Center for Demography and Ecology

University of Wisconsin-Madison

THE DESIGN AND CONTENT OF THE NATIONAL SURVEY OF FAMILIES AND HOUSEHOLDS

James Sweet
Larry Bumpass
Vaughn Call

NSHF Working Paper No. 1

A National Survey of FAMILIES and HOUSEHOLDS

THE DESIGN AND CONTENT OF THE

NATIONAL SURVEY OF FAMILIES AND HOUSEHOLDS

James A. Sweet
Larry L. Bumpass
Vaughn R.A. Call

Center for Demography and Ecology
University of Wisconsin
4412 Social Science Building
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

August 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The National Survey of Families and Households was funded by the Center for Population Research of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, under grant HD 21009. We, and all of the scholarly community working on family and household issues, are deeply indebted to Drs. V. Jeffrey Evans and Wendy Baldwin of the Center for Population Research for their longstanding support and encouragement of work in this area.

The National Survey of Families and Households has truly been a collective effort of a large scholarly community. Larry Bumpass and James Sweet have led and coordinated the work of developing the survey, securing funding, and preparing the data file. The work has, however, been a fully collaborative effort of a group of Wisconsin colleagues:

Vaughn Call
Maurice MacDonald
Sara McLanahan
Judith Seltzer
Annemette Sorensen (now at Harvard)
Elizabeth Thomson

In addition, a large group of family and household researchers from throughout the country have assisted as advisors and consultants. We have also benefited from the written suggestions and advice which dozens of others have offered.

This project would have been far more difficult to carry out, and far less successful, without the facilities, research support staff, and intellectual environment of the Center for Demography and Ecology and the Department of Sociology of the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

The field work was done by the Institute for Survey Research of Temple University. It has been a pleasure working with ISR; their work has consistently been of the highest quality. Dr. William Aquilino played a major role in the success of the National Survey of Families and Households. He did a superb job of assisting us in developing the questionnaires, and of managing the field operations and coordinating the data preparation. The survey has benefited, not only from Bill's technical skill as a survey researcher, but also from his many substantive contributions. Other members of the ISR staff who made outstanding contributions to this project include Allan Walters, Ellin Spector, Marcia Murphy, Zamelia Travis-Bey, and Carolyn Rahe.

We also appreciate the superior work of our support staff at the University of Wisconsin. In particular, we commend the efforts of Barbara Corry, Barbara Witt, and Cheryl Knobeloch, each of whom has worked with us on many previous projects. Barb Corry worked on the National Survey of Families and Households from the beginning, performing a variety of functions including organizing staff meetings and meetings of consultants; managing the drafts and revisions of the interview materials; playing the role of hypothetical respondents in mock interviews; and entering and checking the codebooks. Barb Witt was responsible for creating the public data file. She designed procedures to put together the segments of data received from ISR, reformatted the file, developed various checks and quality control procedures, and wrote the code to recode variables. Cheryl Knobeloch developed programs to extract data, display data segments, and for much of the checking of the data. In addition, she has developed the software to update addresses and other information about the respondent and prepare the mailings. She also prepared the files used in entering frequencies into the codebooks.

I. OVERVIEW OF THE NATIONAL SURVEY OF FAMILIES AND HOUSEHOLDS

I.A. INTRODUCTION

Following each of the recent United States decennial censuses it has been customary to publish something called a "procedural history," in which the Census Bureau describes in some detail what was done, how it was done, and in some cases why it was done as it was. This paper is something of a procedural history of the National Survey of Families and Households.

We attempt to do the following:

a. describe the history of the project;

b. enumerate some of the major criteria that guided our decisions as we designed the survey, decided what topics to cover, and what questions to include; and

c. describe the procedures that were used, including sample design, field procedures, and data preparation

We view this procedural history as an integral part of the documentation of the NSFH data. Some of the material in this report, such as the description of the sample, sample weights, and response rates will be elaborated in separate technical reports.

As in any survey, we had to make difficult choices regarding topics to cover and the amount of scarce interview time to devote to each topic. We tried to give serious consideration to every proposal and suggestion received, and to produce a well-balanced survey that would serve a broad range of interests and perspectives. As with every data collection effort, we will soon discover that we have made errors of judgment on scientific priorities, that some of our innovations have been unsuccessful, and that we have inadvertently omitted key measures and made errors of logic. We accept responsibility for such errors and omissions. However, we ask that users of the data temper their frustration with the limitations of the data with an appreciation of what can be done with them.

I.B. BRIEF DESCRIPTION AND OVERVIEW

The National Survey of Families and Households includes interviews with a probability sample of 13,017 respondents. The sample includes a main cross-section sample of 9,643 households plus a double sampling of blacks, Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, single-parent families and families with stepchildren, cohabiting couples and recently married persons. One adult per household was randomly selected as the primary respondent. Several portions of the main interview were self-administered to facilitate the collection of sensitive information and to ease the flow of the interview. The average interview lasted one hour and forty minutes. In addition, a shorter self-administered questionnaire was given to the spouse or cohabiting partner of the primary respondent.

The design is cross-sectional, with several retrospective sequences. A considerable amount of life-history information was collected, including the respondent's family living arrangements in childhood, the experience of leaving the parental home, marital and cohabitation experience, as well as education, fertility, and employment histories. The cross-sectional design permits the detailed description of past and current living arrangements and other characteristics and experiences, and the analysis of the consequences of earlier patterns on current states, marital and parenting relationships, kin contact, and economic and psychological well-being.

A longitudinal follow-up of the sample is planned, although it is not yet funded. The five-year follow-up will permit analyses of the effects of experience, characteristics, and attitudes measured in the initial survey on subsequent life course transitions. Specific plans for the follow-up will be made over the next few years. It is hoped that respondents of all ages can be followed to permit analyses of life events including leaving the parental home, marriage, first and subsequent births, marital disruption, and retirement. We are eager to receive suggestions for the follow-up from users of the data.

This study has been undertaken explicitly to provide a data resource for the research community at large, and has been designed in light of advice from a large number of consultants and correspondents. To this end (1) the substantive coverage has been kept broad to permit the holistic analysis of family experience from an array of theoretical perspectives; and (2) the release of a public data tape has been given high priority, to be achieved as quickly as possible after the completion of field work.

II. HISTORY OF THE STUDY

In recognition of the importance of an improved understanding of both the structure and functioning of American families, the Center for Population Research of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development issued a Request for Proposals to achieve "recommendations regarding the content and strategy of a large scale data collection effort on the causes and consequences of changing family and household structure" (RFP No. NICHD-DBS-83-8).

In June of 1983, we responded to this RFP with a proposal to design a national study that would permit research on many aspects of family experience as both determinants and consequences of other family and life course events. The research team (Larry Bumpass, James Sweet, Maurice MacDonald, Sara McLanahan, Annemette Sorensen, and Elizabeth Thomson) represented various perspectives including family sociology, social demography, social psychology, and family economics.

We obtained the contract, and on January 13, 1984 held our first meeting with consultants to initiate discussion of the study design. In addition to the Wisconsin project staff, this meeting was attended by nine consultants representing an array of perspectives in family sociology, social demography, and family economics as well as staff from the Center for Population Research. Issues of substantive coverage, relative priorities, and sample design were discussed in detail during this two-day meeting. The consultants were: Frank Furstenberg, Greer Litton Fox, Jennifer Gerner, Joan Huber, Karen Mason, Frank Mott, Harriet Presser, Arland Thornton, and Judith Seltzer. We also received about two dozen letters from other researchers offering advice and recommendations on the survey.

The Wisconsin research team began a series of weekly meetings, normally lasting about half a day. Each week one or more members of the group was assigned responsibility for developing a preliminary draft of questions on a particular topic. We reviewed the literature and compiled past survey experience within each substantive area. The group often considered the pros and cons of replicating questions from earlier surveys versus creating new ones. Revisions were distributed and reviewed by the group until a consensus was reached. By the end of May, we had a draft of a survey instrument that included question sequences for most substantive areas we hoped to cover.

On May 31, we held the second two-day meeting with consultants to critically review our work to this point. Participants included Andrew Cherlin, Frank Furstenberg, Karen Mason, Robert Michael, Judith Seltzer, Arland Thornton, and Richard Udry. In July, Seltzer joined the Wisconsin Sociology faculty and became a member of the research team and a participant in our weekly meetings.

The weekly meetings, and the revision process, continued through October. During the summer of 1984, small-scale pretests of various sections of the draft interview were conducted by the Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory. These pretests provided valuable field experience with the question sequences, including more reliable timing estimates. As is often the case, this pretest experience made it clear that we needed to further streamline the interview and eliminate many lower priority questions.

On November 1, there was a final meeting with the panel consultants, who spent two days reviewing the revised survey instrument and making recommendations on sampling issues. Present at this meeting were: Andrew Cherlin, Frank Furstenberg, Robert Michael, Arland Thornton, Frank Mott, and Koray Tanfer.

In total, eighteen months were spent in the development of a basic design for the survey and possible question sequences. A report summarizing these recommendations was submitted to NICHD in September 1985. In June of 1985, Bumpass and Sweet submitted a grant proposal to the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development for the implementation of this research design. A three-year, $4.8 million grant was awarded to undertake the cross-section survey, which was to be the first round of a longitudinal design. This grant began on January 1, 1986.

After receiving notification of the approval of this grant, we began preparations for the survey in late 1985. In December 1985, following established competitive bidding procedures of the University, we issued a "Request for Proposals" from survey research organizations to do the field work. In April 1986, we selected the Institute for Survey Research at Temple University from the six proposals submitted. ISR assigned William Aquilino and Allan Walters to direct the fielding of the survey.

In May, Vaughn Call joined the research team as a Project Associate. With key personnel in place and the selection of the survey contractor, we began revising interview schedules and questionnaires for pretesting. Bumpass, Sweet, and Call met with ISR staff several times in June and July to review the sampling plan for the survey and to resolve issues on the interview schedule and questionnaires. From these discussions, we developed and prepared for field-testing a main interview schedule, a supplemental respondent questionnaire, questionnaires for the spouse or partner of the respondent and, in certain situations for the householder. In July, ISR conducted the first pretest of the interview schedule.

Three additional rounds of pretests occurred in October, November, and December, each resulting in refinement of the survey instruments and procedures. After each pretest, Bumpass, Sweet, and Call and the ISR staff participated in a debriefing session with all of the interviewers. By the final pretest, the complex interview schedule flowed smoothly, and appeared to be about the right length. In January of 1987, ISR completed a pretest of the Spanish language version of the interview schedule and questionnaires.

On February 23, 1987, the field work commenced with a training conference for field supervisors. During the first three weeks in March, eleven interviewer training sessions were held in major cities across the United States (Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Detroit, Houston, Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, and St. Louis). About 530 potential interviewers attended the training sessions. Each of these three-day training sessions included discussions of standard ISR interviewing procedures, instruction on the intent of question sequences, and intensive practice with the interview schedule using mock interview situations. This simulated interviewing was essential because of the many complex skip patterns in the interview. Either Bumpass, Sweet, or Call participated in each of these training sessions.

After the training sessions, coordinators began assigning work to interviewers, and the first interview was completed during the last week in March. The work proceeded quickly in most sample areas. Approximately 1,800 interviews were completed in both April and May. A review of the progress at the end of May identified a number of areas that needed additional interviewers. In the latter part of June, training sessions were held in St. Louis, Los Angeles, and New York to train additional interviewers. In the fall, additional training sessions were held in Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia, and St. Louis. On February 29, 1988 interviewers were asked to returned all unfinished work to ISR. Staff at ISR determined which areas required further work and assigned about 100 interviewers to contact addresses that had not yet been completed. An additional interviewer training session was held in St. Louis on March 25, with 40 more interviewers receiving training. Field work ended on May 2, 1988.

Number of Interviews Completed by Month

MONTH	NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS
March 1987	322
April	1767
May	1846
June	1421
July	1515
August	1246
September	1067
October	1035
November	967
December	468
January 1988	404
February	449
March	116
April	354
May	40
TOTAL	13017

Shortly after the initiation of the interview process in March 1987, ISR began coding and data entry. By June, a full-scale coding and data entry operation for the main interviews was under way. Shortly thereafter, coding and data entry for the various self-administered questionnaires began. The processed data were sent to Wisconsin in batches; the file was reformatted, the various pieces merged, some variables recoded, and additional consistency checks performed.

III. GOALS AND PHILOSOPHY OF THE NSFH

III.A. CENTER FOR POPULATION RESEARCH REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

The philosophy underlying the original RFP for the design of the family survey was:

a. That a data set covering a broad range of family issues should be developed;

b. that the content of the survey be guided by scientific priorities;

c. that the data set should be a resource for the research community at large; and

d. that a cross-section survey, including appropriate retrospective questions, should be the immediate goal, but that it should be planned as the first round of a longitudinal design.

We developed the survey with these objectives in mind.

III.B. LIMITATIONS OF AVAILABLE DATA

The original RFP, and this project, grew out of the experience of the research community with the limitations of available data on family structure, family process, and family relationships. Much of the research that has been done in the past shared some or all of the following characteristics.

1. The major national data sources had been collected for some other purpose (e.g., the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, the National Longitudinal Surveys of Labor Market Experience, the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), and the Current Population Survey (CPS)). In developing these data sets decisions on what to include and how to ask particular questions were often made on the basis of criteria other than maximizing understanding of family structure and process. A great deal of very important research has been based on these data, but we found that we were very rapidly pressing against their limitations.

A particularly important example is the marriage and fertility histories collected periodically in the June Current Population Survey. Because of the very large sample size, these are probably the only data that will permit the detailed analysis of marriage transitions. The purpose of the Current Population Survey, however, is to produce employment and unemployment statistics that are comparable from month to month. The supplements to the CPS, including the June supplement on marriage and fertility histories must meet stringent criteria designed to ensure that the employment statistics are not adversely affected. Consequently, there is a limit on the number and types of questions that can be included. Thus, little beyond the dates of marriages and births has been included in these CPS supplements.

2. Many of the available data sources are based on samples that did not represent the total United States population. In many cases these are samples of convenience that do not represent any definable population. In other cases they are probability samples of one city or state.

3. Further, most of the previous surveys focus on one specific family issue such as kin contact, fertility, or child support. This facilitates a detailed understanding of the particular topic, but the larger familial context is ignored.

4. Similarly the data were often collected to speak to the concerns of one academic discipline or sub-discipline, often from one particular theoretical perspective. Such data permit the testing of specific hypotheses deriving from one theoretical perspective, but usually do not permit the evaluation of competing hypotheses from other theoretical perspectives.

5. In many cases the sample size has not been large enough to permit detailed analysis of variation in family process and structure among subpopulations. Many of the most important scientific questions, as well as all of the important policy questions, require comparisons among socially significant subpopulations.

6. Finally, we were often forced to use cross-sectional data to address questions that are inherently dynamic, without being able to assess selection bias, or determine causal ordering.

III.C. OBJECTIVES OF THE NSFH

In designing the National Survey of Families and Households, it was clear that we needed:

1. A survey focusing almost exclusively on family issues.

2. A survey that covered a broad range of family structure, process, and relationships, so that each could be examined in relation to the others.

3. A national probability sample so that it would be possible to generalize to the United States population.

4. A sufficiently large sample to permit subgroup comparisons and reliable statistical estimation.

5. A survey that spoke to issues important to a number of disciplines and subdisciplines, and to persons working from a variety of theoretical perspectives.

6. A survey that would permit not only the testing of competing hypotheses concerning a variety of aspects of the American family, but also the description of the current state of the family.

7. A survey that would address many of the most important cross-sectional descriptive and analytic questions; which would provide respective reports of respondents' prior experience in both family and other life domains; and which could form the base line for a longitudinal study of the determinants and consequences of family transitions and experience.

III.D. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SURVEY

III.D.1. Description

We hold the view, shared by most social demographers, that careful, systematic descriptive research is a key part of the scientific process. In fact, we view such research as a precondition of analytical research or hypothesis-testing. There are important areas of family sociology, demography, and economics where few of the descriptive facts are known. One goal of the NSFH is to document the nature and variability of American family life.

III.D.2. Some Further Considerations in Deciding What to Include

There were a number of topics that we felt were important and should be covered in a comprehensive survey of family structure, process, and relationships, but which we ultimately concluded were either not amenable to survey research of this sort or were beyond our collective ability to devise suitable questions. Two examples are parenting practices of respondents with infants and toddlers, and the process by which couples pool and segregate their respective incomes.

Further, other desirable measures might be feasible in another survey, but would require more time than was available (e.g., more detailed job, migration, or income histories) or might compromise the remainder of the data (e.g., more detailed questioning on sexual behavior). Throughout the process of development of the survey, we had to be concerned about the trade-off between interview length and response rates.

III.D.3. Monitoring Social Change: Replication versus Innovation

One of the important reasons for spending a large amount of money and effort in studying American families is because of the rapid and profound changes that have been occurring. In order to be able to directly and convincingly measure change, it is essential to replicate measures that had been made in previous national surveys.

However, there are often reasons for not directly replicating measures that were used in earlier surveys, such as changes in relevant theory, improvements in measurement, a need for more detailed measurement, or changes in social relevance. Further, different interview contexts (ordering and nature of surrounding questions) can often compromise the comparability of even identical items.

We were repeatedly forced to wrestle with the competing goals of replication and innovation. Generally we tried to replicate previously-used questions when doing so appeared to give us adequate information. Quite often, however, we opted to use this survey as an opportunity for innovation in measurement.

III.D.4. Length of Interview

The NSFH interview and self-administered questionnaires are very long. The main interview schedule is 161 pages long, including 671 questions, many of which have several parts; in addition, the self-administered questionnaire (for the primary respondent) is 64 pages long. However, many sections of the interview (and most portions of the self-administered questionnaire) are asked of only a small portion of the total sample (e.g., those with children under age 19 living elsewhere; those with adult children in the household; those with a household member with a disability, etc.).

We decided early in the process of developing the survey that we should try to have an interview with a mean length of no more than an hour and a half. We recognized that there would be considerable variance around that average length, with especially long interviews for persons with complex marriage histories and/or complex family histories while growing up, and/or large and complex current household structure. In developing the interview, we made an effort to keep the mean length to 90 minutes, and also to avoid having many interviews that would last over two hours. In many instances we dropped or shortened proposed question sequences, either because they would raise the mean interview length or because they would tend to be asked of persons who would be likely to have longer than average interviews. One important function of the pretests was to obtain realistic timing estimates for various sections of the interview.

Any of the topics covered in the survey could have been dealt with in greater detail. In many, if not most, cases we developed additional questions that were not included, in order to keep within the 90 minute time limit. We made an effort to base these tough decisions on what we saw as the scientific priority. Clearly another group of social scientists, with different perspectives on the family and different research interests, would have made somewhat different choices.

Distribution of Interviews by Length

	Percent of All Interviews
<40 minutes	0.5
40-49	0.9
50-59	2.4
60-69	7.7
70-79	12.9
80-89	12.4
90-99	17.6
100-109	12.3
110-119	7.0
120-129	8.9
130-139	4.7
140-149	2.5
150-159	2.9
160-169	1.5
170-179	0.7
180 minutes and longer	2.7
unknown	2.4
Total	100.0

III.D.5. Life History Format

We explored the possibility of collecting retrospective information on marriage, fertility, work, schooling, residential location and household situation while growing up in a "life-history" format. This is a procedure where the interviewer and the respondent fill out a large form which has time (ages or years) in the columns and various states or life domains in the rows. They identify when particular transitions such as a marriage, a move, the birth of a child, or a job change occurred, and mark it on the form. The form is a help to the respondent in remembering exactly when things happened - e.g., "Johnny was born in January 1966, and I went back to work just after his first birthday, so it must have been in March of 1967."

We decided not to use this method for several reasons, despite the fact that it would probably have obtained somewhat more accurate dates, and have increased the number of spells (of work, schooling, etc.) reported, especially those of short duration.

The reasons for this conclusion are:

1. It takes more interview time than the approach that we have adopted. Persons who have used it in other surveys agree that this is true. It also requires a great deal of interviewer training.

2. Because our sample ranges in age from 18 to the mid-90s and beyond, the form required would be very large and cumbersome. Surveys that have successfully used this procedure have usually involved samples with very narrow age ranges.

3. In many of our retrospective sequences, we want to ask follow-up questions

about the circumstances surrounding an event. Examples of this are the marriage history where we ask a sequence of questions regarding the circumstances during the first year of marriage, and the fertility history, where we ask whether the birth was wanted at all and whether it occurred too soon. It is very difficult to build this kind of detailed follow-up into a life-history format.

4. The necessary level of temporal precision varies from one type of event to another. So, too, does the precision with which respondents can reasonably be expected to report. Month and year of marital events and births is essential. On the other hand, the ages (in years) between which a respondent lived with a step-parent as a child is quite adequate. The life-history format quickly becomes unwieldy if the level of time detail varies over time or across life domains.

5. For some of the experiences we collected retrospectively, such as fertility and marital histories, there is a great deal of accumulated survey experience. We felt that it was important to build on this experience to get the best possible information on family and household transitions.

6. Some of our advisors urged us to gather retrospective income and/or wage rate data. We decided not to attempt this because we did not think that it could be done reliably, especially without gathering detailed job histories.

IV. THE SAMPLE AND RELATED ISSUES

IV.A. UNIT OF OBSERVATION

Individuals, rather than families or households, are the units of observation. The definition of a household or a family very quickly becomes problematic as divisions and recombinations occur over time. This is as true for retrospective as it is for prospective data. With individuals as the unit of observation, on the other hand, we can cleanly describe the family and household history of the reference individual (and those of his/her partner or spouse), their current circumstances, relationships and attitudes, and follow prospectively their subsequent experience. We are able to describe the circumstances of households, families, marriages, and of adults and children in these units in the United States as observed at survey date, but always from the perspective of the reference individual.

IV.B. POPULATION COVERAGE

The target population consisted of persons age 19 and older, living in households, and able to be interviewed in either English or Spanish.

IV.B.1 Population Age 19 and Older

Persons age 18 and younger were generally ineligible to be interviewed. There were two exceptions to this principle.

1. Currently married persons under age 19 were eligible respondents.

2. In households which had no member age 19 or older, persons age 18 were eligible respondents (in the main sample, but not in the oversample).

These exceptions made it possible to represent all married couples, and essentially all households. Only 31, or 0.1 percent of all respondents were age 18 or younger; 25 of them were married persons.

We had originally intended to define the target population as age 18 and older. We changed to age 19 in order to minimize the number of high school student sons and daughters selected as primary respondents. This was particularly important since we expected to be interviewing throughout the calendar year. In September most 18 year olds would be out of high school, but as we move further from September, a larger and larger portion would still be in high school. We felt that it would be better to use 19 as the lower age limit.

IV.B.2. Household Population

In large part because of logistic and cost considerations, we did not attempt to sample persons living in institutions or other group quarters.

Very young adults and the very old are disproportionately under-represented in samples that include only members of households. The elderly non-household population tends to be living in nursing homes, and tends to be very ill. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to interview a significant portion of this population. A considerable fraction of young adults live in college dorms and in military barracks. Since both dorms and barracks are geographically concentrated, a separate sampling scheme would have been necessary if these living quarters were included in the sample. This would have been quite expensive. In addition, it is often difficult to obtain the cooperation of persons responsible for dorms and military barracks in order to obtain access to their residents.

IV.B.3 Dorm and Barrack Residents

Because of our plans to follow our sample longitudinally, and because young adults have a high probability of making life cycle transitions that we would be likely to want to study longitudinally, we felt that it was crucial to attempt to get as representative as possible a sample of young adults.

Most people living in dorms or military barracks have a household from which they have come. Thus, we included as members of a household all persons who were "currently away at college" or "currently away in the Armed Forces" and "who live in a dorm, sorority or fraternity house" or "in military housing or on a ship." If they were age 19 or older, they were eligible to be selected as the primary respondent. If such a person was selected as the primary respondent, the interviewer was instructed to obtain the person's address and telephone number. An attempt would be made to interview them at their current location, or by telephone, or at some point when they returned to the sample address.

A special version of the primary respondent interview schedule was developed for use when the selected respondent was away from home living in a dorm or military barracks. This special form assumed that the respondent had no children, and that there were no other members of their "household." The preferred procedures were either to interview the person at some time during the field period when they returned home or to transfer the case to an interviewer in the vicinity of the dorm or barrack residence.

Based on the estimated prevalence in the population, we had anticipated that this form might be used for something over 100 cases. In fact, it was used with only 17 cases. We do not yet know whether this reflects the fact that the coverage of this population is very poor, or that we were successful in interviewing them in the parental household or in other more conventional ways.

IV.B.4. English and Spanish-Speaking Population: Spanish Translation of the Interview Materials

Our target population was also limited by language. We wanted to be able to obtain an interview with any selected respondent who spoke either English or Spanish. No attempt was made to obtain interviews with persons not speaking either Spanish or English. A total of 198 respondents were not interviewed because of their inability to be interviewed in English or Spanish.

All questionnaires were translated into Spanish. Bilingual interviewers were hired to work in areas where we believed that there was a significant concentration of Spanish-speaking persons. The initial translation was made by a person who was fluent in Spanish, and familiar with Puerto Rican language usage. This translation was pretested among Puerto Ricans in New York, and also reviewed by persons familiar with Mexican American usage. After revision, an additional round of pretests was completed in a Puerto Rican area of New York and in a Mexican American area of Los Angeles.

A total of 259 interviews (2.0 percent of the total) were conducted in Spanish.

IV.C. SAMPLE SIZE

The determination of sample size involves both statistical and cost considerations. The larger the sample, the more precise are the statistical estimates derived from it, and the more the study costs. In the first meeting of the panel of consultants a sense emerged that a cross-section sample of at least 10,000 respondents would be necessary. We proceeded to make a series of estimates from the Current Population Survey, the 1980 decennial census, and other sources of how many cases of strategic groups would be likely to occur in a sample of 10,000 cases.

IV.D. OVERSAMPLES

For many purposes the numbers seemed sufficient. However, there were some substantively important subgroups for which this sample size would be inadequate. It appeared essential to oversample some strategic population groups.

The highest priority groups for oversampling were:

- minorities - blacks, Mexican Americans, and Puerto Ricans
- one-parent families
- families with step-children (or with children with neither parent in the household)
- cohabitors
- recently married persons

IV.D.1. One-parent and reconstituted families:

From both scientific and policy perspectives, understanding how one-parent families and families with step-children function is very important. Although half of all of today's children can expect to live some of their childhood in a one-parent family, such families are relatively rare in a cross-section of the population. An oversampling of such families is essential for the study of parent-child relationships and the family correlates of well-being. It is essential to be able to make contrasts among one-parent families, families with two natural parents, and two categories of families with step-children - those in which the only children present are those brought to the marriage by one or both of the partners, and those which have a child of either of the partners along with children from the present marriage. It is also important for longitudinal study of remarriage patterns.

In the absence of over-sampling, we estimated that there would be only about 420 female family heads with children under age 18 in the sample of 10,000 cases (about 140 with children under 6, 160 with youngest child aged 6-11, and 120 with youngest child aged 12-17). There would be about 100 father-child families, half of them with teen-aged children, and about 250 families including step-children. Although their numbers are few, we also decided to double-sample families with children who have neither parent in the household. It is important to learn as much as we can about the situation of these children.

IV.D.2. Cohabitors

One of the most important family changes in recent decades is the increase in cohabitation. A better understanding of cohabitation is essential to understanding contemporary marriage and family life. Although cohabitation has become very common among young unmarried persons in the United States, the number of cohabitors in a cross-section sample of 10,000 would be about 400.

IV.D.3. Minority families

About one-tenth of American households have black householders and three percent have Mexican American householders. If minority households were not over-sampled, there would be about 1200 black and 300 Mexican American persons in the sample. This sample would be too small to permit much comparison among blacks, whites, and Mexican Americans, within a given family type or within a given family life cycle stage. For example, there would have been only about 100 black and 20 Mexican American female family heads; and only 110 black and 75 Mexican American married couple families with preschool-age children. We would expect to have fewer than 100 Puerto Rican respondents.

We concluded that in order to have enough cases for detailed comparisons among whites, blacks and Mexican Americans, or to examine variability within these populations, they would have to be oversampled by at least a factor of four. Even with a fourfold oversampling, the number of Mexican American and Puerto Rican cases would be quite small. We considered the possibility of reducing the size of the cross-section sample to about 6000 cases and quadruple-sampling blacks and Mexican Americans. We concluded that this was not wise. The 6000 non-minority cases would yield too few cases for many life cycle stages to achieve the primary goals of the study. The objective of describing American families at large should be given the highest priority and not compromised. Black, Mexican American, and Puerto Rican households were double sampled.

Because we feel that more than a double sampling of major racial and ethnic minorities is desirable, we have tried to interest foundations or other agencies in funding a supplementary survey of blacks, Mexican Americans, and Puerto Ricans during 1988 or 1989. We have not, as yet, been able to raise sufficient funds for this supplementary survey.

IV.D.4. Recently married persons:

We decided to oversample recently married persons in order to have a larger number of cases of groups exposed to the risk of important family transitions in the proposed five-year longitudinal study. Recently married persons have high rates of fertility, marital disruption, and other life cycle transitions.

IV.E. THE SAMPLE

The main sample for the National Survey of Families and Households is a national, multi-stage area probability sample containing about 17,000 housing units drawn from 100 sampling areas in the conterminous United States. The oversample, described above, was accomplished by doubling the number of households selected within the 100 sampling areas. The sampling plan was developed by Robert Santos, sampling statistician at the Institute for Survey Research, Temple University. The sample description that follows is an overview of the procedures utilized in drawing the sample for our survey. A more technical description of the sampling frame is found in the sampling report prepared by Robert Santos of the Institute for Survey Research.

We utilized ISR's 100 Primary Sampling Unit (PSU) National Sampling Frame that is based on 1985 population projections. The PSU's were established by subdividing all counties into two groups: self-representing areas (Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas or Standard Consolidated Areas with two million population or more) and the rest of the country. These 18 self-representing areas comprise 36 percent of the nation's population. The larger of the self-representing areas were divided into two or more PSU's; a total of 37 PSU's were self-representing areas.

The PSU's for the rest of the country were selected from (1) SMSAs or counties with at least 150,000 populations, and (2) combinations of adjacent counties having a population of 150,000 or more population. These areas were divided into 32 strata, on the basis of region and metropolitan status, and one or more of the following variables: degree of urbanization, rate of economic growth, racial composition, and proportion of the population of hispanic origin. From each stratum, two areas were selected with probabilities proportional to population size.

Block groups or enumeration districts were selected from each PSU as secondary election units. The number selected from each PSU depended on its population size, with an average of 17 per PSU. Within each of these 1,700 secondary selection units, listing areas were created. Listing areas contained 45 or more households. One listing area was selected from each secondary selection unit. Approximately 20 housing units were selected from each LA. These procedures resulted in an equal probability sample of 1,700 listing areas for the national sampling frame.

A "lister" was sent to each of the 1,700 areas to list all addresses within the LA boundaries. From the lists of housing units in each listing area, about 20 addresses were selected for inclusion in the sample. Half of the selected addresses within each listing area were randomly assigned to the main sample and half to the oversample.

Interviewers were sent to the preselected clusters in the listing area. From detailed sketches of the listing area made by the lister, interviewers verified the accuracy of the address listings in the area, and then contacted each address within the specified cluster of housing units. Using the predesignated screening form (main sample or oversample) that included a random selection table, the interviewer obtained a listing of all household members and determined the respondent.

V. DATA COLLECTION

V.A. INTRODUCTORY LETTER

An introductory letter was sent to each sample address. The letter provided potential respondents with information about the survey and alerted the household that an interviewer would visit their home. The interviewer visited the home and completed a household screening form. Interviewers were instructed to conduct the screening interview with a knowledgeable adult member of the household.

V.B. THE SCREENING INTERVIEW

The screening interview was different in the main sample and the oversample.

V.B.1 Main Sample Screening

Half of the addresses were in the main sample. The screening forms for the main sample were printed on white paper. In the main sample the purpose of the screener was to randomly select a respondent from among the adult members of the household.

The screening interview began by asking who lives here now:

> "Tell me the first name of everyone who lives here now, starting with yourself. Include everyone who stays here half the time or more."

This was followed by questions to ascertain whether any household members were away at school or in the armed forces; and if so, whether any lived in dorms or barracks (the latter were regarded as household members, eligible to be respondents).

The age and marital status of each household member was ascertained, and all members who were eligible for selection as the respondent were listed in a prescribed order (from youngest to oldest, with those with the same age listed alphabetically by first name). The respondent to be interviewed was then randomly selected from among the eligible adults by means of a pre-printed (Kish) selection table.

V.B.2. Oversample Screening

The oversample screening form was printed on yellow paper. In the oversample, the screener had the additional function of determining whether the household was eligible for the oversample. It also began with a listing of the members of the household.

> "Tell me the first name of everyone who lives here now, starting with yourself. Include everyone who stays here half the time or more, but do not include anyone who is away at college or away in the military."

Each person's age and marital status was ascertained.

Then a series of four questions was asked, where appropriate, to determine eligibility for the oversample:

> "Which of the following groups best describes you: black, Puerto Rican, Mexican American, white or something else?" [Note that the criterion is the race/ethnicity of the screening informant.]
>
> IF ANY CHILDREN AGE 18 OR YOUNGER:
> "This question is about (LIST NAMES OF ALL CHILDREN AGE 18 OR YOUNGER). Do any of these children have a parent who does not live in this household, or who is no longer living?"
>
> "Did anyone living here now get married since January 1, 1982?"
>
> IF ANY MEMBERS OF HOUSEHOLD ARE AGE 19 OR OLDER AND NOT CURRENTLY MARRIED:
> "Nowadays, many couples live together without being married. Is that true of anyone who lives in this household?"

If the household met any of the oversample selection criteria, the household was eligible, and an adult member of the household was randomly selected as the primary respondent by the same procedures as in the main sample.

Note that the randomly selected adult respondent is not necessarily a person who has any of the characteristics that resulted in the household being selected in the oversample. For example, the respondent may be a white person married to a Mexican American "informant," or may be a non-cohabiting person in a multi-adult household including a cohabiting couple. This procedure is necessary because we selected on several criteria which are not mutually exclusive.

Note that the eligibility for selection as the respondent is slightly different in the two samples. In the oversample, members of the household living away from home in dorms or military barracks were not eligible for selection as the respondent; neither were persons age 18 living in households with no one age 19 and older.

A copy of each of the screening forms is included as an appendix.

Respondent selection was determined as of the time of the completion of the screening interview. If the selected respondent moved after the completion of the screener and before the interviewer returned to complete the interview, an attempt was made to interview him/her at the new address. In such a situation, the questions in the interview (e.g., questions concerning children in the household or the respondent's children living elsewhere) were asked with respect to the household situation at the time of the actual interview. An address once determined to be vacant was not revisited, and was given "vacant" as a final result code.

V.C. THE INTERVIEW

Ideally, at the time of initial contact the interviewer began the main interview and asked the spouse or partner, if any, to complete a questionnaire. If the primary respondent was not available at that time, an appointment was made to conduct the interview. If only the interview with the primary respondent was completed, the spouse/partner or tertiary questionnaire (where appropriate) was left, and arrangements were made to pick it up at a specified time. The spouse/partner or tertiary questionnaire was not to be administered, or left to be filled out, unless the interview with the primary respondent was completed.

V.D. "FINAL RESULT CODES:" SCREENING AND INTERVIEW RESPONSE RATES

The sample consisted of 33,869 addresses - 16,941 in the main sample and 16,928 in the oversample. The following is a distribution of these sample addresses by "final result."

	Main Sample	Over-sample	Total
Successful screen			
Completed interview	9643	3374	13017
R away for duration of study	33	5	38
Dorm/barrack (no interview)	2	-	2
No eligible R	57	9950	10007
Too ill to interview	256	46	302
Wrong R interviewed	69	23	92
R moved (unable to interview)	103	66	169
R selected, not interviewed	104	49	153
Refused interview	2752	779	3531
Language barrier	148	50	198
Subtotal	13167	14342	27509
Unsuccessful screen			
Refused screening	1587	733	2320
No one found at home	134	88	222
No final result	61	51	112
Locked building (no access)	57	53	110
Subtotal	1839	925	2764
Other			
Not a housing unit	517	439	956
Vacant	1411	1208	2619
Outside listing area	7	14	21
Subtotal	1935	1661	3596
Total	16941	16928	33869

The screening response rate can be defined as:

$$\frac{\text{Successful screens}}{\text{Successful screens + Unsuccessful screens}}$$

	Main Sample	Over-Sample	Total
The screening response rates were:	.877	.939	.909

The interview response rate can be defined as:

$$\frac{\text{Completed interviews}}{\text{Successful screens - No eligible respondent}}$$

	Main Sample	Over-Sample	Total
The interview response rates were:	.735	.768	.743

A later paper will examine response rates in greater detail.

V.E. SELF-ADMINISTERED QUESTIONNAIRES

V.E.1 Self-administered Portions of the Main Interview

Portions of the interview were conducted by having the respondent fill out sections of a self-administered questionnaire. This was done for four reasons:

First, having the more sensitive portions of the interview self-administered ensures greater privacy, and should help to improve data quality. In a household interview it is not possible to ensure that only the respondent and the interviewer will be present (or within hearing range) during the interview. There are some questions, such as those on conflict between spouses or the respondent's perceived likelihood of separation or divorce, that require privacy to maximize data quality (and to permit the interview to continue).

Second, some question sequences, such as the series on sex-role and family attitudes or the semantic differential on role performance, can be done more efficiently in self-administered format. We have timed this series using both an interviewer and self-administration; it goes at least twice as quickly when self-administered.

Third, it may be easier for some respondents to answer questions involving the use of multi-point scales if they can actually look at the scale.

Fourth, in a long interview, mixing self-administered and interviewer-administered sections help to break up the monotony of the interview and improve respondent morale. It also provides a welcome break for the interviewer.

The self-administered questionnaire is divided into 13 sections. Three of these are completed by all respondents, and the remaining ten are completed only when they are relevant - e.g., if the respondent was married, or had an adult child living in the household, or was cohabiting. The average number of parts completed by a respondent was 4.5. The following table lists the subject of each SE; defines the population for which it each is relevant, and gives the proportion of respondents who completed each.

SE#	Topic	Applicable Population	Percent of sample
SE-1	Household tasks	All respondents (except 17 cases living in dorms/ barracks)	99.9
SE-2	Well-being, role performance, health social support, social participation	All respondents	100.0
SE-3	Feelings and plans regarding living in parental household	Respondents living in parental household	5.6
SE-4	Experience of marital separation	Respondents experiencing marital separation in past 10 years	19.2
SE-5	Feelings about marriage and cohabitation	Unmarried, non-cohabiting respondents, age 35 younger	19.9
SE-6	Couple relationship; feelings about marriage and cohabitation	Cohabiting respondents	5.4
SE-7	Couple relationship	Married respondents	52.9
SE-8	Considerations affecting decision to have a child	Females age <40; Males with spouse/partner age <40 or age <45 and no spouse/partner	56.0
SE-9	Parenting and step-parenting	Respondents with child or step-child under age 5 and none age 5-18 in household	11.4
SE-10	Parenting and step-	Respondents with child	

	parenting	or step-child age 5-18 in household	33.8
SE-11	How having adult child in household works out	Respondents with child or step-child age 19+ in household	7.7
SE-12	Quality of relation-ship with children and step-children	Respondents with living children or step-children	75.6
SE-13	Relationship with parents and siblings; attitudes/opinions	All respondents	100.0

The first of these self-administered segments occurs very early in the interview. The interviewer reads an introductory statement that defines the task as she hands the questionnaire to the respondent:

> "This booklet contains some forms that you can fill out on your own at different times during the interview. You won't do all the forms, just those appropriate for you. The first form, on Page 1, asks about who in your household normally spends time doing various household tasks. If no time is spent doing the task, write in zero.
>
> Tell me when you are finished with this page."

In training interviewers, we asked them to watch to see if the respondent was having any difficulty with the task. In instances where the respondent was not sufficiently literate or for other reasons was not able to fill out the questionnaire on his/her own, interviewers were instructed to complete the questionnaire verbally or to provide assistance when requested.

Note that the directions to complete the self-administered sections are built directly into the routine administration of the interview. For example while interviewing a currently married respondent, the interviewer (following the skip instructions in the interview) comes to question 187. She reads the "question:"

> 187. "Please turn to page 35 in your booklet. Here are some questions about your marriage. Tell me when you are finished"

The self-administered questionnaire booklet was printed so that every other section was on contrasting white and yellow paper. This helped the respondent realize that he/she had completed the task and it helped the interviewer unobtrusively monitor that the respondent was in the right place. There was also the instruction, "PLEASE TELL THE INTERVIEWER YOU ARE FINISHED," at the end of each part.

One major challenge in developing the self-administered questionnaires was to avoid complex skip patterns. We used the following strategies:

1. We tried to design the individual sections of the self-administered questionnaire so that all questions within the section would be answered by all respondents who received it.

2. When that was impossible, we tried to put questions that many respondents would skip at the end of the section, so that if the skip was missed, the respondent would be answering irrelevant questions, but no one would miss questions that they should be answering because of a missed skip.

3. When skips were necessary, we tried to avoid skips within a page. Most skips moved the respondent to the next page. This seemed to minimize misdirection.

4. When skips within a page were necessary, we used a system of arrows and boxes. Arrows went from where an answer was circled to a box containing the questions to which the respondent giving a particular answer should go next. This appears to have worked quite well.

V.E.2. Spouse/Partner Questionnaire

Even though marriages and relationships involve two separate individuals, many studies of marriage and family life gather information from only one of the partners, or obtain information on the other partner by proxy from the one who is interviewed.

Early in the process we decided that it was essential to collect information directly from each partner. Financial considerations precluded conducting separate personal interviews with both of the spouses (or partners), so we developed a self-administered questionnaire to be filled out by the primary respondent's spouse or cohabiting partner. The spouse questionnaire is 45 pages long; in the pretests it took an average of about 30 minutes to complete.

Whenever possible, the questionnaire was given to the spouse or partner at the beginning of the main interview, to be completed in another room. When this was not possible, the questionnaire (and an envelope in which the completed questionnaire was to be placed and sealed) was left for the spouse/partner to complete later. The interviewer arranged a time to return to the household to pick up the completed questionnaire. Under certain circumstances, the supervisor could authorize an interviewer to complete the questionnaire by telephone.

All questions asked of the spouse/partner were replicates of questions in the main interview. However, many of the questions had to be simplified and adapted to a self-administered format.

Obviously, it was not possible to collect as much information from the spouse/partner as was collected from the primary respondent in the main interview. The following discussion summarizes some of the considerations involved in determining the content of the spouse/partner questionnaires.

There are two primary reasons for collecting information from the partner of primary respondents who are married or cohabiting. First, it is essential to obtain information about the partner's experiences, characteristics, behaviors, and attitudes in order to describe or explain family organization and outcomes. Such information is usually more accurate when obtained directly from the spouse/partner. For example, to describe and explain the quality of marital or cohabiting relationships, we must know the feelings of each partner; to estimate the effects of homogamy on marital outcomes, we must have information about both partners' cultural, economic and social backgrounds and current characteristics. For the attitudinal measures, "proxy" reports by the primary respondent about her/his partner will contain large amounts of random (due to guessing) and nonrandom (due to social desirability or normative biases) errors. It is essential for data quality to obtain responses directly from the partner. For more objective characteristics, the primary respondent may be able to provide reasonably accurate proxy reports. Obtaining the information directly from the partner may improve data quality only slightly, but will save time in the primary respondent's interview. In between these two extremes are a number of variables for which a proxy report would have intermediate levels of measurement error. For example, when the primary respondent's step-children do not live in the household, we may wish to ask the children's natural parent (i.e., the primary respondent's spouse) about her/his relationship with them. Although the primary respondent (step-parent) will certainly have some information about the relationship, it may be incomplete or her/his reports may be biased by the quality of the step-parent/step-child relationship.

A second reason for having secondary respondents is to obtain duplicate reports where both partners' responses are likely to contain systematic biases. For example, marital conflict may be under-reported. However, the tendency to under-report such behaviors should be distributed across individuals rather than couples; obtaining two reports increases the likelihood that the behavior will be reported by one or the other partner. Similarly, reports of one's own household work might tend to be upwardly biased, while estimates of partner's household work might more often be downwardly biased.

Many of the advantages and disadvantages of obtaining the spouse/partner information by self-administered questionnaire, rather than by personal interview, were mentioned earlier in the discussion of the self-administered portions of the main interview.

Advantages:

--It is less expensive to do it by self-administered questionnaire than with an interviewer

--The self-administered questionnaire is shorter and will take less time than a face-to-face interview, thus increasing the likelihood that the spouse/partner will agree to participate in the survey.

--If there is a separate room available, the questionnaire can be completed during the primary respondent's interview, thus reducing the household's commitment of time to the survey, and increasing the "couple" response rate.

--If necessary, the self-administered questionnaire could be completed at a different time than the primary interview, and retrieved later by the interviewer. This reduced scheduling problems and probably increased the spouse/partner response rate.

--Sensitive information, such as questions on the quality of the marital relationship, can often be collected more adequately in self-administered format than in a verbal interview.

Disadvantages:

--It is quite likely that the response rate is somewhat lower using a self-administered questionnaire than a personal interview, since the interviewer can do more in a personal interview to persuade a reluctant respondent to participate.

--If the spouse questionnaire is not completed at the same time as the primary interview, there is a higher likelihood of contamination of the spouse/partner's responses. If the primary interview is discussed by spouses/partners before the self-administered instrument is completed, or if it is likely that the primary respondent will find out about her/his partner's responses, those responses could be biased.

--Complex skip patterns are not feasible in a self-administered questionnaire.

--Question wording and response options often had to be simplified in the self-administered version, often precluding exact replication of materials in the main interview.

V.E.3. Partner Questionnaire

A separate questionnaire form was developed for the cohabiting partner of the main respondent. We found that generic wording covering both spouses and partners was often quite awkward. In addition, there were some questions that were appropriate for only one or the other group of respondents.

In most instances, the only difference was the replacement of the phrase "husband or wife" with "partner." In other instances a reference to "your marriage" was changed to "your relationship." There are, however, two significant differences between the questionnaires.

In the husband or wife questionnaire, questions 50 - 68 deal with marriage and cohabitation prior to marriage. This section was replaced in the partner questionnaire with the following:

A. Dates of birth for all children

B. Times married

C. (if previously married) How prior marriage ended

D. Information on current cohabitation relationship
   1. Date cohabitation started
   2. Marriage plans

In most parts of the main interview cohabiting respondents were treated exactly like married persons. This is the case in all of the series of questions on parenting. In other sections, they were treated like persons living with non-relatives. This is the case in the questions asking about income, assets, and debt, where they were asked only about their own economic situation, and not about the situation of their partner or other household members. To complete the economic picture, a section on the partner's economic situation was included in the partner's self-administered questionnaire.

V.E.4 "Tertiary Respondent" Questionnaire

One goal of the NSFH is to gather information about households, as well as about the family and household experience of individuals. In most cases the adult respondent was the householder or spouse of the householder. It seems reasonable in these situations to expect that the respondent can provide reasonably reliable reports on such things as the income of all household members.

However, in some cases the respondent is an adult son or daughter or relative of the householder, or someone who is not related to the householder. These three types of situations in combination represent about 8 percent of all respondents. In these cases, it did not seem reasonable to ask for proxy reports from the respondent (on the incomes, etc.) of other members of the household.

We developed a 29-page "tertiary respondent" questionnaire which was filled out by the householder in situations where the primary respondent was the adult son or daughter or other relative of the householder. In situations where the respondent is a non-relative of the householder, we did not ask the householder to complete a questionnaire because this is such a diverse population that it was not possible to develop an appropriate questionnaire that would provide useful information. About one percent of all respondents were non-relatives of the householder.

There is another, more substantive, reason for asking the householder to complete a questionnaire when the primary respondent is an adult son or daughter or other relative of the householder. Although only a small proportion of all adults are living in the parental household or in the household of a relative at any given time (5.7 percent and 1.4 percent respectively), a large portion of the population is in such a situation at some point during their lives. It seems important to understand how this sort of living arrangement is structured and how it functions, from the perspectives of both the individual sharing someone else's household and from the householder. To this end we have tried to assess the perceived quality of the relationship, the economic exchanges involved, and sources of both problems and satisfactions in such living arrangements.

V.E.5. Response Rates for Secondary and Tertiary Respondents

The proportion of the total sample (main sample and oversample combined) which was currently married or cohabiting and thus eligible for a married secondary respondent questionnaire was 57.3 percent (52.1 percent married and 5.2 percent cohabiting). The response rate for the married secondary respondent questionnaire was 83.2 percent, and for the cohabiting secondary respondent questionnaire was 76.5 percent. Seven percent of the respondents were sons or daughters or other relatives of the householder and thus eligible for a tertiary respondent questionnaire. The tertiary respondent response rate was 77.6 percent.

V.E. MISCELLANEOUS DATA COLLECTION ISSUES

V.F.1. Respondent Payment

When the study was originally designed and budgeted, no incentive payment to respondents was planned. During the course of the field period, we became convinced by the interviewers and coordinators that respondent cooperation would be facilitated by offering primary respondents a modest payment. A respondent payment of $10 was instituted on July 29, 1987 (about halfway through the interviewing). No payment was offered to secondary or tertiary respondents.

As a part of the refusal conversion, coordinators could authorize interviewers to offer a payment of $15 to respondents who had previously refused the interview. Interviewers were also given an incentive payment of $10 for converting a refusal.

V.F.2 Compensation of Interviewers

Interviewers were paid on a piece-rate basis. A fee schedule was established which paid a certain amount for each completed interview, each secondary and tertiary respondent questionnaire retrieved, and for each screening interview completed with the determination that there was no eligible respondent. At the end of the field period when remaining unfinished addresses were more geographically dispersed (about March 1, 1988), the payment system was changed and interviewers were paid on an hourly basis.

To encourage higher productivity, interviewers who completed more than 40 interviews (and certain other final results) received modest bonus payments, over and above the standard per interview payment.

V.F.3 Refusal Conversion

When interviewers encountered refusals to participate in the study, an attempt was made to reassign the housing unit to a different interviewer in the hope that a different person with a different approach might be more successful. If it was not possible to reassign the case, the original interviewer returned after a period of about two weeks and attempted to convert the refusal. In either instance, the coordinator sent a refusal conversion letter to the household explaining the study's importance, emphasizing confidentiality, and asking for reconsideration of the decision not to participate. Sometimes a telephone call was also made by the coordinator in an attempt to convert the refusal. At least two attempts were made to convert all refusals.

V.F.4. Continuation of the Field Period into 1988.

Originally the field period was scheduled to last about nine months, from April through December of 1987. This field period was assumed when the interview forms were printed. For a variety of reasons, it was not possible to complete the interviewing in 1987. The final interview was not done until early in May of 1988. The length of the field period, and especially its extension into 1988, caused some difficulty with the reference year for the income questions. As is conventional in sample surveys, we used the previous calendar year (1986) as the reference period. By the end of 1987, this was a long time in the past. However, rather than abruptly changing the reference period to 1987 at the beginning of 1988, we continued to refer to 1986 throughout the study. We have no way of knowing whether respondents reported 1986 income, 1987 income, or some combination of the two.

V.F.5. The School Year

Because of the length of the field period, it was necessary to adapt the referent of questions involving school attendance and related school issues to the phase of the school year. We began interviewing in the spring, when most children were in school. The field period continued through the summer, when the referent became "last spring." This adaptation was built into the wording of the question. The field period continued into the fall of the next school year. At the beginning of the summer and again at the beginning of the school year in the fall, memos were sent to interviewers reminding them to adapt the questions appropriately.

V.F.6. Random selection of a child

A major part of the interview is devoted to various aspects of parenting, including the relationship between parents and children, the behavior and activities of children, and parenting practices of the respondent. Questions are asked, for example, regarding the respondent's minor children living in the household, step-children living in the household, adult sons and daughters in the household, and children and spouse/partner's children living elsewhere. In order to precisely specify the referent of such question sequences, we adopted the procedure of selecting a specific child. Rather than using a random selection table each time, we used the procedure of listing the first names of each of the children meeting a particular set of criteria, and then selecting the child whose first name came first alphabetically. Interviewers (and respondents in the self-administered spouse/partner questionnaires) seemed to be able to make the selection quickly and reliably. We are unable to come up with any reason why this procedure might introduce an important bias.

V.F.7. Number of Interviewers

A total of 814 persons were trained to interview on the NSFH, of whom 646 were females and 168 males; 85 of the interviewers receiving training were black and 93 were bilingual - i.e., able to interview in both Spanish and English. An attempt was made to assign black interviewers to work in predominantly black listing areas and to assign bilingual interviewers to listing areas where Spanish-speaking respondents were likely to be encountered.

A total of 663 interviewers completed at least one interview. The following table shows the distribution of interviewers by number of interviews completed.

Number of Completed Interviews	Number of Interviewers
1	127
2	41
3-5	77
6-9	72
10-14	69
15-19	49
20-29	79
30-39	44
40-49	38
50-74	37
75-99	18
100+	12
	663

VI. DATA PREPARATION AND PROCESSING

VI.A. CHECK-IN

Interviewers received computer printouts that specified the households to be contacted in each listing area assigned to them. They kept a record of their completed interviews on this form, and sent all completed interviews and questionnaires to ISR as soon they were completed.

As interviews and questionnaires arrived at ISR, they were recorded on a form, and the respondent's name, address, interview dates, and result codes were entered into a computerized data management file. During this check-in process, each interview was assigned an ID number.

VI.B. VERIFICATION

A letter was sent to every respondent in order to verify that the interview was conducted properly with the proper respondent. The verification letter contained a short questionnaire that the respondent was asked to return. The questionnaire asked if the respondent was interviewed in a face-to-face interview. It also asked for answers to a few key questions that could be compared to the answers given in the interview (including date of birth, marital status, number of children borne or fathered). If the validation letter was not returned in a reasonable time, a second identical letter was sent. For interviewers who had a low return rate, or whose work's validity was questioned for any reason, telephone validations were conducted. This process helped minimize the incidence of fabricated interviews and other interviewer cheating.

VI.C. EDITING

Once the interview had been checked in and the verification process initiated, each page of the interview schedule and the questionnaires was examined for data inconsistencies, skipped questions, blank pages, and comments requiring clarification or special coding. Editors either resolved the omissions and discrepancies or requested clarification from the interviewer. During the editing process the quality of the interviewers' work was assessed and field supervisors were notified if a particular interviewer was having difficulty. The work of the editors was also checked to ensure a complete and accurate editing of the interviews and questionnaires.

VI.D. MISSING INFORMATION AND ERROR MEMOS

If the interviewer did not get answers to some of the key questions or sequences, they were sent a missing information memo, and asked to recontact the respondent to get the missing information. In addition to getting missing information, this procedure alerts the interviewer to problems and errors that they have made. Also, they may tend to be less careless if they know that they may be asked to go back to get missing information. Interviewers were sent "error memos" regarding mistakes that they made in administering the questionnaire, even when no retrieval of missing information was required.

VI.E. CODING

The edited interview and questionnaire booklets were then assigned to coders who coded the "other - specify" open-ended questions and the coding strip on the self-administered questionnaires. Responses to open-ended questions that did not appear in the coding manual were copied verbatim on a special card or sheet. These cards were forwarded to Wisconsin where final coding decisions were made. Occupations were coded to 1980 census categories.

VI.F. DATA ENTRY

Once the coding was complete, the edited and coded interviews were forwarded to data entry. All data from the main interview were entered using the Direct Data Entry facility of the CASES program. This program utilized the skip patterns in the interview and numerous programmed checks to ensure that the data entry process properly captured all data. Interviewer errors in following skip instructions and invalid codes were easily identified and, where possible, corrected with this program. In addition, a separate data cleaning program checked for numerous potential data inconsistencies. These logic checks flagged errors that were resolved either by checking other information in the interview or by contacting the respondent.

The self-administered questionnaires were entered directly from the respondents' answers or the coded edit strips on the questionnaire into a computer file. Aside from editing checks, the questionnaire data were entered exactly as the respondent filled out the questionnaire. Very few logic checks were performed, although all fields were checked to be sure values were in the appropriate range. Each of the forms was processed independently. No attempt was made to assess consistency (or to "correct" inconsistencies) among the interviewer portion of the main interview, the self-administered portion of the main interview, the secondary respondent (spouse/partner) questionnaire, or the tertiary respondent questionnaire. Both the questionnaire data and main interview data were entered twice and data entry consistency checks performed.

Once data entry errors and logical inconsistencies were corrected, the "cleaned" data were shipped to Wisconsin in batches of about 1000 cases. At Wisconsin, the data files were reformatted into a public user data file for analysis and distribution to other researchers.

VII. LONGITUDINAL DESIGN: PREPARING FOR THE FIVE-YEAR FOLLOW-UP

It is hoped that there will be a follow-up survey about five years after the initial interview. Some or all of the initial sample will be reinterviewed to determine what changes have occurred in their lives since the first interview, and how these changes are related to prior characteristics and experiences as measured in the initial interview.

Respondents were told that we may recontact them in about five years. The following information was collected to help in locating them:

1. respondent's full name

2. address and telephone number at time of interview

3. date of birth (Q 485)

4. name of employer (Q 543)

5. names of all schools from which received post-secondary degrees (Q 522)

6. names, addresses, and telephone numbers of three relatives who, five years from now, "would know where you have moved" (Q 669)

7. spouse/partner's full name (for women, "maiden name") (Q 670)

8. for female respondents ("maiden name") (Q 671)

9. date of birth of spouse/partner (Q 1 of spouse/partner questionnaire)

10. notes for finding respondent's residence (made by person doing LA listing)

We have funds to send an annual mailing to all respondents, in order to maintain a current address for as many respondents as possible. By doing this annually we can take advantage of the Postal Service's address correction procedures. In the first year, we are sending a thank you letter. During the second year we plan to send respondents a "report" on the study, as well as ask them to confirm or correct their addresses by returning postcards.

VIII. OUTLINE OF THE CONTENT OF THE NATIONAL SURVEY OF FAMILIES AND HOUSEHOLDS

INTERVIEW WITH PRIMARY RESPONDENT

Household Composition

A. Household composition
1. Household composition - age, sex, marital status
2. R's relationship to household members
3. Part-time household members
4. Relatives and non-relatives living in household-duration and reason
5. "Householder"

B. Children living in household
1. Adopted/foster children
2. Relationship of R's children to R's spouse/partner
3. Non-biological children living in household

C. Disabled or Chronic Illness
1. Care and assistance given household members
2. Care and assistance given relatives living elsewhere

R's Household History

A. Childhood household history
1. Periods R lived with parents, step-parents, or other people
2. Periods R's lived with grandparents or other relatives
3. Periods R's grandparents lived with R

B. Step-, half-, and full sibs

C. Homeleaving experience

D. Periods when R's parents lived with R

Marriage and Cohabitation History

A. Marriage History
1. Times married
2. Dates married
3. When and how marriage ended

B. Cohabitation History (Currently or Previously Married)
1. Prior to first marriage
2. Prior to second marriage
3. Prior to current or most recent marriage
4. Since (last) marriage ended

C. Cohabitation History (Never Married)
   1. Total number of times
   2. First time cohabited (start, stop)
   3. Current cohabitation

D. Dating activities of not currently married
   1. Dating behavior
   2. Marriage plans
   3. Cohabitation plans
   4. Marriage plans

Social background of R's first spouse

A. Previous marriages and children

B. Education, socioeconomic background, religion, and intact family

C. Marital separations during first marriage

Married R, living apart from spouse for reasons other than marital conflict

A. Reasons

B. Frequency of contact

C. Expected duration

Fertility History and Expectations

A. Birth history
   1. Adopted children
   2. Biological children
   3. Death dates of children

B. Fertility intentions
   1. Unwanted births
   2. Sterilization
   3. Intentions for future births

Quality of relationships with Children

A. Children age 5 -18 (ALL)
   1. Behavior problems
   2. Difficulty (or ease) in raising

B. Children age 0 - 18 (Select One Focal Child)
   1. R's educational expectations for child
   2. Separations from child
   3. R's and spouse/partner's difficulty dealing with child

C. Focal child aged 0 - 4
   1. Difficulty (or ease) in raising
   2. Preschool/nursery attendance

3. R's description of child's behavior
4. Frequency of spanking
5. Time spent caring for child
6. Family rules regarding bedtime and television
7. Read to child
8. Leaving child alone

D. Focal child age 5 - 11
1. R's description of child's behavior
2. School performance
3. Family rules regarding bedtime, television, chores, allowance
4. Leaving child alone

E. Focal child age 12 - 18
1. R's description of child's behavior
2. Homework and school performance
3. Family rules regarding bedtime, television, chores, allowance, earned money
4. Leaving child alone
5. Child's employment
6. Areas of open disagreements with child
7. Dating
8. Vehicle ownership and expenses

F. Children with only one parent in household (Select One Focal Child)
1. Information on absent parent regarding residence, marital status, other children
2. Child's contact with other parent
3. R's contacts with child's other parent
4. Conflict over child
5. Legal agreements regarding residence, visits, child support, alimony
6. Child support payments

G. Stepchild and partner's child (Select One Focal Child)
1. Residence of absent parent of spouse's/partner's child
2. Child's contact with other parent
3. Child support payments

H. Children with no biological parent in household (Select One Focal Child)
1. Residence of child's absent parents
2. Child's contact with parents
3. Child support payments

I. Biological children under age 19 who live elsewhere (Select One Focal Child)
1. When last lived with R
2. Current residence
3. Information on other parent regarding residence, marital status, other children
4. R's contact with child
5. Conflict over child

6. Legal agreements regarding residence, visits, child support, alimony
7. Child support payments

J. Spouse's/partner's biological children under age 19 who live elsewhere
(Select One Focal Child)
1. When last lived with R
2. Current residence
3. Spouse's/partner's contact with child
4. Child support payments

K. Children or step-children age 19 or older in household OR children or step-children of any age away from home attending college
(Select one focal child)
1. School attendance
2. Financial aid
3. R's contribution toward schooling expenses
4. Child's living arrangements
5. Child's employment and earnings
6. Child's payments to R for room or board
7. R's payments of child's expenses

L. All biological and stepchildren over age 19 who are not away at school, but who live elsewhere
1. Children's age, marital status, own children
2. Current residence
3. R's contact with children

Social and Economic Characteristics

A. Social background
1. Race
2. Religious preference and activity
3. Recent residential movement
4. Parent's occupation and education
5. Family's receipt of public assistance during R's youth

B. Secondary and postsecondary educational history
1. High school or GED diploma
2. Postsecondary enrollment history
3. Degrees and Certificates

C. Military Service

D. Employment
1. Employment history
2. Current occupation, hours, earnings
3. Current second job
4. Current work schedule
5. Travel to work and away from home
6. Childcare arrangements while at work
7. Work experience in 1986

8. Occupation at age 50

E. Income
   1. Earnings of all household members age 14 or older
   2. Other sources of income for household members
   3. Interest and investment income
   4. Public assistance income

F. Economic relationships with other relatives living in the household
   1. Regular payments to R
   2. R's payments for relative
   3. Relatives gifts or loans to R
   4. R's gifts or loans to relative

G. R living in household of parent or relative
   1. Regular payments to relative
   2. Relative's payment of R's expenses
   3. Relatives gifts or loans to R
   4. R's gifts or loans to relative

H. First home purchase
   1. When purchased and price
   2. Financial help with home purchase

I. Interhousehold economic transfers
   1. Inheritances
   2. Gifts or loans to R
   3. R's gifts or loans to others

J. Assets and Debts
   1. Assets: types, value, owed
   2. Debts: types, amount

SELF-ADMINISTERED QUESTIONNAIRE: PRIMARY RESPONDENT

SE-1 Household Tasks (all respondents)

A. Hours per week that the respondent, the respondent's spouse, and others in the household spend doing 9 different types of household tasks.

SE-2 (all respondents)

A. Happiness (Global)

B. Depression scale (12 items)

C. Evaluation of roles
   1. Housework
   2. Paid job
   3. Parent
   4. Husband or wife

D. Health (Global)

E. Alcohol or drug problems

F. Physical or mental limitations
   1. Type of limitation
   2. Duration of limitations

G. Automobile use

H. Sources of help outside household
   1. Emergency at night
   2. Cash loan
   3. Depression

I. Social activities
   1. People R socializes with
   2. Social activities at church
   3. Bar or tavern use
   4. Organized group recreational activities

J. Participation in organizations (15 types)

K. Help provided to and received from people outside household
   1. Child care
   2. Transportation
   3. Home or car repairs
   4. Housework
   5. Emotional support

L. Help provided to and received from each adult child
   1. Listens to problems
   2. Provides news

3. Household tasks
4. Financial assistance
5. Companionship

SE-3 Respondent living in parental household

A. How living there works out (Global)

B. Amount Paid to parents
   1. Room or board
   2. Other payments

C. Future residence plans

D. Areas of disagreement with parents (10 areas)

E. Perceived alteration of life if R moved

SE-4 Divorce and separation experience
(only if R was divorced or separated after January 1, 1977)

A. Who wanted marriage to end?

B. Current relationship with former spouse (Global)

C. Sources of emotional support during separation (8 sources)

D. Spouse's income level prior to separation

E. Verbal and physical arguments prior to separation

F. Resumption of dating

G. R's and spouse's involvements with others prior to divorce

H. Contact with former spouse

I. Perceived changes in life due to divorce (9 areas)

SE-5 Non-married, non-cohabiting respondents age 35 and younger

A. Perceived changes in life if R married (9 areas)

B. Marital timing considerations (5 items)

C. Marriage considerations (12 items)

D. Sexual frequency

E. Attitudes for and against cohabitation (13 items)

F. Attitudes toward
   1. Marriage
   2. Pre-marital childbearing
   3. Cohabitation
   4. Sexual relations

SE-6 Cohabitation Relationships (Cohabiting R)

A. Marriage plans

B. Quality of relationship (Global)

C. Fairness in role allocation
   1. Household chores
   2. Working for pay
   3. Spending money
   4. Childcare

D. Time spent together (Global)

E. Sexual frequency

F. Areas of disagreement with partner (7 areas)

G. Coping with disagreement

H. Physical arguments

I. Perceived changes in life if separated (6 areas)
   1. For R
   2. For partner

J. Probability of separation

K. Attitudes for and against cohabitation (13 items)

L. Perceived changes in life if R married (9 areas)

M. Marital timing considerations (5 items)

N. Marriage considerations (12 items)

O. Attitudes toward
   1. Marriage
   2. Pre-marital childbearing

SE-7 Married Couple Relationships (Married R)

A. Quality of relationship (Global)

B. Type of marriage ceremony

C. Fairness in role allocation

1. Household chores
2. Working for pay
3. Spending money
4. Childcare

D. Time spent together (Global)

E. Sexual frequency

F. Areas of disagreement with partner (7 areas)

G. Coping with disagreement

H. Physical arguments

I. Perceived changes in life if separated (6 areas)
1. For R
2. For husband/wife

J. Probability of separation

SE-8 Fertility considerations
(only if R is female age 39 or younger, a single male age 44 or younger, or a married male whose wife/partner is age 39 or younger)

Things that people consider when thinking about having a child or another child. (16 items)

SE-9 Parenting
(only if all children are under age 5)

A. Time spent with children
1. On outings
2. Playing together
3. Reading to child

B. Discipline
1. Praise
2. Spank
3. Cuddle
4. Yell

C. R's desires for child's behavior (12 items)

D. Step-parenting (8 items)

SE-10 Parenting
(only if one or more children age 5-18)

A. Meals with children

B. Time spent with children

1. Leisure activities
2. Playing together
3. Private talks
4. Helping with homework

C. Discipline
1. Praise
2. Help set rules
3. Spank
4. Cuddle
5. Yell

D. R's involvement in youth groups

E. R's desires for child's behavior (12 items)

F. Step-parenting (8 items)

SE-11 R has adult son or daughter living in household

A. How child living here works out (Global)

B. Meals with child

C. Time spent with child
1. Leisure activities
2. Playing together
3. Private talks

D. Perceived alteration of life if child moved

E. Areas of disagreement with parents (10 areas)

F. Frequency of enjoyable or difficult times with child

G. R's perception of child's future residence plans

H. Coping with disagreement

I. Physical arguments

SE-12 Relationship with Children

(only if R or spouse/partner has living children)

Quality of relationship with each child (Global)

SE-13 Parents, Relatives, and General Attitudes
(all respondents)

A. Information about mother
1. Current age or age at death
2. Health

3. Quality of relationship with mother (Global)
4. Current residence
5. Contact with mother

B. Information about father
1. Current age or age at death
2. Health
3. Quality of relationship with father (Global)
4. Marital status
5. Current residence
6. Contact with father

C. Information about step-parent
1. Current age or age at death
2. Health
3. Quality of relationship with step-parent (Global)
4. Marital status
5. Current residence
6. Contact with step-parent

D. Brothers and sisters
1. Number
2. Quality of relationship
3. Quality of relationship with spouses of brothers and sisters

E. In-Laws
1. Quality of relationship with parents-in-law
2. Quality of relationship with spouse's sibs
3. Quality of relationship with the spouses of husband/wife/partner's sibs

F. Attitudes
1. Mothers who work
2. Fertility
3. Employment
4. Sex roles
5. Kinship help
6. Marriage
7. Cohabitation
8. Religiosity
9. Self-esteem
10. Nonmarital sex
11. Extra-marital affairs
12. Parenting

SELF-ADMINISTERED QUESTIONNAIRE: HUSBAND OR WIFE OF PRIMARY RESPONDENT

A. Birth date

B. Ages lived with natural or step-parents

C. Information about mother
   1. Current age or age at death
   2. Health
   3. Quality of relationship with mother (Global)
   4. Current residence
   5. Contact with mother

D. Information about father
   1. Current age or age at death
   2. Health
   3. Quality of relationship with father (Global)
   4. Marital status
   5. Current residence
   6. Contact with father

E. Brothers and sisters
   1. Number
   2. Residential proximity
   3. Contact
   4. Quality of relationship
   5. Quality of relationship with spouses of brothers and sisters

F. In-Laws
   1. Quality of relationship with parents-in-law
   2. Quality of relationship with spouse's sibs
   3. Quality of relationship with the spouses of husband/wife/partner's sibs

G. Marriages and Births
   1. Times married
   2. (if previously married) How prior marriage ended
   3. Dates of birth of children born prior to current marriage.

H. Characteristics at marriage
   1. Level of education
   2. Employment
   3. Religion

I. Cohabitation
   1. Prior to first marriage
   2. Between first and second marriage

J. Current marriage
   1. Date of Marriage
   2. Quality of relationship (Global)
   3. Type of marriage ceremony
   4. Fairness in role allocation
      a. Household chores
      b. Working for pay
      c. Spending money
      d. Childcare
   5. Time spent together (Global)
   6. Sexual frequency
   7. Areas of disagreement with partner (7 areas)
   8. Coping with disagreement
   9. Physical arguments
   10. Perceived changes in life if separated (6 areas)
      a. For R
      b. For husband/wife
   11. Probability of separation

K. Fertility intentions

L. Fertility considerations

M. Relationships with children
   1. Quality of relationship with each child (Global)
   2. Enjoyable or difficult times with children
   3. Meals with children
   4. Time spent with children
      a. Leisure activities
      b. Playing together
      c. Private talks
      d. Helping with homework
   5. Discipline
      a. Praise
      b. Child helps set rules
      c. Spank
      d. Cuddle
      e. Yell
   6. R's desires for children's behavior (12 items)
   7. Step-parenting (8 items)

N. Information on absent parent of child currently in household (Select focal child)
   1. Marital status, other children
   2. Child's contact with other parent
   3. Conflict over child
   4. Child support

O. Information on child age 18 or younger who does not live in household. (Select focal child)
   1. R's contact with child
   2. R's influence in child's life
   3. R's child support payments
   4. Information on absent parent regarding marital status, other children

5. Conflict with other parent over child

P. Adult Child Living in household (Select focal child)
   1. How child living at home works out (Global)
   2. Time spent with child
      a. Leisure activities
      b. Playing together
      c. Private talks
   3. Perceived alteration of life if child moved
   4. Areas of disagreement with parents (10 areas)
   5. Enjoyable or difficult times
   6. Coping with disagreement

Q. Divorce and separation (if R was divorced or separated after January 1, 1977)
   1. Current relationship with former spouse (Global)
   2. Contact with former spouse
   3. Verbal and physical arguments prior to separation

R. Information about R
   1. Happiness (Global)
   2. Health (Global)
   3. Alcohol or drug problems
   4. Physical or mental limitations
      1. Type of limitation
      2. Duration of limitations
   5. Automobile use
   6. Highest level of education completed by parents
   7. Religious preference and attendance
   8. Race

S. Military, education, and occupation
   1. Military experience
   2. R's highest level of education
   3. Degrees
   4. Postsecondary education history (since 1970)
   5. Full and Part-time work history (since 1970)
   6. Work experience in 1986
   7. Current occupation, hours, earnings
   8. Current second job
   9. Current work schedule
   10. Childcare arrangements while at work

T. Household Tasks
   1. Hours per week that the respondent, the respondent's spouse, and others in the household spend doing 9 different types of household tasks.

U. Income
   1. Wages, salary,commissions
   2. Self-employment income

V. Occupation at age 50

W. Attitudes

1. Mothers who work
2. Fertility
3. Employment
4. Sex roles
5. Kinship help
6. Marriage
7. Cohabitation
8. Religiosity
9. Self-esteem
10. Nonmarital sex
11. Extra-marital affairs
12. Parenting

SELF-ADMINISTERED QUESTIONNAIRE: COHABITING PARTNER OF PRIMARY RESPONDENT

The cohabiting partner of the primary respondent completes a questionnaire, most of which is identical to that completed by spouses, except for minor changes in wording.

In the husband or wife questionnaire, questions 50 - 68 deal with marriage and cohabitation prior to marriage. This section was replaced in the partner questionnaire with the following:

A. Dates of birth for all children

B. Times married

C. (if previously married) How prior marriage ended

D. Information on current cohabitation relationship
   1. Date cohabitation started
   2. Marriage plans

In the main questionnaire married respondents were asked the income, assets, and debt, of themselves and their spouses. Questions on these topics were not included in the spouse questionnaire. Cohabiting primary respondents were asked only about their own economic situation, and not about the situation of their partner or other household members. To complete the economic picture, a section on the partner's economic situation was included in the partner's self-administered questionnaire.

SELF-ADMINISTERED QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED TO HOUSEHOLDER WHEN PRIMARY RESPONDENT IS SON OR DAUGHTER OR OTHER RELATIVE OF HOUSEHOLDER

Tertiary Questionnaire

The content of the tertiary questionnaire is as follows:

A. Householder's relationship with adult child living in household
   1. How child living at home works out (Global)
   2. Time spent with child
      a. Leisure activities
      b. Playing together
      c. Private talks
   3. Perceived alteration of life if child moved
   4. Areas of disagreement with parents (10 areas)
   5. Enjoyable or difficult times with child
   6. Householder's perception of child's future residence plans
   7. Coping with disagreement
   8. Physical arguments
   9. College Expenses
      a. Financial aid
      b. Share paid by householder

B. Householder's relationship with other adult relative living with householder
   1. How relative living here works out (Global)
   2. Perceived alteration of life if relative moved
   3. Difficulty dealing with relative
   4. Why is relative living here?
   5. Householder's perception of relative's future residence plans
   6. Coping with disagreement
   7. Relative's health
   8. Amount paid to householder
      a. Room or board
      b. Other payments
   9. Expenses paid by householder
   10. Gifts and loans
      a. From householder
      b. To householder

C. Household Tasks
   1. Hours per week that the householder, the householder's spouse, and others in the household spend doing 9 different types of household tasks.

D. Marital History

E. Quality of relationship (Global)

F. Areas of disagreement with spouse (6 areas)

G. Relationship with children
   1. Quality of relationship with each child (Global)

H. Alcohol or drug problems

I. Information about householder and spouse
   1. Health (Global)
   2. Religious preference and attendance
   3. Military experience
   4. Highest level of education
   5. Work experience in 1986
   6. Current occupation, hours, earnings
   7. Current second job

J. Household Income
   1. Employment income of all household members
   2. Other sources of income for household members
   3. Interest and investment income

K. Assets and Debts
   1. Assets: types, value, owed
   2. Debts: types, amount

L. Attitudes
   1. Sex roles
   2. Kinship help
   3. Marriage
   4. Cohabitation
   5. Religiosity
   6. Self-esteem
   7. Nonmarital sex
   8. Extra-marital affairs
   9. Parenting

INSTITUTE FOR SURVEY RESEARCH

#540-381-01
1987

INTERVIEWER:______________________________ ID#:______

REASSIGNED INTERVIEWER: __________________ID#:______

COORDINATOR:____

NATIONAL SURVEY OF FAMILIES & HOUSEHOLDS: CALL REPORT FORM

Telephone (   )   -

RECORD CORRECT ADDRESS ABOVE

CALL #	DATE	TIME	RESULT CODE	*WRITE DESCRIPTION FOR RESULT CODES 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14
1		AM PM		
2		AM PM		
3		AM PM		
4		AM PM		
5		AM PM		
6		AM PM		
7		AM PM		
8		AM PM		

CODES FOR RESULT OF CALL

1. Completed interview
*2. Appointment made
*3. Respondent not at home
4. No one home for screening
5. Vacant
*6. Refused screening
*7. Respondent refused interview

*8. Language barrier
*9. HU outside Listing Area boundaries
*10. Not a housing unit
*11. Respondent away for duration of study
12. (DO NOT USE)
13. No eligible respondent in household
*14. Other

SCREENING FORM

1. Tell me the name of everyone who lives here now, starting with yourself. Include everyone who stays here half the time or more, but do not include anyone who is away at college or away in the military. (PROBE:) Is there anyone else who stays here at least half the time? (PRINT NAMES IN COLUMN 1 OF HH ROSTER, OPPOSITE)

2. (FOR EACH PERSON ON ROSTER, ASK:) How old (were you/was PERSON) on (your/his/her) last birthday? (RECORD AGE IN COLUMN 2)

3. (FOR EACH PERSON AGE 14 OR OLDER, ASK:) (Are you/is PERSON) currently married, separated due to marital problems, divorced, widowed, or never married? (RECORD IN COLUMN 3)

4. Which of the following groups best describes you:

1. black,
2. Puerto Rican,
3. Mexican American,
4. white, or something else?

(IF NO CHILDREN AGE 18 OR UNDER IN HH, SKIP TO Q.6)

5. This question is about (CHILDREN AGE 18 OR YOUNGER). (Does CHILD/Do any of these children) have a parent who does not live in this household, or who is no longer living?

1 Yes 2 No

6. Did anyone living here now get married since January 1, 1982?

1 Yes 2 No

CHECKPOINT A: THIS HOUSEHOLD CONTAINS: (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

_____ A BLACK, PUERTO RICAN OR MEXICAN AMERICAN INFORMANT (Q.4)

_____ A CHILD WITH AN ABSENT PARENT (Q.5)

_____ PERSON MARRIED SINCE JAN.1, 1982 (Q.6)

ON THE ROSTER, CIRCLE THE NAMES OF ALL PERSONS AGE 19 AND OVER, AND ALL CURRENTLY MARRIED OF ANY AGE. THEN SKIP TO INSTRUCTION BOX AT TOP OF PAGE 4.

_____ NONE OF THE ABOVE (GO TO INSTRUCTIONS ABOVE Q.7)

(IF THERE ARE HH MEMBERS AGE 19 OR OVER WHO ARE NOT CURRENTLY MARRIED, ASK Q.7. OTHERWISE, TERMINATE; USE RESULT CODE 13)

7. Nowadays, many couples live together without being married. Is that true of anyone who lives in this household?

1 Yes

2 No (TERMINATE; USE RESULT CODE 13)

ON THE ROSTER, CIRCLE THE NAMES OF ALL PERSONS AGE 19 AND OVER, AND ALL CURRENTLY MARRIED OF ANY AGE. THEN SKIP TO INSTRUCTION BOX AT TOP OF PAGE 4.

______ SCREENING ROSTER		CODERS: [________] # IN HH				
COLUMN 1 (PRINT) First Name	COLUMN 2 Age	COLUMN 3 Marital Status				
		Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed	Never Married
(1) ____________ (INFORMANT)		1	2	3	4	5
(2)		1	2	3	4	5
(3)		1	2	3	4	5
(4)		1	2	3	4	5
(5)		1	2	3	4	5
(6)		1	2	3	4	5
(7)		1	2	3	4	5
(8)		1	2	3	4	5
(9)		1	2	3	4	5
(10)		1	2	3	4	5
(11)		1	2	3	4	5
(12)		1	2	3	4	5
(13)		1	2	3	4	5
(14)		1	2	3	4	5

INSTITUTE FOR SURVEY RESEARCH

#540-381-01
1987

INTERVIEWER:______________________________ ID#:______

REASSIGNED INTERVIEWER: __________________ID#:______

COORDINATOR:____

NATIONAL SURVEY OF FAMILIES & HOUSEHOLDS: CALL REPORT FORM

Telephone (   )   -

RECORD CORRECT ADDRESS ABOVE

CALL #	DATE	TIME	RESULT CODE	*WRITE DESCRIPTION FOR RESULT CODES 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14
1		AM PM		
2		AM PM		
3		AM PM		
4		AM PM		
5		AM PM		
6		AM PM		
7		AM PM		
8		AM PM		

CODES FOR RESULT OF CALL

 1. Completed interview
*2. Appointment made
*3. Respondent not at home
 4. No one home for screening
 5. Vacant
*6. Refused screening
*7. Respondent refused interview
*8. Language barrier
*9. HU outside Listing Area boundaries
*10. Not a housing unit
*11. Respondent away for duration of study
 12. (DO NOT USE)
 13. No eligible respondent in household
*14. Other

SCREENING FORM

1. Tell me the name of everyone who lives here now, starting with yourself. Include everyone who stays here half the time or more.
(PROBE:) Is there anyone else who stays here at least half the time or more?
(PRINT NAMES IN COLUMN 1 OF SCREENING ROSTER, OPPOSITE)

2. How many members of this household, if any, are currently away at college? __________ (IF NONE, SKIP TO Q.3)

2a. Tell me the first names of those who live in a dorm, sorority or fraternity house. (ADD NAMES TO ROSTER, AND CIRCLE CODE 1 IN COLUMN 1)

2b. Who, if anyone, is away at college and not living in a dorm, sorority or fraternity house? (CROSS OUT THESE NAMES IF LISTED ON THE ROSTER)

3. How many members of this household, if any, are currently away in the Armed Forces? __________ (IF NONE, SKIP TO Q.4)

3a. Tell me the first names of those who live in military housing, or on a ship. (ADD NAMES TO ROSTER, AND CIRCLE CODE 2 IN COLUMN 2)

3b. Who, if anyone, is away in the Armed Forces and not living in military housing, or on a ship? (CROSS OUT THESE NAMES IF LISTED ON THE ROSTER)

(ASK Q.4 FOR EACH PERSON LISTED ON THE SCREENING ROSTER)

4. How old (were you/was PERSON) on (your/his/her) last birthday? (RECORD AGE IN COLUMN 3)

5. (FOR EACH PERSON AGE 14 OR OLDER, ASK:) (Are you/is PERSON) currently married, separated due to marital problems, divorced, widowed, or never married? (CIRCLE CODE IN COLUMN 4)

CHECKPOINT A: HOW MANY PERSONS ON THE ROSTER ARE AGE 19 OR OVER, OR CURRENTLY MARRIED OF ANY AGE? (X THE BOX AND CIRCLE THESE NAMES ON ROSTER)

_____ NONE (GO TO CHECKPOINT B)

_____ ONE (CONDUCT PRIMARY INTERVIEW WITH THIS PERSON; RECORD NAME ON PAGE 4)

_____ TWO (SKIP TO INSTRUCTION BOX ON PAGE 4)

CHECKPOINT B: HOW MANY PERSONS AGE 18 ARE LISTED ON THE ROSTER? (X THE BOX AND CIRCLE THESE NAMES ON THE ROSTER)

_____ NONE (TERMINATE; USE RESULT CODE 13)

_____ ONE (CONDUCT PRIMARY INTER-VIEW WITH THIS PERSON)

_____ TWO OR MORE (SKIP TO INSTRUCTION BOX ON PAGE 4)

SCREENING ROSTER				CODERS: [________] # IN HH				
COL. 1 (PRINT) First Name	COL. 2 PERSON lives in:		COL. 3	COL. 4 Marital Status				
	Dorm	Mil. housing	Age	Mar	Sep	Div	Wid	NM
(1) ____________ (INFORMANT)				1	2	3	4	5
(2)	1	2		1	2	3	4	5
(3)	1	2		1	2	3	4	5
(4)	1	2		1	2	3	4	5
(5)	1	2		1	2	3	4	5
(6)	1	2		1	2	3	4	5
(7)	1	2		1	2	3	4	5
(8)	1	2		1	2	3	4	5
(9)	1	2		1	2	3	4	5
(10)	1	2		1	2	3	4	5
(11)	1	2		1	2	3	4	5
(12)	1	2		1	2	3	4	5
(13)	1	2		1	2	3	4	5
(14)	1	2		1	2	3	4	5

NOTE: DO NOT TRANSFER THE NAMES OF DORM OR MILITARY HOUSING RESIDENTS TO PAGE 1 OF QUESTIONNAIRE.

INSTRUCTION BOX

(A) IN THE SUMMARY BOX: STARTING WITH THE YOUNGEST, LIST THE AGES AND FIRST NAMES OF ALL PERSONS CIRCLED ON THE SCREENING ROSTER. IF TWO OR MORE PERSONS HAVE THE SAME AGE, LIST NAMES ALPHABETICALLY.

(B) IN THE SELECTION TABLE: IN COLUMN 1, CIRCLE THE NUMBER OF ELIGIBLES LISTED IN THE SUMMARY BOX. IN COLUMN 2, CIRCLE THE NUMBER TO THE RIGHT OF IT.

(C) IN THE SELECTION TABLE: THE NUMBER CIRCLED IN COLUMN 2 IS THE LINE # OF THE ONLY PERSON SELECTED TO BE THE PRIMARY RESPONDENT. NO SUBSTITUTIONS ARE ALLOWED.

(D) IN THE SUMMARY BOX: CIRCLE THE PRIMARY RESPONDENT'S LINE #, THEN PRINT THE NAME ON PRIMARY RESPONDENT'S LINE BELOW.

SUMMARY BOX				SELECTION TABLE	
LINE #	FIRST NAMES OF ELIGIBLE HH MEMBERS, BY AGE	AGE		COLUMN 1	COLUMN 2
1				IF NUMBER OF ELIGIBLES LISTED IN SUMMARY BOX IS:	THEN INTERVIEW PERSON LISTED IN SUM. BOX LINE #:
2				TWO	
3				THREE	
4				FOUR	
5				FIVE	
6				SIX OR MORE	

PRIMARY RESPONDENT IS: ____________________ (RECORD PHONE # ON PAGE 1)

(E) IF PRIMARY RESPONDENT IS CURRENTLY MARRIED, PRINT SPOUSE'S NAME AS SECONDARY RESPONDENT BELOW. GIVE SECONDARY RESPONDENT SAQ TO HIM/HER AT THE TIME OF THE PRIMARY INTERVIEW.

(F) THE TERTIARY RESPONDENT, IF ANY, WILL BE SELECTED DURING THE PRIMARY INTERVIEW. AFTER SELECTION, PRINT NAME BELOW.

SECONDARY RESPONDENT IS: ____________________ (SPOUSE/PARTNER OF PRIMARY R)

TERTIARY RESPONDENT IS: ____________________ (SELECTED DURING PRIMARY INTERVIEW)

Center for Demography and Ecology
University of Wisconsin
1180 Observatory Drive, Rm. 4412
Madison, WI 53706-1393
U.S.A.
608/262-2182
FAX 608/262-8400