

Appendix E

Fragile Families Data Set

E.1 Outcome Tables for Fragile Families Data Set

Table E-1. Demographic and background characteristics households at least 50 percent below poverty line

Variable	Stably Housed n = 187 (%)	At-Risk n = 347 (%)	Doubled-Up n = 231 (%)	Homeless n = 73 (%)	Significant Group Comparisons					
					Stable			At Risk		Dbl
					vs. A	vs. D	vs. H	vs. D	vs. H	vs. H
Demographics – Mother (Baseline)										
Race – All Categories										
White	16	18	22	12						
Black	63	66	62	70						
Asian	2	2	1	3						
American Indian	7	6	7	4						
Hispanic	--	0.3	--	--						
Other	13	9	9	11						
Race – % African American	62	65	61	70						
Age (mean, standard deviation)	24.7 (5.5)	24.2 (5.5)	24.1 (6.1)	24.0 (6.0)						
Mother's Income (%)										
< \$5,000	46	51	55	49						
\$5,000 – \$10,000	36	34	26	37						
> \$10,000	17	15	20	14						

E-1

Table E-1. Demographic and background characteristics households at least 50 percent below poverty line (continued)

Variable	Stably Housed n = 187 (%)	At-Risk n = 347 (%)	Doubled-Up n = 231 (%)	Homeless n = 73 (%)	Significant Group Comparisons					
					Stable vs.			At Risk vs.		DblD vs.
					A	D	H	D	H	H
Demographics – Father (Baseline)										
Race – All Categories										
White	14	16	21	10						✓
Black	63	69	62	79						✓
Asian	2	1	0.4	1						
American Indian	7	5	7	1						
Hispanic	--	--	--	--						
Other	15	9	11	9						
Race – % African-American (mother’s report)	54	59	58	60						
Age (mean, standard deviation)	16.5 (17.5)	18.4 (16.3)	16.8 (16.2)	19.2 (17.5)						
Father’s Income (%)										
< \$5,000	18	17	15	8						
\$5,000 – \$10,000	9	15	19	17						
> \$10,000	73	69	66	75						

E-2

Table E-1. Demographic and background characteristics households at least 50 percent below poverty line (continued)

Variable	Stably Housed n = 187 (%)	At-Risk n = 347 (%)	Doubled-Up n = 231 (%)	Homeless n = 73 (%)	Significant Group Comparisons					
					Stable vs.			At Risk vs.		DblD vs.
					A	D	H	D	H	H
Background – Mother										
Living with both biological parents at age 15	39	30	35	29	✓					
Had first birth as a teen	30	30	27	36						
Mothers Age at 1 st Birth	19.8	19.4	20.0	19.1						
Any new pregnancies or children?										
Year 1	27	16	11	16						
Year 3	41	35	36	45						
Mother's Education – Baseline										
< HS	54	51	55	55						
HS +	47	49	45	45						
Currently attend any school/training – 1 year	17	20	14	18						
Mother has worked since child's birth – 1 year	65	73	75	73						
Do any regular work for pay last week?										
Year 1	35	38	37	34						
Year 3	51	47	44	32			✓		✓	
Visited a doctor/health care professional to check on the pregnancy – Baseline	93	94	98	92				✓		✓

Table E-1. Demographic and background characteristics households at least 50 percent below poverty line (continued)

Variable	Stably Housed n = 187 (%)	At-Risk n = 347 (%)	Doubled-Up n = 231 (%)	Homeless n = 73 (%)	Significant Group Comparisons					
					Stable vs.			At Risk vs.		Dbl'd vs.
					A	D	H	D	H	H
Mother's Household Composition										
Lives with Partner/Spouse										
Baseline	42	44	38	40						
Year 1	57	48	35	40		✓	✓	✓		
Year 3	45	45	36	30			✓	✓	✓	
Lives with Mother (i.e. child's grandmother)										
Baseline	27	18	27	23	✓			✓		
Year 1	16	10	22	14				✓		
Year 3	9	6	8	18		✓		✓		✓
Child lives with mother										
Baseline	98	99	100	94		✓			✓	✓
Year 1	97	99	94	93				✓	✓	
Year 3	97	98	95	89			✓		✓	
Number of adults in Household (not partner)										
Baseline	.80	.52	.87	.59	✓			✓		✓
Year 1	.67	.39	.97	.62	✓	✓		✓		✓
Year 3	.69	.58	1.04	.87		✓		✓	✓	
Number of children in household										
Baseline	1.89	1.57	1.56	1.44	✓	✓	✓			
Year 1	2.83	2.68	2.86	2.56						
Year 3	2.94	2.79	2.76	2.77						
Spouse/Partner Working										
Baseline	34	37	31	30						
Year 1	41	31	20	18	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Year 3	16	13	7	5		✓	✓	✓		

Table E-1. Demographic and background characteristics households at least 50 percent below poverty line (continued)

Variable	Stably Housed n = 187 (%)	At-Risk n = 347 (%)	Doubled-Up n = 231 (%)	Homeless n = 73 (%)	Significant Group Comparisons					
					Stable			At Risk		Dbl
					A	D	H	D	H	H
Other adult in household working										
Baseline	31	20	39	25	✓			✓		✓
Year 1	22	13	31	19	✓	✓		✓		✓
Year 3	33	28	44	38		✓		✓		
Housing										
Mother lives in housing project										
Baseline	23	24	18	23						
Year 1	33	31	18	19		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Year 3	28	26	21	27						
Mother receives housing subsidy										
Baseline	28	35	20	38				✓		✓
Year 1	31	34	19	14		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Year 3	32	34	22	29		✓		✓		
Safety of streets around home at night – Baseline										
Very Safe	19	13	18	16						
Safe	61	60	56	47			✓			
Unsafe	16	21	21	27			✓			
Very Unsafe	4	6	5	10						

Table E-1. Demographic and background characteristics households at least 50 percent below poverty line (continued)

Variable	Stably Housed n = 187 (%)	At-Risk n = 347 (%)	Doubled-Up n = 231 (%)	Homeless n = 73 (%)	Significant Group Comparisons					
					Stable vs.			At Risk vs.		Dbl'd vs.
					A	D	H	D	H	H
Problems Making Ends Meet										
Received free food/meal in past 12 months										
Year 1	3	15	20	34	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Year 3	2	15	16	35	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
In past 12 months, children went hungry – Year 1	0	2	2	5			✓			
In past 12 months, mother went hungry – Year 1	2	7	12	22	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Social Support										
During pregnancy, received financial support other than baby's father? – Baseline	53	57	67	67		✓	✓	✓		
Next year, would someone in family loan you \$200?										
Baseline	85	81	80	79						
Year 1	74	74	67	64						
Year 3	82	72	75	74	✓					
Next year, would someone in family give you a place to live?										
Baseline	90	86	88	85						
Year 1	82	72	80	64	✓		✓	✓		
Year 3	82	74	79	62			✓		✓	✓

Table E-1. Demographic and background characteristics households at least 50 percent below poverty line (continued)

Variable	Stably Housed n = 187 (%)	At-Risk n = 347 (%)	Doubled-Up n = 231 (%)	Homeless n = 73 (%)	Significant Group Comparisons					
					Stable			At Risk		Dbl'd
					A	D	H	D	H	H
Next year, would someone help you with babysitting/child care?										
Baseline	92	37	88	89						
Year 1	82	79	81	81						
Year 3	90	77	84	75	✓		✓	✓		
Count on someone to co-sign loan for \$1000										
Year 1	50	37	42	33	✓		✓			
Year 3	54	40	37	26	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Government Assistance										
In last year, had income from public assistance, welfare, or food stamps – Baseline	60	69	58	74	✓		✓	✓		✓
In last year, had income from unemployment insurance, worker's compensation, disability, or SSI - Baseline	8	8	17	12						
Received food stamps in past 12 months										
Year 1	68	75	68	82			✓			✓
Year 3	60	71	74	76	✓	✓	✓			
Complete tax form – Year 1	44	47	44	36						
Applied for Earned Income Tax Credit? – Year 1	43	72	65	74	✓	✓	✓			

Table E-1. Demographic and background characteristics households at least 50 percent below poverty line (continued)

Variable	Stably Housed n = 187 (%)	At-Risk n = 347 (%)	Doubled-Up n = 231 (%)	Homeless n = 73 (%)	Significant Group Comparisons					
					Stable vs.			At Risk vs.		Dbl'd vs.
					A	D	H	D	H	H
Have any health insurance										
Year 1	88	90	84	85				✓		
Year 3	90	93	93	97						
Health, Mental Health, and Substance Abuse										
Mother's health (avg.)										
Baseline	2.07	2.28	2.32	2.48	✓	✓	✓			
Year 1	1.95	2.39	2.42	2.55	✓	✓	✓			
Year 3	2.05	2.45	2.45	2.65	✓	✓	✓			
Use Alcohol										
Baseline	9	12	13	25			✓		✓	✓
Year 1	17	28	28	29	✓	✓	✓			
Year 3	30	47	49	49	✓	✓	✓			
Use Drugs										
Baseline	7	5	13	25		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Year 1	1	3	5	5		✓	✓			
Year 3	1	9	9	20	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Use Cigarettes										
Baseline	20	29	30	40	✓	✓	✓			
Year 1	25	36	39	47	✓	✓	✓			
In past year, has alcohol or drugs interfered with work/relationships?										
Baseline	1	4	6	4	✓	✓				
Year 1	2	1	6	5		✓		✓	✓	
Year 3	3	6	7	16	✓		✓			✓
Felt sad/depressed 2 or more weeks in a row										
Year 1	12	24	24	46	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Year 3	15	31	38	39	✓	✓	✓			

Table E-1. Demographic and background characteristics households at least 50 percent below poverty line (continued)

Variable	Stably Housed n = 187 (%)	At-Risk n = 347 (%)	Doubled-Up n = 231 (%)	Homeless n = 73 (%)	Significant Group Comparisons					
					Stable vs.			At Risk vs.		DblD vs.
					A	D	H	D	H	H
Lost interest in hobbies/work for 2 or more weeks in a row										
Year 1	3	16	19	20	✓	✓	✓			
Year 3	6	14	15	24	✓	✓	✓			
Felt tense/anxious for month or longer										
Year 1	7	20	20	36	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Year 3	5	22	24	39	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Sought help or was treated for drug or alcohol problems										
Year 1	4	4	6	12			✓		✓	
Year 3	1	1	6	6		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Hit or slapped by spouse/partner										
Baseline	2	4	7	8		✓	✓			
Year 1	4	10	12	19	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Year 3	8	13	16	25		✓	✓		✓	

Table E-2. Logistic regression models year 1 and year 3 homeless households at least 50 percent below poverty line

Nagelkerke R ²	Year 1 Model	Yr 1 or 3 Model	Year 3 Model
	n=778 .157	n=775 .166	n=688 .333
Age			
Race (% Black)			
Live Both Parents @ 15			
Teen Birth			.872*
Preg @ Year 1			
Preg @ Year 3			
Partner – Baseline			
Partner – Yr 1			
Change Partner B-1			
Change Partner 1-3			-1.536***
Live with Mother – Base			
Live with Mother – Yr 1			1.007*
Change Live Mom B-1			
Change Live Mom 1-3			
# Adults in Hhld – Base			
# Adults in Hhld – Yr 1			
# Adults in Hhld – Yr 3			.509**
# Kids – Baseline			
# Kids – Yr 1			
# Kids – Yr 3			
Social Support – Base (# Sources 0-3)			
Social Support – Yr 1			
Social Support – Yr 3			
\$1000 Loan – Yr 1			
\$1000 Loan – Yr 3			-1.303*
Educ Level – Baseline (<HS/HS+)			
Mother Working – Base			
Mother Working – Yr 1			-1.537*
Change Mom Work B-1			
Change Mom Work 1-3			-1.803**
Income – Year 1 (ln)	-.155*	-.182**	-.303***
Partner Working – Base			
Partner Working – Yr 1			
Change Partner Work B-1			
Change Partner Work 1-3			
Other Adult Work – Base			
Other Adult Work – Yr 1			
Other Adult Work – Yr 3			

Table E-2. Logistic regression models year 1 and year 3 homeless households at least 50 percent below poverty line (continued)

Nagelkerke R ²	Year 1 Model	Yr 1 or 3 Model	Year 3 Model
	n=778 .157	n=775 .166	n=688 .333
Health Status – Base (1:Excellent – 5:Poor)			
Health Status – Yr 1			
Health Status – Yr 3			
Ever Use SA – Base and Yr 1	1.076*		
SA Ever Interfere – B and Yr 1		.781*	
Ever DV – B and Yr 1	1.092**	.764*	
MH Prob – Yr 1	.306	.473***	
Ever Use SA – Base, 1, 3			
SA Ever Interfere – B, 1, 3			
Ever DV – B, 1, 3			
MH Prob – Yr 3			.637**
Neigh Safety – Baseline (1 Very Safe – 4 Very Unsafe)			.535*
Public Hsng – Base			
Public Hsng – Yr 1			
Change Pub Hsng B-1			
Change Pub Hsng 1-3			
Hsng Assist – Baseline		-.815*	
Hsng Assist – Yr 1			-1.473*
Change Hsng Assist B-1	-1.029***	-1.359***	
Change Hsng Assit 1-3			
TANF/Food Stamps – Base			
Receive TANF – Yr 1	.995**	1.029***	.759
Change TANF 1-3			
Receive Food Stamps – Yr 1			
Change Food Stamps 1-3			

*Significant at P<.05

**Significant at P<.01

***Significant at P<.001

Table E-3. Logistic regression models year 1 and year 3 stably housed households at least 50 percent below poverty line

Nagelkerke R ²	Year 1 Model	Yr 1 or 3 Model	Year 3 Model
	n=778 .221	n=775 .197	n=688 .183
Age		.033	
Race (% Black)			
Live Both Parents @ 15			
Teen Birth			
Preg @ Year 1			
Preg @ Year 3			
Partner – Baseline	.530**	.548*	
Partner – Yr 1			
Change Partner B-1	.456*		
Change Partner 1-3			-.303
Live with Mother – Baseline			
Live with Mother – Yr 1			
Change Live Mom B-1	.336		
Change Live Mom 1-3			-.479**
# Adults in Hhld – Baseline	.186*	.210*	
# Adults in Hhld – Yr 1			
# Adults in Hhld – Yr 3			
# Kids – Baseline	.194***		
# Kids – Yr 1			
# Kids – Yr 3			
Social Support – Base (# Sources 0-3)			
Social Support – Yr 1			
Social Support – Yr 3			
\$1000 Loan – Yr 1	.291		
\$1000 Loan – Yr 3			
Educ Level – Baseline (<HS/HS+)			
Mother Working – Baseline	-.283		
Mother Working – Yr 1			
Change Mom Work B-1			
Change Mom Work 1-3			.383**
Income – Yr 1 (ln)	.091	.112	
Partner Working – Base			
Partner Working – Yr 1			
Change Partner Work B-1	.705**	.881***	
Change Partner Work 1-3			
Other Adult Working –Base			
Other Adult Working – Yr 1			
Other Adult Working – Yr 3			

Table E-3. Logistic regression models year 1 and year 3 stably housed households at least 50 percent below poverty line (continued)

Nagelkerke R ²	Year 1 Model	Yr 1 or 3 Model	Year 3 Model
	n=778 .221	n=775 .197	n=688 .183
Health Status – Base (1:Excellent – 5:Poor)	-.149	-.323***	
Health Status – Yr 1			-.130
Health Status – Yr 3			
Ever Use SA – Base and Yr1	-.473**	-.644**	
SA Ever Interfere – B and Yr 1			
Ever DV – B and Yr 1	-1.037***	-.928*	
MH Prob – Yr 1	-.546***	-.625***	
Ever Use SA – Base, 1, 3			-.692***
SA Ever Interfere – B, 1, 3			
Ever DV – B, 1, 3			
MH Prob – Yr 3			-.583***
Neigh Safety – Baseline (1 Very Safe – 4 Very Unsafe)			
Public Hsng – Base		.823**	
Public Hsng – Yr 1			.528**
Change Pub Hsng B-1		.548*	
Change Pub Hsng 1-3			
Hsng Assist – Baseline			
Hsng Assist – Yr 1			
Change Hsng Assist B-1		.352	
Change Hsng Assit 1-3			
TANF/Food Stamps – Base			
Receive TANF – Yr 1			-.304
Change TANF 1-3			
Receive Food Stamps – Yr 1			
Change Food Stamps 1-3			-.508**

*Significant at P<.05

**Significant at P<.01

***Significant at P<.001

E.2 Overview of Fragile Families Data Set

Fragile Families and Child Well-being Study	
Conducted by	<p>Princeton University's Center for Research on Child Wellbeing and Columbia University's Social Indicators Survey Center</p> <p>Principal Investigators: Sara McLanahan, Irwin Garfinkel, Jeanne Brooks-Gunn and Christina Paxson</p> <p>Funders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development- National Science Foundation- U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services- Over 20 foundations including: Commonwealth Fund, Ford Foundation, William T. Grant Foundation, William and Flora Hewitt Foundation, Hogg Foundation, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
Sample	<p>The study is a stratified random sample of US cities with a population of 200,000 or more. The sample is representative of non-marital births in each of the 20 cities and also representative of non-marital births in US cities with populations over 200,000.</p> <p>The sample is new, mostly unwed mothers approached and interviewed at the hospital within 48 hours of giving birth, and fathers were interviewed at the hospital or elsewhere as soon as possible after the birth. Hospitals were chosen over prenatal clinics because of higher response rates from the fathers and to gain a more representative sample of all non-marital births.</p> <p>Baseline interviews were conducted across the United States in: Austin, TX; Pittsburgh, PA; Boston, MA; Oakland, CA; Baltimore, MD; San Antonio, TX; Philadelphia, PA; Detroit, MI; New York City, NY; Jacksonville, FL; San Jose, CA; Indianapolis, IN; Chicago, IL; Toledo, OH; Newark, NJ; Richmond, VA; Milwaukee, WI; Corpus Christi, TX; Norfolk, VA; and Nashville, TN.</p>
Size	<p>Baseline datasets include 4,898 completed mother interviews (1,186 marital births and 3,712 non-marital births) and 3,830 completed father interviews. One year followup dataset includes 4,365 completed mother interviews and 3,367 completed father interviews.</p>
Timeframe	<p>Baseline collected between 1998-2000, followups conducted 1 year, 3 years, and 5 years</p>
Data availability	<p>Baseline, one year and three-year followup currently available. Five-year followup available Spring/Summer 2007</p>

E.2 Overview of Fragile Families Data Set (continued)

Fragile Families and Child Well-being Study

Knowledge Gaps At-risk for homelessness factors (including, doubled-up)
Pregnant Mothers
Specific city information
Data on children from birth to 5 years
Longitudinal design that tracks risk and protective factors

Relevant Variables **At-risk for Homelessness.** Questions related to at-risk for homelessness predictors include whether the mother needed financial support from family or friends, whether or not there was someone who could provide the mother with a place to live, whether family lives in a house owned by another family. Other relevant questions regarding the previous 12 months, assess family hunger, eviction, inability to pay utility bills, borrowing money to pay bills, moving in with others while experiencing financial problems, staying in a shelter, abandoned building, or automobile or any other place not meant for regular housing even for one night.

Demographics. Background data on the mother includes, race, education level, and employment status (including income).

Domestic Abuse. Father and mother’s physical relationship was assessed through questions about sexual, physical, and verbal abuse, including if hospitalization was necessary from abuse.

Family Separation. If mother and child were separated, describes where child stayed during separations and why mother and child were originally separated.

Government Programs. Utilization of government programs for children including, Healthy Start nurses, Head Start, childcare referral agencies, and WIC. Other governmental programs questioned, include, TANF, SSI, energy and housing assistance, food stamps, worker’s compensation.

Housing Composition. The number of people currently living in the house (i.e., children, husband, mother). Provides data on name, gender, age, relationship, and place of employment.

Marital. Marital status and whether the mother is currently pregnant or recently given birth.

Mental Health. The mother’s level of depression, anxiety, and general mental health.

Physical Health. The mother’s general level of physical health is assessed.

Substance Abuse. Drug use and treatment for alcohol and drug usage assessed.

E.3 Measuring Household Income and Poverty Sample

As noted in the report, two samples of families from the Fragile Families dataset were selected for re-analysis. An initial sample was limited to families where the mother is 18 years of age or older and has a household income at their Year 1 interview at or below the national poverty threshold based on the year of their interview (1999 through 2001). The second sample, the primary sample used for these analyses, is limited to families where the household income at Year 1 was at or below 50 percent of the national poverty rate.

The one-year followup was used as the time period to measure household income, instead of the baseline, because residential information was not collected until the Year 1 followup, so it matches the time point that homelessness could first be measured. Analyses also showed that approximately one-fifth of the households classified as being below the poverty line at baseline were above the poverty line at Year 1, indicating that the use of baseline income data might too widely broaden the pool of households in the analyses.

A question concerning household income included in the Year 1 Fragile Families survey was the first source of income data used. Of the 4,365 households in the Year 1 sample, 2,525 (58%) gave their total household income. For those women who could not give an exact dollar amount, a followup question asked them for at least an income range. An additional 1,426 woman (33%) answered this question. Using the midpoint of the range as an estimate, household income data was thus available on 91 percent of the Year 1 sample.

The household income information, together with information on household composition (number of children and other adults) was used to determine whether a household was above or below the poverty line. In 1999, for example, a household with one adult and one child needed to have a household income below \$11,483 to meet the poverty threshold, while a family with two adults and two children had to be below \$16,895. For those families missing any household income information, questions about the receipt of welfare/TANF or Food Stamps were used to indicate whether the family met the poverty criterion. Using these various measures, a total of 1,756 (36%) families were considered part of the poverty sample.

To determine whether families were at or below 50 percent of the poverty threshold, each income criteria (specified by household size) was divided in half. Since no other proxy measure, such as receiving TANF or Food Stamps, appeared to be a reliable indicator of being 50 percent below the poverty level, households with missing income data were excluded from this sample. A total of 838 families (17% of the entire Fragile Families dataset; 48% of the poverty sample) meet these more stringent income qualifications.