is available in the documentation memo "[Fragile Families & Child Wellbeing Study: A Brief Guide to Using the Weights for Waves 1-6.](#)" For detailed information on the construction of the sample weights, please read "[Fragile Families & Child Wellbeing Study: Methodology for Constructing Mother, Father, and Couple Weights for Core Telephone Surveys](#)".



## 7. Introduction to Topics from the Data

Year 1 data covers a range of topics throughout surveys administered to the focal child’s biological mother and biological father. Table 6 provides an overview of some of the topics covered in Year 1 by survey instrument.

Table 6: Major topics in Year 1 by survey instrument

Topics	m	f
Attitudes and Expectations	X	X
Childcare	X	X
Cognitive and Behavioral Development	X	X
Demographics	X	X
Education and School	X	X
Employment	X	X
Family and Social Ties	X	X
Finances	X	X
Health and Health Behavior	X	X
Housing and Neighborhood	X	X
Legal System	X	X
Paradata and Weights	X	X
Parenting	X	X
Romantic Relationships	X	X

The next sections of this User Guide are organized by these topic categories. Within each section, we will list **constructed variables** (created by staff to add shortcuts for data users), followed by **scales** and **concepts** that relate to each topic. We define a scale as a composite measure that is composed of variables within the same construct. By constructing a scale, researchers can indicate the degree or intensity to which respondents adhere to the given construct. Scales are typically derived from an established source or existing study. Information on scoring a scale can be found within each section. Concepts are also aggregations of similar variables; however, we do not provide information on scoring, nor do we treat concepts as validated scales.

Researchers are also encouraged to interrogate the data further and to refer to the questionnaires provided in the [Documentation](#) for more information on the survey content.

## 8. Paradata

Every survey at Year 1 includes variables with information about the interview, also known as paradata. Within the available Year 1 paradata is the date (month and year) the interview was administered, the language it was administered in (English or Spanish) and the way in which it was delivered to the respondent (in person or by phone). Variable flags were constructed by staff to help users sort the data by (1) respondent participation in a given survey and if applicable, their reason for non-response, or (2) whether the respondent belongs to the nationally-representative or city-representative sample.

### 8.1. Constructed Variables - Age

Age is recorded in the Core Surveys for mother, father and child and can be retrieved through the constructed variables: **cm2age** (mother's age at the interview), **cf2age** (father's age at the interview), **cm2b\_age** and **cf2b\_age** for the child's age at the mother and father interview, respectively. **cm2fbir** is mother's age at her first birth.

### 8.2. Constructed Variables - Sample Flags

There are two types of sample flags – **interview flags** and **status flags**. Interview flags denote whether a person was interviewed in a particular wave. Status flags provide other important information about a case at a particular period (non-response reason, in a particular subsample, etc.). The following lists the sample flags from Year 1 (cm2samp, cf2samp, cm2natism, cf2natism, cq2natism, cm2natismx, cf2natismx, cm2citsm, cf2citsm, cq2citsm, cm2mint, cf2mint, cm2fint, cf2fint, cm2fdiff)

#### 8.2.1. *Interview completion flags*

- **cm2mint/cm2fint** indicates whether mother/father was interviewed, respectively, using mother's record(s).
- **cf2mint/cf2fint** indicates whether mother/father was interviewed, respectively, using the father's report.

Cases in which one or more respondents in a family were not interviewed in the current wave are included in the data file but are coded "Not in wave" (-9) for all variables from the survey(s) that were not completed. Therefore, you will need to use these interview flags to subset out appropriate samples.

#### 8.2.2. *Status flags*

- **cm2samp** and **cf2samp** provide information on the mother or father's disposition status (whether eligible and reasons for non-response, such as mother/father/child died since previous wave).
- **c\*2natism** and **c\*2citsm** indicate whether the respondent is in the national sample and/or the 20-cities sample and was interviewed in the wave
- **cm1innatism** and **cm1citsm** (from the baseline file) indicate whether the respondent was part of the national/city sample (regardless of whether they were interviewed at any given wave).

Note: There are a small number of cases that do not have weights but have valid survey data and there are a small number of cases that have positive weights, but no

survey data because the parent/child was deceased or the child was adopted (see the appendix of "[Using the Fragile Families Weights](#)" for more information).

A handful of mothers provided conflicting information over the waves about who is the biological father of the child.

- **cm2fdiff** specifies cases where mother indicated that the biological father of focal child was a different man than had been indicated at earlier waves and for whom we had no reason to doubt this information. However, we cannot determine the accuracy of these reports

At the time of the follow-up interviews, we attempted to interview the mother first. This was based on the assumption that, if the parents are not living together, the mother would be easier to locate and would have updated locating information about the father. There were, however, cases in which the mother was interviewed after the father. Before comparing mothers' and fathers' reports of time sensitive measures (i.e. relationship status, income), data users should check the time gap between parent interviews using the **cm2tdiff** constructed variable.

*Table 7: Constructed variables with administrative information:*

Constructed Variable	Description of Constructed Variable
c[m   f]2age	Mother's/Father's age (years)
c[m   f]2b_age	Child's age at time of Mother/Father interview (months)
c[m   f   q]2citsm	Year 1 city sample flag
c[m   f   q]2natism	Year 1 national sample flag
c[m   f   q]2natismx	Year 1 national sample flag (excluding one city)
c[m   f]2fint	Was father interviewed at Year 1?
c[m   f]2intmon	Mother/Father interview month
c[m   f]2intyr	Mother/Father interview year
c[m   f]2mint	Was mother interviewed at Year 1?
cf2new12	Was father interviewed at Year 1 but not at baseline?
c[m   f]2samp	Mother/Father non-response reason
c[m   f]2span	Interview conducted in Spanish
c[m   f]2tele	Interview conducted by telephone
c[m   f]2twoc	Two cities flag
cm2fdiff	Different father was reported at Year 1
cm2tdiff	Time difference between mother and father interviews

## 9. Finances

At Year 1, mother and fathers were asked questions on their household finances. Table 8 details subtopics within “finances” covered in the surveys.

The mother and father surveys include questions regarding the amount of money the respondent receives or pays in child support, as well as the frequency of payment. The surveys also measure respondent’s earnings from traditional and non-traditional employment (including cash, housing and meals), financial assets (bank accounts, credit cards, vehicle ownership), household income and poverty, material hardship (including hunger, eviction, forgone medical care), private transfers (from family or friends), and public transfers/social service receipt.

Table 8: Subtopics in Finances in Year 1 by survey instrument

<u>Subtopics</u>	<u>m</u>	<u>f</u>
Child support	X	X
Earnings	X	X
Expenses	X	X
Financial assets	X	X
Household income/poverty	X	X
Income tax	X	X
Material hardship	X	X
Private transfers	X	X
Public transfers and social services	X	X

### 9.1. Constructed Variables - Household Income

Household income measures were constructed for mothers and fathers, but users should review the following information regarding the imputation and construction process carefully before deciding how and whether to use these variables.

- **cm2hhinc** and **cf2hhinc** are mother and father’s household income at Year 1, respectively
- **cf2hhincb**, an additional father variable, uses mother reports of household income for married and cohabiting couples.

Respondents were asked to provide an exact dollar amount of their household income. If they could not, they were asked to provide a range. This strategy was effective in reducing missing data to about 10 percent, although a portion of parents reported a range rather than an exact dollar amount. In constructing household income (**c\*2hhinc**), we first imputed dollar amounts for those who reported a range of income (using others who provided income in the same range but provided a detailed amount of income). Next, we imputed dollar amounts for those with no reported income. Both imputations included the following covariates: relationship status (mother report), age, race/ethnicity, nativity, whether employed last year, earnings, total adults in the

household, and whether welfare was received. Imputations for those who reported a range were based on parent's own characteristics. Imputations for missing income were based on both parent's characteristics for married and cohabiting couples; otherwise, they were based on parent's own characteristics.

### 9.2. Constructed Variables - Household Income Imputation Flags

- **cm2hhimp**, **cf2hhimp** and **cf2hhimpb** indicate which parent reported income and which parents have imputed income (in reference to **cm2hhinc**, **cf2hhinc**, and **cf2hhincb**, respectively).

*Please note* that if parents reported a range of income in brackets, they are not flagged as having imputed data in these flags. Users can examine the raw variables to determine who had detailed/bracketed data.

### 9.3. Constructed Variables - Poverty Measures

- **cm2povco** and **cf2povco** indicate the poverty ratio. The poverty ratio is the ratio of total household income, as defined in **c\*2hhinc**, to the official poverty thresholds, designated by the U.S. Census Bureau.
- **cm2povca** and **cf2povca** indicate poverty categories by transforming the poverty ratios into categorical variables.

The thresholds in **c\*2povca** vary by family composition and year. At each wave, we used the poverty thresholds for the year preceding the interview. We calculated separate thresholds based on mother and father reports of household size and composition. However, calculations for married/cohabiting mothers and fathers rely on mother reports of household size and composition. A small number of missing values (don't know, refused) were treated as 0 in household membership counts.

- **cf2povcob** and **cf2povcab** are the poverty ratio and categories based on household income for married and cohabiting couples (corresponding to **cf2hhincb**, **cf2hhimpb**).

The imputation flags created for the household income variables also refer to the poverty variables.

Please visit <https://www.census.gov/topics/income-poverty/poverty/guidance/poverty-measures.html> for detailed information about poverty thresholds.

## 9.4. Scale - Material Hardship

At Year 1, 12 questions were asked to both mother and father to determine material hardship. These questions are derived from the “Basic Needs – Ability to Meet Expenses” section of the Survey on Income and Program Participation (SIPP) 1996 Panel Wave 8 Adult Well-Being Topical Module Questionnaire,<sup>5</sup> and the 1997 & 1999 New York City Social Indicators Survey (SIS).<sup>6,7</sup> These questions are also similar to Mayer and Jencks Chicago study of hardship and poverty.<sup>8</sup>

### 9.4.1. Variables

Mother questions: **m2h19a-m2h19l** (12 variables)

Father questions: **f2h17a-f2h17l** (12 variables)

Some of the hardship questions are derived from the 1997 and 1999 SIS. This study looked at families and individuals in New York City and monitored changes over time. Some of the material hardship questions found in the SIS are similar to those found in the SIPP, such as items referring to not paying bills on time and loss of utilities. Other questions concern the respondent or his/her child going hungry, access to free food, and places he/she has lived, all within the past 12 months and all due to financial difficulties.

### 9.4.2. Modifications

These “YES/NO” questions are exact replicates of the original questions taken from other surveys, with one exception. In the SIPP, respondents are asked whether “you/anyone in your household” had encountered the specified hardship. In the SIS, questions refer to “you [or your partner].” In W164 of the 1997 SIS, the question is asked of “you [or your spouse/partner] [or your child] [or your children].” The corresponding FFCWS questions refer only to the respondent and not to his/her partner or children.

Note: The FFCWS Year 1 Surveys include only a subset of the hardship questions used in the SIPP, SIS and IOWA studies.

### 9.4.3. Scoring

There is no established scoring for the material hardship questions included in the Year 1 surveys.

---

<sup>5</sup> Survey on Income and Program Participation: 1996 Panel Wave 8 Adult Well-Being Topical Module Questionnaire. (1998). Retrieved March 27, 2003, from [http://www.sipp.census.gov/sipp/top\\_mod/1996/quests/wave8/awbook.html](http://www.sipp.census.gov/sipp/top_mod/1996/quests/wave8/awbook.html)

<sup>6</sup> Social Indicators Survey Center, Columbia University School of Social Work. (1997). 1997 New York City Social Indicators Survey: Codebook and Documentation. Retrieved March 27, 2003, from <http://www.siscenter.org/>

<sup>7</sup> Social Indicators Survey Center, Columbia University School of Social Work. (1999). 1999 New York City Social Indicators Survey: Documentation and Codebook, Revised Version. Retrieved March 27, 2003, from <http://www.siscenter.org/>

<sup>8</sup> Mayer, S.E., & Jencks, C. (1989). Poverty and the Distribution of Material Hardship. *Journal of Human Resources*, 24 (1), 88-114.

Table 9: Variables on material hardship

SIPP	SIS 1997	SIS 1999	Item	Source item
AW35_NEED1			m2h19d f2h17d	Was there any time in the past 12 months when (YOU/YOUR HOUSEHOLD) did not pay the full amount of the rent or mortgage?
AW38_NEED2			m2h19e f2h17e	In the past 12 months (WERE/WAS) (YOU/ANYONE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD) evicted from your home or apartment for not paying the rent or mortgage?
AW41_NEED3		HAR08	m2h19f f2h17f	During the past 12 months was there ever a time when you [or your partner] missed a payment or were late with the gas or electricity bill because you didn't have enough money?
AW44_NEED4		HAR09	m2h19g f2h17g	During the last 12 months, was either the gas or electricity ever turned off because the bill was not paid?
AW44_NEED5			m2h19h f2h17h	How about the telephone company disconnecting service because payments were not made?
AW50_NEED6			m2h19i f2h17i	In the past 12 months was there a time (YOU/ANYONE IN YOUR HOUSEHOLD) needed to see a doctor or go to the hospital but did not go?
	W164		m2h19a f2h17a	In the past 12 months, have you [or your spouse/partner] [or your child] [or your children] received free food or meals because there wasn't enough money?
	W166	HAR06	m2h19b f2h17b	In the past 12 months, was there a time when your [child/children] went hungry because there wasn't enough money to buy food?
	W167	HAR07	m2h19c f2h17c	Was there ever a time when [you] [you or your spouse/partner] went hungry in the past 12 months because there wasn't enough money for food?
		HAR10	m2h19j f2h17j	In the past 12 months, did you ever move in with other people even for a little while because of financial problems?
		HAR12	m2h19k f2h17k	In the past 12 months, did you ever stay at a shelter, in an abandoned building, an automobile or any other place not meant for regular housing even for one night because you didn't have enough money for a place to live?
			m2h19i f2h17i	In the past 12 months, did you borrow money from friends or family to help pay bills?

## 10. Health and Health Behavior

Questions on health and health behavior were asked to mothers and fathers in the Year 1 surveys. These variables help identify the health limitations within the family, access to healthcare, as well as physical and mental health.

Table 10: Subtopics in Health and Health Behavior in Year 1 by survey instrument

<u>Subtopics</u>	<u>m</u>	<u>f</u>
Accidents and Injuries	X	X
Disabilities	X	X
Fertility History	X	X
Health behavior	X	X
Health care access and insurance	X	X
Height and weight	X	X
Mental health	X	X
Physical health	X	X
Substance use and abuse	X	X

### 10.1. Concept - Height and Weight Measurements

In the Year 1 Core Survey, child weight is reported by mothers and fathers (**m2b5c1** and **m2b5c2**, **f2b5b1** and **f2b5b2**). Parents' height and weight are not reported at this wave.



## 10.2. Concept - Alcohol, Drug & Tobacco Use

We included the essential items from the Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI) - Short Form (CIDI-SF) to obtain a scores for Major Depression and Generalized Anxiety Disorders, but the Fragile Families Year 1 Surveys do not include the CIDI-SF Alcohol and Drug Dependence Scale. Instead, less specific questions were used to obtain a general sense of the respondent's smoking, drinking, and drug habits (J5-J11).

### 10.2.1. *Variables*

*Mother questions:* **m2j5, m2j5a, m2j6, m2j6a, m2j7, m2j7a, m2j8, m2j8a, m2j9, m2j10, m2j11** (11 variables)

*Father questions:* **f2j5, f2j5a, f2j6, f2j6a, f2j7, f2j7a, f2j8, f2j8a, f2j9, f2j10, f2j11** (11 variables)

### 10.3. Scale - Mental Health Depression (CIDI-SF)

#### 10.3.1. *Variables*

##### *Mother questions:*

18 cities: **m2j12, m2j13, m2j13a, m2j13b, m2j14, m2j14a, m2j14b, m2j15a, m2j15b, m2j15b1, m2j15c, m2j15c1, m2j15d, m2j15e, m2j15f** (15 variables)

2 cities: **m2j12, m2j13, m2j13a, m2j14, m2j14b, m2j15a, m2j15cx, m2j15c, m2j15d, m2j15e, m2j15f** (11 variables)

##### *Father questions:*

18 cities: **f2j12, f2j13, f2j13a, f2j13b, f2j14, f2j14a, f2j14b, f2j15a, f2j15b, f2j15b1, f2j15c, f2j15c1, f2j15d, f2j15e, f2j15f** (15 variables)

2 cities: **f2j12, f2j13, f2j13a, f2j14, f2j14b, f2j15a, f2j15cx, f2j15c, f2j15d, f2j15e, f2j15f** (11 variables)

*Constructed:* **cm2md\_case\_lib/cf2md\_case\_lib** mother/father meets depression criteria (liberal); **cm2md\_case\_con** and **cf2md\_case\_con** mother/father meets depression criteria (conservative)

Note: The scoring procedures described below rely primarily on memos issued by Kessler and Mroczek in 1994 and 1997.<sup>9</sup> In 2002, Walters et al.<sup>10</sup> issued "*Scoring the World Health Organization's Composite International Diagnostic Interview Short Form*" which recommends scoring procedures that differ in two respects. In the following, we note where the procedures used to identify major depression in the Fragile Families respondents deviate from the 2002 version. When procedures are consistent, language is taken directly from the 2002 scoring guide.

The Major Depressive Episode questions from the Year 1 Core Survey are derived from the Composite International Diagnostic Interview - Short Form (CIDI-SF), Section A.<sup>11</sup> The short form of the CIDI interview takes a portion of the full set of CIDI questions and generates from the responses the probability that the respondent would be a "case," (i.e., a positively diagnosed respondent), if given a full CIDI interview.

The CIDI questions are consistent with the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders – Fourth Edition (DSM-IV).<sup>12</sup> The CIDI is a standardized instrument for assessment of mental disorders intended for use in epidemiological, cross-cultural, and other research studies.

---

<sup>9</sup> Personal communications from Ron Kessler and Dan Mroczek, "Scoring the UM-CIDI Short Forms," revised 2/22/94, and "UM-CIDI Short Form 03.20/97, Kessler and Mroczek – DSM-IV Version."

<sup>10</sup> Walters, E.E., Kessler, R.C., Nelson, R.C., & Mroczek, D. (2002). Scoring the World Health Organization's Composite International Diagnostic Interview Short Form (CIDI-SF; Dec 2002). For a copy of this memo please contact [ffdata@princeton.edu](mailto:ffdata@princeton.edu).

<sup>11</sup> Kessler, R.C., Andrews, G., Mroczek, D., Ustun, T.B., & Wittchen, H.U. (1998). The World Health Organization Composite International Diagnostic Interview Short-Form (CIDI-SF). *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 7, 171-185.

<sup>12</sup> American Psychiatric Association (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders, Fourth Edition*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.

Respondents are asked whether they have had feelings of dysphoria (depression) or anhedonia (inability to enjoy what is usually pleasurable) in the past year that lasted for two weeks or more, and if so, whether the symptoms lasted most of the day and occurred every day of the two week period. If so, they were asked more specific questions about: 1) losing interest, 2) feeling tired, 3) change in weight, 4) trouble sleeping, 5) trouble concentrating, 6) feeling worthless, and 7) thinking about death.

### 10.3.2. *Modifications*

All of the essential CIDI-SF questions to score a major depressive episode are included in the Year 1 survey. A few questions are omitted. These omitted questions deal with persistence, recency, and impairments associated with major depression and the subject's contact with a health care provider or other professional. The omitted questions play no part in generating predicted probabilities for the presence of disorders.<sup>13</sup>

### 10.3.3. *Scoring Information*

Section A of the CIDI-SF is used to classify respondents according to the criteria for a DSM-IV major depressive episode. No distinction is made between respondents with major depressive disorder, major depressive episodes that occur as part of a bipolar disorder, or major depressive episodes that occur in the course of psychotic disorders.

There are two ways to meet the diagnostic stem requirement for Major Depression (MD) either:

- 1) to endorse all questions about having two weeks of dysphoric mood (J5-J6-J7) or
- 2) to endorse all questions about having two weeks of anhedonia (J9-J10-J11)

Consistent with the procedures described by Kessler and Mroczek in 1994 and 1997, each series requires the respondent to report two weeks of symptoms lasting at least about half of the day (J6, J10) and almost every day (J7, J11). Either denying the existence of the symptom or denying persistence leads to a skip, and the respondent receives a probability of caseness equal to zero. If respondents endorsed the dysphoric stem, they were not asked the anhedonia stem questions.

Note that the scoring instructions issued by Walters et al. creates more stringent conditions for endorsing the stem; respondents must report the two weeks of symptoms last at least "most of the day" in questions J6 and J10. As a consequence, the approach used here results in more respondents endorsing the stem than would endorse if the 2002 revisions were employed.

If the respondent endorses the diagnostic stem series, an additional seven symptom questions are asked:

- 1) losing interest (J13B=1, only if the stem involves dysphoria; the anhedonia stem question J14=1 should be counted when the anhedonia stem is endorsed),
- 2) feeling tired (J15A=1),

---

<sup>13</sup> Walters, E.E., Kessler, R.C., Nelson, R.C., & Mroczek, D. (2002). Scoring the World Health Organization's Composite International Diagnostic Interview Short Form (CIDI-SF; Dec 2002). For a copy of this memo please contact [ffdata@princeton.edu](mailto:ffdata@princeton.edu).

- 3) change in weight greater than or equal to 10 pounds (J15B=1, 2, or 3 and J15B1>=10),
- 4) trouble with sleep (J15C=1 and J15C1=1 or 2 )
- 5) trouble concentrating (J15D=1),
- 6) feeling down (J15E=1), and
- 7) thoughts about death (J15F=1).

The respondent's MD score (range 0-8) is then calculated as the sum of positive responses to each of these seven symptom questions and the first dysphoric stem question (J12). Note that the scoring scheme proposed by Walters et al. excludes J12 from the symptom count, leading to an MD score range of 0-7.<sup>14</sup>

Table 11 shows the cross-classification of MD short-form scores with the probability of being a CIDI case.<sup>15</sup> This cross-classification reflects the probability that a respondent with a particular response profile will meet full diagnostic criteria when given the complete CIDI interview.<sup>16</sup> As shown in the table, the probability of being a CIDI case is related to the MD score with the probability of being a case being greater than 0.5 among respondents who endorsed three or more symptoms.

There are two scoring alternatives for the CIDI-SF MD section. The first is to create a dichotomous score, classifying respondents as either probable cases or probable non-cases based on whether or not they have a MD score of three or more. The second is to assign respondents the probability of caseness score. Note that respondents who denied the MD stem questions or otherwise skipped out of the section prior to assessing the symptoms in the MD score receive a probability of caseness equal to zero.

A Memo Edit issued by Kessler in December 2002 indicates that subjects who volunteer they are taking medication for depression (J12 or J14=-11) should be counted as depressed. Note that while they receive a positive score for caseness, they are not asked any of the seven symptom questions.

**SUGGESTED SCORING MODIFICATIONS** There are five items (J13B, J14A, J15B, J15B1, and J15C1) that were not asked in the first two cities. Consequently, there are a few modifications in the scoring procedure to compensate for these missing data. The distributions in Tables 11 and 12 reflect these modifications.

- If a respondent from the 18 cities endorses sadness for two weeks or more, he/she is asked J13B, whether he/she lost interest in things during a two-week period. Though the same symptom is addressed in J14 (a question asked in all 20 cities), respondents only answer that question if they do not endorse the dysphoria stem; J14 is part of the anhedonia stem. Therefore, respondents from

<sup>14</sup> Walters, E.E., Kessler, R.C., Nelson, R.C., & Mroczek, D. (2002). *Scoring the World Health Organization's Composite International Diagnostic Interview Short Form (CIDI-SF; Dec 2002)*. For a copy of this memo please contact [ffdata@princeton.edu](mailto:ffdata@princeton.edu).

<sup>15</sup> For the distributions in Tables 11 and 12, respondents who did not know or refused to answer the initial dysphoria or anhedonia screening questions (J12 and J14= -1 or -2) are considered missing. Respondents who answered the initial screening questions but did not report how much or how often they experienced the state are scored as not meeting the stem.

<sup>16</sup> Please note: Kessler urges caution when interpreting the probability of caseness. The probabilities are derived from a single sample and have not been validated.

the first two cities who endorse the dysphoric stem can only have 7 of the 8 possible symptoms. This may result in a potential underestimation of MD in the first two cities.

- There is no two-cities equivalent of J14A (how much of the day the respondent lost interest in things). We recommend estimating the MD score based on the two available anhedonia stem questions (J14, J14B), resulting in a potential overestimation of MD in the first two cities.
- Though J15B (whether any weight was gained or lost in the two-week period), and J15B1 (the amount of weight gained or lost) were not asked in the first two cities, users can substitute m2j15cx/f2j15cx (during the two-week period, did the respondent gain or lose ten pounds without trying?) as a replacement for these two questions
- Though J15C1 (how often the respondent had trouble falling asleep at night) was not asked in the first two cities, the symptom can be estimated with J15C (did you have more trouble falling asleep than you usually do during those two weeks) for the two-city cases only. This potentially overestimates the presence of this symptom in the first two cities.

*Table 11: Major Depression Liberal Caseness*

Short form MD Score	Probability of CIDI Caseness	Year 1 Mothers	Year 1 Fathers
0	0.0001	3,628	2,980
1	0.0568	36	16
2	0.2351	28	24
3	0.5542	51	29
4	0.8125	79	55
5	0.8895	157	86
6	0.8895	191	88
7	0.9083	135	59
8	0.9083	58	27
Totals		4,363	3,364

*Table 12: Major Depression Liberal Caseness*

MD Caseness	Year 1 Mothers	Year 1 Fathers
Yes (1)	868	470
No (0)	3,353	2,821
Totals	4,221	3,291

## 10.4. Scale - Mental Health for Generalized Anxiety Disorder (CIDI-SF)

### 10.4.1. Variables

Mother questions:

18 cities: m2j16, m2j16a, m2j16b, m2j16b1a, m2j16b1b, m2j16b1c, m2j16b2a, m2j16b2b, m2j16b2c, m2j17, m2j18a, m2j18b, m2j18c, m2j18d, m2j18e, m2j19, m2j19a, m2j20a, m2j20b, m2j20c, m2j20d, m2j20e, m2j20f, m2j20g (24 variables)  
2 cities: m2j16, m2j16a, m2j16b, m2j16b1a, m2j16b1b, m2j16b1c, m2j16b2a, m2j16b2b, m2j16b2c, m2j17, m2j18a, m2j18b, m2j18c, m2j18e, m2j19, m2j20a, m2j20b, m2j20c, m2j20e, m2j20g (20 variables)

Father questions:

18 cities: f2j16, f2j16a, f2j16b, f2j16b1a, f2j16b1b, f2j16b1c, f2j16b2a, f2j16b2b, f2j16b2c, f2j17, f2j18a, f2j18b, f2j18c, f2j18d, f2j18e, f2j19, f2j19a, f2j20a, f2j20b, f2j20c, f2j20d, f2j20e, f2j20f, f2j20g (24 variables)  
2 cities: f2j16, f2j16a, f2j16b, f2j16b1a, f2j16b1b, f2j16b1c, f2j16b2a, f2j16b2b, f2j16b2c, f2j17, f2j18a, f2j18b, f2j18c, f2j18e, f2j19, f2j20a, f2j20b, f2j20c, f2j20e, f2j20g (20 variables)

Constructed: **cm2gad\_case/cf2gad\_case** mother/father meets anxiety criteria.

Note: The information below is taken directly from the " *Scoring the World Health Organization's Composite International Diagnostic Interview Short Form.*" <sup>17</sup>

The Generalized Anxiety Disorder (GAD) Year 1 questions are derived from the Composite International Diagnostic Interview - Short Form (CIDI-SF).<sup>18</sup> The short form of the CIDI interview asks a portion of questions from the full CIDI and generates from the responses the probability that the respondent would be a "case," or positively diagnosed respondent if given a full CIDI interview.

The CIDI GAD questions are based on the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV). The CIDI is a standardized instrument for assessment of mental disorders intended for use in epidemiological, cross-cultural, and other research studies.

GAD is indicated by a period of six months or more when an individual feels excessively worried or anxious about more than one thing, more days than not, and has difficulty controlling their worries. Other symptoms include:

- 1) being keyed up or on edge,
- 2) irritability,
- 3) restlessness,
- 4) having trouble falling asleep,
- 5) tiring easily,

---

<sup>17</sup> Walters, E.E., Kessler, R.C., Nelson, R.C., & Mroczek, D. (2002). *Scoring the World Health Organization's Composite International Diagnostic Interview Short Form (CIDI-SF)*; Dec 2002).

<sup>18</sup> Kessler, R.C., Andrews, G., Mroczek, D., Ustun, T.B., & Wittchen, H.U. (1998). The World Health Organization Composite International Diagnostic Interview Short-Form (CIDI-SF). *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 7, 171-185.

- 6) difficulty concentrating, and
- 7) tense or aching muscles.

#### 10.4.2. *Modifications*

The essential CIDI-SF questions to score GAD are included in the Fragile Families Year 1 data. A few questions are omitted. These omitted questions deal with types of worry reported by subject and the subject's contact with a health care provider or other professional. These omitted questions are not needed to score the CIDI-SF and play no part in generating predicted probabilities for the presence of disorders.<sup>19</sup>

#### 10.4.3. *Scoring Information*

Section B of the CIDI-SF is designed to classify respondents according to the criteria of DSM-IV generalized anxiety disorder. If the diagnostic requirements are fulfilled, the respondent receives a probability of caseness equal to one.

The diagnostic stem requirement of GAD is met when the respondent reports a period of feeling worried, tense, or anxious (J16 or J16A=1) that lasted at least six months (J17=1 (J16B1>=6 months or J16B2>=6 months)). Respondents who do not report an anxious period lasting at least six months are skipped out of the section and receive a probability of caseness equal to zero.

If an anxious period of sufficient duration is endorsed (J17=1), further qualifiers are asked to determine whether the worry was excessive (J18A=1), lasted more days than not (J18B=1), and involved worrying about more than one thing (J18C=1 or J18E=1), all of which are necessary qualifiers for DSM-IV GAD criterion A. Lack of control over these worries (criterion B) is then assessed in a series of three questions (J18D=1 or J19=1 or J19A=1). The types of physiological symptoms that characterize the worried, tense, or anxious period (criterion C) are then assessed in questions J20a-g.

As outlined in Table 13, if respondents endorse an anxious period that lasted at least 6 months (J17=1), the above mentioned qualifiers are satisfied (J18A=1 and J18B=1 and either J18C=2 or J18E=1), lack of control over this anxious period was endorsed (J18D=2 or J19=1 or J19A=1) and at least three of the physiological symptoms are endorsed (J20a-g=1), a probability of caseness equal to one is assigned.

#### SUGGESTED (NECESSARY) SCORING MODIFICATIONS/CAUTIONS

Four items (J18D, J19A, J20D, and J20F) are found in the 18-cities questionnaire but not in the two-cities sample. Because of that there are a few modifications in the scoring procedure to compensate for these missing data.

---

<sup>19</sup> Questions B11 and B13-B17 from the CIDI-SF are omitted in the Fragile Families Study. The types of worries are listed at the end of the B11 question series, so that exclusions as listed in DSM-IV criterion D could be evaluated (e.g. panic disorder, social phobia, obsessive-compulsive disorder and anorexia nervosa). Also, in the CIDI-SF 12 month DSM-IV version, B13 is similar to A7 and A15 in the MD section and the considerations in deciding whether or not to administer this section are similar. These questions evaluate contact with a health care provider or other professional (B14-15), use of medication, drugs or alcohol (B16), and interference with daily functioning (B17).

- There is not a two-cities equivalent of J18D, which asks whether the respondent finds it difficult to stop worrying. The estimated GAD score can still be determined, but it will not be as precise for the two-cities cases.
- Instead of using J19A in the scoring for GAD, J19 should be used for twocities cases only. J19A (how often respondent finds it difficult to control his/her worry) allows less stringent criteria for the two-cities data which are missing and will prevent cases that otherwise qualify from becoming missing data.
- There are no equivalents for J20D (difficulty keeping mind on what respondent is doing when anxious or worried) and J20F (tense, sore, or aching muscles when anxious or worried), so this will decrease the sensitivity for the two-city sample.

*Table 13: Generalized Anxiety Disorder Caseness*

Probable GAD Caseness	Year 1 Mothers	Year 1 Fathers
Yes (1)	137	85
No(0)	4,220	3,288
Totals	4,357	3,373



## 11. Cognitive and Behavioral Assessments

In Year 1, behavior questions describe father's impulsivity, and the focal child's shyness and emotionality. Mother's impulsivity is reported on in Year 3 and father's is also reported on again in Year 5.

There are no questions or assessments at Year 1 regarding cognitive development.

*Table 14: Subtopics in Cognitive and Behavioral Assessments in Year 1 by survey instrument*

<b>Subtopics</b>	<b>m</b>	<b>f</b>
Behavior	X	X

## 11.1. Scale - Impulsivity

### 11.1.1. *Variables*

Father questions: **f2j21-f2j26** (6 variables) – available for 18-cities only

The impulsivity questions included in the Year 1 Father’s Survey are an abbreviated form of Dickman’s impulsivity scale.<sup>20</sup>

Scott J. Dickman designed a scale to identify two types of impulsivity: functional and dysfunctional. The Year 1 Father’s Survey includes questions pertaining only to dysfunctional impulsivity, which is associated with the tendency to deliberate less than most people of equal ability before taking action when this type of decision making is not optimal. The measure of dysfunctional impulsivity provides a useful summary measure of the capacity for self-control.

With cognitive ability, impulsivity is a major individual predictor of violent offending.<sup>21</sup> This finding from psychological research is consistent with sociological theory that shows that capacity for self-control is a key determinant of crime.<sup>22</sup> Impulsivity can be dysfunctional when an individual is unable to use a slower, more methodical approach to information processing. The dysfunctional impulsivity scale correlates highly with alternative scales of impulsiveness.<sup>23</sup>

### 11.1.2. *Modifications*

The full impulsivity scale developed by Dickman consists of 23 items. Twelve items loaded primarily for dysfunctional impulsivity and these items are listed in Table 15. The twelve items had an alpha of .86. The Year 1 Father’s Survey includes six of these items (the items with positive weights), as indicated in the table. The alpha for these items using the Fragile Families father sample is .84.

### 11.1.3. *Scoring Information*

The items are coded on a 4-point Likert scale (1=strongly agree and 4-strongly disagree). Dickman scored by calculating a weighted sum, weighting responses by the factor loadings.

Given that Fragile Families did not implement the full scale, we suggest summing the items and dividing by the total number of items.

*Table 15: Dickman’s Factor Loadings and Corresponding Fragile Families Items*

Variables	Source Item
-----------	-------------

<sup>20</sup> Dickman, S.J. (1990) Functional and Dysfunctional Impulsivity: Personality and Cognitive Correlates. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 95-102.

<sup>21</sup> Farrington, D.P. (1998). Predictors, Causes, and Correlates of Male Youth Violence. *Crime and Justice*, 24, 421-475.

<sup>22</sup> Gottfredson, M.R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A General Theory of Crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

f2j21	I will often say whatever comes into my head without thinking first.
	I enjoy working out problems slowly and carefully.
	I frequently make appointments without thinking about whether I will be able to keep them.
	I frequently buy things without thinking about whether or not I can really afford them.
f2j26	I often make up my mind without taking the time to consider the situation from all angles.
f2j22	Often, I don't spend enough time thinking over a situation before I act.
f2j24	I often get into trouble because I don't think before I act.
f2j25	Many times, the plans I make don't work out because I haven't gone over them carefully enough in advance.
	I rarely get involved in projects without first considering the potential problems.
	Before making any important decisions, I carefully weigh the pros and cons.
	I am good at careful reasoning.
f2j23	I often say and do things without considering the consequences.

## 11.2. Scale - Child's Emotionality and Shyness

### 11.2.1. *Variables*

*Mother questions: m2b17a-m2b17f* (6 variables, resident mothers), *m2b43a-m2b43f* (6 variables, non-resident mothers)

*Father questions: f2b16a-f2b16f* (6 variables, resident fathers), *f2b37a-f2b37f* (6 variables, non-resident fathers)

EAS Temperament Survey for Children: Parental Ratings is used to measure temperament in 1 to 9 year-old children.<sup>23</sup> Selected questions from the Emotionality and Shyness scales from this survey are available in the Year 1 Mother and Father Surveys. In behavioral genetics studies, these two traits – Emotionality and Shyness - have been shown to be heritable personality traits.<sup>24,25</sup> Also, higher shyness scores have been related to fear and anxiety disorders that occur later on in life.<sup>26,27</sup>

Buss and Plomin define the four types of temperaments measured in the EAS as:

(1) Emotionality – the tendency to become aroused easily and intensely – a global pattern of distress in the very young infant which becomes differentiated into fear and anger tendencies in the older child.

(2) Activity – preferred levels of activity and speed of action.

(3) Sociability – the tendency to prefer the presence of others to being alone – in general children value interaction with others over the benefits of privacy.

(4) Shyness – the tendency to be inhibited and awkward in new social situations.<sup>28</sup>

Note: Mothers in 2 CITIES were not asked these questions if they did not live with the child at least some of the time (N=7). Father in 2 CITIES were ONLY asked if they had sole custody of the child (not residing with partner). Therefore, only a small number (N=12) of fathers in the 2 CITIES sample were asked these questions.

### 11.2.2. *Modifications*

The full EAS contains five questions in each of the four temperaments (Emotionality, Activity, Sociability, and Shyness). The Year 1 Surveys ask three of the five questions regarding Shyness and three of the five questions regarding Emotionality (see Table 16 below).

---

<sup>23</sup> Buss, A.H., & Plomin, R. (1984). *Temperament: Early developing personality traits*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

<sup>24</sup> *ibid*

<sup>25</sup> Plomin, R., Pedersen, N.L., McClearn, G.E., Nesselroade, J.R., & Bergeman, C.S. (1988). EAS temperaments during the last half of the life span: Twins reared apart and twins reared together. *Psychology and Aging*, 3, 43-50.

<sup>26</sup> Boer, F., & Westenberg, P.M. (1994). The factor structure of the Buss and Plomin EAS Temperament Survey (Parental Ratings) in a Dutch sample of elementary school children. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 62, 537-551.

<sup>27</sup> Stevenson-Hinde, J., & Simpson, A.E. (1982). *Temperament and relationships*. Ciba

Foundation Symposium 89, *Temperament differences in infants and younger children*. London: Pitman, pp. 51-65.

<sup>28</sup> Mathieson, K.S., Tambs, K. (1999). The EAS temperament questionnaire – Factor structure, age trends, reliability, and stability in a Norwegian sample. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 40, 431-439.

The scoring categories are slightly different between the original and the FF implementation. Where 1="not characteristic or typical of your child" and 5="very characteristic or typical of your child" in the original EAS, 1="not at all like my child" and 5="very much like my child" in the Fragile Families Survey. There was also one deviation in wording -- instead of "reacts intensely when upset," the Fragile Families Survey reworded to "reacts strongly when upset."

*Table 16: Shyness and Emotionality Source Items*

	Item	Source Item
<b>Shyness</b>		
	m2b17a, f2b16a, m2b43a, f2b37a	Tends to be shy
		Makes friends easily (R)
	m2b17c, f2b16c, m2b43c, f2b37c	Is very sociable (R)
		Takes a long time to warm up to strangers
	m2b17f, f2b16f, m2b43f, f2b37f	Is very friendly with strangers (R)
<b>Emotionality</b>		
		Cries easily
		Tends to be somewhat emotional
	m2b17b, f2b16b, m2b43b, f2b37b	Often fusses and cries
	m2b17d, f2b16d, m2b43d, f2b37d	Gets upset easily
	m2b17e, f2b16e, m2b43e, f2b37e	Reacts intensely when upset

### 11.2.3. Psychometrics

Below is a table of internal consistencies (Cronbach alphas) for Emotionality and Shyness (the two temperament scales used in the Year 1 Surveys). These alphas are taken from Mathiesen and Tamb,<sup>29</sup> whose study was similar to Rowe and Plomin's.<sup>30</sup> The internal consistencies are reported at three different ages in their study (18 months, 30

<sup>29</sup> Mathiesen, K.S., Tambs, K. (1999). The EAS temperament questionnaire – Factor structure, age trends, reliability, and stability in a Norwegian sample. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 40, 431-439.

<sup>30</sup> Rowe, D.C., & Plomin, R. (1977). Temperament in early childhood. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 41, 150-156.

months and 50 months), and include all questions from the scale. The reliability of the Shyness scale is higher than the Emotionality scale. Both scales also show an increase of reliability as age increases.<sup>31</sup> Children in the Fragile Families sample are generally between twelve and eighteen months at the Year 1 follow-up interviews.

Analyses of the Year 1 Mother and Father Surveys produce the following Cronbach alphas: child’s shyness as reported by the mother (0.45), child’s shyness as reported by the father (0.41), child’s emotionality as reported by the mother (0.60), and child’s emotionality as reported by the father (0.61). Please note: the alphas for shyness are lower than those obtained in the original study and therefore researchers should use the shyness scale with caution.

The correlations found between the Shyness scale and the Emotionality scale using the mother reports data resemble that of Mathiesen and Tamb’s study of Norwegian children for 18-month olds. The correlation for the father reports in Fragile Families is comparable to the mother correlation (see table)

*Table 17: EAS Internal Consistency (Cronbach’s alpha): Full scale taken from Mathieson & Tambs*

	t <sub>1</sub>	t <sub>2</sub>	t <sub>3</sub>
Emotionality	0.61	0.64	0.67
Shyness	0.71	0.73	0.79

Note: t<sub>1</sub> (18 months, N=921), t<sub>2</sub> (30 months, N=784), and t<sub>3</sub> (50 months, N=737)

*Table 18: EAS Scale Correlations: Full scale taken from Mathieson & Tambs*

Scale	Emotionality	Shyness
Emotionality		0.18

Note: EAS ratings by mothers; for 18 months old children (t<sub>1</sub>)

*Table 19: Shyness and Emotionality Correlations among those with both mother and father interview at Year 1.*

	Mother report of child shyness	Mother report of child emotionality	Father report of child shyness	Father report of child emotionality
Mother report of child shyness	1			
Mother report of child emotionality	0.1343	1		
Father report of child shyness	0.2341	0.0574	1	
Father report of child emotionality	0.0784	0.1771	0.1038	1

Using Fragile Families Year 1 data

<sup>31</sup> Mathieson, K.S., Tambs, K. (1999). The EAS temperament questionnaire – Factor structure, age trends, reliability, and stability in a Norwegian sample. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 40, 431-439.

#### 11.2.4. *Scoring Information*

The original EAS scales implemented questions using a 5-point rating scale. Some questions also require reverse-coding of responses. These items are marked with an “R” in Table 16. The scores for each category were obtained by calculating a weighted sum, weighting responses by the factor loadings.

Given that Fragile Families did not implement the full scale, we suggest reverse coding as appropriate, summing the items, and dividing by the total number of items.

## 12. Employment

At Year 1, mothers and fathers were asked about their employment, including questions regarding their work schedule, and the type of employment, specifically non-traditional employments (including working for self, “hustles”, and other work). Respondents were also asked whether their work schedule causes stress to their life and family.

Table 20: Subtopics in Employment in Year 1 by survey instrument

Subtopics	m	f
Traditional work	X	X
Non-traditional work	X	X
Unemployment	X	X
Work stress/flexibility	X	X

### 12.1. Open Ended Response Codes - Occupations

For **traditional employment**, we constructed an occupation variable for mothers (m2k10bc) and fathers (f2k15bc) based on the 3 digits codes from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) Occupational Classification System by Major Occupational Groups. These categories are summarized below:

- 101 – Professional, Technical, and Related Occupations (Group A)
- 102 – Executive, Administrative, and Managerial Occupations (Group B)
- 103 – Sales Occupations (Group C)
- 104 – Administrative Support Occupations, including Clerical (Group D)
- 105 – Precision Production, Craft, and Repair Occupations (Group E)
- 106 – Machine Operators, Assemblers, and Inspectors (Group F)
- 107 – Transportation and Material Moving Occupations (Group G)
- 108 – Handlers, Equipment Cleaners, Helpers, and Laborers (Group H)
- 109 – Service Occupations, except Private Household (Group K)
- 110 – Unspecified
- 112 – Military
- 113 – Farming/Agriculture

For **non-traditional employment** (e.g. working in own business and other sources of income), occupation variables (m2k17a1, m2k18a1, m2k20a1, f2k22a1, f2k23a1, f2k25a1) were coded using a slightly different set of categories designed by staff that incorporated some additional categories necessitated by the data. The staff followed the classifications described by Occupational Classification System by Major Occupational Groups (though these code numbers differ slightly).

- 101 – Artists and Athletes: includes athletes, photographers, artists, musicians. This category is based on a Board of Labor Statistics sub-grouping.
- 102 – Administrative Support: to include clerical jobs, bookkeepers, and people working for temp agencies.
- 103 -- Sales



104 – Construction and Precision Trades: includes jobs related to building and home improvement (brickmasons, carpet installers, drywallers, painters, carpenters, etc.) as well as the respondent who said he makes uniforms. This is based on the BLS Major Occupational Group E with mechanics and repairers removed. (See code 110)

105 – Military

106 – Gambling

107 – Education and Training

108 – Service Occupations: includes food (restaurants, catering, bartending), health (aromatherapists, personal trainers), and personal services (babysitting, in home care of the elderly, cosmetology). This is based on BLS Major Occupational Group K.

109 – Professional

110 – Mechanics and Repairers: includes work related to car repair or audio installation. This is the other portion of BLS Major Occupational Group E (most are in code 104).

111 – Real Estate and Finance

112 – Landscaping and Agriculture: includes landscaping, cutting grass, ranching, farming, raising cattle.

113 – Information Technology

114 – Transportation and Delivery

115 – Entertainment

116 – Illegal Activity

117 – Other

### 13. Childcare

At Year 1, both mother and father were asked about their childcare arrangements.

Table 21: Subtopics in Childcare in Year 1 by survey instrument

<b>Subtopics</b>	<b>m</b>	<b>f</b>
Childcare Services and Availability	X	X

## 14. Romantic Relationships

During the Year 1 mother and father surveys, questions were asked about parents' romantic relationship with one another as well as, if applicable, new partners. Questions were asked regarding their relationship quality with their partner (i.e. communication, supportiveness, cooperation, intimate partner violence), their relationship status (whether they are married, cohabiting, dating, no longer together), and their relationship history. Constructed variables regarding their relationship status was made by staff.

Table 22: Subtopics in Romantic Relationships in Year 1 by survey instrument

<u>Subtopics</u>	<u>m</u>	<u>f</u>
Relationship Quality	X	X
Relationship Status	X	X

### 14.1. Constructed Variables - Mother's relationship with child's father

- **cm2relf** mother's reported romantic relationship with child's father at Year 1

In the Year 1 mother survey, the mother's relationship status was reported based on information reported by a mother. Mothers were asked about their relationship status with the baby's father (m2a7), and cohabitation status as reported in question (m2a7a).

Mothers are considered married to the focal child's father for cm3relf if m3a4 =1. For mothers who report to be romantically involved (m2a7=2), m2a7a is tabulated to determine the cohabitation status. Mothers who are romantically involved and live with their respective babies' fathers "all or most of the time" are considered to be romantically involved – cohabiting (cm2relf=2). Mothers who are romantically involved with the respective babies' fathers but live with father only "some of the time" are coded as rom-some visit (cm2relf=3). Mothers who are romantically involved with the respective babies' fathers but live with them only "rarely", "never" or "rarely/never" are coded as rom-no-visit (cm2relf=4). Mothers who don't live with the respective babies' fathers due to separation, divorce or death are coded as "sep/div/wid" (cm2relf=5). The three additional categories in the cm2relf variable: "friends", "not in any kind of relationship" and "father unknown" are based on mothers' report in m2a7. Two specific cases in the Year 1 follow-up reporting romantic involvement in m2a7, but unsure whether cohabiting or not are coded as missing (-3). Four cases where mother reported "father unknown" but we have father interviews were recoded based on father reports after confirming key facts about the couple.

*Table 23: Constructed variables about parent's romantic relationships*

Constructed Variable	Description of Constructed Variable
cm2alvf	Mother age when started living with father (years)
cm2amrf	Mother age when married father (years)
cm2cohf	Mother living with (not married) child's father at Year 1
cf2cohm	Father living with (not married) child's mother at Year 1
c[m   f]2cohp	Mother/Father living with (not married) new partner at Year 1
cm2marf	Mother married to baby's father at Year 1
cf2marm	Father married to baby's mother at Year 1
c[m   f]2marp	Mother/Father married to new partner at Year 1
cm2relf	Mother relationship with father at Year 1

## 15. Parenting

Questions were asked to the mother and father at Year 1 about the respondents' relationships with their child. In the category of parent-child contact are questions related to the time parent spends with child and the extent of their communication and visitation, for those parents who do not live with their child. In the parenting abilities subtopic, are questions regarding parent's decision-making, co-parenting, stress and self-perception as a parent. Activities, routines and discipline-related questions are grouped within the parenting behavior category.

Table 24: Subtopics in Parenting in Year 1 by survey instrument

<b>Subtopics</b>	<b>m</b>	<b>f</b>
Child Welfare Services	X	X
Parent-Child Contact	X	X
Parenting Abilities	X	X
Parenting Behavior	X	X

## 15.1. Scale - Aggravation in Parenting

These items are taken from the JOBS<sup>32</sup> (Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program) Child Outcomes Study, and also are found in the Child Development Supplement of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (*Primary Caregiver of Target Child Household Questionnaire for the Child Development Supplement to the Family Economics Study*, 1997).

### 15.1.1. *Variables*

*Mother questions:*

18 cities: **m2b20a-m2b20d** (4 variables, resident mothers), **m2b44a-m2b44d** (4 variables, non-resident mothers)

2 cities: **m2b20ax, m2b20bx, mx2b20cx** (3 variables)

*Father questions:*

18 cities: **f2b18a-f2b18d** (4 variables, resident fathers), **f2b38a-f2b38d** (4 variables, non-resident fathers)

2 cities: **f2b20ax, f2b20bx, f2b20cx** (3 variables)

The aggravation in parenting questions in the Year 1 Core Survey are derived from the Child Development Supplement (CDS) of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID). The scale measures the amount of parenting stress brought on by changes in employment, income or other factors in the parent's life. It was developed for the JOBS child outcome survey by Child Trends, Inc. and several items come from the Parent Stress Inventory.<sup>33</sup> Items Q1B11a-e in Table 25 are from the primary caregiver/child questionnaire in the PSID-CDS, and Q2A29a-d are from the primary caregiver/household questionnaire. The items used in the JOBS study are marked with an asterisk in the table below. Their 5-question scale had an alpha of 0.69. Research has shown that high levels of aggravation in parenting are related to mothers' employment status and to child behavior problems.<sup>34</sup>

## 15.2. *Modifications*

The Year 1 study does not use all 9 of the items mentioned above. Instead, the four questions from Q2A29a-d are used (see Table 25 below). The Year 1 questions are also scored on a 4-point scale, where 1 = "strongly agree," 2 = "somewhat agree," 3 = "somewhat disagree," and 4 = "strongly disagree," whereas the original questions used a 5-point Likert scale that ranged from "not at all true" to "completely true."

## 15.3. *Scoring Information*

Given that Fragile Families did not implement the full scale, we suggest summing the items and dividing by the total number of items.

---

<sup>32</sup> Also known as the National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies (NEWWS).

<sup>33</sup> Abidin, R. (1995). Parent Stress Inventory, 3rd Edition. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

<sup>34</sup> Hofferth, S., Davis-Kean, P.E., Davis, J., & Finkelstein, J. *The Child Development Supplement to the Panel Study of Income Dynamics: 1997 User Guide*. Survey Research Center, The University of Michigan Institute for Social Research.

Table 25: Aggravation in Parenting Variables

PSID-CDS	Year 1 Variables	Source Items
Q1B11a	m2b20ax/f2b20ax	(CHILD) seems to be harder to care for than most children.
Q1B11b*		There are some things that (he/she) does that really bother me a lot.
Q1B11c*		I find myself giving up more of my life to meet (CHILD)'s needs than I ever expected.
Q1B11d*	m2b20bx/f2b20bx	I often feel angry with (CHILD).
Q1B11e	m2b20cx/f2b20cx	I would be doing better in my life without (CHILD).
Q2A29a*	m2b20a, m2b44a f2b18a, f2b38a	Being a parent is harder than I thought it would be
Q2A29b*	m2b20b, m2b44b f2b18b, f2b38b	I feel trapped by my responsibilities as a parent
Q2A29c	m2b20c, m2b44c f2b18c, f2b38c	I find that taking care of my child(ren) is much more work than pleasure
Q2A29d	m2b20d, m2b44d f2b18d, f3b38d	I often feel tired, worn out, or exhausted from raising a family

## 16. Legal System

At Year 1, both mother and father were asked about any involvement they had had with the criminal justice system and if so, when did the incident occur, whether they were charged with a crime and if so, what were they charged for, as well as if and how long did they spend time in jail or in prison. Questions were even asked regarding their history with the criminal justice system, including if they were ever spent to a youth correctional facility. Other questions within this topic include parental custody and the father's legal paternity.

Table 26: Subtopics in Legal System in Year 1 by survey instrument

<u>Subtopics</u>	<u>m</u>	<u>f</u>
Criminal Justice Involvement	X	X
Legal Custody	X	X
Paternity	X	X

### 16.1. Constructed Variables - Father in Jail

**cm2finjail, cf2finjail, cm2cfinjail, cm2fevjail, cf2fevjail, cm2cfevjail**

The constructed jail variables for mother report of father in jail, father report of his own jail, combined reports, and cumulative measures of whether father has ever been in jail are available in the Year 1 Mother and Father Surveys. The jail variables maximize reports of fathers' jail status based on information in the core files and from disposition reports. The variables are coded as 0 for not in jail/never in jail and 1 for in jail/ever in jail. We did not code cases "not in wave" on these variables; instead, missing values represent no information available on jail status.



## 17. Housing and Neighborhood

At Year 1, mothers and fathers were asked questions regarding their living arrangements (both the arrangements which pertain to them and those that pertain to the child). A housing roster was used to plot the number of people in the home, what relationship the respondent had to each person, how old each person is and whether they were working. Mothers and fathers were asked for details of their current housing situation and number of recent moves.

Table 27: Subtopics in Housing and Neighborhood in Year 1 by survey instrument

<b>Subtopics</b>	<b>m</b>	<b>f</b>
Child Living Arrangements	X	X
Home Environment	X	X
Household Composition	X	X
Housing Status	X	X
Parents' Living Arrangements	X	X
Residential Mobility	X	X

Table 28: Constructed variables for household composition

<b>Constructed Variable</b>	<b>Description of Constructed Variable</b>
c[m   f]2adult	Number of adults 18 or over in household
c[m   f]2kids	Number of children under 18 in household
cm2cohf	Mother living with (not married) child's father at Year 1
cf2cohm	Father living with (not married) child's mother at Year 1
c[m   f]2cohp	Mother/father living with (not married) new partner at Year 1
c[m   f]2gdad	Grandfather present in household
c[m   f]2gmom	Grandmother present in household
cm2finst	Does father live in the same state as mother in Year 1?
cm2stflag	Flag indicating imputed data about father's state of residence
cm2biok	Number of mother's biological children

## 18. Education

At Year 1, both mothers and fathers were asked about their own educational attainment including any schooling they had attended or completed since baseline. They were also asked about the highest level of education attained by their own parents (focal-child's grandparents). Mothers and fathers were also asked if they had talked to the child's care provider about how the child was doing in the past year.

Table 29: Subtopics in Education in Year 1 by survey instrument

<u>Subtopics</u>	<u>m</u>	<u>f</u>
Educational Attainment/Achievement	X	X
Parent School Involvement	X	X

### 18.1. Constructed Variables - Parent's Education

- **cm2edu, cf2edu** mothers' and fathers' education at baseline

In constructing these variables, parents' report of new education, training and schooling since the previous wave was used. Parents' reports from previous waves were used as needed when parents did not report attaining any new, additional education at the time of the interview. Mothers' reports of fathers' education were also used when fathers' reports were missing and mothers' were available.

## 19. Other Topics in Year 1

The following table includes subtopics within topics that are not explicitly written about in this user guide. For more on these topics, please refer to the survey instruments/questionnaires and [the FFCWS metadata website](#).

Table 30: Other topics and subtopics in Year 1 by survey instrument

<b>Topics and Subtopics</b>	<b>m</b>	<b>f</b>
<i>Attitudes and Expectations</i>		
Attitudes/Expectations/Happiness	X	X
<i>Demographics</i>		
Age	X	X
Citizenship and Nativity	X	X
Language	X	X
Mortality	X	X
Race/Ethnicity		X
Sex/Gender	X	X
<i>Family and Social Ties</i>		
Community Participation	X	X
Grandparents	X	X
Parent's Family background	X	X
Religion	X	X
Social Support	X	X