



**California Center for Population Research**  
**University of California - Los Angeles**

**An Assessment of Available Data and Data Needs for  
Studying Intra- and Inter-Generational Family  
Relationships and Behavior**

Suzanne Bianchi  
V. Jeffery Evans  
V. Joseph Hotz  
Kathleen McGarry  
Judith A. Seltzer

CCPR-020-07

***California Center for Population Research  
On-Line Working Paper Series***

Preliminary Draft

**An Assessment of Available Data and Data Needs for  
Studying Intra- and Inter-Generational Family Relationships and Behavior\***

Suzanne Bianchi  
University of Maryland

V. Jeffery Evans  
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development

V. Joseph Hotz  
UCLA and NBER

Kathleen McGarry  
UCLA and NBER

Judith A. Seltzer  
UCLA

Latest Draft: June 19, 2007

\*The work undertaken for this report is part of the *Explaining Family Change and Variation* project funded by NICHD. We wish to thank Kate Choi for her able research assistance in helping to compile the summaries of the existing data collection studies analyzed in this study and Bijou Hunt for her able assistance in coordinating our efforts to gather information from the directors and principal investigators of these data collection studies. We benefited from comments from Duncan Thomas, Kate Choi and Bijou Hunt on an earlier draft.

## 1. Introduction

In this report we present results from a systematic assessment of the available data and future data needs for assessing important unanswered questions about intra-generational and intergenerational relationships. We are especially interested in understanding how these dimensions of families have changed over time and vary across various subgroups in the population. The area of intra- and intergenerational relationships is fast transforming into a field in which the social, behavioral and health sciences must be combined in new ways to make scientific progress. A key issue concerns the adequacy of existing data to address these questions and ways to enhance and improve existing or future data collection efforts. This assessment is part of the NICHD Project on *Explaining Family Change and Variation*. One of the goals of this Project is to provide NICHD, other funding agencies, and the demographic research community with: (a) an informed assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of existing data sources for conducting research on family change and variation across subgroups in the population; (b) a summary of key data needs, in terms of samples, data content, and other elements for the future for such research; and (c) a set of new and innovative data gathering strategies to sustain research in this area, including new methods for developing and following sampling frames, combining modes of data collection, and collecting new types of information. The report addresses these questions for research on the changes and differences in how the “extended” family, both across and within generations, is structured, how it functions, and how families affect the welfare of individual members. Our findings also provide a basis for some of the recommendations about data collection that are contained in the Final Report of the *Explaining Family Change and Variation* Project.

Our assessment derives from a two-pronged information collection effort that we undertook as part of the *Explaining Family change and Variation* Project. First, we examined the content and sampling methodology of 22 existing data sets, each of which collects some data related to inter- and intra- generational relationships (or which has the potential to generate such data). Second, we surveyed the directors and/or principal investigators of these datasets concerning the strengths and weaknesses of their existing studies with respect to supporting research on inter- and intra-generational relationships and innovations that might enhance their data collection efforts to support such research in the future. We then summarized their responses. In what follows we discuss the results from both components of our inquiry and the conclusions to which these results lead.

## 2. The Structure and Content of Existing Data Collection Studies

We begin with the discussion of our investigation into existing surveys. The names of the 22 data collection efforts on which we focused are listed in Table 1 below.<sup>1</sup> Our choice of these particular data sets was based on the following considerations. First, we excluded official gov-

---

<sup>1</sup> For each of these data sets, we used publicly-accessible documentation to develop comparable information on the each of the following features of the study: target population, sample design, dates of data collection, the degree to which the study represents multiple generations of the same family by self and/or proxy reports, coverage of biological and nonbiological kin, coverage of co-resident and non-co-resident kin, mode(s) of data collection, content (primarily with respect to inter- and intra-generational relationships), supplemental files (administrative records, biomedical information), and funding sources. We describe these dimensions in more detail below. Appendix A to this report includes the standardized, detailed descriptions for each data set.

ernment data collection studies, such as the Current Population Surveys (CPS) and the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), and focused on data collected by non-governmental survey organizations (e.g., Institute for Survey Research at the University of Michigan or NORC at the University of Chicago) and designed and conducted by non-governmental organizations and/or investigators. Second, we did not review any propriety or semi-propriety data sets, including data sets that were not yet in the public domain.<sup>2</sup> Third, with a few exceptions, we analyzed studies that were or have the potential to be on-going, rather than those that have been completed.<sup>3</sup> Fourth, although our emphasis was on studies that gather data on the U.S. population, we also include some studies of foreign populations. Fifth, almost all of the studies we selected were longitudinal, rather than cross-sectional in design.

Finally, we sought to include data sets that are exemplars or illustrative of different data collection strategies. The list of studies in Table 1 is obviously far from comprehensive as it is impossible to summarize adequately the entire universe of survey collection efforts. In addition to the factors noted above, however, we endeavored to choose studies that differed in the degree to which they emphasized younger or older families because the salience of different dimensions of intergenerational and intragenerational relationships varies across the life course. We also sought to target individual studies within larger comparative projects (with the exceptions of the Luxembourg Income Study and the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe). Thus, the Comparative Study of Aging and Health in Asia is represented by the Indonesian Family Life Survey rather than all four of the data sets in the project (<http://aha.psc.isr.umich.edu/>).

In addition to the data sets listed in Table 1 we reviewed other data sources, including the completed National Longitudinal Surveys of Mature Women and Young Women and community studies, such as the Los Angeles Family and Neighborhood Study (LA FANS). We also consulted with scholars in the United States, Canada and Germany about existing and planned studies in those countries, and we reviewed the Generations and Gender Programme comparative project (<http://www.unece.org/pau/ggp/Welcome.html>). Although the results of our investigations of these studies are not reported here in the detail in which we discuss other surveys, they helped to inform our recommendations and we draw on insights obtained from these efforts throughout the report.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The first wave of the Mexican American Study Project (MASP), conducted by Leo Grebler in 1976-66 is available from the UCLA Institute for Social Science Research Data Archives <http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/issr/da/index/techinfo/M5431.HTM>.

<sup>3</sup> Of the studies listed in Table 1, the National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH) and the Intergenerational Panel Study of Parents and Children are complete but have the potential to be re-initiated. The National Survey of Black Americans (NSBA) is complete, but it has become incorporated in a new study, the Family Connections Across Generations and Nations.

<sup>4</sup> For a more comprehensive summary of electronic data on aging see the *Data Collections from the National Archive of Computerized Data on Aging* (ICPSR, 2002; <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/NACDA/publications/nacda02.pdf>). We build on the report of the 2005 NIA-NICHHD sponsored workshop, "Intergenerational Family Resource Allocation," Thornton's (2001) *The Well-being of Children and Families: Research and Data Needs*, the PAA Ad Hoc Committee report by Hayward et al. (2006) on data collection at NIA, and the compendium of data sources on population and health in developing countries prepared by Duncan Thomas ([http://chd.ucla.edu/dev\\_data/index.html](http://chd.ucla.edu/dev_data/index.html)).

**TABLE 1: DATA COLLECTION STUDIES EXAMINED**

Study	Provided Responses to Questions?
Early Childhood Longitudinal Study (ECLS)	Yes
English Longitudinal Survey of Ageing (ELSA)	Yes
Fragile Families and Child Well Being Study (Fragile Families)	Yes
Health and Retirement Study (HRS)	Yes
Indonesian Family Life Survey (IFLS)	Yes
Intergenerational Panel Study of Parents and Children (Intergen. Panel)	Yes
Longitudinal Study of Generations (LSOG)	Yes
Luxembourg Income Study (LIS)	Yes
Mexican American Study Project (MASP)	No
Mexican Family Life Survey (MxFLS)	Yes
Mexican Health and Aging Survey (MHAS)	No <sup>a</sup>
National Child Development Study (NCDS)	No
National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health)	Yes
National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 (NLSY79)	Yes
National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997 (NLSY97)	No
National Survey of Black Americans (NSBA) <sup>b</sup>	Yes
National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH)	Yes
National Survey of Midlife Development in the US (MIDUS)	Yes
New Immigrant Survey (NIS)	Yes
Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID)	Yes
Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE)	Yes
Wisconsin Longitudinal Study (WLS)	Yes

<sup>a</sup> Professor Rebecca Wong, a former co-PI of this study, reviewed the spreadsheet for this study and provided us with corrections, but we did not receive responses from the PIs to the questions about the strengths and weaknesses of the design.

<sup>b</sup>This study has developed into a component of the Family Connections Within and Across Generations study.

We organize our summary of each data set around the following categories:

- *Design features*, including the sampling strategy; characteristics of targeted respondents; modes of data collection; the “generational structure” of individuals represented in the data (e.g., parents, children, and/or siblings); the marital or union (partnership) status of individuals; whether or not individuals in specific roles (parent, child, sibling, spouse) are represented by their own reports or proxy reports provided by someone else in the family or household; whether or not family members were restricted to those in the same household as the primary respondent; and whether family members studied consisted of only blood relatives or also included “step” relatives and in-laws.
- *General Content of Surveys and/or Data Collected*, including the types of demographic, economic, social, psychological and biomarker data gathered on respondents and, as relevant, family members represented by proxy reports; whether or not cognitive, achievement, and

personality assessments were conducted; unusual features of the study, such as matching to administrative records.

- *Inter- and Intra-Generational Information Gathered*, including information on financial transfers among family members, the incidence and nature of time transfers, caregiving and social ties, the proximity of family members and assessments of the quality of ties among family members.
- *Transfers to/from Non-Relatives and/or Organization*.
- *Measures of General Attitudes on Families*, including attitudes about parenting, division of labor within the family, family-related norms and/or culture, etc.

Where possible, we asked the data collection organizations or Principal Investigators to verify the accuracy of the information we entered for these various dimensions of their data sets and to identify other features of their data sets that were relevant for the study of generational relationships among family members.

The summaries of information we compiled on these studies are contained in Appendix A, with comparable information provided for each of the 22 data sets listed in Table 1. We shall not try to summarize the structure and content of these studies here, other than several features that are particularly relevant for the study of inter- and intra-generational relationships with surveys.

## **2.1 Generational Coverage**

The studies listed in Table 1 differ with respect to which generations of a family are considered and whether individuals from the various generations are respondents to the survey. Almost all of the studies, as well as many others that we did not examine in as much detail, ask respondents questions about their parents, their children and, in the case of older respondents, about their grandchildren. Thus, much of the information about various family members is typically provided “by proxy” and is not verified by the family members themselves. We therefore highlight those surveys with multigenerational interview designs.

Half of the studies listed in Table 1, however, involved direct data collection from more than one family member, other than the primary respondent’s spouse. For example, there are a number of 2-generation, *Parent(s)-Child* studies (ECLS, Fragile Families, Intergen. Panel, NCDS, Add Health, NLSY79, PSID) that collect information on the behavior, health status, etc. of children, who are interviewed or given cognitive assessments. This information is combined with data from interviews with parents to learn about the home and childrearing environments of children and/or to obtain information about the child that the child may not be able to provide either because the child is too young<sup>5</sup> or because the child him/herself is not a respondent in the survey. All of these studies involve longitudinal designs that follow the children (and sometimes the parents as well) to gather information on the child’s development. Several of the surveys (In-

---

<sup>5</sup> For example, parents in the ECLS serve as a proxy for their infant children, providing basic information that the child is not yet able to provide, e.g., the child’s birth date, weight, height, etc.

tergen. Panel, NLSY79, PSID, WLS) follow the children into adulthood to support analysis of the links between early childhood experiences, the transition to adulthood, and well-being in mid-life.

Finally, for several of the studies in Table 1, three or more generations in the same family are interviewed, observed by proxy reports, or are represented by combining the survey data with data from other sources (e.g., administrative records). These include the IFLS, Intergen. Panel, LSOG, MxFLS, NLSY79, NSFH, PSID, and WLS. With the exception of the LSOG, which recruited three generations of family members (parents, their adult children and their grandchildren) at the outset, most of the other studies observed a second and third generation through a combination of proxy reports about a second generation (parent reports about children; child reports about parents) and interviews with all children or a randomly selected child or parent. For example, the sampled adult in the NSFH reports information about their own parents and children at the baseline, but at the first follow-up, a parent and a randomly selected child were also interviewed. Similarly, early waves of the NLSY79 have reports from the sampled youth about the characteristics of their parents. As these youths age, reach adulthood, and have children of their own, the mothers began to report information about their children. The study was then extended to include direct assessments of children's cognitive skills. Studies with three or more generations differ in whether self-reports from a second or third family member are predicated upon co-residence with the original sample person or alternatively require that the family members live in different households. The NLSY79, for example, obtains child assessments and interviews only for children who live with their mother, the original NLSY79 youth respondent. These children are now followed into adulthood whether or not they live with their mother as part of the Young Adults supplement (NLSY79-YA), which interviews the adult (15 years or older) children of the female respondents to the NLSY79. The PSID, on the other hand, has proxy information for children living in the household, but does not treat children as respondents until the child has established an independent household.<sup>6</sup>

The most "extended" 3+ Generation study is the PSID, which has continued to follow the generations of PSID respondents since 1968. This strategy has the potential to produce an extremely rich set of data on multiple generations of families, with, in principle, comparable data on various phenomena on the same stage of the life cycle for family members from different generations. Data such as these can play a crucial role in the study of, and testing of models of, intergenerational mobility, the transmission of values, and intergenerational exchange. Note that several variants of these 3+ Generation studies also produce information on multiple members of a single generation within a family, i.e., of siblings, data which we later note are often not obtained. The WLS includes interviews with a randomly selected sibling of the original respondent. Both siblings then report on their parents and each sibling reports on all of their own children with detailed reports about one of their children chosen at random. As noted above, such *within*-generation data allows one to assess various behaviors and phenomena based on a within-family, cross-sibling, cross-cousin design. Finally, some studies have "following rules" for subsequent generations that are not necessarily restricted to biological offspring. For example, the IFLS,

---

<sup>6</sup> The Child Development Supplement (CDS) to the PSID is an exception. The PSID conducted child assessments with co-resident children under age 13 in 1997, with a follow-up in 2002 and, for a subset of children who had reached young adulthood, another follow-up in 2005. For most of the PSID's history, however, children did not become respondents until they were living independently in "split off" households.

MxFLS, NSFH, and WLS have followed, or will follow, step as well as biological children, thus providing data on a broader and increasingly relevant generational form of families in which individuals are linked through divorce/widowhood and remarriage, cohabitation, and out-of-wedlock childbearing.

Aspects of intergenerational and intragenerational relationships vary across cohorts. For example, the ages at which individuals become parents and grandparents have changed substantially over the course of the twentieth century in the United States as have the likelihoods that a mother of young children worked outside the home or that parents divorced. Similarly, the number of siblings and their age distributions reflect cohort differences in fertility. We purposely reviewed studies that varied in their coverage of multiple cohorts and single birth cohorts. Multi-cohort designs allow researchers to take account of variation in the economic, social, and policy environments that affect individual and family decisions about the timing of marriage, childbearing, employment, and other dimensions of life that are important for individual health and well-being. Examples of multi-cohort designs include several of the studies focused on midlife and aging (ELSA, HRS, MHAS, SHARE) as well as those that were targeted toward young as well as older adults (e.g., IFLS, MIDUS, MxFLS, NIS, NSBA, NSFH, PSID). The single cohort studies, on the other hand, have more detailed information about all stages of individuals' lives because they typically began observing individuals earlier in life than the multi-cohort studies. About half of our selected cohort studies began observing the sample at birth (ECLS, Fragile Families, Intergen. Parents, NCDS), and the remainder began during the cohort's teenage years (AddHealth, NLSY79, NLSY97, WLS). Thus, there is a trade-off in practice, if not in principle, between covering multiple cohorts and observing more years of an individual's life. A single cohort study can obviously be combined with other single cohort studies to investigate the causes of cohort variation in generational aspects of family life, but this requires comparable measurement across the single cohort studies. The NLS studies and the British birth cohort studies, which include the NCDS, have been used for such comparisons.

## **2.2 Content Relevant for Inter- and Intra-Generational Analysis**

In addition to the structure of data collection studies listed in Table 1, we also assessed the portion of each survey's content that is most relevant to understanding the interactions and relationships between family members. In particular, we examined whether the survey included questions concerning the following phenomena: (i) *financial transfers, exchanges and/or bequests* from one family member to another; (ii) the incidence and nature of *time spent and/or caregiving* among family members; (iii) the incidence and nature of *social contact* among family members; (iv) assessments and indicators of the *quality of ties* among family members; (v) whether family members *co-reside* and the *proximity* of non-co-resident family members; and (vi) information about the sense of *obligations* family members have for their kin and what *expectations* family members have with respect to providing or receiving care from their offspring in old age and providing or receiving bequests, inheritances, and other material or financial transfers from family members. Summaries of what information is gathered with respect to these interactions and relationships between family members are provided for each of the studies presented in Appendix A.

We offer several observations about the information gathered in the existing surveys concerning inter- and intra-generational relationships and interactions. First, in many of the studies,

the questions asked of respondents about the types of interactions and/or relationships among family members do not have a specific family member as the referent. That is, many studies ask general questions about transfers given or received from individuals outside the household. Even those surveys that ask about transfers to or from specific types of relatives, such as questions asked of older parents about whether they gave or received transfers from their children, do not include follow-up questions to determine which child gave or received the transfer. Similarly, adult children may be asked if they gave or received a transfer from their parents, but there is typically no distinction made between transfers to/from the mother and father. These distinctions are becoming increasingly important as divorce and nonmarital childbearing become more common. Exceptions to this practice include the MHAS, HRS, and NSFH which ask respondents to specify which child provided and/or received a transfer.

Despite the lack of a specific referent in questions about interactions and relationships, the responses to these questions do provide insight into an individual's overall welfare by summarizing the individual's net receipts. These more general questions may also be easier to administer and less burdensome to respondents than a series of questions about transfers to and from specific children (or parents). Conversely, questions referring to specific individuals may facilitate recall. Data about transfers to and from specific children (or parents) are necessary to explore hypotheses about the motivations for transfers because the existing models of behavior predict variation in transfers with variation in the characteristics of the donors and recipients. Very few surveys obtain information about transfers to/from all of the children in a family<sup>7</sup>, but instead contain information for a single randomly selected child. Although incomplete from a family point of view, these data for a randomly selected child do enable researchers to investigate differences in interactions by gender, birth order, and other characteristics of a respondent's family members.

A second observation on the breadth of family data collection efforts concerns the sources of information about familial ties. As noted above, approximately one-half of the studies we analyzed interviewed only one family member (the respondent) and asked this person to report on the incidence and nature of their interactions with other family members. In essence, researchers obtain information from only one member of a dyad. In the other half of studies, researchers obtain information about relationships from both members of a particular dyad although the reference period about which each individual reports typically differs due to the timing of interviews. Obtaining information from both sides of a dyad is more costly than relying on a single respondent but there have been few efforts to measure its worth. Even for reasonably objective aspects of interactions, such as whether or not a transfer occurred and the amount of the transfer, the studies we reviewed had not attempted to assess whether parents or children (or donors or recipients) provide more accurate reports. Methodological studies do, however, generally find that donors are more likely to report transfers than are recipients.

Finally, very few of the studies we reviewed gave "equal treatment" to couple and generational relationships in the designation of respondents and in the coverage of questions about relationships. Most of the studies emphasized either couple relationships (division of labor, conflict and emotional quality of the bond, union stability) or parent-child relationships (quality of

---

<sup>7</sup> The NSFH attempted this in the second wave by asking about transfers from any child and then including a follow-up asking which children provided or received the transfer.

the relationship, transfers of time and money). Exceptions are surveys that focus on younger children and the transition to adulthood because of the potential impact on children's well-being of instability in the parent couple's relationship (e.g., Fragile Families, NCDS, NLSY79, NLSY97, NSFH, and PSID Child Development Supplement). The NSFH is the only one of these studies that obtains moderately parallel information about the spouse/partner and adult child-parent relationships. It does so both in the designation of respondents (spouse/partner, parent, child) and in the content of the survey questions about the nature and quality of the different relationships. The wording of many of the questions and responses, however, differ by type of relationship. These differences are due, in part, to the conceptual and practical problems of asking about relationships between co-resident family members using the same response categories as for relationships between non-co-resident family members (Bianchi et al., forthcoming). Another small subset of surveys provides comparable coverage of parent-child and sibling relationships: IFLS, LSOG, MxFLS, NSFH, and WLS. The NLSY79, AddHealth, and MIDUS include siblings in their samples, but they have very limited coverage on relationships between siblings. The limited information available on different types of family relationships from a single data set constrains researchers' ability to investigate which relationships are more beneficial or salient to individuals and why. The incomplete coverage of relationships also limits efforts to learn more about how the family as a whole operates and how the nature of conjugal and generational bonds interact.<sup>8</sup>

### **3. Findings from Data-Collector Assessments of Strengths, Weaknesses and Possible Future Directions of Data Sets for Studying Generational Relationships of Families**

We asked a series of questions of the directors or principal investigators of the 22 studies listed in Table 1 to obtain their own assessments of the strengths and weaknesses of their data sets. We asked them to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses in the context of studying inter- and intra-generational family structure and relationships and to identify future needs and potential innovations in data collection that could enhance such research. The set of questions that we posed to the directors or data collectors is reported in Appendix B. We sent the questions to the investigators (along with the spreadsheets containing the information on the structure and content of their data discussed in the previous section) in the middle of December 2006 and we requested responses by the end of January 2007. Despite the tightness of the deadline, as of March 25, 2007, we received responses to these questions from the 18 data collection studies noted in Table 1. The discussion that follows is based on these responses. We organize our findings under three headings: Sampling and Coverage Issues; Content Issues; and Potential Innovations and Challenges in Future Data Collection Efforts.

---

<sup>8</sup> Two recent studies attempt to provide more complete coverage of generational and couple relationships: The Netherlands Kinship Panel Study (NKPS <http://www.nkps.nl/NKPSEN/nkps.htm>) and the German PAIRFAM (<http://www.pairfam.uni-bremen.de/index.php?id=8&L=1>). The NKPS tried to interview the spouse/partner, parent, sibling and up to two children of the primary respondent (ego) – whether or not these others (alters) lived with the primary respondent. The PAIRFAM pilot panel study tried to interview partners and children (or parents, depending on the respondent's age). The design of these projects is consistent with the Generations and Gender Programme (GGP) effort, of which NKPS is part, to provide more complete coverage of the types of relationships within families. The standardized GGP design, in contrast to the NKPS study, includes only a single respondent per family.

### 3.1 Sampling and Coverage Issues

Principal Investigators and data providers identified a range of issues related to sampling frame and coverage for studies of intragenerational and intergenerational relationships.

- A common theme in the comments we received was the importance of *sampling families, not households* to improve our understanding of changes in what families do and why families and their interactions differ by race, ethnicity, economic and social class, and other statuses.
  - “Population aging, caused by declining fertility and mortality, is in the present or future of the vast majority of the world’s societies. This changing age structure has crucial implications for the intergenerational allocation of resources via both public and family mechanisms for the well-being of children, adults and the elderly. ... We need data capable of following different cohorts over their life cycles, using designs such as the HRS steady state design or the PSID genealogical design in order to deal with changes in marriage and divorce and their implications for investments in children, the care of disabled elderly and many other key demographic, social and economic problems.” *HRS*
  - [It would be desirable to] “... reach beyond traditional household-based samples and explore alternatives for developing fuller understanding of the interplay between individual, household, family and broader networks.” *IFLS*
- There are alternative strategies for obtaining a sample of families, especially those containing *multiple generations* that are *not co-resident*. One strategy is to recruit a sample of family members when at least two of the generations have reached adulthood regardless of whether they co-reside. This was the strategy followed in the LSOG, and, to some extent, the NSFH. As the researchers heading the LSOG study noted, gaining the cooperation and participation of family members who are adult and not-coresident “is a difficult undertaking.”
- A second strategy is to “accumulate” a sample of families by interviewing an initial sample of individuals in households and then following the offspring of the original family household as they form their own households and families. This strategy has been followed by the PSID, NLSY79, IFLS, MxFLS, Intergen. Panel, Add Health, and the NSFH.
  - “The PSID genealogical sampling frame remains the most beautiful and powerful frame for studying intergenerational relations ... it is a sampling frame that will support additional data collection into the indefinite future. Supplementing the PSID questionnaire, [and] adding sub-studies to enrich the content relevant to intra- and inter-generational study would capitalize on this investment. [T]here are similar studies in other countries (e.g. Britain, Germany, Australia, Korea) which employ the same approach and thus can support comparative research.” *HRS*
  - “Moving away from a household-based sample but using the baseline respondents to develop a sample of families by following-up and interviewing non co-resident family members would yield a dataset that is very well-suited for testing some of the models of inter- and intra-generational relationships. This would quickly become expensive; however, sampling from the baseline respondents using well-chosen sampling weights can

achieve high levels of sample efficiency at arguably reasonable cost.” *MxFLS*

- Unfortunately, building multi-generational family data by this second strategy takes time. More importantly, this approach must confront the problem that the sample becomes less “representative” of the population over time due to sample attrition and underlying changes in population demographics through processes such as immigration (or emigration).
- Several data providers noted the *importance of not limiting sampling of families to members who are biologically-linked*, but should also include individuals who are (or have been) members of *blended families* as a result of *divorce and cohabitation*.
  - The PSID noted that their “sample design does not follow contemporary family-types, including: step-relatives; some biological parents of sample children may be non-sample and not followed if non-custodial.” *PSID*
  - “The embedded genetic design of Add Health (which oversampled twins, half sibs, and non-biologically related adolescents who live in the same household, with full sibs occurring in the sample in large numbers) makes it possible to examine both within- and between-family variation in both intra- and inter-generational processes.” *Add Health*
- There is a related and challenging issue for designing new studies of inter- and intra-generational relationships and that is: *Who is a member of the family?* Forty years ago cohabiting partners were not an important relationship to include in a family survey. Today, cohabiting partners rear biological and step children, for at least part of childhood. Older adults will increasingly have cohabiting or Living-Apart-Together relationships as a result of cohort replacement and high period rates of cohabitation. Researchers will need to think creatively about how to obtain high quality information about relationships that some respondents think of as family relationships and others do not, without burdening respondents. This information is essential for studying change over individuals’ lives as some people become incorporated into the family as well as change over historical time as cultural notions of family are modified. Time series analyses always face the difficulty of finding a common definition of family for each time period, but broad coverage of quasi-kin relationships provides more opportunity for studying historical change.
- It is important not only to interview and follow family members from *different generations* but also to follow family members *within the same generation*.
  - “Relationships among siblings are likely a very important part of the dynamic process of decision-making and providing care. The relevant matrix of relationships includes the emotional tone and ability to cooperate among siblings and of each with the parents in question. It is important to note here that our usual measures of frequency of contact may be useful, but that they may not provide the most essential information. Siblings who have rather little contact on a regular basis may, or may not, be able to cooperate in decisions about, for example, when a parent can no longer live alone and what to do about it. Further, relationships among siblings are a potentially important component of intra-generational emotional and/or instrumental support.” *NSFH*

- To fully appreciate the role of sibling relationships with each other and their parents over the life course requires the collection of parallel information about siblings in a longitudinal design. This point was brought home to us in a conversation members of the Generations Group had with researchers involved in the WLS. The WLS provides this for a specific cohort and allows researchers to investigate how sibling and parent-child relationships unfold from late adolescence through old age. The WLS is more useful for studying the relationships between biological siblings than it would be for studying how step and half siblings relate to each other, because the WLS cohort experienced lower rates of divorce, remarriage and post-marital cohabitation than those experienced by more recent cohorts.
- “There are few studies that contain data on siblings and their relationships over the life course. Siblings are certainly important during childhood and adolescence, and there is anecdotal information that they are important among the elderly. But, what happens in between, and how do siblings reconnect in old age, if indeed it is a reconnection? Siblings are an interesting frame within which to study intra-generational relations because with such designs it is possible to separate out (or just control for) genetic from environmental influence. The various roles of genetic and environmental influence also should change over the life course. Theory suggests that as we age and experience fewer different environments, genetic influence play a larger role in behavioral choices and outcomes.” *Add Health*
- *Interviewing family members from multiple, as well as the same, generations eliminates “proxy” reporting which can be inaccurate and misleading for a range of phenomena.*
  - “There are many important dimensions that cannot be reported by proxy, such as how parents and children view their relationships with each other, and the more general psychological wellbeing and family-related attitudes that they bring to these relationships. Further, dyadic data from married/ cohabiting (or divorced/separated) partners provided a much richer representation of the family context in which inter-generational relationships occur. An important feature of this has been the attempt to ask parallel questions from both sides of a dyad.” *NSFH*
  - *An extreme version of this is failure to get information about and, more importantly from, absent parents and/or estranged family members.* Efforts by Fragile Families to include fathers of children born in nonmarital relationships illustrate the importance and difficulty of learning about “absent” fathers’ involvement and interactions with their biological children, what resources, if any, they provide and with what frequency they provide these resources. Even with a sample of children whose fathers were contacted at the time of the child’s birth, it has been difficult to keep disengaged fathers in the study. More work and thought needs to be devoted to how to include estranged family members in studies. This involves confronting both methodological and ethical challenges.
  - The MxFLS individually assesses every household member with each adult completing a face-to-face interview. This provides a substantially richer picture of household and family dynamics than would be the case if one person reported for all household members. It also achieves higher quality data. *MxFLS*

- But having the family as the sampling frame, rather than households, and focusing on the behavior and interactions of family members, especially non-co-resident ones, *poses some important challenges*.

- “The advantage of having multiple respondents for studying intergenerational relationships is hampered by the implications of this approach for joint response rates. At its most complex, this is illustrated by our samples of main respondents, time 1 spouse/partners, and focal children. We [NSFH] have many more respondents of each type than we have cases with responses from all three respondent types. The problem is even more problematic when cases with all desired respondents are sought across all three waves: any member of the set may be absent from one or more waves. These problems are inherent in multiple-respondent and longitudinal designs, and are compounded when these are combined.

... NSFH response rates are generally not out of line with what would be expected in annual surveys with high inter-annual response rates for comparisons between waves separated by NSFH intervals. Nonetheless, the long duration between waves clearly exacerbated problems of sample attrition. While education differences in response rates are routine in sample surveys, representation of high-school dropouts was particularly problematic in the third wave of NSFH.

We had particular problems in following focal children when we were unable to interview the main respondent at the third wave. Others may already have good solutions to this, but with no parent to tell us that Susie Smith is now Susie Jones we were up a stump about how to find her. This wasn't much easier for male focal children. We did very well in cases in which the main R was interviewed at wave 3.

... the length of time between interviews ... is also a serious limitation for many substantive analyses. For example, the relationship between changes in family contexts and changes in intergenerational relationships between waves are conditional on a great deal else that may have changed over this period. At the same time, with resources for only a limited number of waves, the longer intervals provided a better window for observing life-course transitions as, for example, focal children had more time to cohabit, marry, and have children.” *NSFH*

- The most serious problem of joint response rates is nonparticipation bias. Families represented by multiple reports have higher quality relationships than those represented by a single respondent. In the first wave of the NKPS, for example, there is a high correlation between the primary respondent's evaluation of the quality of a dyadic relationship and the participation of the other member of the dyad in the survey (Dykstra et al., 2004). Nonparticipation bias of this type highlights the difficulty of studying how families operate and the effects on individual well-being when some family members do not get along or are estranged.
- Data on families and family members would be significantly enhanced by combining them with *data on the contexts* in which families reside, work, go to school, and seek health care. Recent efforts to gather data of this type, such as Add Health and the LA FANS indicate the

importance of gathering data on families' contexts and the effort that this requires.

- “To understand the role of social context on intra- and inter-generational relationships, a sampling frame that samples the contexts in which families are embedded would be needed. This could include institutional settings, like schools or religious institutions, neighborhoods (which is more common), or political organizations. To study change over time, families within such settings would need to be followed, as would data on how contexts change, both the origin context and any new context to which an original family moves. This design is fairly high cost and maintenance.” *Add Health*
- *Some general design issues.*
  - “Broad inclusive surveys such as NSFH need to be repeated as fresh cross-sections at regular intervals. Researchers will not be able to resist the temptation and opportunity to improve at successive surveys, but they must also be able to track changes in the nature of family relationships over time. When there are no interactions with time, surveys can be pooled for larger samples as has been done for some work with NSFG.”<sup>9</sup> *NSFH*

There also is the inevitable problem of the tradeoff between *breadth* and *depth* of coverage on any given survey:

- “At the same time, the limitations of ‘depth’ in many areas in NSFH only point to the obvious need for surveys that are more limited in scope but more intensive in coverage. The power of such studies will be greatly increased to the extent that they can be coordinated.” *NSFH*

### 3.2 *Content Issues*

In this section we summarize the assessments provided by PIs and data directors on issues related to the content of their studies, that is, the types of information that have been gathered about inter- and intra-generational relationships and behavior and what types of information should be gathered in the future to sustain research on the structure and content of generational relationships. As noted in Section 2, a number of these studies have already developed questions about the nature of relationships between family members in the area of transfers, social contact, and the quality of ties. Some, either by virtue of their designs or through survey questions, gain information on the geographical proximity of non-co-resident family members. Here, we focus on what data gatherers told us about *what additional information should be gathered about these relationships, what phenomena and constructs we should try to measure* in these studies, and *how we might gather such information* to support research on families.

---

<sup>9</sup> Pooling surveys that are repeated cross-sections requires that at each time the survey define the population at risk in the same way. The National Surveys of Family Growth (NSFG) and their earlier incarnations, the National Fertility Surveys (1965, 1970) and the Growth of American Families Studies (GAF 1955, 1960) illustrate the importance of balancing forward-looking data collection with designs that are sensitive to what potential respondents think are appropriate questions. Earlier versions of the NSFG did not include never-married women unless they had already had a child. Only since 1982 has the NSFG target population included all women, regardless of marital status, prior fertility, and race-ethnicity. Change in the target population to include never-married women regardless of whether they had a child reflects change in the acceptability and incidence of nonmarital fertility.

- As noted above, an *important benefit of surveying multiple members of a family is the ability to ascertain differences in perspectives about interactions and exchanges between these family members.*
  - “From a modeling perspective we need to better link inter- and intra-generational processes, for instance how marital conflict and instability affects parent-child relationships, how grandparents intervene after divorce, how transitions among older parents (health crisis, widowhood) affect sibling relations.” *LSOG*
  - “The PSID sample includes many family members from both sides of relationship dyads – e.g., parent and adult child, brother and sister, etc. We have considered asking questions of both sides of the dyad about transfers and relationships between the two. The PSID is uniquely designed to allow this to occur. Some background analysis on the representativeness of the sample should be conducted prior to fielding these questions.” *PSID*
- It is important to *ask more about the motivations or reasons why transfers/exchanges were made (or not made)* as well as to measure the incidence and types of financial and time transfers.
  - “[The PSID] Intergenerational transfer module in 2007 asks respondents to rate: importance of leaving estate to children, religious institutions, charities; importance of paying for children’s education; expectation of children’s future earnings; whether provided support for elderly parents: financial support and co-residence of one year +.” *PSID*
- *More attention also needs to be placed on interactions that do not occur between some family members and why they don’t.* For example:
  - “One issue that just never made it to the drawing table [of the NSFH] concerns the penumbra of concern over parents that is not captured in measures of *actual* interaction or provision of care. This is particularly relevant to the period during which elder parents approach not being able to live alone. Uncertainty about these issues can be an important factor affecting adult children’s well-being, and decision making about their own life plans and resources.” *NSFH*
- While a number of surveys ask about financial and time transfers *across generations*, fewer ask questions about such transfers and exchanges *within generations.*
  - “The [NLSY79 survey] instruments currently have no questions that deal with exchanges or transfers within the same generation between and among siblings. Given the investment already made in data for siblings, this addition would be fairly easy to make. ... The potential here is substantial given the extensive data in place. Because we know a lot about siblings in the NLSY79 (demographics, location, economic position), we are in an excellent position to put transfers between that generation and their parents into context. For women in the NLSY79 and their children the situation is even better with a full roster of her children and extensive detail on the situations of her children. Modules on exchanges and transfers of time, goods and money could be added to the surveys.” *NLSY79*

Siblings might have a division of labor to provide for older parents when they have acute or chronic health problems. Or there might be a designated caregiver. In either case, a sibling who provides less care to parents may compensate another sibling who provides more by helping the caregiving sibling directly or helping that sibling's child, perhaps by contributing to that child's schooling or daycare expenses. Studies like the WLS and NSFH include information on whether a parent lives with any of the children in the family and some information on help siblings provide each other. Similarly, MIDUS asks parallel questions about family relationships of respondents and a sub-sample of respondents' siblings. The survey questions posed, however, are typically too general to investigate these kinds of cooperative caregiving arrangements (e.g., transfers to/from specific siblings are uncommon).<sup>10</sup> Most studies, including those like MIDUS, that include a sibling sample, lack information on the characteristics of all siblings, let alone relationships among siblings or between all siblings and their parents.

- A difficulty in designing survey questions to obtain information about parent-child and sibling relationships in the same study is making sure that the parents and set of siblings to whom respondents refer are the same parents and siblings about whom designated "sibling respondents" are reporting. We learned from the WLS researchers that this problem comes up even in the WLS cohort for whom divorce and remarriage in the parents' generation were relatively uncommon. It is important to design questions that make clear whether the referent is biological parents or biological and stepparents, and similarly biological, half, and stepsiblings. Because members of the same family may define "their family" differently, studies of more recent cohorts and even the children of the WLS respondents would benefit from closer attention to this issue.
- There also is an important set of issues concerning improving the measurement of the *timing* of *transfers* and *exchanges* between family members.
  - "More attention needs to be given to the timeframe of questions regarding some types of transfers. Many needs may be episodic but extremely important, and a substantial proportion of related transfers are missed when questions focus on a recent period. Our [NSFH] questions about whether a parent has ever lived with the respondent, or about whether a parent or family member helped them with their first home purchase are good examples. In each case, if I remember correctly, about a quarter answered "yes" Few of these would have been seen if the question were about "the last year" or even "last 5 years." NSFH
- A related point concerns gathering information about family responses surrounding *specific life course events*, such as the death of a family member.
  - Researchers directing the WLS note that the death of a spouse is a time when the surviving parent is most likely to need help from children. Timing data collection to interview surviving spouses and children at this critical transition will provide much needed insight into families' responses to crises and how they reach a new equilibrium after their loss. Crisis-timed interviewing cannot take the place of routine data collection in panel surveys, but neither can we expect routinely timed interviews to capture the process of re-

---

<sup>10</sup> See our discussion above about targeting questions about transfers.

sponding to crises.

- Several data collectors noted that surveys that contain multiple generations and/or multiple members of the same generation in their designs need to gather *bio-marker data* and *more direct measures of health status*:
  - “We [NLSY79] feel the large kinship networks in the data would be a real advantage for any effort to collect genetic data. This reduces the genetic variation and allows one to focus on those factors that vary within the kinship network. This raises difficult confidentiality issues. ... [The] administrative obstacles at the Bureau of Labor Statistics are great.” *NLSY79*
  - “Collection of biological data is new and innovative, with payoffs unknown at this point (but potentially very high in terms of scientific discovery), and should be relatively less expensive in the future. For example, collection of saliva DNA (and saliva for other tests) is easy via mail, and blood spots can also be self-collected by the respondent and mailed to a lab. The technology in this area is developing rapidly and should revolutionize the bridge between social and biological sciences. Such data would provide new insights into intra- and inter-generational studies of health and behavior (i.e., genetic analyses, consequences of risky behavior).” *Add Health*
  - “IFLS collects detailed health data, both biomarkers and self-reported data on all household members. This can be very useful to understand inter-generational household transfers.” *IFLS*.
  - The MxFLS “explored collecting a broader array of indicators of health status including markers for inflammation, diabetes risk, risk of heart disease but did not have resources to implement these plans. Have collected dry blood spots to enable measurement of some of these markers as we raise additional resources.” *MxFLS*
- Several data collectors mentioned that they are gathering or would find it *useful to obtain measures of such preferences as aversion to risk, altruism, time preferences, etc.* and to *get more information about family member’s perceptions of obligations or norms* with respect to what is expected in terms of relationships between family members at different stages of their inter- and intra-generational relationships.
  - The MxFLX is “exploring the possibility of including measures of preferences in the next wave of MxFLS. Work on a separate project is attempting to develop and validate methods for eliciting attitudes towards risk, time preferences and pro-social attitudes in a population-based survey. A broader array of indicators of preferences including pro-social preferences such as reciprocity, trust and trustworthiness would significantly enhance the potential contributions of these data.” *MxFLS*
  - “For questions on attitudes, values and preferences.... In terms of content, a coordinated effort to study intergenerational transfers using the NLSY79 and Young Adult surveys offers the ability to look at transfers from the point of view of both giver and recipient, and to account for the detailed circumstances of all siblings – contextual information that

is most frequently missing.” *NLSY79*

- “Family members’ perceptions of their obligations to each other can change over time as they grow older, acquire new responsibilities, or experience losses. Longitudinal data are essential for studying this process. Individuals may also experience cognitive or personality changes as they age because of illness or the effects of medication. This implies the need for repeated cognitive assessments and survey reports about obligations.” *Conversation between WLS Researchers and Generations Group*
- “[The *vignette approach*] has been used [in a study in] China, where obtaining variation in the expression of filial norms remains problematic. A fictional situation is presented in which an individual faces a family dilemma that requires a forced choice. The ideal solution chosen by the respondent gives insight into their underlying values. Vignettes hold much promise in the measurement of preferences and I hope to expand their use in our study. *LSOG*
- *An important issue in “collective” models of the family developed in economics concerns the extent to which resources are in the control of individuals. While many surveys ask individuals about their own labor market earnings, most surveys do not ask about a person’s own assets versus assets that are held jointly by spouses in a marriage. The IFLS and MxFLS have attempted to overcome this problem in their respective studies.*
  - “For intrahousehold family issues, a major strength of ILFS is that information is collected on income of all household members, plus assets, not just owned at the household level, but assets owned by individuals within households. Further, we get information on assets brought to marriage by each spouse. All of these data can be very useful in modeling intrahousehold allocations. ... IFLS has modules that quantify shocks of various types that have occurred both at the household and individual levels. This, too, is essential in helping us understand intergenerational transfers.” *IFLS*
  - “Information [in the MxFLS] is obtained from each adult respondent about control over resources, decision-making about family affairs and economic choices and attitudes towards risk and inter-temporal preferences. With these data it is possible to test a series of hypotheses about the role that resources and preferences play in family dynamics.” *MxFLS*
- Use *diary methods* to collect detailed information on time allocation and resource allocation. Collect data on a broad array of expectations, attitudes and values. These might include expectations about self, household members, parents, siblings and children as well as relationship-specific attitudes and preferences. *MxFLS*

Other investigators also identified diary methods as a way to learn more about deference and closeness in family relationships as well as linguistic skills.

- “Tu-vous patterns would be extremely useful to address systematically. These are rich with implications for future attachment to democracy and, of course, for the extent of English acquisition. ... The NIS staff continues to think hard about many possible meas-

ures, including a time diary of tu-vous patterns....” *NIS*

- We note that certain resources available in the community may eliminate the need for families to provide inter-generational or intra-generational transfers. These include information about the receipt of transfers from outside of the family, such as government programs, charities, and/or church. Many of the surveys we analyzed gather information from respondents about their receipt of such forms of support/transfers. Some surveys, such as the IFLS and MXFLS, address this by collecting information, with supplemental community surveys, on the availability of support services available in communities or regions in which households reside.

### ***3.3 Potential Innovations and Challenges in Future Data Collection Efforts***

Data directors and PIs offered a number of suggestions on possible innovations in their own and other surveys to help foster research on family generational structure and relationships. We summarize their suggestions and identify some of the challenges (not already discussed) that must be addressed to implement the innovations they propose and for data gathering on generational relationships. The following represent examples of such innovations, some of which have been tried and others which are being contemplated by some of the data directors and PIs from whom we solicited advice.

- *The Internet, for example, might be an inexpensive way to establish contact with relatives of a sample person who could provide contact information (i.e., address, email address, etc.).*  
*HRS*
- *Creating networks of respondents via the Internet is another potentially promising approach.*  
*HRS*
- A number of surveys supplement telephone and face-to-face interviews with self-administered questionnaires, for instance the HRS uses a “Psycho-social leave behind” questionnaire, the NSFH, and the WLS also combine survey modes to increase respondent’s comfort in addressing sensitive questions and reduce social desirability bias. The internet or web-based methods are an alternative to mail back surveys. Audio CASI methods also provide more privacy than more conventional modes for administering confidential questions.
- *Administrative data* requires the respondent’s informed consent (usually written), as well as the cooperation of the administrative unit providing the data. “The HRS has obtained these consents from Social Security and Medicare for husbands and wives. Extending such consents to non-coresidential relatives and obtaining cooperation from SSA or CMS strikes me as highly problematic. Linkage of state-level administrative data is still more problematic in the context of a national survey. In a few countries – mainly Scandinavian – administrative data holds considerable potential for intra- and intergenerational studies, but I know little in detail about the potential designs or obstacles in these countries.” *HRS*
- *Combining qualitative interviewing with traditional survey methods* offers considerable promise as is evident from the Fragile Families study. The Welfare, Children and Families: A Three-City Study project has also made valuable use of this combination of methods to learn

more about the meanings and motivations of lower income parents. “This approach could be used to supplement the PSID and Child Supplement data” (*HRS*) or other standardized surveys.

- Embedded experiments are another valuable innovation. “For example, Ernst Fehr has run the ‘trust game’ on respondents to the German Socioeconomic Panel and several investigators (Duncan Thomas, Orazio Attanasio, Rebecca Thornton and others) have embedded experiments in surveys in developing countries. These can be (and in the case of Thomas, have been) used to investigate intergenerational issues.... We have considered briefly using embedded experiments (i.e., the trust game) in the HRS but have not done so, in part, because of fear that participation in the game might alienate respondents and, in part, because the co-PI group was not convinced of the value of experimental data for the purposes of the HRS. My own guess is that the HRS will do experiments in the future, but that development of appropriate experiments with goals relevant to the HRS will be done in smaller supplementary projects using other sample before being fielded on the HRS.” *HRS*

#### 4. Conclusions

This investigation into a number of data sets has left us impressed about the magnitude of information available on generational ties as well as the diversity of formats and designs used to collect these data. We have, however, also come upon several areas in which improvements can be made both in the quantity and quality of data. Our own analyses and the input of the survey directors and principal investigators lead to specific conclusions as to how best to construct future data collection efforts and how existing surveys might be modified to create even richer analytic files. Fortunately, in those cases where improvements can be made, many of the ideas offered are easily implemented.

Specifically, we recommend:

- 1) that existing panel surveys which include incomparable longitudinal data be continued as it is impossible to replicate the decades’ worth of information anytime in the near future. Data sources, such as the PSID, which has nearly 40 years of data on many respondents, the NLS79, nearing 30 years, the HRS with 14 years, and the WLS with 50 years, among others, afford researchers the opportunity to observe family relationships evolve over time as well as to observe individuals at different points in their lives and in different familial roles.
- 2) that where possible, these existing data sources be augmented to include additional information on family relationships that was not considered at the time of the initial survey development. For example, stepfamilies have grown more common and yet stepchildren and parents are not followed in the PSID.
- 3) The most suitable means of augmenting existing surveys will depend on the content and structure of the existing survey. Some broad themes that have emerged however, include a recognized need for
  - a. Information on step families and cohabitation

- b. Greater effort to contact and interview hard-to-find and potentially estranged family members, such as non-custodial parents
- c. More information on the relationships between adult siblings
- d. Effort to interview both parties in a particular dyadic relationship, a mother and children for example.

## References

- Bianchi, Suzanne M, V. Joseph Hotz, Kathleen McGarry, and Judith A. Seltzer. Forthcoming. "Intergenerational Ties: Alternative Theories, Empirical Findings and Trends, and Remaining Challenges." In A. Booth, A. Crouter, S. Bianchi, and J.A. Seltzer (eds.), *Caring and Exchange Within and Across Generations*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Dykstra, Pearl A., Matthijs Kalmijn, Trudie C.M. Knijn, Aafke E. Komter, Aart C. Liefbroer, and Clara H. Mulder 2004. Codebook of the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study, a multi-actor, multi-method panel study on solidarity in family relationships, Wave 1. *NKPS Working Paper No. 1*. The Hague: Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute. (<http://www.nkps.nl/NKPSen/nkps.htm>. Codebook version July 2004, Version 0.)
- Hayward, Mark, James Smith, Doug Wolf, and Mary Jo Hoeksema. 2006. *Recommendations of the Ad Hoc PAA Committee: Comments on Data Collection and Dissemination At the National Institute on Aging Behavioral and Social Research Program*, Population Association of America, <http://www.popassoc.org/NIA%20data%20collection%20report%2002-06.pdf>
- National Institute on Aging and National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. 2005. *Intergenerational Family Resource Allocation: Summary of a Grantee Research Workshop*, March 10-11, 2005. Bethesda, MD. Report prepared by Rose Li and Associates, Inc. April, 2005.
- Thomas, Duncan. *Data Compendium for Study of Economic Development and Population*. [http://chd.ucla.edu/dev\\_data/index.html](http://chd.ucla.edu/dev_data/index.html).
- Thornton, Arland (Ed.). 2001. *The Well-being of Children and Families: Research and Data Needs*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

## **Appendix A: Structure and Content of Existing Data Collection Studies for Research on Generational Family Structure and Relationships**

The initial information in the tables below was compiled using information obtained from data user guides and codebooks for the study. The project relied on these sources and other information posted on the web (when available), with occasional supplementation by material in published books or articles.<sup>1</sup> We provided the information for a particular study to its principal investigator(s) and/or director(s), requesting that they or their staff examine the information for its accuracy. In cases where we had made factual errors in the entries below, we corrected them, based on the information provided to us by the study's personnel. In some cases, the personnel provided us with additional information about the content/structure of their study, which we have included at the end of each table, under the heading "Additional Information Provided by the Principal Investigators."

The data sets described in this Appendix are listed in Table 1 of the text for the report, *Assessment of Available Data and Data Needs for Studying Intra- and Inter-Generational Family Relationships and Behavior*. That table is reproduced here for convenience.

---

<sup>1</sup> Kate Choi ably compiled this information with the collaboration of Kristen Hunt and Vanessa Wight.

**TABLE 1: DATA COLLECTION STUDIES EXAMINED**

<b>Study</b>	<b>Provided Responses to Questions?</b>
Early Childhood Longitudinal Study (ECLS)	Yes
English Longitudinal Survey of Ageing (ELSA)	Yes
Fragile Families and Child Well Being Study (Fragile Families)	Yes
Health and Retirement Study (HRS)	Yes
Indonesian Family Life Survey (IFLS)	Yes
Intergenerational Panel Study of Parents and Children (Intergen. Panel)	Yes
Longitudinal Study of Generations (LSOG)	Yes
Luxembourg Income Study (LIS)	Yes
Mexican American Study Project (MASP)	No
Mexican Family Life Survey (MxFLS)	Yes
Mexican Health and Aging Survey (MHAS)	No <sup>a</sup>
National Child Development Study (NCDS)	No
National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health)	Yes
National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 (NLSY79)	Yes
National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997 (NLSY97)	No
National Survey of Black Americans (NSBA) <sup>b</sup>	Yes
National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH)	Yes
National Survey of Midlife Development in the US (MIDUS)	Yes
New Immigrant Survey (NIS)	Yes
Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID)	Yes
Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe (SHARE)	Yes
Wisconsin Longitudinal Study (WLS)	Yes

<sup>a</sup> Professor Rebecca Wong, a former co-PI of this study, reviewed the spreadsheet for this study and provided us with corrections, but we did not receive responses from the PIs to the questions about the strengths and weaknesses of the design.

<sup>b</sup>This study has developed into a component of the Family Connections Within and Across Generations study.

## EARLY CHILDHOOD LONGITUDINAL STUDY (ECLS)

- WEBSITE** : <http://nces.ed.gov/ecls/>
- I. DESIGN**
- Data type : Longitudinal Survey on U.S. Populations
  - Dates collected : Birth cohort: 9 months (2001), 2 years (2003), pre-school (2005), and kindergarten (2006 and 2007)  
Kindergarten cohort: kindergarten (1998-1999), 1st grade (1999-2000), 3rd grade (2002), 5th grade (2004), 8th grade (2007)
  - # of waves : 3 waves completed, 4th wave in progress, and 5th wave scheduled
- A Sample**
- Target population : Birth : A nationally representative sample of children born in 2001  
Kindergarten: A nationally representative sample of children who were enrolled in kindergarten programs in 1998-1999
  - Sample design : Multi-stage stratified probability design collected from U.S. birth certificates
  - Primary sampling unit : Counties or groups of contiguous counties
  - Achieved N : Birth: 10,688 children  
Kindergarten: 21,260 children
  - Respondents : Children, parents, childcare providers, teachers, school administrators
  - Geographic scope : Contiguous states in the U.S.
  - Mode of data collection : In-home child assessments, parent interviews, father interviews, early-care and education providers questionnaire, teacher interviews, etc. and face-to-face interviews for parents, interviews for school administrators
  - Over-sampled populations : Asian and Pacific Islander children, American Indian and Alaska Native children, Chinese children, twins, and low birth-weight children
  - Retrospective histories : Retrospective histories on parent's marriage, child's living arrangements
  - Response rates : Response rates are calculated as the weighted number of children with completed parent interviews divided by the weighted number of children eligible to participate in the 9-month interview  
Baseline: 74% of the 1,277 sampled schools that agreed to participate, 76% for resident fathers and 50% for non-resident fathers in the 9 month interview. Cumulative response rates are 69% until the 2nd year surveys
  - Source : [http://nces.ed.gov/ecls/pdf/9mo\\_samplesize.pdf](http://nces.ed.gov/ecls/pdf/9mo_samplesize.pdf)  
[http://nces.ed.gov/ecls/pdf/2yr\\_Sample\\_Sizes.pdf](http://nces.ed.gov/ecls/pdf/2yr_Sample_Sizes.pdf)
- B Type of information gathered for inter/intragenerational relationships**
- Multi-generational : Proxy reports on grandparents and reports on quality of child's relationship as reported by the sampled child
  - Co-residential & biological orientation : Sample based on co-residential relationships, but also includes information on biological relationships such as information about non-resident parents
- II. CONTENT**
- A Main focus** : Child in kindergarten or birth cohort
- Mode of reporting : Child in-school assessments, proxy reports from parents, caregivers and teachers
  - Socio-demographic data : Race/ethnicity, sex, age, date of birth
  - Education : Child's grade of enrollment
  - Cognitive ability : Direct child cognitive tests, physical and socio-emotional assessments over time
  - Family structure : Household roster information on family structure, partial history on child's living arrangement and parent's marital, cohabitation, and relationship histories

- Health : Birth weight, prematurity, activity level after birth, diagnosis of illness/disabilities, parent rated child's health
- B Secondary focus** : Parent - usually the mother of the child, but it could also be the child's father
- Mode of reporting : Self reports
- Socio-demographic data : Race/ethnicity, sex, age
- Education : Educational attainment and current enrollment in school
- Marital history : Current marital status, marital histories
- Fertility history : Maternal age at birth, number of births
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current employment status, characteristics of current job, current occupation
- Assets/earnings : Household income over the past year
- Health : Self-rated health, mother's prenatal behaviors, weight prior to pregnancy, smoking, alcohol use, emotional well-being, disability status
- C Other focus** : Spouse of child's parent
- Participant in survey : Proxy reports by child's parent
- Race : Race/ethnicity
- Gender : Gender
- Age : Age
- Education : Highest level of education completed
- Marital history : Marital status, union formation/dissolution information is available if the spouse of the child's parent is also the child's biological father
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Labor market activities, type of job, hours worked
- Assets/earnings : Earnings information
- D Other focus** : (1) Includes grandparents' socio-demographic information, such as educational attainment  
: (2) Includes information on teachers' assessment of child's academic proficiency, their description of the classroom environment, socio-demographic information specific to teacher such as their race/ethnicity and highest level of education completed by the teacher

### III. INFORMATION ON INTER/INTRA-GENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

#### A Intergenerational transfers

- Financial transfers :
- Time/caregiving : Whether grandparent provided childcare
- Frequency of social contact : Frequency of child's social contact with non-resident biological parents
- Quality of ties : Closeness between child and any grandparent

#### B General questions on transfers

- Financial transfers : Financial transfers from relatives
- Time/caregiving : Extensive information on childcare from relatives and non-relatives, head start
- Co-residence : Living arrangement of mother with other relatives
- Social contact : Type of activities performed with family member, such as doing homework together, eating breakfast, after-school care and asks parents to identify the family members with whom the child performs each activity
- Quality of ties : Closeness with some relatives

#### C Transfers with other individuals/organizations

##### Government support

- Financial transfers : Asks whether parent or child are recipients of welfare and other types of public transfers, financial assistance from government agencies to pay for childcare

### IV. GENERAL ATTITUDES ABOUT FAMILY

- Division of labor within family :
- Parenting : Parents' attitude on childrearing

- Family function :
- Norms/culture :

**V. SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION**

List of supplemental files :

**VI. FUNDING AGENCIES** : National Center of Educational Statistics, Department of Education

**VII. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS**

- Response rates : 90% anticipated for kindergarten cohort of 2006
  - Mode of data collection : Videotape data of children and mothers were also collected
  - Prospective histories : Collected prospective histories on child's living arrangements
  - Cognitive ability of the child : Direct child cognitive, physical and socio-emotional assessments over time beginning at 9-months. Revised Bayleys used at 9-month and 2-year waves. At preschool and kindergarten assessments were guided by established measures and those used in the ECLS-K (to facilitate comparison across cohort studies). These include proficiencies in language, literacy, mathematics, and color knowledge, and fine and gross motor skills.
  - Time/caregiving : Parents were asked about the quality and nature of the care provided by grandparents
  - Parenting : Beliefs and practices on childrearing were measured specifically by KIDI
-

## ENGLISH LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF AGEING (ELSA)\*

- WEBSITE** : <http://www.ifs.org.uk/elsa/>
- I. DESIGN**
- Data type : Longitudinal Survey on Foreign Elderly Populations
  - Dates collected : Wave 1: 2002  
Wave 2: 2004  
Wave 3: 2006 (in progress since May)  
Wave 4: planned for 2008
  - # of waves : 2 waves and 2 in progress
- A SAMPLE**
- Target population : For wave 1, individuals ages 50 years and older and their younger spouse/partner living in non-institutionalized households if the sampled individual had a spouse/partner who was younger than 50
  - Sample design : Respondents in the 1998, 1999, 2001 Health Survey of England (HSE)
  - Achieved N : Wave 1: 11,392 individuals 50 and over and their 708 younger or new spouses/cohabiting partners in 7,935 households  
Wave 2: 8,680 core members (of the 11,392 in wave 1) and their 652 partners who were not core members
  - Respondents : Core sample: individuals born before Feb. 29, 1952 who had taken part in HSE  
Young partner sample: cohabiting spouses or wives who were born after Feb. 29, 1952  
New partner sample: cohabiting spouses or wives who joined the sampled households between the HSE sample collection and ELSA interviews
  - Geographic scope : England
  - Mode of data collection : Wave 1: Face-to-face interviews, self-administered questionnaires  
Wave 2: Face-to-face interviews, self-administered questionnaire, nurse's visit
  - Over-sampled populations :
  - Retrospective histories : Partial retrospective history on employment and complete retrospective history on marriage
  - Response rates : Wave 1: 94% HSE households were contacted. 70% of these contacted households had at least one member who responded to the survey. The cumulative response rate was 66%.
  - Source : [http://www.ifs.org.uk/elsa/docs\\_w1/user\\_guide\\_6.pdf](http://www.ifs.org.uk/elsa/docs_w1/user_guide_6.pdf)
- B Type of information gathered for inter/intragenerational relationships**
- Multi-generational : Collects information on the respondent and their children. Very little information is available on their parents
  - Co-residential & biological orientation : ELSA was sampled at the household level, however, it also collects information on biological relationships
- II. CONTENT**
- A Main focus** : Individuals in core, young partner, and new partner samples
- Mode of reporting : Self reports, collection of biological specimens, proxy reports by household members
  - Socio-demographic data : Race/Ethnicity (White, Mixed, Black, Black British, Asian, Asian British), cultural background (Scottish, English, Irish), age, date of birth, sex, year of migration to England
  - Education : Enrollment in educational programs in the last 12 months, highest degree obtained, age when respondent completed his/her schooling
  - Family background : Whether respondent lived with biological or other types of parents for most of his/her

- Marital history : childhood, whether respondent lived with biological parents at the age of 16
- Fertility history : Current marital status, complete marital histories
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Number of biological, adopted, step children, age and sex of each child, complete fertility histories for men and women
- Assets/earnings : Current labor force and employment status, number of weeks employed in the past 12 months, partial employment history including start and end date of last job
- Health : Homeownership, savings, total family earnings in the past 12 months, income, pension plans, lump sum payment after retirement
- Health : Self-rated health, illness, disability, activity test (quarter mile walking test), emotional well-being, health behaviors, health insurance coverage, saliva tests, nurse assessments of respondent's health
- B Secondary focus** : Parent of main respondent
- Mode of reporting : Proxy report by main respondent
- Socio-demographic data : Whether biological mother/father is still alive, age, date when biological mother died, date when biological father died
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Parent's occupation when respondent was 14
- Health : Cause of parent's death if deceased
- C Other focus** : Collects information on respondent's children including information on each child's sex and age and whether co-resident. Also number of grandchildren and great grandchildren

### III. INFORMATION ON INTER/INTRA-GENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

#### A Intergenerational transfers

- Co-residence between adult children and parent : Whether respondent lives with their parent, biological children, step children, or adopted children, and grandchildren
- Social contact : Number of times per month respondent contacts children in person, by phone, or e-mail
- Quality of ties : Whether respondent is close with his/her children (very close, quite close, not close), whether respondent feels understood by his/her children
- Expectations/obligations : Respondent rates the likelihood of receiving inheritances of 10,000 pounds or more in the next 10 years, respondent rates the likelihood that he/she or his/her spouse will leave an inheritance of 50,000 pounds or more

#### B General questions on transfers

- Financial transfers : Whether respondent currently owes money to friends, relatives, or other parties; amount of money owed to friends, relatives, or other parties
- Time/caregiving : Whether respondent took care of his/her spouse/partner, child, friend in the previous week
- Social contact : Frequency of social contact via phone, meeting, etc.
- Quality of ties : Respondent rates closeness to partner (very close, quite close, not close), whether respondent feels understood by his/her partner

#### C Transfers with other individuals/organizations

##### Friends

- Social contact : Number of times respondent contacts friends in person, by phone, or by e-mail
- Quality of ties : Number of friends who are close to respondent

##### Government

- Financial transfer : State pension received by respondent/spouse, amount received for state pension, state pensions

##### Charity

- Time/caregiving : Whether respondent's daily routine includes spending time volunteering, being part of

### IV. SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FILES

- List of supplemental files :

### V. FUNDING AGENCIES

- : UK government departments:

Department of Health  
 Department for Work and Pensions  
 Office for National Statistics  
 Department for Transport  
 Department for the Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs  
 Department for Communities and Local Government  
 HM Revenue and Customs  
 National Institute of Aging

**VI. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS**

- Respondents : Wave 3 includes a supplementary sample of people born between March 1, 1952 and February 29, 1956 who had taken part in HSE 2001-4, partners of these people who were outside this birth date range but were included as part of the HSE sample, new partners
- Mode of data collection : Wave 2 also collected physical measurements obtained by a nurse's visit
- Retrospective histories : Future waves will collect life histories starting in 2007
- Response rates : Wave 1: When allowing for estimated number of eligible people in households with no contact, the cumulative response rate was 61%  
 Wave 2: 82% of core members who took part in Wave 1
- Socio-demographic characteristics : Race/ethnicity and cultural background may not be appropriate for group level analyses since the N's are extremely small  
 Also includes information on number of books in the household when respondent was 10
- Fertility history : Histories include information on adoption
- Health or main focus : Anthropometry, blood pressures, various blood analyses, balance tests, grip strength
- Quality of ties : Whether respondent feels that partner, children, and friends understands him/her
- Transfers to charity : Whether volunteered last week, number of hours respondent volunteered

---

\*The information in this summary was compiled using the Wave 1 questionnaires, Wave 1 User's Guide, Wave 2 questionnaires, and a list of biomarker data collected in Wave 2.

## FRAGILE FAMILIES AND CHILD WELL-BEING STUDY (FF)

- WEBSITE** : [www.fragilefamilies.princeton.edu](http://www.fragilefamilies.princeton.edu)
- I. DESIGN**
- Data type : Longitudinal Survey on U.S. Populations
  - Dates collected : Baseline: February 1998-September 2000  
One year: June 1999- March 2002  
Three year: April 2001 to Dec. 2003  
Five year: July 2003-January 2006
  - # of waves : 4 waves completed, 5th wave (9 year) into the field in May 2007
- A Sample**
- Target population : A cohort of children born between 1998 and 2000 living in cities with more than 200,000 people and the children's parents
  - Sample design : Multi-stage stratified probability design
  - Primary sampling unit : U.S. cities with 200,000 or more people
  - Achieved N : 4,898 children (1,186 marital and 3,712 non-marital births) in 75 hospitals in 20 cities across the U.S.
  - Respondents : Parents of children born between 1998 and 2000
  - Geographic scope : U.S. cities with 200,000 or more
  - Mode of data collection : Telephone interviews, face-to-face interviews, and child assessments
  - Over-sampled populations : Non-marital births
  - Retrospective histories : Partial histories on fertility, marriage, cohabitation, and romantic relationships, maternal employment histories, childcare histories
  - Response rates : Wave 1: 82% married mothers, 87% unmarried mothers, 89% married fathers, 75% unmarried fathers  
Wave 2: 91% married mothers, 90% unmarried mothers, 82% married fathers, 70% unmarried fathers  
Wave 3: 89% married mothers, 88% unmarried mothers, 82% married fathers, 68% unmarried fathers
- B Type of information gathered for inter/intragenerational relationships**
- Multi-generational : Parents report on transfers from child's grandparents that indirectly benefit the child
  - Co-residential and biological orientation : Biological relationships are sampled including non-resident biological fathers, but survey includes questions on co-residential relationships
- II. CONTENT**
- A Main focus**
- Mode of reporting : Proxy reports from biological mother and biological father
  - Socio-demographic data : Race/ethnicity, nationality, sex, date of birth, age
  - Cognitive skills : Series of tests of child development outcomes, such as Woodcock-Johnson Letter Word Identification, Peabody Picture Vocabulary Tests- Revised
  - Family background : Biological parent reports whether they reside with the child's other biological parent; they also report whether they expect to marry the child's other biological parent; amount of time child spends living with each parent, number of times child was separated from mother, and reasons for separation
  - Health : Parent-rated child health, physical disabilities, number of doctor's visits since birth due to illness or injury
- B Secondary focus** : Biological mother and biological father of child born between 1998 and 2000

- Mode of reporting : Self reports and proxy reports from the other parent
- Socio-demographic data : Race/ethnicity, nationality, sex
- Education : Educational attainment
- Family background : Family background at age 15
- Marital history : Current marital status, detailed marital, cohabitation, and relationship history with child's biological father
- Fertility history : Number of biological children, partial fertility histories
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Last employment place, employment status since birth of the child, current occupation, maternal employment histories
- Assets/earnings : Earnings, income
- Health : Self-rated health, health limitations, health behaviors, injuries caused by domestic violence, medical and dental checkup histories, alcohol and drug use
- C Other focus** : Grandparents of child born between 1998 and 2000
- Mode of reporting : Proxy report on maternal grandparents provided by biological mother and paternal grandparents provided by biological father
- Socio-demographic data : Nationality, sex
- Education : Highest level of schooling completed by paternal and maternal grandfather
- Health : Parent reports whether grandparents have a history of mental health problems
- D Other focus** : Parents' current spouse/partner
- Mode of reporting : Proxy reports by biological mother/father if their current spouse is not child's biological father/mother
- Socio-demographic data : Race/ethnicity, nationality, sex
- Education : Educational attainment
- Family background : Family background at age 15
- Marital history : Current marital and cohabitation status, date of marriage with child's biological parent, start date of current relationship, duration of current relationship
- Fertility history : Number of biological children
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Work-related activities performed during previous week, such as attending school, working at a regular job, looking for work, date current partner worked at a full-time job for more than 2 consecutive weeks
- Assets/earnings : Earnings, income
- Health : Self-rated health, health limitations, health behaviors, injuries caused by domestic violence
- E Other focus** : Includes information on the age and sex of child's siblings

### III. INFORMATION ON INTER/INTRA-GENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

#### A Intergenerational transfers

- Financial transfers : Reports whether biological parent makes/receives child support payments to/from other biological parent
- Time/caregiving : Amount of time spent with child
- Co-residence between adult children and parents : Household roster information available to determine whether biological parent resides with adult child, biological mother reports whether they lived with their parents/in-laws during pregnancy
- Social contact : Type and frequency of activities that biological parent and their partners perform with the child, frequency of visits with child's grandparents
- Quality of ties : Biological parent reports on current partner's suitability to be child's parent figure, parent's ties to child's grandparents, quality of relationship with father while growing up
- Expectations/obligations : Biological mother reports whether they expect to live with parents/in-laws after the birth of the child

#### B General questions on transfers

- Financial transfers : Financial support during pregnancy from family members or friends
- Time/caregiving : Childcare history lists whether care was provided by mother, father, other relatives, baby's father's relatives, government, friends
- Co-residence : Biological parents report with whom biological mother lived during pregnancy,
- Quality of ties : Quality of parent's relationship with his/her current partner
- Expectations/obligations : Expectations of financial assistance from family, relatives, friends, and others

#### **C Transfers with other individuals/organizations**

##### **Government**

- Financial transfers : Biological parent reports whether parents or child are recipients of vouchers for government sponsored childcare and/or Head Start for childcare, parents report whether they receive TANF, welfare, SSI, food stamps, and the monetary value of each assistance, Medicare coverage

##### **Charities**

- Financial transfers : Biological parent reports whether child received scholarship money from childcare independent of government assistance

#### **IV. GENERAL ATTITUDES ON FAMILY**

- Division of labor within family :
- Parenting : Attitudes about fatherhood
- Family function : Attitudes about marriage
- Norms/culture :

#### **V. SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FILES**

- List of supplemental files : Biological specimens, geocode data, medical records

#### **VI. FUNDING AGENCIES**

- : NICHD, NSF, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (ASPE and ACF), California Healthcare Foundation, The Center for Research on Religion and Urban Civil Society at the University of Pennsylvania, Commonwealth Fund, Ford Foundation, Foundation for Child Development, Fund for New Jersey, William T. Grant Foundation, Healthcare Foundation of New Jersey, William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Hogg Foundation, Christina A. Johnson Endeavor Foundation, Kronkosy Charitable Foundation, Leon Lowenstein Foundation, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, A.L. Mailman Family Foundation, Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Public Policy Institute of California, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, St. David's Hospital Foundation, St. Vincent Hospital and Health Services

#### **VII. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS**

- Education of main focus : Collects monthly retrospective histories on school attendance for children
  - Health of main focus : In the 9-year-old data, respondents also collect information on the mental health of the child. The survey also collects saliva samples from mothers and children.
  - Intergenerational financial transfers : Information on transfers from grandparents list whether the intention of the transfer was to benefit the child
-

## HEALTH AND RETIREMENT STUDY (HRS)

- WEBSITE** : <http://hrsonline.isr.umich.edu/intro/index.html>
- I. DESIGN**
- Data type : Longitudinal Survey on Elderly Populations in the U.S.
  - Background : HRS is currently comprised of 5 subsamples: the Health and Retirement Study (HRS), the Asset and Health Dynamics Among the Oldest Old (AHEAD), War Baby (WB), Children of Depression Era (CODA), and Early Baby Boomer (EBB)
  - Dates collected : **HRS:** 1992, 1994, 1996, merged with AHEAD in 1998, 2000, 2002, 2004, 2006 in progress, 2008 and 2010 planned  
**AHEAD:** 1993, 1995, merged with HRS in 1998  
**WB:** 1998, 2000, 2002, 2004, 2006 in progress, 2008 and 2010 planned  
**CODA:** 1998, 2000, 2002, 2004, 2006 in progress, 2008 and 2010 planned  
**EBB:** 2004, 2006 in progress, 2008 and 2010 planned
  - # of waves : 7 waves, Wave 8 in progress, Waves 9 and 10 are being planned
- A Sample**
- Target population : **HRS:** All individuals who were born between 1931 and 1941, who were household residents in the coterminous U.S. in the spring of 1992, and their current/former spouse or partner were first interviewed in 1992 and every two years thereafter  
**AHEAD:** All individuals who were born in 1923 or earlier, who were household residents of the coterminous U.S. in the spring of 1992, and were still residents at the time of their first interview in 1993 or 1994, and their current/former spouse or partner were interviewed in 1993-1994, 1995-1996, 1998, and every two years thereafter  
**WB:** All individuals born between 1942 and 1947, who were household residents in the coterminous U.S. in the spring of 1992 and did not have a current spouse/partner born before 1942 or between 1931 and 1941, and were still household residents in the coterminous U.S. when they were first interviewed in 1998 and their current/former spouse or partner were first interviewed in 1998 and every two years thereafter  
**CODA:** All individuals born between 1924 and 1930, who were household residents in the coterminous U.S. when they were first interviewed in 1998, and their current/former spouse or partner were first interviewed in 1998 and every two years thereafter  
**EBB:** All individuals born between 1948 and 1953, who were household residents in the coterminous U.S. in 2004 and did not have a current spouse or partner born before 1948, and their current/former spouse or partner were interviewed in 2004 and every two years thereafter  
(Servais, 2004: p. 22)  
In the beginning, all HRS, AHEAD, CODA, EBB, and WB samples are non-institutionalized individuals, but these individuals are followed into institutions
  - Sample design : Multistage area probability sample
  - Primary sampling unit : U.S. metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs) and non-MSAs counties
  - Achieved N : Although HRS and AHEAD were merged in 1998, documentation collects information on number of interviews, attrition with follow-up separately. This summary document follows the format of the documentation

- HRS - Wave 1: 12,654 individuals interviewed out of 15,497 eligible individuals  
HRS - Wave 2: 11,597 individuals interviewed out of 13,010 eligible individuals  
HRS - Wave 3: 11,199 individuals interviewed out of 12,974 eligible individuals  
HRS - Wave 4: 10,856 individuals interviewed out of 12,788 eligible individuals  
HRS - Wave 5: 10,377 individuals interviewed out of 12,351 eligible individuals  
HRS - Wave 6: 10,142 individuals interviewed out of 11,942 eligible individuals  
HRS - Wave 7: 9,759 individuals interviewed out of 11,315 eligible individuals  
AHEAD - Wave 1: 8,222 individuals interviewed out of 10,229 eligible individuals  
AHEAD - Wave 2: 7,802 individuals interviewed out of 8,405 eligible individuals  
AHEAD - Wave 3: 6,935 individuals interviewed out of 7,675 eligible individuals  
AHEAD - Wave 4: 5,909 individuals interviewed out of 6,681 eligible individuals  
AHEAD - Wave 5: 5,004 individuals interviewed out of 5,690 eligible individuals  
AHEAD - Wave 6: 4,438 individuals interviewed out of 4,912 eligible individuals  
CODA - Wave 1: 2,320 individuals interviewed out of 3,200 eligible individuals  
CODA - Wave 2: 2,214 individuals interviewed out of 2,404 eligible individuals  
CODA - Wave 3: 2,106 individuals interviewed out of 2,327 eligible individuals  
CODA - Wave 4: 1,970 individuals interviewed out of 2,176 eligible individuals  
WB - Wave 1: 2,529 individuals interviewed out of 3,619 eligible individuals  
WB - Wave 2: 2,432 individuals interviewed out of 2,680 eligible individuals  
WB - Wave 3: 2,419 individuals interviewed out of 2,690 eligible individuals  
WB - Wave 4: 2,324 individuals interviewed out of 2,654 eligible individuals  
EBB - Wave 1: 3,340 individuals interviewed out of 4,420 eligible individuals
- Respondents : Individuals over 50 who met the eligibility for the 5 subsamples and their spouse or partner regardless of their relationship status
  - Geographic scope : Representative of the coterminous U.S.
  - Mode of data collection : HRS: Face-to-face interview at Wave 1 and telephone interviews at Wave 2  
AHEAD: Telephone interviews for respondents younger than 80 and face-to-face interviews for respondents 80 years and older for every wave  
CODA: Face-to-face interviews at Wave 1 and telephone interviews at Wave 2  
WB: Face-to-face interviews at Wave 1 and telephone interviews at Wave 2  
EBB: Telephone interview  
Telephone interviews will be used in the collection of biomarker data
  - Special modules : Several experimental modules were collected on a wide range of topics including modules on risk aversion, asset ownership, and transfers
  - Over-sampled populations : Individuals living in areas with high representations of blacks and Hispanics and the state of Florida
  - Retrospective histories : Retrospective histories available on employment, marriage, and fertility
  - Response rates : Response rate for Wave 1 is defined as the number of interviews completed over the number of sampled members identified as eligible in the household screener or sampling frame. Response rate for follow-up surveys is defined as the number of interviews completed over the number of individuals who completed a survey in Wave 1 or had a spouse who completed a survey in Wave 1  
HRS - Wave 1: 81.7%  
HRS - Wave 2: 89.1%  
HRS - Wave 3: 86.3%  
HRS - Wave 4: 84.9%  
HRS - Wave 5: 84.0%  
HRS - Wave 6: 84.9%  
HRS - Wave 7: 86.2%  
AHEAD - Wave 1: 80.4%

AHEAD - Wave 2: 92.8%  
 AHEAD - Wave 3: 90.4%  
 AHEAD - Wave 4: 88.4%  
 AHEAD - Wave 5: 87.9%  
 AHEAD - Wave 6: 90.4%  
 CODA - Wave 1: 72.5%  
 CODA - Wave 2: 92.1%  
 CODA - Wave 3: 90.5%  
 CODA - Wave 4: 90.5%  
 WB - Wave 1: 69.9%  
 WB - Wave 2: 90.7%  
 WB - Wave 3: 89.9%  
 WB - Wave 4: 87.6%  
 EBB - Wave 1: 75.6%

**B Type of information gathered for inter/intragenerational relationships**

- Multi-generational : Collects information on respondent, respondent's children, and respondent's grand-children
- Co-residential & biological orientation : Sampled at the household level with an orientation toward co-residential relationships, however, it also collects information on biological relationships including non-resident children

**II. CONTENT**

**A Main focus**

- : Individuals eligible in the HRS, AHEAD, WB, CODA, or EBB subsamples (respondent)
- Mode of reporting : Self report and proxy reports if deceased
- Socio-demographic data : Race/ethnicity, age, date of birth, sex, sexual orientation (same sex couple flag), country of birth, religious preference
- Education : Highest level of education completed, whether respondent received a high school diploma and/or college degree, on-the-job training
- Family background : Whether respondent's parents have always lived together
- Marital history : Marital status at each wave, marital history includes information on start and end date of current marriage, number of times married
- Fertility history : Number of biological, step, and adopted children
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Employment status at each wave, employment history includes information on start and end date of job, job characteristics such as industry and job title, retirement status, date of retirement
- Assets/earnings : Self-rated financial situation, homeownership, value of home, value of other assets, amount of debt, individual retirement accounts, total family income in the past 12 months
- Health : Self-rated health, health at each wave compared to health two years prior to the interview, self-rated emotional health, health problems such as hypertension, high blood sugar, diabetes, and cancer, hospitalization, smoking, alcohol use, vital capacity measured by health professional

**B Secondary focus**

- : Respondent's child
- Mode of reporting : Proxy reports by respondent
- Socio-demographic data : Sex, age, year of death if deceased
- Education : Enrollment in school at select waves, highest level of education completed
- Marital history : Current marital status if the child is over 18
- Fertility history : Whether respondent's child has any children, number of children who are under 18 living with respondent's child at each wave
- Labor force participation/ : Employment status at each wave, full-time or part-time status at each wave

- employment/occupation
- Assets/earnings : Homeownership, annual family income at each wave
- C Other focus** : Respondent's parent
- Mode of reporting : Proxy reports by respondent
- Socio-demographic data : Whether mother/father is still living, age, age at death if deceased, year of death if deceased
- Marital history : Marital status at each wave, whether parent is married to respondent's other parent at the time of the interview
- Assets/earnings : Respondent rates the financial health of his/her parents, homeownership
- Health : Whether parent was afflicted with illness for 3 months or more in the previous year or during the year prior to their death, whether parent is living in a nursing home, disability in performing daily activities, whether respondent's parent can be left alone for more than an hour
- D Other focus** : Respondent's sibling
- Participant in survey : Proxy reports by respondent
- Socio-demographic data : Sex
- Education : Highest level of education completed
- Marital history : Marital status at each wave
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Employment status at each wave, full-time or part-time status at each wave
- Assets/earnings : Homeownership, respondent rated financial situation

### III. INFORMATION ON INTER/INTRA-GENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

#### A Intergenerational transfers

- Financial transfers : Whether respondent or respondent's sibling gave/received financial assistance to/from parents in the past 12 months, amount of financial assistance that respondent or sibling gave to/received from parent in the past 12 months, whether respondent gave/received financial assistance to/from child in the past 12 months, amount of financial assistance received/given
- Time/caregiving : Whether respondent spent a total of 50 hours or more in the past 12 months helping his/her parent with basic personal activities like dressing, eating, bathing, and chores, number of hours respondent spent giving assistance to their parents in the past 12 months, whether respondent spent a total of 100 hours or more in the past 12 months taking care of grandchildren, amount of time spent taking care of grandchildren in the past 12 months
- Co-residence between adult children and parent : Whether respondent or respondent's sibling is living with his/her parents at each wave, whether respondent is living with his/her child at each wave, year and month respondent's parent/child moved in with respondent
- Proximity : Whether respondent's parent/child lives within 10 miles of respondent at each wave, state where parent/child lives at each wave
- Social contact : Frequency of contact between respondent and his/her parent/child in the past 12 months either in person, via phone, or e-mail (more than once, once a week, once a month, almost never)

#### B General questions on transfers

- Financial transfers : Whether respondent or respondent gave/received financial assistance to/from friends or relatives other than parents or children in the past 12 months, amount of assistance given/received
- Proximity : Number of relatives that live in the same neighborhood as respondent at each wave
- Social contact : Frequency of contact between respondent and his/her family or friends in the past 12 months either in person, via phone, or e-mail (more than once, once a week, once a month, almost never)

- Quality of ties : Respondent rates the quality of their ties with their current spouse or partner, frequency of criticism from respondent's spouse or partner, number of close friends, number of close co-workers in the Social Support Experimental Module
- Expectations/obligations : Number of people respondent can count on for help or advice, identification of people respondent can resort to for help or advice in the Social Support Experimental Module

**C Transfers to/from organizations**  
**Charitable organizations**

- Time/caregiving : Whether respondent volunteered in religious or charitable organizations in the past 12 months, amount of time spent volunteering in these charitable organizations

**IV. GENERAL ATTITUDES ON FAMILY**

- Parenting : Respondent rates the importance of providing financial support to their children when they start their own financial households, leave an estate for their children, make sure that their children have a good education
- Norms/culture :

**V. SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FILES**

- List of supplemental files : Possible linkage with files from Social Security Administration  
 Biomarker data will be collected in the future

**VI. FUNDING AGENCIES**

- : National Institute of Aging, with supplemental funding from the Social Security Administration, the Department of Labor's Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, the Department of Health and Human Services Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, and the State of Florida

## INDONESIAN FAMILY LIFE SURVEY (IFLS)

<b>WEBSITE</b>	:	<a href="http://www.rand.org/labor/FLS/IFLS/">http://www.rand.org/labor/FLS/IFLS/</a>
<b>I. DESIGN</b>		
- Data type	:	Longitudinal Survey on Foreign Populations
- Dates collected	:	Wave 1: August -November 1993 Wave 2: August 1997-January 1998 Wave 2+: August - November 1998 Wave 3: 2000 Wave 4 planned for November 2007-May 2008
- # of waves	:	4 waves, 5th wave planned for 2007
<b>A Sample</b>		
- Target population	:	Randomly selected households in 321 enumeration areas in 13 Indonesian provinces at time of baseline in 1993. Representative of 83% of population.
- Sample design	:	Includes a household sample and a community/facility sample. The baseline household sample is a stratified random sample of 7,731 households in 13 Indonesian provinces. The community/facility sample is based on the availability of public and private health facilities and schools that respondents identify as being available to them.
- Primary sampling unit	:	Wave 1, 2, 3: 13 Indonesian provinces Wave 2+ : 25% of baseline enumeration areas selected from 7 Indonesian provinces
- Achieved N	:	Wave 1: 7,224 households and 22,000 individuals within these households; 6,385 schools and health facilities Wave 2: 7224 original households x 94% = 6,791 and 878 "split off" households in which an IFLS1 household member moved to a new location and approximately 33,000 individuals within these households Wave 2+: 2,068 households and 10,000 individuals within these households Wave 3: 10,400 households and 39,000 individuals within these households
- Source	:	<a href="http://www.rand.org/labor/FLS/IFLS/ifls3.html">http://www.rand.org/labor/FLS/IFLS/ifls3.html</a>
- Special feature	:	Multiple respondents per household
- Respondents	:	Wave 1: Household head, household head's spouse, up to 2 children of household head, and a sample of other adult household members (15-49 year olds and individuals over 50) Wave 2: All members of all households interviewed. All IFLS1 respondents who split off from the IFLS1 household are tracked and, if found, interviewed along with their new household members. In addition, all members of IFLS1 households born before 1967 are tracked and interviewed. Respondents who leave Indonesia or reside outside the 13 IFLS provinces are not followed. Wave 2+: All members of all households who were interviewed at baseline in the 80 enumeration areas selected for the 25% subsample. All household members interviewed. All split-offs followed as long as remained in an IFLS province. Wave 3: All members of all households interviewed. Same tracking rules as IFLS2 except randomly selected sample of IFLS1 household members born after 1967 who were not individually interviewed in 1993 also tracked. "Split off" households are households formed by respondents who left the households in which they were living in 1993. Source: <a href="http://www.rand.org/labor/FLS/IFLS/ifls3.html">http://www.rand.org/labor/FLS/IFLS/ifls3.html</a>

- Geographic scope : 13 Indonesian provinces
- Mode of data collection : Face-to-face interviews, physical assessments
- Over-sampled populations : Individuals between 15 and 49 and individuals over 50
- Retrospective histories : Retrospective histories on education, marriage, migration, employment, fertility and contraceptive use
- Response rates : Wave 1: 93% of those sampled  
Wave 2: 94% of Wave 1 respondents  
Wave 2+: 96% of all Wave 1 and Wave 2 households who were resident in selected enumeration areas at baseline  
Wave 3: 95% of households interviewed in Wave 1; 91% interviewed in all 3 waves

#### **B Type of information gathered for inter/intragenerational relationships**

- Multi-generational : Sample includes household head, spouse of head, head's children; and seniors are largely the parents of household head or their in-laws
- Co-residential & biological orientation : Original sample was at the household level; and therefore, focused on co-residential relationships; however, information was extensively gathered on non-resident parents and children. Also, follow-up surveys track individuals who have left the household of their family of origin and formed "split-off" families

## **II. CONTENT**

- ### **A Main focus** : Adult respondents age 15 years and older complete detailed individual interviews
- Mode of reporting : Self reports, proxy reports, and physical health assessments
  - Socio-demographic data : Age, sex
  - Education : Ever attended school, current enrollment in school, highest grade completed/attended, educational histories, standardized test scores
  - Cognitive ability : Cognitive assessments
  - Family background : Whether respondent lived with his biological mother/father prior to the age of 15
  - Marital history : Current marital status, marital history includes information on the start and end date of each marriage up to the 7th marriage
  - Fertility history : Pregnancy history includes information on number of biological children, sex of each child, number of miscarriages for women less than 50, date of birth, date of miscarriage, prenatal care, birthweight, size at birth for recent pregnancies
  - Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Employment status in the last 12 months, description of last job, description of current job, partial employment history for the past 5 years, current occupation. (See below)
  - Assets/earnings : List of assets, total value of assets, ownership of assets within households, earnings in the last 12 months
  - Health : Lung capacity, blood pressure, height, weight, frequency of hospital visits, medical access, health insurance coverage, smoking. (See below.)
- ### **B Secondary focus** : Child 14 years and younger
- Mode of reporting : Proxy reports from parent or caregiver and physical health assessments
  - Socio-demographic data : Age, sex
  - Education : Current school enrollment, highest grade level completed, type of school (Public non-religious, Public religious, Private Islam, Private Catholic), number of grades repeated, age when child quit school, grades on standardized tests
  - Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Whether child was employed
  - Family background : Household roster available, fertility and marital history of heads and their spouses
  - Health : General health status, height, weight, head circumference, illness in the past 4 weeks, use of outpatient and inpatient services, blood pressure, hemoglobin levels, nurse assessments
- ### **C Other focus** : Parents/parents-in-law of each adult respondent
- Mode of reporting : Self report by senior respondent or proxy reports by head or head's spouse

- Socio-demographic data : Whether they are still alive, age, month and year when father/mother died
- Education : Highest level of education completed by mother/father
- Marital history : Whether biological mother and biological father are still married to each other
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current employment status, employment status prior to death if deceased, current occupation, occupation prior to death if deceased
- Assets/earnings : Homeownership, farm or business ownership
- Health : Whether parent had a chronic disease in general terms
- D Other focus** : Siblings of each adult respondent
- Mode of reporting : Proxy data by respondent if siblings are non-resident; self report if siblings are members of the interviewed household and older than 50 or between 15 and 49 in some households
  
- Socio-demographic data : Whether still alive, age, age at death if deceased, sex
- Education : Current school enrollment, enrollment in school prior to death, highest level of education completed
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current employment status, employment status prior to death if deceased, current occupation, occupation prior to death if deceased
- Assets/earnings : Homeownership, farm or business ownership
- Health : Whether the sibling had a chronic disease in general terms
- E Other focus** : Non co-resident children of each adult respondent
- Mode of reporting : Proxy reports by respondent
- Socio-demographic data : Whether still alive, age, age at death if deceased, sex
- Education : Current school enrollment, enrollment in school prior to death, highest level of education completed
- Family background : Whether child is from respondent's current marriage, age when child left respondent's household
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current employment status, employment status prior to death if deceased, current occupation, occupation prior to death if deceased
- Health : Whether the child had a chronic disease
- F Other focus** : Village leaders
- Mode of reporting : Self reports
- Socio-demographic data : Age, sex
- Education : Highest level of education completed
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Formal/informal position in the village

### III. INFORMATION ON INTER/INTRA-GENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

#### A Intergenerational transfers

- Financial transfers : Type of financial assistance provided to/received from parents and children in the past 12 months, amount of financial assistance given to/ received from parents and children in the past 12 months, whether parent bequeathed inheritance to respondent, type of inheritance bequeathed, total value of inheritances bequeathed by parent
- Time/caregiving : Whether respondent helps parents/non-resident child with chores/childcare
- Co-residence between adult children and parent : Household roster available
- Social contact : Frequency of social contact with parents in the past year or year prior to their deaths

#### B Intragenerational transfers

- Financial transfers : Type of financial assistance provided to/received from siblings (money or loan, tuition, health care cost) in the past 12 months, amount of assistance provided to/received from siblings by type of assistance in the past 12 months
- Time/caregiving : Whether siblings provided assistance with childcare, physical care, household chores

- Co-residence between respondent and sibling : Household roster available
- Proximity : Distance between respondent's place of residence and respondent's siblings place of residence (same village, same province, same country)
- Social contact : Number of times respondent visited sibling in the previous year or the year prior to the sibling's death

**C General questions on transfers**

- Financial transfers : Financial assistance provided to family members, friends or neighbors, employers in the past 12 months, amount of financial assistance
- Time/caregiving :
- Co-residence : Household roster available

**IV. GENERAL ATTITUDES ON THE FAMILY**

- Division of labor within family :
- Parenting :
- Family function :
- Norms on fertility : Ideal number of children
- Norms/culture : Expert in tradition law (Adat) fills out extensive questionnaires about traditional laws on family norms

**V. SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FILES**

- List of supplemental files : Physical health assessments collected by nurses to measure lung capacity, blood pressure, hemoglobin levels, mobility, and anthropomorphy, community survey includes information on community level characteristics and facilities in the communities such as schools or health facilities

**VI. FUNDING AGENCIES**

- : National Institute on Aging (NIA)
- : National Institute for Child Health and Human Development (NICHD)
- : United States Agency for International Development (USAID)
- : World Health Organization (WHO)
- : John Snow (OMNI project)
- : Hewlett Foundation
- : Futures Group (the POLICY project)
- : International Food Policy Research Institute
- : United Nations Population Fund
- : World Bank
- : Ford Foundation

**VII. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS**

- Health of main focus : Morbidities suffered in the last month, price of services, types of services, activities of daily living, psycho-social health
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Retrospective history of occupations
- Assets/earnings : Earnings from each secondary job, benefits
- Economic shocks : Whether there were any economic/demographic "shocks" such as loss of crops, householder's death, unemployment, drop in prices, amount of money necessary to overcome the shock
- Dowry : Value of assets brought to marriage, dowry/bride price, relative social standing of husbands and wives at marriage
- Consumption : Consumption and expenditure on roughly 35 items
- Migration : Birthplace; complete migration history from age 12
- Time/caregiving : Advice on birth control from a family member or friend
- Decision making processes : Decision making process on things like parenting and household functions

## INTERGENERATIONAL PANEL STUDY OF PARENTS AND CHILDREN

**WEBSITE** : [http://nichd.nih.gov/cpr/dbs/res\\_intergen.htm#socio](http://nichd.nih.gov/cpr/dbs/res_intergen.htm#socio)

### I. DESIGN

- Data type : Longitudinal Survey on US Populations
- Dates collected : Mother only - Wave 1: Winter 1962, Wave 2: Fall 1962, Wave 3: 1963, Wave 4: 1966, Wave 5: 1977  
Mother and child - Wave 6: 1980, Wave 7: 1985, Wave 8: 1993
- # of waves : 8 waves

#### A Sample

- Target population : Detroit-area Caucasian families who had given birth to their first, second, or fourth child in 1961
- Sample design : Probability sample
- Primary sampling unit : Detroit based area
- Achieved N : Wave 1: 1,304 mothers  
Wave 6: 916 mother-child pairs
- Respondents : Children born in 1961 and their mothers
- Geographic scope : Detroit area
- Mode of data collection : Wave 1: In-person interviews with mothers  
Wave 2 to Wave 8: Telephone interviews
- Retrospective histories : Retrospective histories on marriage, cohabitation, separation, divorce, childbearing, living arrangements, paid employment, education, and military service
- Response rates : Response rate is defined as the % of base-year mothers that remained eligible (i.e., mothers who did not die or become permanently ill)  
Response rate is 85.9%  
(Thornton & Freedman, 1998: Table A.1)

#### B Type of information gathered for inter/intragenerational relationships

- Multi-generational : Mother-child pairs
- Co-residential & biological orientation : Sampled on biological relationship. It includes information on co-residential relationships such as adopted children, step children

### II. CONTENT

#### A Main focus

- Mode of reporting : Children born in 1961 (Target child)  
Proxy reports by mothers until 1980 and self reports starting in 1980
- Socio-demographic data : Sex, age
- Education : School enrollment at each wave, high school diploma, college diploma, educational attainment summaries, monthly retrospective school attendance histories from ages 15-31
- Family background : Asks whether target child's mother and father are living together at the time of the survey, asks whether target child lived with both parents at 15, monthly retrospective living arrangement histories from ages 15-31
- Marital history : Current marital status, current cohabitation status, monthly retrospective marital and cohabiting relationship histories from ages 15-31
- Fertility history : Fertility histories including information on age at first intercourse, number of pregnancies, number of wanted pregnancies, number of unwanted pregnancies, fetal deaths; gender and dates of all births that occurred for all target children (regardless of their gender) between the ages of 15 and 31
- Labor force participation/ : Employment and occupational status at each interview, job characteristics including

employment/occupation	information on whether target child performs supervisory duties, monthly retrospective work hour histories from ages 15-31, monthly retrospective military service histories from ages 15-31
- Assets/earnings	: Assets, income
- Health	: Self rated health, illness, health complication at birth as reported by mother, congenital diseases, mental illness, tests on emotional well being
<b>B Secondary focus</b>	: Mother of target child
- Mode of reporting	: Self reports by mothers and proxy reports by target child after 1980
- Socio-demographic data	: Age, date of birth, date of mother's death if mother is deceased
- Education	: Highest level of education completed
- Marital history	: Marital status at each wave, asks whether mothers were ever married, retrospective marital and cohabitation histories at Wave 8
- Fertility history	: Fertility histories including date of birth of each child, number of children, timing, wantedness of target child, future child-bearing intentions and preferences
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation	: Current employment, current occupation, last occupation, work histories between births, future work plans
- Assets/earnings	: Total family income, home ownership, automobile ownership, other types of assets held
- Health	: Self rated health
<b>C Other focus</b>	: Mother's spouse (possibly father of target child) at the time of interview
- Mode of reporting	: Proxy report by mother on co-resident husbands
- Socio-demographic data	: Age
- Education	: Highest level of education completed
- Marital history	: Marital status at each wave
- Fertility history	: Number of children including children born with a partner other than mother
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation	: Current employment status, main occupation
- Assets/earnings	: Relative size of mother's and spouse's income
- Health	:
<b>D Other focus</b>	: Siblings of target child
- Mode of reporting	: Proxy reports by mother
- Socio-demographic data	: Sex, date of birth
- Education	: School enrollment at each wave, high school diploma, college diploma
- Marital history	: Marital status at each wave, asks whether sibling of target child has ever been married, widowed, divorced, or separated, date of 1st marriage, widowhood, separation, cohabitation
- Fertility history	: Asks whether sibling of target child has ever had children, number of children, date of birth of first child
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation	: Employment status at later waves

### III. INFORMATION ON INTER/INTRA-GENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

#### A Intergenerational transfers

- |                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| - Financial transfers | : Asks whether mother contributed financially to child when they were living in target child's home. Asks whether children contributed financially to mother when target child was living in mother's home, retrospective target child reported yearly parental financial assistance. Asks target child to report the amount of financial assistance that they provided their parents between the ages of 15 and 23. Retrospective mother reported total financial help given to child. Asks mothers to report the amount of financial assistance that they gave the target child when the target child was between the ages of 23 and 31. Asks target child to report whether they gave parents financial help between 1985 and 1993 |
|-----------------------|---|

- Time/caregiving : Asks target child to list whether they received/gave non-financial help from/to parents in past year in interview conducted in 1993
- Co-residence between adult children and parent : Reports whether target child lives with his/her parents or in-laws, monthly co-residence histories from ages 15-31
- Proximity : Reports whether parents live in the same neighborhood as target child  
Reports whether parents live within a 30-minute ride from target child
- Social contact : Frequency of contact between parent and target child including number of visits, contact by phone
- Expectations/obligations : Target child rates his/her parent's desire for target child to have children, marry, go to college; Mother rates her desire for target child to have children, marry, go to college

**B Intra-generational transfers**

- Social contact :

**C General questions on transfers**

- Financial transfers : Mother and child report whether they received/gave financial assistance from/to relatives, amount of money received/given
- Time/caregiving : Mother and child report which relative helped out with childcare
- Co-residence : Household roster information allows one to ascertain who is in residence  
Reports on whether target child's children are living with relatives

**IV. GENERAL ATTITUDES ON THE FAMILY**

- Division of labor within family : Mother reports whether target child views being a parent and working as conflictive roles, target child reports whether he/she views being a parent and working as conflictive, mother and target child sex-role attitudes
- Parenting :
- Family function : Asks questions on the importance of family structure, asks whether grown children should live with their aging parents
- Norms on fertility : Asks whether married couples ought to have children, attitudes about ideal family size
- Norms/culture :

**V. SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FILES**

- List of supplemental files :

**VI. FUNDING AGENCIES** : National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD)

**VII. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS**

- Cognitive ability : Intelligence
- List of supplemental files : Mother's gregariousness in 1962, 1977; extent of target child's social life in 1980 and 1985

## LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF GENERATIONS (LSOG)

**WEBSITE** : <http://www.usc.edu/dept/gero/research/4gen/index.htm>

### I. DESIGN

- Data type : Longitudinal Survey on the US Elderly Population
- Dates collected : 1971, 1985, 1988, 1991, 1994, 1997, 2001
- Source : <http://www.usc.edu/dept/gero/research/4gen/index.htm>
- # of Waves : 7 waves

#### A Sample

- Target population : 349 three- and four-generation California families: grandparents, parents, adolescents and post-adolescent grandchildren (16+), and great-grandchildren in 1991
- Sample design : Random sample of families in which a grandfather over 60 was a member of an HMO
- Sampling frame : List of members of a California health maintenance organization with 840,000 subscribers. From this list, researchers identified men over 60. They mailed self-administered surveys to determine whether the men had grandchildren between 16 and 26 and determined their eligibility for the sample
- Achieved N : Baseline: 516 grandparents, 701 parents, 827 grandchildren
- Respondents : Grandparents, middle aged parents, and grandchildren between the ages of 16 and 26 in 1971. In 1991, great-grandchildren aged 16 and older were added
- Geographic scope : Five county region of southern California, including greater Los Angeles
- Mode of data collection : Predominantly self-administered questionnaires, but also personal interviews and telephone interviews
- Over-sampled populations : None
- Retrospective histories : Partial retrospective history on marriage, employment, and fertility
- Response rates : Baseline: 65% of sampled individuals participated, Wave 2: 65%, Wave 3: 73%, Wave 4: 74%, Wave 5: 74%, Wave 6: 74% (Bengtson, Biblarz, & Roberts, 2002). Response rates for the follow-ups only included those that did not die and did not become mentally or physically incapacitated

#### B Type of information gathered for inter/intragenerational relationships

- Multi-generational : LSOG was sampled to include grandparents, parents, adolescent grandchildren, and subsequently great-grandchildren
- Co-residential & biological orientation : Originally sampled with an orientation toward biological relationships. Participation did not depend on co-residential relationships. Select waves also sampled stepchildren and step parents and questions ask about step relations.

### II. CONTENT

- #### A Main focus
- Relationships among great-grandparents, grandparents, parents, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren
  - Mode of reporting : Self reports
  - Socio-demographic data : Race/ethnicity, sex, age, date of birth
  - Education : Enrollment in school at the time of the interview, highest level of education completed
  - Family background : Respondent's age when parents divorced, identification of parent who had custody of the respondent, whether the custody arrangements changed over time
  - Marital history : Current marital status, partial marital history includes start and end date of first marriage, date of separation
  - Fertility history : Number of biological, adopted, step children
  - Labor force participation/ : Employment at the time of the interview, full-time and part-time status, number of years

employment/occupation	one worked in the same job, employment history includes information on date of retirement, occupation at the time of interview and SEI of occupation at the time of the interview
- Assets/earnings	: Self rated financial health, personal and total household income in the past 12 months
- Health	: Self rated health, whether respondent needs medical care, chronic illness, emotional illness, health problems in last few years, mental health; functional health (older generations only)
<b>B Secondary focus</b>	: Parent
- Mode of reporting	: Proxy reports from middle generation and adolescent grandchildren on their own parents
- Age	: Whether their parents are alive, age, age at death if deceased
- Education	: Highest level of education completed by parents and parents in-law
- Marital history	: Whether respondent's parents are living together, whether they are legally married to each other, marital history including date of parental divorce
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation	: Father's employment status at the time of interview, father's occupation when respondent was 16
- Health	: Whether parent has chronic illness
<b>C Other focus</b>	: Child
- Mode of reporting	: Grandparent provides proxy reports on middle generation, parent provides proxy reports on children in the generation of adolescent children
- Socio-demographic data	: Sex, age at death, date of birth
- Marital history	: Whether child is currently married
<b>D Other focus</b>	: Spouse
- Mode of reporting on siblings	: Proxy report by respondent
- Socio-demographic data	: Date of birth
- Education	: Whether respondent was enrolled in school, highest level of education completed
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation	: Employment status, type of occupation at the time of the interview, number of hours worked in this job
- Asset/earnings	:
- Health	: Chronic illness experienced by spouse

### III. INFORMATION ON INTER/INTRA-GENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

<b>A Intergenerational transfers</b>	
- Financial transfers	: Whether respondent received inheritance from parents, financial help provided to/received from parents
- Time/caregiving	: Whether respondent ever raised grandchildren, date when respondent raised grandchildren, age of grandchildren when respondent provided help, whether respondent provided care for their mother/father, duration of their caregiving activities, type and amount of caregiving
- Co-residence between adult children and parent	: Date when respondent moved out of his/her parents home, whether they provided housing to parents, identification of individuals that reside in the same household as respondent
- Proximity	Distance between respondent's place of residence and parent's/children's/grand children's place of residence (less than 5 miles, 5-50 miles, 51-150 miles)
- Social contact	: Frequency of contact between respondents and great-grandparent/grandparent/parent/child/grandchild in the past year either in person, via mail, and via telephone (daily or more often, once a week, not at all)
- Quality of ties	: Respondent rates the closeness they feel towards their parent (very close, not too close), respondent is asked how much conflict, tension, and disagreement respondent feels towards great-grandparent/grandparent/parent/child (none at all, some, pretty much, quite a bit, a great deal), whether relationship with mother/father has changed

substantially over time

**B Intra-generational transfers**

- Financial transfers : Whether respondent gave/received financial assistance to/from siblings
- Time/caregiving : Whether respondent gave/received personal care assistance to/from siblings, whether respondent gave/received help with childcare or household chores to/from siblings
- Co-residence between adult siblings : Asks individuals to identify the individual who resides with respondent (sibling)
- Proximity : Distance between respondent's place of residence and sibling's place of residence (less than 5 miles, 5-50 miles, 51-150 miles)
- Social contact : Frequency of social contact with siblings in the past year either in person, via e-mail, via telephone
- Quality of ties : Respondent rates the closeness s/he feel towards his/her sibling (very close, not too close)

**C General questions on transfers**

- Financial transfers : Whether respondent received/gave financial assistance from/to relatives or friends
- Time/caregiving : Whether respondent received/gave help with childcare from/to relatives or friends, whether respondent received/gave assistance with personal care/household chores from/to friends/relatives, identification of relative who gave/received help
- Co-residence : Household roster available to provide information on who resides with respondent
- Proximity : Proximity of respondent's place of residence to relatives or friends in the past year
- Social contact : Whether respondent received emotional support from relatives or friends either in person, via telephone, or via mail

**D Transfers to individuals/organizations****Charities**

- Time/caregiving : Whether respondent volunteered in charitable organizations, number of hours spent doing volunteer work, type of organizations where respondent performed volunteer work

**IV. GENERAL ATTITUDES ON THE FAMILY**

- Division of labor within family : Attitudes on equality among wife and husband, division of labor within family
- Parenting : Asks whether children should be allowed to talk back to parents, punishment, children's activities
- Family function : Importance of family life, asks whether marriage should be viewed as an extension of extended families, women and work, asks whether respondent feels that adult children have the responsibility to take care of their elderly parents
- Norms/culture : Women and work

**V. SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FILES**

- List of supplemental files

**VI. FUNDING AGENCIES** : National Institute of Aging (Waves 2-8), NIMH (Wave 1)**VII. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS**

- Dates collected : 2005
  - Number of waves : 8 waves
  - List of supplemental files : Qualitative data on caregiving families
  - Marital ties : Marital closeness, satisfaction, and conflict
  - Salience : Values rankings of collectivism, individualism, humanitarianism
-

## LUXEMBOURG INCOME SURVEY (LIS)

### WEBSITE

<http://www.lisproject.org/>

### I. DESIGN

- Data type : Cross-sectional Survey on Foreign Populations
- Dates collected : Australia: 1981, 1985, 1989, 1994, 1995, 2001/2003  
Austria : 1987, 1994, 1995, 1997, 2000  
Belgium : 1985, 1988, 1992, 1995, 1997, 2000  
Canada : 1971, 1975, 1981, 1987, 1991, 1994, 1997, 1998, 2000  
Czech Republic: 1992, 1996  
Denmark: 1987, 1992, 1995, 2000, 2004  
Estonia: 2000, 2005  
Finland: 1987, 1991, 1995, 2000, 2005  
France: 1979, 1981, 1984, 1989, 1994, 2000  
Germany: 1973, 1978, 1981, 1983, 1984, 1989, 1994, 2000, 2005  
Greece : 1995, 2000  
Hungary: 1991, 1994, 1999, 2005  
Ireland: 1984, 1994, 1995, 1996, 2000  
Israel: 1979, 1986, 1992, 1997, 2001  
Italy: 1986, 1987, 1989, 1991, 1993, 1995, 1998, 2000, 2002, 2004  
Luxembourg: 1985, 1991, 1994, 1997, 2000  
Mexico: 1984, 1989, 1992, 1994, 1996, 1998, 2000, 2002, 2004  
Netherlands: 1983, 1986, 1987, 1991, 1994, 1999  
Norway: 1979, 1986, 1991, 1995, 2000, 2004  
Poland: 1986, 1992, 1996, 1999  
Romania: 1995, 1997  
Russia: 1992, 1995, 2000  
Slovak: 1992, 1996, 2005  
Slovenia: 1997, 1999  
Spain: 1980, 1990, 1995, 2000, 2005  
Sweden: 1967, 1975, 1981, 1987, 1992, 1995, 2000  
Switzerland: 1982, 1992, 2000, 2002, 2004  
Taiwan: 1981, 1986, 1991, 1995, 1997, 2000  
United Kingdom: 1969, 1974, 1979, 1986, 1991, 1994, 1995, 1999, 2005  
United States: 1969, 1974, 1979, 1986, 1991, 1994, 1997, 2000
- # of waves : 5 cross-sections, 6th cross-section in progress  
Cross-sectional surveys collected around 1980 in various countries are pooled together to create the Wave 1 survey. Cross-sectional surveys collected around 1985 in various countries are pooled together to create the Wave 2 survey. Cross-sectional surveys collected around 1990 are pooled together to create the Wave 3 survey. Cross-sectional surveys collected around 1995 in various countries are pooled to create the Wave 4 survey. Cross sectional surveys collected around 2000 in various countries are pooled together to create the Wave 5 survey.
- A Sample** : The different datasets pooled in the Luxembourg Income Study are collected by the Central Statistical Offices of the countries listed above. Each dataset has a different mode of data collection and a different sampling scheme.

- Target population : National population
- Sample design : Varies by dataset
- Primary sampling unit :
- Achieved N :
- Respondents :
- Geographic scope :
- Mode of data collection :
- Over-sampled populations :
- Retrospective histories :
- Response rates :

**B Type of information gathered for inter/intragenerational relationships**

- Multi-generational : Collects information on household head, head's spouse, and head's children
- Orientation toward co-residential & biological relationships : Collects information at the household and individual level. The survey focuses on co-residential relationships.

**II. CONTENT**

**A Main focus**

- : Household head
- Mode of reporting : Varies by dataset
- Socio-demographic data : Ethnicity, nationality, age, sex, immigrant status
- Education : Education level, occupational training
- Family background :
- Marital history : Current marital status
- Fertility history : Number of children under 18, age of youngest child
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current labor force and employment status, current occupation, job characteristics such as industry, type of worker, weeks worked full time, weeks worked part time, weeks unemployed, hours worked per week
- Assets/earnings : Market value of residence, total household income, extensive information on amount of income by source such as salary, interests, dividends, rental income, royalties. A separate project (Luxembourg Wealth Study) has rich information on assets but less on demographics.
- Health : Disability status

**B Secondary focus**

- : Household head's spouse or cohabiting partner, including in some countries same sex partners
- Mode of reporting : Varies by dataset
- Socio-demographic data : Ethnicity, nationality, age, sex, immigrant status
- Education : Education level, occupational training
- Family background :
- Marital history : Current marital status
- Fertility history :
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current labor force and employment status, current occupation, job characteristics such as industry, type of worker, weeks worked full time, weeks worked part time, weeks unemployed, hours worked per week
- Assets/earnings : Market value of residence, total household income, extensive information on amount of income by source such as salary, interests, dividends, rental income, royalties
- Health : Disability status

**C Other focus**

- : Children present in household
- Socio-demographic data : Age, sex
- Family background : Relationship to household head, family structure as reported by household head, number of children in the household who are under 18 years of age

**III. INFORMATION ON INTER/INTRA-GENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS**

**A Intergenerational transfers**

- Financial transfers : Whether respondent pays/receives child support, amount of child support given/received
- Time/caregiving :
- Co-residence between adult children and parent : Is included in most cases or can be deduced from person-level files.
- Social contact :

**B Intragenerational transfers**

- Financial transfers :
- Time/caregiving :
- Co-residence between siblings :
- Social contact :

**C General questions on transfers**

- Financial transfers : Amount of transfers received from/given to relatives
- Time/caregiving :
- Co-residence :
- Proximity :

**D Government**

- Financial transfers : Amount of cash transfers received from government programs such as social retirement benefits, child and family allowances, unemployment compensation, maternity/nursing allowances, single parent allowances, near cash benefits for food, housing, heating, and medical expenditures, old age assistance, social security income, invalid care premium

**IV. GENERAL ATTITUDES ON THE FAMILY**

- Division of labor within family :
- Parenting :
- Family function :
- Norms on fertility :

**V. FUNDING AGENCIES**

- : National Science Foundations of member countries
- : Social Science Foundations of member countries

## MEXICAN AMERICAN STUDY PROJECT (MASP)\*

- WEBSITE** : <http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/issr/masp/>
- I. DESIGN**
- Data type : Longitudinal Survey on U.S. Populations
  - Dates collected : Wave 1: 1965-1966, Wave 2: 1997-2000
  - # of waves : 2 waves
- A Sample**
- Target population : Mexican Americans in Los Angeles and San Antonio
  - Sample design : Multistage stratified sampling of individuals that self identified as Mexican American/ Spanish or had a Spanish surname
  - Primary sampling unit : Census tracts in 1960
  - Achieved N : 973 households in Los Angeles and 603 households in San Antonio
  - Respondents : In Wave 1, household heads or spouses of household head who identified either as Mexican American or Spanish  
In Wave 2, the original respondents who were between 18 to 50 years of age and 2 randomly selected adult children of original respondents who were 0 to 18 in 1965
  - Geographic scope : Los Angeles and San Antonio
  - Mode of data collection : Face-to-face interviews
  - Over-sampled populations :
  - Retrospective histories : Includes partial retrospective histories on employment
  - Response rates : In the follow-up survey, 79% of the original respondents were tracked
- B Type of information gathered for inter/intragenerational relationships**
- Multi-generational : In the Wave 1 survey, respondent provided proxy reports on their children and parents. In Wave 2, self reports are available for the original respondent and two biological children.
  - Co-residential & biological orientation : Interviews were conducted with the household head or the spouse of the household head. The respondent provided proxy reports on all household members and all children including non-resident children. In Wave 2, in addition to the original respondent who was 50 years and younger in Wave 1, two biological children were also sampled in the survey. The survey has an orientation toward co-residential and biological relationships.
- II. CONTENT**
- A Main focus** : Household head or spouse of household head in 1965 interviewed alternatively for men and women who are household heads and/or spouses of household heads  
The information reported below refers exclusively to the self reports in Wave 1
- Mode of reporting : Self reports
  - Socio-demographic data : Self identified ethnicity (Mexican American, Spanish speaking, Latin Americans, Mexicans), sex, age
  - Education : Highest grade completed, on-the-job training, type of school attended (Public, Catholic, or Private school) for elementary, middle, and high school
  - Marital history : Current marital status
  - Fertility history : Number of biological, non-resident, and co-resident children, number of times pregnant if the respondent is a female respondent
  - Labor force participation/ employment/occupation : Current employment status of household head, duration of current job, current occupation, partial employment histories
  - Assets/earnings : Homeownership, savings, total debt, total monthly payment due to debt, total family income, hourly wage rate

- Health : Whether the respondent experienced an illness and accidents in the previous 4 weeks, chronic health conditions, health insurance, medication
- B Secondary focus** : Children
- Mode of reporting : Proxy reports on all children in Wave 1 and 2, self reports for 2 randomly selected biological children in Wave 2. The information below is based exclusively on the proxy reports in Wave 1
- Socio-demographic data : Sex, age
- Education : Type of school attended (Public, Catholic, or Private) for elementary, middle, and high school
- Family background :
- Marital history : Current marital status
- Fertility history :
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Occupation in 1968
- Health :
- C Other focus** : Main respondents' parents. The information below is based exclusively on the proxy reports in Wave 1
- Mode of reporting : Proxy reports
- Socio-demographic data : Sex, age
- Education : Highest level of education completed
- Family background :
- Marital history :
- Fertility history :
- Occupation : Father's occupation
- D Other focus** : Household head provided information on the sex, age, marital status, current occupation, education, and earnings contribution for all members of the household. Respondents were also asked about the occupation and place of residence of siblings and whether their parents lived with sibling

### III. INFORMATION ON INTER/INTRA-GENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

#### A Intergenerational transfer

- Financial transfers :
- Time/caregiving :
- Co-residence between adult children and parent : Household roster available
- Proximity : Respondent report on the city, state, and country where their parents live
- Social contact :
- Quality of ties :

#### B Intragenerational transfers

- Financial transfers :
- Time/caregiving :
- Co-residence between adult siblings :
- Proximity : Location of their sibling's place of residence
- Social contact : Frequency of social contact
- Quality of ties :

#### C General questions on transfers

- Financial transfers : Whether respondent gave/received financial help to/from relatives
- Time/caregiving : Whether respondent gave/received non-financial help to/from relatives
- Co-residence between relatives and respondent : Household roster available
- Social contact : Frequency of social contact via mail, telephone, and visitation with the relative

- Quality of ties : Identification of the relative to whom they feel the closest
- Expectations/obligations :

**D Transfers to/from other individuals/organizations**

**Government**

- Financial transfers :
- Time/caregiving :

**Charities**

- Financial transfers :
- Time/caregiving : Whether respondent sought help from priest, type of help sought from priest

**IV. GENERAL ATTITUDES ON THE FAMILY**

- Division of labor within family : Respondent rates whether it is appropriate for man/woman to manage finances, care for children, perform household chores, etc.
- Parenting : Whether the use of daycare by a mother with a 3 year old is appropriate
- Family function : Whether having children is the most important thing for a married woman
- Norms on fertility : Respondent rates the value of children, acceptance for contraception, expected number of children
- Norms/culture : Respondent predicts Mexican American status in the US in 50 years  
Strength of Mexican American families, Mexican American work ethics, and Mexican American emotionality

**V. SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FILES**

- List of supplemental files :

**VI. FUNDING AGENCIES**

- : National Institute for Child and Human Development (NICHD)
- Ford Foundation
- Rockefeller Foundation
- Russell Sage Foundation
- Haynes Foundation
- UC California Policy Seminar
- UC-Mexus
- UCLA Institute of American Cultures
- UCLA California Center for Population Research
- UCLA Office of the Chancellor
- UCLA Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research
- UCLA Office of the Chancellor for Academic Development
- UCLA Office of the Dean of Social Sciences

---

\*Documentation for wave 2 was unavailable when the information in this summary was compiled.

## MEXICAN FAMILY LIFE SURVEY (MxFLS)\*

- WEBSITE** : [www.mxfls.cide.edu](http://www.mxfls.cide.edu)
- I. DESIGN**
- Data type : Longitudinal Survey on Foreign Populations
  - Dates collected : Wave 1: August 2002-December 2002  
Wave 2: August 2005-August 2006  
Wave 3: Planned for August 2008-August 2009  
Wave 4: Planned for August 2011-August 2012
  - # of waves : 1st wave completed; 2nd wave in progress; 3rd and 4th waves planned
- A Sample**
- Target population : Nationally representative sample of individuals in 150 communities in Mexico
  - Sample design : Multistage stratified probability sample
  - Primary sampling unit : Three strata unit constructed using 14 variables from the ENEU sample frame
  - Achieved N : Wave 1: 8,440 households in 150 localities and 35,000 individuals in these households
  - Respondents : Household members 15 years and older
  - Geographic scope : Nationally representative of Mexico
  - Mode of data collection : Face-to-face interviews for all respondents in Mexico, telephone interviews with movers to U.S., cognitive assessments and health assessments
  - Special feature : Multiple respondents per household
  - Over-sampled populations :
  - Retrospective histories : Retrospective histories on education, employment, migration, marriage, consensual unions, and fertility
  - Response rates : Wave 1: 84% of sampled households were interviewed of 10,000 targeted households. Response rate of 97% for eligible households. 13% were deemed ineligible due to problems in the sampling frame. (See below.)  
Wave 2: 90% of households were interviewed. 90% of migrants to the U.S. were tracked and interviewed
- B Type of information gathered for inter/intragenerational relationships**
- Multi-generational : Collects information on respondent's parents, respondent, respondent's siblings and respondent's children
  - Co-residential & biological orientation : Sampling is based on co-residential relationships, but survey also collects information on all biological relationships including information on non-resident family members. All household members who move from the baseline household are eligible for tracking to their new household.
- II. CONTENT**
- A Main focus** : Adults 15 years and older
- Mode of reporting : Self reports, proxy reports, and physical health assessment
  - Socio-demographic data : Age, sex, current migration status, whether they have ever migrated
  - Education : Current enrollment in school, highest level of education completed, educational history including information on educational interruption, type of school attended (public, private, etc.)
  - Cognitive ability : Cognitive tests are administered to respondents between the ages of 5 and 65
  - Family background : Whether parents are alive, age of parent's death if deceased, parental education and occupation

- Marital history : Current marital and cohabiting status, marital and consensual union history
- Fertility history : Number of biological children, whether each biological child is still alive, fertility history collected for women between the ages of 15 and 49 and included information on number of stillbirths, abortions, miscarriages, age at each pregnancy, pregnancy outcome, gender of each child, age of each child
- Labor force participation/employment, occupation : Employment status in the previous week, employment history, number of hours worked in the previous week, retirement, current occupation, last occupation if currently unemployed
- Assets/earnings : Earnings in last month, partial earning history recorded separately by spouse  
: Home ownership, amount of savings, amount of debts, total family income, total family income originating from labor in the past 12 months, total family income originating from non-labor activities in the past 12 months, household economic shocks in the past 12 months such as total loss of crops, robbery, death of a household member, unemployment of a household member, or business failure
- Health : Self-rated health, self-assessed emotional well-being, illness, acute morbidity, use of health services, physical health assessments measures anthropometry, hemoglobin levels, blood pressure. (See below)
- B Secondary focus** : Child less than 15 years of age
  - Mode of reporting : Proxy reports by child's mother or caregiver
  - Socio-demographic data : Age, sex
  - Education : Current enrollment in school, whether child ever attended school, highest level of education completed, educational history
  - Cognitive skills : Cognitive achievement
  - Family background : Household roster available, marital and fertility histories collected on mother and/or female caregiver
  - Labor force participation/employment, occupation : Chores or paid labor activities performed to contribute to household expenses, number of hours worked on paid labor activities
  - Assets/earnings : Weekly earnings in the past year
  - Health : Respondent rated child's health, illness, disability, inpatient and outpatient hospital utilization, medical history, anthropometry, hemoglobin levels
- C Other focus** : Adult's parent
  - Mode of reporting : Proxy reports by adults 15 years and older
  - Socio-demographic data : Age, sex, age at death
  - Education : Highest level of education completed
  - Family background :
  - Marital history : Current marital status, marital status prior to death if deceased
  - Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current labor force and employment status, retirement, current occupation, occupation prior to death if deceased, first occupation
  - Health : Whether respondent's parent had a chronic illness, disability
- D Other focus** : Socio-demographic information (age, sex, highest level of education completed, current employment status, total family income in previous 12 months) are collected for each household member. This information is also obtained for all biological kin such as non-resident parents, non-resident siblings, and non-resident children

### III. INFORMATION ON INTER/INTRA-GENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

#### A Intergenerational transfers

- Financial transfers : Whether financial transfers were given to/received from parents and children, amount of transfers given to/received from parents and children in the past 12 months
- Time/caregiving : Amount of time giving/receiving care to/ from parents and children due to illness in the last 12 months, non-resident father's involvement in activities with the sampled children

- Co-residence between adult children and parent : Household roster, total number of non-resident children
- Proximity : Distance between place of residence after migration and place where family of origin resides

#### **B Intragenerational transfers**

- Financial transfers : Whether respondent gave/received financial transfers to/from siblings in the last 12 months, type of financial help received from siblings (help with tuition, medical costs)
- Time/caregiving : Amount of time spent giving/receiving care to/from siblings in the past 12 months
- Co-residence between siblings : Household roster

#### **C General questions on transfers**

- Financial transfers : Whether respondent gave/received financial transfers to/from others, amount of financial transfers that respondent gave to/received from relatives in the past 12 months, means of financing migration costs (own money, other household members, relatives, friends)
- Time/caregiving : Amount of time spent giving/receiving care to/from relatives in the past 12 months
- Co-residence : Household roster
- Proximity :
- Expectation/obligations : Whether respondent has someone to borrow money from (relatives, friends, known people)

#### **D Transfers from other organizations/individuals**

##### **Government**

- Financial transfers : Whether they received financial assistance from government, amount of financial assistance received from governments, whether respondent or child used public hospitals

#### **IV. GENERAL ATTITUDES ON THE FAMILY**

- Division of labor within family :
- Parenting :
- Family function :
- Norms on fertility : Ideal number of children
- Norms/culture :

#### **V. SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FILES**

- List of supplemental files : Physical health assessments collect information on anthropometry, blood pressure, hemoglobin levels, cholesterol, glucose, dry blood spots stored

#### **VI. FUNDING AGENCIES**

: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD)  
 Mexican Council for Science and Technology  
 The Ford Foundation  
 The University of California Institute for Mexico and the United States  
 Mexican Ministry of Social Development  
 Mexican Social Security Institute  
 Mexican Ministry of Health  
 DHL  
 Banamex

#### **VII. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS**

- Response rates : Of the 10,000 targeted households, 12.7% households were deemed ineligible due to problems in the sampling frame and 2.8% of households did not respond. This yielded a response rate of 96.7% of eligible households and 84.4% targeted households
- Decision making process : Who decides consumption, allocation of assets, and migration decisions
- Consumption : Consumption and expenditure on ~35 items

- Migration : Birthplace; complete migration history from age 15; people moved with for each migration
  - Time use : Time allocation of each adult respondent in economic and non-economic activities including leisure
  - Victimization/crime : Crime history experienced outside and at the household
  - Preferences : Risk taking and preferences
  - Biomarkers : Cholesterol, fasting glucose, dry blood spots (C-Reactive Protein assayed for subsample)
  - List of supplemental files :
- 

\*The User's Guide for MxFLS was unavailable when the information in this summary was compiled.

## MEXICAN HEALTH AND AGING STUDY (MHAS)

- WEBSITE** : [http://www.mhas.pop.upenn.edu/english/documents\\_avdoc.htm](http://www.mhas.pop.upenn.edu/english/documents_avdoc.htm)
- I. DESIGN**
- Data type : Longitudinal Survey on Elderly Populations in Mexico
  - Dates collected : Wave 1: 2001  
Wave 2: 2003
  - # of waves : 2 Waves
- A Sample**
- Target population : Baseline survey includes a nationally representative sample of Mexicans ages 50 and older and their spouses or partners in consensual unions
  - Sample design : Multistage stratified sample
  - Sampling frame : Households sampled for the National Survey of Employment (ENE) 2000 that were surveyed between October and December 2000
  - Achieved N : Wave 1: 15,186 individuals in 9,862 households  
Wave 2: 14,222 individuals in 9,191 households
  - Respondents : Individuals 50 years and older and their spouses or partners in consensual unions
  - Geographic scope : Mexico
  - Mode of data collection : Face-to-face interviews
  - Over-sampled populations : The six Mexican states which are the state of origin for 40% of all migrants to the U.S. were oversampled
  - Retrospective histories : Partial retrospective histories on marriage, employment, and migration
  - Response rates : Wave 1: 90% of sampled households (9,862 households were interviewed out of 10,933 sampled households)  
Wave 2: 94% of households were re-interviewed
- B Type of information gathered for inter/intragenerational relationships**
- Multi-generational : Collects information on respondent, respondent's parents, and respondent's children
  - Co-residential & biological orientation : Sampled households with an orientation toward co-residential relationships, but includes questions on biological relationships including non-resident children, siblings, and parents
- II. CONTENT**
- A Main focus** : Individuals 50 years and older and (if applicable) their spouses or partners in a consensual union
- Mode of reporting : Self reports and proxy reports if the sampled individual did not speak Spanish or was incapacitated due to health reasons
  - Socio-demographic data : Age, sex, date of birth, whether respondent had ever migrated to the US
  - Education : Highest level of education completed
  - Cognitive ability : Administration of a battery of cognitive exams such as the Verbal Delayed Memory Recall Test
  - Family background : Whether respondent lived with grandparents before 10
  - Marital history : Current marital status, partial marital history includes information on the start and end date of last marriage or last union, number of marriages, number of consensual unions
  - Fertility history : Number of live births, number of children still alive, ages of children who are alive
  - Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current employment status, current occupation, whether respondent has ever worked in the U.S., partial employment history includes information on age at first employment, end date of last job, number of years respondent has worked over lifetime, and

- Assets/earnings : years worked in main occupation  
: Self rated financial situation, home ownership, business ownership, amount of debts, total monthly earnings, pension income
- Health : Self-rated health, current health compared to health 2 years ago, illness such as hypertension, diabetes, cancer, heart problems, depression, inability to perform activities of daily living, smoking, alcohol use, medical access, medical expenses, anthropometric measures such as height, weight, waist width, hip circumference
- B Secondary focus** : Child
- Mode of reporting : Proxy report by individual over 50 or spouse/partner
- Socio-demographic data : Age, sex, relationship to head, whether they are currently living in the U.S. or had ever lived in the U.S.
- Education : Highest level of education completed
- Family background : Household roster information shows whether child's parents are living together
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Activity performed in the previous week (employment, job search, school attendance, household chores), whether each child has ever worked in the US
- Health : Current health problems, health problems before child was 10 years old
- C Other focus** : Parent
- Mode of reporting : Proxy report by individual over 50 or their spouse/partner
- Socio-demographic data : Whether parent is still alive, age, age at death if deceased, whether parent has ever lived in the U.S.
- Education : Highest level of education completed
- Marital history : Whether parent is currently married or in a union
- Fertility history : Number of respondents' siblings born alive
- Asset, earnings : Respondent rated parent's financial situation
- Health : Disability originating from health problems, whether parent can be left alone for an hour or more
- D Other focus** : Socio-demographic information (sex, age, highest level of education completed, current marital status, health, current migration status, number of children, financial situation) collected on all household members, co-resident children 12 years and older, and respondent's biological children who are 12 years or older and are not residing with respondent

### III. INFORMATION ON INTER/INTRA-GENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

#### A Intergenerational transfers\*

- Financial transfers : Whether respondents provided financial assistance to their parents in the last 2 years, total amount of financial support that respondents gave to their parents, whether respondent's siblings provided financial assistance to their parents in the last 2 years, total amount of financial support that respondents' siblings gave their parents, whether respondents gave/received financial assistance to/from their children in the last 2 years, amount of financial assistance given to/received from their children
- Time/caregiving : Whether respondents or their siblings took care of parents who were ill in the last 2 years, number of hours respondents or their siblings spent taking care of their parents, whether respondents took care of their children or grandchildren in the last 2 years, number of hours respondents spent taking care of their children or grandchildren
- Co-residence between adult children and parent : Household roster available, whether respondent's parents have always lived with respondent, number of years respondent has lived with their parents, whether respondent is currently living with his/her children over 12 years of age
- Proximity : Whether respondent's parent lives in the same neighborhood, same locality, or same city as the respondent
- Social contact : Number of times respondent has been in contact with his/her parent by telephone, mail, or in person

- Expectations/obligations : Expectations of future assistance from children

**B General questions on transfers**

- Financial transfers : Identification of individuals who financed moving, settling down, and migration costs resulting from the move of respondent's children over 12 years of age (no one, resident adult child's spouse, respondent, respondent's other siblings)
- Time/caregiving : Identification of individuals who helped respondent with activities of daily living in case respondent has a disability (child, child in law, grandchild, parent, other relative)
- Co-residence : Household roster available
- Proximity : Number of relatives currently living in the same neighborhood as respondent

**C Transfers from/to other individuals/organizations**

**Charities**

- Time/caregiving : Whether respondent volunteered for charities in the last 2 years, number of hours per week respondent spent volunteering

**IV. SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FILES**

- List of supplemental files :

**V. FUNDING AGENCIES**

- : National Institutes of Health /National Institute of Aging  
Grant No. AG18016

**VI. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS**

- List of supplemental files : Individual files linked to community level data on socioeconomic conditions of the community of residence using the 2000 Mexican Census. Use of this data is restricted  
Individual files linked to community level data on health care services in the community of residence using Ministry of Health facilities in the 2000 Mexican Census using restricted data

---

\* Individual over 50 answers the questions. In couples, only one is selected to answer the questions on transfers to/from children.

## NATIONAL CHILD DEVELOPMENT STUDY (NCDS)\*

**WEBSITE** : <http://www.esds.ac.uk/longitudinal/access/ncds/>

### I. DESIGN

- Data type : Longitudinal Survey on Foreign-Born Cohorts
- Dates collected : Wave 1: 1958, Wave 2: 1965, Wave 3: 1969, Wave 4: 1974, Wave 5: 1978 (tests only)  
Wave 6: 1981, Wave 7: 1985, Wave 8: 1999-2000 (Combined with 1970 Birth Cohort Study), Wave 9: 2004, Wave 10: 2008 (in progress)
- # of waves : 9 waves, 10th wave in progress

#### A Sample

- Target population : All individuals born in England, Scotland, and Wales between 3/3/1958~ 3/9/1958
- Sample design : Collected data for total universe
- Primary sampling unit : No sampling was involved
- Achieved N : 17,634 respondents in 1958
- Respondents : Children born in 1958, their parents, midwives present at birth, medical officer for tests
- Geographic scope : England, Scotland, and Wales
- Mode of data collection : Self-administered questionnaires, face-to-face interviews, school teacher questionnaires  
school assessment, medical examination
- Retrospective histories : Retrospective histories on marriage and cohabitation
- Response rates : Response rate is defined as the % of base year respondents who were interviewed  
Wave 2: 94%, Wave 3: 92%, Wave 4: 91%, Wave 5: 90%, Wave 6: 88%  
Wave 7: 88%, Wave 8: 88%, Wave 9: N/A- documentation has not been released

#### B Type of information gathered for inter/intragenerational relationships

- Multi-generational : Sampled mothers and children. Includes questions on grandparents, parents, and child
- Co-residential & biological orientation : Sampled on biological relationships, but also includes questions on co-residential relationships

### II. CONTENT

#### A Main focus

- Mode of reporting : Children born in the first week of March, 1958 (Target child)  
Proxy reports on target child from mothers, midwives, and health care professionals and self reports collected from target child after 1969
- Socio-demographic data : Race/ethnicity (European, African, Indian, Other Asian, Mixed Race, N/A), sex, date of birth
- Education : Highest level of education completed, detailed information on school environments in each wave, educational assessments (A-levels, CSE, O-levels, reading, arithmetic, etc.), on the job training
- Marital history : Current marital status, marital and cohabitation histories
- Family background : Family structure during childhood can be inferred from records that detail date of separation from mother. Household roster data is available longitudinally
- Fertility history : Number of children, dates of birth
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Job histories include detailed information on first job, current job, hours worked in current job, unemployment spells, job search efforts, occupation
- Assets/earnings : Financial position of household in which target child lives, total family income, wage rate in part time work, wage rate, frequency of pay
- Health : Self rated health, detailed medical histories including information on medical problems, medical examinations by a health care professional

- B Secondary focus** : Target child's mother

- Mode of reporting : Self reports from mother and proxy reports by target child
- Socio-demographic data : Date of birth
- Education : Ascertains whether mother received more education beyond minimum schooling requirements, age when she left school
- Marital history : Current marital status, date current marriage began
- Fertility history : Number of children born by sex and survival outcomes, obstetric histories include information on pregnancy outcomes, sex of all children born to mother, weight, method of delivery, medical condition of child born, still birth, infant mortality within 20 days
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Mother reports whether she was employed since birth of target child, employment status prior to target child's enrollment in school, employment status after target child's enrollment in school, duration of employment, weekly hours worked, current employment status, type of job
- Assets/earnings : Homeownership, self rated financial situation, income
- Health : Weight prior to pregnancy, prenatal care
- C Other secondary focus** : Target child's children
- Mode of reporting : Proxy report by target child
- Socio-demographic data : Date of child's birth, asks whether the child in question is still alive
- Cognitive ability : Cognitive tests including Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test - Revised (PPVT-R) and Verbal Memory Subscale
- Family background : Target child's marital history provides information on their children's family background
- Health : Weight at birth, height at birth
- D Other focus** : Mother's husband (usually the father of the target child)
- Mode of reporting : Proxy reports by target child's mother
- Socio-demographic data : Age
- Education : Asks whether target child's father stayed in school beyond the minimum schooling requirements, age when he left school
- Marital history : Age at marriage of mother's first husband, age at marriage of mother's current husband, marital status of mother's husband when they first met
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Employment and occupation status at each wave
- Assets/earnings : Weekly wage rate, frequency of pay
- Health : Whether mother's husband smokes
- E Other focus** : Spouse of target child
- Mode of reporting : Proxy reports by target child
- Socio-demographic data : Age, sex
- Education : Asks whether spouse stayed in school beyond the minimum schooling requirements, age when she/he left school
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current employment status, current/last occupation
- Assets/earnings : Earnings, frequency of pay
- F Other focus** : Reports on mother's father including information on his occupation at the time mother left school, place of residence of target child's parents at each wave, time of target child's parents' entry into the UK  
Reports on the number of co-resident siblings when target child's mother left school  
Contains information on the sex, age, and relationship to target child for all household members living with target child at each wave

### III. INFORMATION ON INTER/INTRA-GENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

#### A Intergenerational transfers

- Financial transfers :
- Time/caregiving : Person who cares for the target child including biological parents, grandparents, others

- Co-residence between adult children and parent : Household roster available
- Social contact : Frequency of social contact between target child and mother in case of separation
- Quality of ties : Frequency of disagreements between target child and parent

**B General questions on transfers**

- Financial transfers : List of relatives or other household members who contribute towards total family income, inheritance from relatives
- Time/caregiving :
- Co-residence : Household roster available
- Social contact : Frequency with which target child performs a family activity, number of close friends that respondent has

**C Transfers to/from other individuals/organizations**

**Government Support**

- Financial transfers : Reports whether target child received financial assistance from government including school meals
- Time/caregiving : Reports whether target child was under the care of the local authority for over a month when they were a child

**Charities**

- Time/caregiving : Reports whether child was under the care of the Voluntary Society for over a month

**IV. GENERAL ATTITUDES ON THE FAMILY**

- Norms on fertility : Target child reports on the ideal number of children
- Norms/culture : Target child reports on the ideal age at marriage

**V. SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION**

- List of supplemental files : NCDS Qualitative Survey, NCDS DNA Project, NCDS Biomedical Survey, Exam tests collected from school

**VI. FUNDING AGENCIES** : National Birthday Trust Fund

---

\*Formerly know as 1958 Perinatal Mortality Survey.

## NATIONAL LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF ADOLESCENT HEALTH (ADD HEALTH)

- WEBSITE** : [www.cpc.unc.edu/addhealth](http://www.cpc.unc.edu/addhealth)
- I. DESIGN**
- Data type : Longitudinal Survey on U.S. Populations
  - Dates collected : Wave 1 in-school questionnaire: September 1994-April 1995  
Wave 1 in-home interview: April 1995-December 1995  
Wave 2 in-home interview: April 1996-August 1996  
Wave 3 in-home interview: August 2001-April 2002  
Wave 4 in progress
  - # of waves : 3 waves completed. Wave 4 is in progress
- A Sample**
- Target population : Wave 1: Nationally representative sample of adolescents in grades 7 through 12 in the U.S. in the 1994–95 academic year (target adolescent)  
Wave 2: Target adolescent with the exception of students in 12th grade and students disabled between Wave 1 and Wave 2  
Wave 3: Target adolescent and a sub-sample of partners who participated in Wave 1
  - Sample design : Stratified probability sample of adolescents enrolled in non-saturated schools and all adolescents enrolled in 16 saturated schools
  - Primary sampling unit : Schools in a database collected by Quality Education Data, Inc.
  - Achieved N (including oversamples) : Wave 1 in-school questionnaire: 90,118 adolescents in 132 schools and 164 administrators. Eligible high schools included an 11th grade and had at least 30 students. The in-home interview was completed by 20,745 students who responded to the in-school questionnaire and/or were part of the school roster in the school sampled for the in-home interviews. 17,700 parents responded to the parent questionnaire  
Wave 2 in-home interview: 14,738 respondents to Wave 1 except for those who graduated or dropped out of high school and 128 school administrators  
Wave 3 in-home interview: 15,197 persons (target adolescents and a subsample of their partners)  
Wave 4: Planning in progress
  - Respondents : Adolescents, school administrators, and parents
  - Geographic scope : Nationally representative
  - Mode of data collection : Wave 1 in-school questionnaire: Self-administered  
Wave 1 in-home interview: Face-to-face  
Wave 1 parent interviews: Face-to-face  
Wave 1 school administrator questionnaire: Self-administered  
Wave 2 in-home interview: Face-to-face  
Wave 2 school administrators interview: Telephone  
Wave 3 in-home interview: Face-to-face
  - Special feature : Geographic identifiers were collected  
May include multiple respondent households
  - Over-sampled populations : Ethnic: well-educated Blacks, Chinese, Cubans, Puerto Ricans  
Saturated schools: every student enrolled in the 16 (2 large and 14 small) saturated schools

Disabled: 589 students with disabilities involving the limbs

Genetic: pairs of siblings (identical twins, fraternal twins, and half siblings) were sampled. Also, non-biological pairs of siblings (step siblings, foster, and adopted children) were sampled

- Retrospective histories : Retrospective histories on education, employment, fertility, and marriage
- Response rates : Wave 1 -78.9% of main school sample, Wave 2 -88.2% of those eligible for Wave 2, Wave 3 -77.4% of Wave 1 respondents and a sub-sample of partners

## **B Type of information gathered for inter/intragenerational relationships**

- Multi-generational : Information is available on target adolescent, their parent, and their children
- Co-residential & biological orientation : In-home interviews gear sampling toward co-residential relationships, but questionnaires also include information on non-resident biological fathers/mothers as reported by student

## **II. CONTENT**

### **A Main focus**

- : Target adolescent and subsample of current partners in Wave 3
- Mode of reporting : Self reports
- Socio-demographic data : Race/ethnicity, sex, age
- Education : Current grade level in school, educational histories
- Family background : Household roster information on family structure, reports by target adolescent on number of siblings, and parent reports on their marital and cohabitation histories
- Cognitive ability : Add Health Picture Vocabulary Test (AHPVT): Computerized, abridged version of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test
- Marital history : Current marital status, number of times married, marital and cohabitation histories
- Fertility history : Sexual histories, number of pregnancies, number of children
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current employment status, partial employment histories, active military service, current occupational status
- Assets/earnings : Hourly wage rate, overtime, pre-tax annual earnings, respondent's evaluation on his/her current financial situation
- Health : Self-rated health, weight, height, disabilities, biological specimens collected for sexually transmitted infections, health insurance

### **B Secondary focus**

- Mode of reporting : Spouse, cohabitation, and romantic partner of target adolescent in Wave 3
- : A subsample of partners provide self reports on all domains reported by the target adolescent. The adolescent provides proxy reports on all other partners. The information below is gathered exclusively from proxy reports
- Socio-demographic data : Race/ethnicity, age, and sex
- Education : Highest degree attained
- Marital history : Partial marital, cohabitation, and romantic relationship histories
- Fertility history : Sexual histories, number of pregnancies, and number of children
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current employment status, partial employment histories, active military service, and current occupational status
- Assets/earnings : Target adolescent rated financial status
- Health : Self-rated health, weight, height, disabilities, biological specimens collected for sexually transmitted infections, and health insurance coverage

### **C Other focus**

- : Parent of target adolescent
- Mode of reporting : Self and proxy reports
- Socio-demographic data : Race/ethnicity, sex, age, month and year when target adolescent's parents died
- Education : Highest level of school attended
- Marital history : Current marital status, marital histories, age at first marriage
- Fertility history : Number of target adolescent's siblings
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Full-time employment, retirement status, current occupational status

- Assets/earnings : Total family income
- Health : Self-rated health, disability, alcohol use, smoking
- D Other focus** : Spouse of parent
- Mode of reporting : In some cases, the spouse of parent provided self reports in Parent Questionnaires. For those cases, the information gathered is the same as that collected for the adolescent's parent. For all other cases, proxy reports are provided by parents and the target adolescent. The information reported below refers exclusively to the information obtained from the proxy reports
- Socio-demographic data : Race/ethnicity, sex, age
- Education : Educational attainment
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Employment status, retirement plans, current occupational status
- Assets/earnings :
- Health : Self reported health, disability
- E Other focus** : Children of adolescent in Wave 3
- Mode of reporting : Proxy reports by target adolescent
- Socio-demographic data : Age
- Family background : Target adolescent reports the persons with whom the child lives including biological parents, siblings, grandparents, other relatives, friends, adoptive and foster parents
- Education :
- Health : Target adolescent rated child's health, emotional, physical, or mental limitations

### III. INFORMATION ON INTER/INTRA-GENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

#### A Intergenerational transfers

- Financial transfers : Financial transfers from parents to adolescent, amount of transfers between parent and adolescent, amount of child support given to/received from the other parent of target adolescent's child, medical expenses incurred due to child's medical condition
- Time/Caregiving : Childcare provided by parents
- Co-residence between adult children and parent : Target adolescent reports whether they live with parents. They also report the individuals with whom their child resides: biological parents, foster parents, adopted parents
- Social contact : Frequency of contact with non-resident father/mother, type of activity performed by adolescent with parents, such as reading, going to the mall, number of hours target adolescent spent with parents in the last 12 months, date target adolescent last spent with his/her children
- Quality of ties : Closeness between target adolescent and his/her parents
- Expectations/Obligations : Parents' expectation of the target adolescent's educational attainment, target adolescent's perception of parents' expectation of educational attainment

#### B Intra-generational transfers

- Co-residence with adult sibling : Household roster provides information on co-resident siblings
- Social contact : Frequency of contact via e-mail and telephone, number of times traveled together
- Quality of ties : Closeness with siblings, desire for more/less closeness
- Expectations/obligations : Expectations of help from sibling in case of problems

#### C Transfers to/from other individuals/organizations

##### Friends

- Social contact : Frequency of interaction with friends via e-mail, telephone, visits
- Quality of ties : Relative influence of friends compared to family

##### Government support

- Financial transfers : Target adolescent and parent report whether they participate in welfare programs. They also report whether they participated in government sponsored job training

programs

**IV. GENERAL ATTITUDES ON FAMILY**

- Division of labor within family :
- Parenting : Parent reports on his/her attitudes about childrearing
- Family function :
- Norms on fertility :
- Norms/culture : 10-scale item rating importance of endogamy, living in a committed relationship, importance of money, questions on activities performed by respondent to balance marriage, work, and schooling

**V. SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FILES**

- List of supplemental files : Contextual data for Waves I and II

**VI. FUNDING AGENCIES**

- : National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD)
- National Cancer Institute
- National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism
- National Institute of Deafness and Other Communication Disorders
- National Institute of Drug Abuse
- National Institute of General Medical Sciences
- National Institute of Mental Health
- National Institute of Nursing Research
- National Institute of Health and Human Services

**VII. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS**

- Special supplemental files : Genetic data on twins and full siblings is also available
- Funding agencies : Additional Cofunders:
  - Office of AIDS Research, NIH
  - Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research, NIH
  - Office of the Director, NIH
  - Office of Research on Women's Health, NIH
  - National Center for Health Statistics, CDCP, DHHS
  - Office of Population Affairs, DHHS
  - Office of Minority Health, CDCP, DHHS
  - Office of Public Health and Science, DHHS
  - Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, DHHS
  - The National Science Foundation
  - Center for Disease Control, NCHS, DHHS
  - National Institute of Aging
  - MacArthur Foundation
  - National Center for Minority Health and Health Disparities, NIH

## NATIONAL LONGITUDINAL SURVEY OF YOUTH 1979 (NLSY 79)

- WEBSITE** : <http://www.bls.gov/nls/nlsy79.htm>
- I. DESIGN**
- Data type : Longitudinal Survey on a U.S. Cohort
  - Dates collected : Collected annually between 1979 and 1994 and biennially since 1994
  - # of waves : 21 waves, 22nd in progress
  - A Sample**
  - Target population : Nationally representative sample of men and women born 1957-64 and present in the U.S. in 1978
  - Sample design : Multistage probability sample of individuals within households
  - Primary sampling unit : Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSAs), counties (or parishes in Louisiana), parts of counties (parishes), and independent cities
  - Achieved N : 1979: 12,686, 1984: 12,069, 1990: 10,346 1994: 8,891 2000: 8,891 2004: 7,724
  - Respondents : 1979: Individuals between 14 and 21 in (1) cross-sectional sample designed to be representative of the non-institutionalized population, (2) supplemental oversample of Hispanic, black, and economically disadvantaged youths who are non-black/non-Hispanic, and (3) a military sample of youths who enlisted by 9/30/1978  
1986: NLSY 79 children supplement includes children born to the NLSY 79 women. It was later split into two supplementary files: (1) the Children Supplement collected information on children 14 years and younger and (2) the Young Adult supplement includes information on children 15 years and older
  - Geographic scope : Nationally representative
  - Mode of data collection : Face-to-face and telephone interviews
  - Special modules : NLSY 79 Child supplement, NLSY 79 Young Adult Children supplement  
1980 high school survey, 1980-1983 transcript collections, 1980 administration of ASVAB
  - Over-sampled populations : (1) Civilian Hispanic, black, and economically disadvantaged non-Hispanic/non-black youths living in the U.S. during 1979 born between 1/1/1957 and 12/31/1964  
(2) Youths born between 1/1/1957 and 12/31/1961 and enlisted in the military as of 9/30/1978
  - Special features : (1) Due to the funding constraints, the oversample of youths in the military with the exception of 201 youths were dropped from the sample after 1984  
(2) Due to funding constraints, the oversample of economically disadvantaged non-Hispanic/non-black youths were dropped from the sample after 1990  
(3) Geocode data is available  
(4) Multiple respondent households include extensive information on respondent's siblings
  - Retrospective histories : Event history from data on employment, marriage, welfare program participation, and education
  - Response rates : Response rate is defined as the % of base-year respondent youths that remained eligible (i.e. youths that were not part of the oversamples that were permanently dropped and were alive)  
1980: 96%, 1981: 96%, 1982: 96%, 1983: 97%, 1984: 96%, 1985: 95%

1986: 93%, 1987: 91%, 1988: 91%, 1989: 93%, 1990: 91%, 1991: 92%  
 1992: 92%, 1993: 92%, 1994: 91%, 1996: 89%, 1998: 87%, 2000: 83%  
 2002: 81%, 2004: 81%

## **B Type of information gathered for inter/intragenerational relationships**

- Multi-generational : Starting in 1986, NLSY 79 also collected information on the children born to the NLSY 79 women who were later split off to form the Young Adult Children supplement when they turned 15
- Co-residential & biological orientation : Sampled with a focus on biological relationships, but also includes questions on co-residential relationships and non-resident parent and children

## **II. CONTENT**

- A Main focus** : Youths born 1957-64 and living in the U.S. in 1978 (NLSY 79 youths)
    - Mode of reporting : Self reports
    - Socio-demographic data : Race/ethnicity, nationality, date of birth, age, sex
    - Education : Current enrollment status, highest degree received, date received
    - Marital history : Current marital status, changes in marital status since last interview, dates of each change, number of marriages, start date and end date of marriage, cohabitations since last interview, on-going cohabitations
    - Family background : Household roster when respondent was 14, residential history from birth to age 18, parental education and occupation, nativity of parents
    - Fertility history : Number of children in household, relationship of each child to respondent
    - Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current labor force status including information on whether the respondent was employed, unemployed, or out of the labor force in the week preceding the survey, company specific information if employed, start and end date of current and previous jobs, number of hours worked per week in the past year, occupation, class of worker
    - Assets/earnings : Possession and value of assets, debt, total family income, wage rate, severance payment, fringe benefits, participation in pension plans
    - Health : Self-rated physical and emotional health, disabilities, height, weight, illness, health insurance coverage, prenatal care if respondent was ever pregnant, job injuries, drug, alcohol and tobacco use
  - B Secondary focus** : Spouses (and partners in recent rounds) of NLSY 79 youths
    - Mode of reporting : Proxy reports from NLSY 79 youths
    - Socio-demographic data : Age
    - Education : Highest grade completed
    - Marital history : Current marital status, number of previous marriages
    - Fertility history : Number of children with respondent
    - Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current labor force status
    - Assets/earnings : Total family income, hourly wage rate
    - Health : Disabilities
  - C Other focus** : Parents of NLSY 79 youths
    - Mode of data collection : Proxy reports from NLSY 79 youths - mostly in first round
    - Socio-demographic data : Whether respondent's parents are still living
    - Education : Highest grade completed by parents
    - Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Parent's employment status, parent's occupation when youth was 14
    - Health : Health status if parents are still living, cause of death if parents are dead
  - D Other focus** : Children of NLSY 79
    - Mode of reporting : Self-administered questionnaires and proxy reports from NLSY 79 youths
- More detailed data was collected for the Child and Young Adult Children supplement

- Socio-demographic data : Ethnic self identification, age, sex, date of birth, place of birth
  - Education : Ever attended school, current grade in school, reasons for stopping school, on the job training, detailed quality information from children & young adults
  - Cognitive Ability : Battery of cognitive tests including memory for locations, Peabody Vocabulary Tests
  - Marital history : Current marital status, cohabitation, relationship histories including dating
  - Family background : Children of NLSY 79 youths report on their living arrangements. Information can also be ascertained from the NLSY 79 youth's report of their marital histories and household rosters at each wave
  - Fertility histories : Fertility histories were collected for those in the NLSY79 Young Adult Children supplement
  - Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Respondents in the Child Supplement report whether they worked for pay, frequency of work per week  
Respondents in Young Adult Supplement provide information on their current labor force status, weeks and hours of work per week in previous year, union membership, spells of unemployment, and characteristics of current employment
  - Assets/earnings : Money earned during a week, hourly wage rate, fringe benefits
  - Health : Illness, accidents, medical treatment, prenatal care if older than 14 and ever pregnant, height, weight, substance use, prenatal care for children of Young Adults
- E Additional information gathered on NLSY 79 youths and children of NLSY 1979 youths :** *NLSY 1979 Youths:*
- (1) The 1993 survey asked the NLSY 79 youths to report the age, education, and fertility of as many as 13 biological siblings. Follow-up questions in 1994 confirmed whether the relationship was that of an identical or fraternal twin  
*Child & Young Adult Supplement*
  - (1) Principals of schools where child respondent attended were interviewed to get information about child's school environment for 1994 and 1995 school years
  - (2) Information by proxy was also collected from respondents on the characteristics of children's current or previous spouses on topics such as ethnicity, education, employment, and income
  - (3) Basic demographic information is available for each person living in the respondent's household including information on each resident's sex, age, relationship to respondent, highest grade of schooling completed, and labor force status during the past year

### III. INFORMATION ON INTER/INTRA-GENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

#### A Intergenerational transfers

- Financial transfers : Inheritances and rights to estate (the source of inheritance is not ascertained)
- Time/caregiving :
- Co-residence between adult children and parent : Household roster available for NLSY 79 and Young Adults
- Social contact : Contact with non-residential children, support provided by children, type of activities performed with parents
- Proximity : Proximity may be determined by geocode data on NLSY 79 respondents and their children
- Quality of ties : Intergenerational closure, quality of interaction between parent and child  
Closeness between parents and children in the supplement as reported by child, frequency of arguments between parent and child

#### B Intra-generational transfers

- Social contact : Social contact with sibling to whom respondent feels closest

#### C General questions on transfers

- Financial transfers : Whether respondent received property, inheritance from relatives or friends during the previous year, amount of the inheritance (source not ascertained)

- Time/caregiving : Childcare arrangements for the first 3 years of children's life; whether care provided by parents, step parents, relatives, non-relatives, formal childcare
- Co-residence between adult siblings : Household roster available of siblings
- Social contact :
- Quality of ties :

**D Transfers to/from other individuals/organizations**

**Friends**

- Quality of ties : Closeness with friends is reported in the NLSY 79 Child supplement and Young Adults supplement

**Government Support**

- Financial transfers : Subsidy for rent or public housing, earned income tax credit, targeted benefits from public assistance programs for NLSY 79 respondents and their children in the supplement

**Charities**

- Time/caregiving : Whether child in Young Adult Supplement performed volunteer work in the last 2 years

**IV. GENERAL ATTITUDES ON THE FAMILY**

- Division of labor within family : NLSY 79 youths and Young Adults report on attitudes about women working, whether respondent would work if they had sufficient resources
- Parenting : Attitudes on parenting
- Family function :
- Norms on fertility : Young adult children report on youngest age one should have a child
- Norms/culture : Young adult children report on ideal age for marriage

**V. FUNDING AGENCIES**

- : Bureau of Labor Statistics
- : U.S. Department of Labor
- : National Institute of Child Health and Human Development
- : Department of Defense
- : National Institute on Drug Abuse
- : National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism

**VI. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS**

- Cognitive ability : Measured using ASVAB
- Fertility history : Collects detailed fertility roster, contraception and abortion, desired fertility
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : On-the-job training, job hierarchies
- Health : Health inventory at age 40
- Political Involvement of main focus : Questions about voting and ideology from American National Election Survey
- Miscellaneous : Preferences, consumption, and financial behavior

## NATIONAL LONGITUDINAL SURVEY OF YOUTH 1997 (NLSY 97)

- WEBSITE** : <http://www.bls.gov/nls/nlsy97.htm>
- I. DESIGN**
- Data type : Longitudinal Survey on a U.S. Cohort
  - Dates collected : Wave 1: Feb/Oct. 1997- Mar/May 1998  
Wave 2: Oct. 1998- April 1999  
Wave 3: Oct. 1999-April 2000  
Wave 4: Nov. 2000-May 2001  
Wave 5: Nov. 2001- May 2002  
Wave 6: Nov. 2002-May 2003  
Wave 7: Nov. 2003- May 2004
  - # of waves : 7 waves, 8th in progress
- A Sample**
- Target population : Nationally representative sample of youths born between 1980 and 1984 residing in the U.S. in 1996
  - Sample design : Multistage probability sample of individuals within households
  - Primary sampling unit : Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSAs), counties (or parishes in Louisiana), parts of counties (parishes), and independent cities
  - Achieved N : 8,984 respondents from 6,819 households (6,748 cross-sectional sample and 2,236 oversamples), 6,124 parents for 7,942 youths in Wave 1
  - Respondents : Youths born in 1980-1984 in all waves; parents were also sampled in Wave 1
  - Geographic scope : Nationally representative
  - Mode of data collection : Face-to-face interviews, telephone interviews
  - Over-sampled populations : Supplemental sample of Blacks and Hispanic youths
  - Special features : (1) Multiple respondent households include detailed information on respondent's siblings  
(2) Geocode data
  - Retrospective histories : Event history form data on employment, marriage, welfare program participation, and education
  - Response rates : Response rate in Wave 1 and retention rates from Wave 2 to Wave 8  
Retention rates defined as the % of base-year respondents who were interviewed in the survey years. Deceased respondents are included in the calculations below.  
Wave 1: 91% of those sampled, Wave 2: 93%, Wave 3: 92 %, Wave 4: 90%,  
Wave 5: 88%, Wave 6: 87%, Wave 7: 86%
- B Type of information gathered for inter/intragenerational relationships**
- Multi-generational : NLSY 97 also sampled the parents of NLSY 97 youths and asked questions about the children of NLSY 97 youths
  - Co-residential & biological orientation : Sample is based on co-residential relationships, but also includes questions on non-resident parents as reported by NLSY 97 youth and the parent in residence
- II. CONTENT**
- A Main focus** : Youth born in 1980 to 1984 (NLSY 97 youth)
- Mode of reporting : Self reports
  - Socio-demographic data : Race/ethnicity, date of birth, age, sex
  - Education : Current enrollment status, highest grade attended, highest grade completed, GPA, on the job training
  - Cognitive Ability : Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (CAT-ASVAB) in the summer of 1997,

- the fall of 1997, and the winter of 1998
- Marital history : Current marital status, marital histories, cohabitation histories
  - Family background : Co-resident parent of NLSY 97 youth provided marital and partner histories, residential histories as reported by respondent, household roster available
  - Fertility history : Number of biological/adopted children, number of pregnancies, fertility and sexual histories for NLSY 1997 youths 17 years and older
  - Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current employment status, hours per week worked, methods of job search in the previous 4 weeks, start and end dates in jobs, number and duration of unemployment spells, current occupation
  - Assets/earnings : Whether they possess certain assets, value of each asset, debt, whether they incurred debt, wage rate, total family income in previous year, income by source
  - Health : Self-rated general health, mental health, health behaviors, height, weight, chronic health conditions, health insurance
- B Secondary focus** : Current and previous partner of NLSY 97 youth
- Mode of data collection : Proxy reports from NLSY 97 youth
  - Socio-demographic data : Race, age
  - Education : Highest grade completed, highest degree earned
  - Marital history : Current marital status
  - Fertility history :
  - Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current labor force status, current occupation
  - Assets/earnings : Income in previous year by source of income, perceived economic status of children's other parent as reported by NLSY 97 youths
  - Health :
- C Other focus** : Parents of NLSY 97 youth
- Mode of reporting : Self reports in wave 1 and proxy reports in follow-up surveys
  - Socio-demographic data : Nationality, place of birth, date biological father/mother died if deceased
  - Education : Highest grade completed
  - Marital history : Current marital status, marital and partner histories
  - Family Background : Reports whether parents of NLSY 97 youths lived with biological parents
  - Fertility history : Parent's household roster may provide number of parent's co-resident children
  - Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Employment history
  - Assets/earnings : Assets in previous year, total income in previous year
  - Health : Longstanding health problems, height, weight
- D Other focus** : NLSY 97 includes information about race, ethnicity, sex, age, employment, marital status and occupation on all household members and non-resident children. Limited information is also available on the other parent of the NLSY 97 youth

### III. INFORMATION ON INTER/INTRA-GENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

#### A Intergenerational transfers

- Financial transfers : Amount of child support received/given from/to partner with children
- Time/caregiving :
- Co-residence between adult children and parent : Whether the NLSY 97 youth co-resides with their parents
- Proximity : Distance from biological mother/father as reported by NLSY 97 youth, geocode data
- Social contact : Frequency of contact between respondent and non-resident parents, frequency of family rituals and holidays
- Quality of ties : Closeness between respondent and parents, youth's opinion on parent's supportiveness, communication with parental figures

#### B Intra-generational transfers

- Social contact :

**C General questions on transfers**

- Financial transfers : Whether respondent receives financial assistance from relatives/friends for tuition, childcare and housing costs
- Time/caregiving : Whether childcare needs met by spouse, relatives, or non-relatives
- Co-residence : Household roster available
- Proximity : Number of relatives living close by
- Social contact :
- Quality of ties : Quality of relationship between respondent and partner/child's biological father

**D Transfers to/from other individuals/organizations**

**Government Support**

- Financial transfers : Earned income tax credit on last year's return, number and duration of food stamp spells, number and duration of AFDC/TANF/ADC spells, eligibility for government assistance, benefits/limits of government assistance for NLSY 97 youths and parents
- Time/caregiving : Respondent's participation in the Head Start program

**IV. GENERAL ATTITUDES ON THE FAMILY**

- Division of labor within family :
- Parenting :
- Family function :
- Norms/culture :

**V. SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FILES**

- List of supplemental files : Census of all high schools within the primary sampling unit, high school transcripts collected

**VI. FUNDING AGENCIES** : Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor

---

## NATIONAL SURVEY OF BLACK AMERICANS (NSBA)\*

**WEBSITE** : <http://webapp.icpsr.umich.edu/cocoon/ICPSR-STUDY/06668.xml>

### I. DESIGN

- Data type : Longitudinal Survey on U.S. Populations
- Dates collected : Wave 1: 1979-1980, Wave 2: 1987-1988, Wave 3: 1988-1989, Wave 4: 1992
- # of Waves : 4 waves

#### A Sample

- Target population : Individuals 18 years and older who self-identified as Black Americans and were U.S. citizens
- Sample design : National multistage probability sample
- Primary sampling unit : Survey Research Center (SRC) areas
- Achieved N : Wave 1: 2,107, Wave 2: 951, Wave 3: 793, Wave 4: 659
- Respondents : Black Americans in the U.S. ages 18 and older who are citizens
- Geographic scope : Continental U.S.
- Mode of data collection : Face-to-face interviews
- Retrospective histories : Partial retrospective histories on employment, military service
- Response rates : Wave 1: 67% of sampled individuals

#### B Type of information gathered for inter/intragenerational relationships

- Multi-generational : Includes questions about respondent's parents, respondent, respondent's children
- Co-residential & biological orientation : Sampled at the household level. Therefore, it has an orientation toward co-residential relationships. However, some questions ask about biological relationships including questions about non-resident family members

### II. CONTENT

#### A Main focus

- Mode of reporting : Self reports
- Socio-demographic data : Sex, date of birth, place of birth, interviewer reports about skin color, words used by respondent to describe his/her race
- Education : Highest level of education completed, whether respondent has high school diploma, whether respondent attended college, on-the-job training
- Family background : Number of siblings while growing up, identification of father figure during childhood
- Marital history : Current marital, cohabitation, and dating status, duration of marriage
- Fertility history : Number of children, number of biological children, number of children under 18 living with respondent
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current labor force and employment status, number of hours worked per week, number of years spent working full time and part time, labor union status, main occupation, job characteristics such as promotion opportunities, supervisor's race, reasons for not working, occupation after retirement
- Assets/earnings : Homeownership, total family income in previous year, wage rate, fringe benefits, financial situation compared to 3 years ago
- Health : Psychological well-being, respondent reports on their self esteem, self rated health, health problems

#### B Secondary focus

- Respondent's spouse : Respondent's spouse
- Mode of reporting : Proxy reports by respondent
- Socio-demographic data : Age
- Education : Highest level of education completed, whether respondent has high school diploma,

- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : whether respondent attended college, on-the-job training  
: Current employment status, current occupation, last occupation
- C Other focus** : Respondent's parents
- Socio-demographic data : Whether father and mother are still alive
- Education : Highest level of education completed by mother/father
- Assets/earnings : Mother's main occupation while respondent was growing up, father's main occupation

### III. INFORMATION ON INTER/INTRA-GENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

#### A Intergenerational transfers

- Financial transfers :
- Time/caregiving : Whether parents helped respondent settle in a new place if they moved recently
- Co-residence between adult children and parent : Household roster available to report whether respondent lives with parents, grandparents, great-grandparents, and children, asks respondent to identify where respondent's immediate family lives
- Quality of ties : Problems between respondent and children

#### B General questions on transfers

- Financial transfers : Whether respondent has received help from family members, amount of financial assistance received from family members
- Time/caregiving : Whether relative helped respondent settle in a new place, identification of the relative who helped respondent settle in, asks whether respondent can count on someone for childcare, provide advice on childrearing, whether respondent provides care to family members with health problems and whether it affects their work
- Co-residence between relatives and respondent : Number of relatives that live in the same household, whether respondent's family has taken in a relative or friend who needed a place to stay, identification of the friends or relatives who were taken in because they didn't have a place to go
- Social contact : Frequency of social contact with family and friends either in person, via mail or phone
- Quality of ties : Whether respondent's family is close to each other, respondent's satisfaction with his/her family life, respondent's closeness to Black community
- Proximity : Number of relatives that live in the same neighborhood, city, state, asks whether the reason for most recent move is to be closer to friends and family, respondent rated distance from relatives
- Expectations/obligations : Expectations to receive help from relatives

#### C Transfers with other individuals/organizations

##### Friends

- Financial transfers : Whether respondent received/gave financial assistance from/to friends
- Time/caregiving : Whether respondent received/gave non-financial assistance from/to friends
- Frequency of social contact : Frequency of social contact with friends in the past 12 months either in person, via telephone, or e-mail
- Proximity : Whether move was motivated to be near friends

##### Government

- Financial transfers : Government transfers such as unemployment compensation, general assistance, retirement benefits

##### Charity

- Time/caregiving : Type of volunteer work performed by respondent, number of hours spent volunteering

### IV. GENERAL ATTITUDES ABOUT THE FAMILY

- Division of labor within family : Attitudes on gender division of labor in the family, importance of having a man or a woman for money reasons or housework
- Parenting : Importance for respondent to have a man/woman in the house to raise children
- Norms on fertility :
- Norms/culture : Respondent rates his/her perceptions of Blacks by rating truthfulness of statements, such

as Blacks are hardworking, lazy, honest, liars, giving, selfish, whether he/she believes that Blacks shouldn't date whites, Blacks should only shop in Black stores, the effects of Civil Rights on respondent's prospects in life, impact of miniseries Roots

**V. FUNDING AGENCIES**

: National Institute of Mental Health  
Center for Study of Minority Group Mental Health

---

\*See also the Family Connections across Generations and Nations Survey. The information in this summary was obtained, in part, from <http://webapp.icpsr.umich.edu/cocoom/n/ICPSR-Study/08512.xml> active in November 2006.

## FAMILY CONNECTIONS ACROSS GENERATIONS AND NATIONS\*

<b>WEBSITE</b>	:	<a href="http://micda.psc.isr.umich.edu/project/detail.html?id=32839">http://micda.psc.isr.umich.edu/project/detail.html?id=32839</a>
<b>I. DESIGN</b>		
- Data type	:	Survey of list sample generated in NSAL of U.S., Jamaica, and Guyana
- Dates collected	:	April 2004 through December 2005
- # of waves	:	1 Wave
<b>A Sample</b>		
- Target population	:	Individuals aged 13+ who resided in a consecutive 3-generation family
- Sample design	:	National multistage probability sample
- Primary sampling unit	:	Survey Research Center (SRC) areas
- Achieved N	:	U.S.: 2,304, Jamaica 1,559, Guyana 2,068
- Respondents	:	African American, white, and Caribbean Black aged 13 or older who spoke English
- Geographic scope	:	United States and the Caribbean
- Mode of data collection	:	U.S. CATI telephone interviews, Caribbean face-to-face paper and pencil
- Retrospective histories	:	
- Response rates	:	N/A
<b>B Type of information gathered for inter/intragenerational relationships</b>		
- Multi-generational	:	Questions about respondent, spouse, parents, children. Also, interview conducted with 2 other family members that make up 3-generation triad.
- Co-residential & biological orientation	:	Sampling went beyond the HH level and asked about all family members, therefore a random triad could be selected. Families could have been represented nationally or internationally.
<b>II. CONTENT</b>		
<b>A Main focus</b>	:	Individuals 13 years old and older
- Mode of reporting	:	Self reports
- Socio-demographic data	:	Sex, date of birth, place of birth, interviewer reports about skin color, words used by respondent to describe his/her race, race, shade of skin color
- Education	:	Highest level of education completed, whether respondent has high school diploma, whether respondent attended college, degree earned
- Family background	:	Number of siblings while growing up, identification of father figure during childhood
- Marital history	:	Current marital, cohabitation, and dating status, duration of marriage
- Fertility history	:	Number of children, number of biological children, number of children under 18 living with respondent
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation	:	Current labor force and employment status, number of hours worked per week, number of years spent working full time and part time, main occupation, irregular work and volunteer work
- Assets/earnings	:	Homeownership, total family income in previous year, wage rate, fringe benefits, outside support, oversees support
- Health	:	Psychological well-being, respondent reports on their self esteem, self-rated health, health problems, self-reported dental health
<b>B Secondary focus</b>	:	Respondent's spouse
- Mode of reporting	:	Proxy reports by respondent
- Socio-demographic data	:	Age, race, shade of skin color
- Education	:	Highest level of education completed, whether respondent has high school diploma, whether respondent attended college, degree earned,

- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current employment status, current occupation, last occupation
- C Other focus** : Respondent's parents
- Socio-demographic data : Race, place of birth
- Education : Highest level of education obtained
- Assets/earnings :

### III. INFORMATION ON INTER/INTRA-GENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

#### A Intergenerational transfers

- Financial transfers : Anyone not in HH give money or other goods to support HH
- Time/caregiving : OASIS questions about responsibility for caregiving of elderly
- Co-residence between adult children and parent : Family listing available denote location of residence
- Quality of ties : Positive and negative interactions between respondent and parents, and children

#### B General questions on transfers

- Financial transfers : Anyone not in HH give money or other goods to support HH
- Time/caregiving : Social support received from other relatives
- Co-residence between relatives and respondent :
- Social contact : Frequency of social contact with family and friends either in person, via mail or phone
- Quality of ties : Positive and negative interactions between respondent and family members
- Proximity :
- Expectations/obligations :

#### C Transfers with other individuals/organizations

##### Friends

- Financial transfers :
- Time/caregiving :
- Frequency of social contact :
- Proximity :

##### Government

- Financial transfers : Government transfers such general assistance

##### Charity

- Time/caregiving : Type of volunteer work performed by respondent, number of hours spent volunteering

### IV. GENERAL ATTITUDES ABOUT THE FAMILY

- Division of labor within family :
- Parenting :
- Norms on fertility :
- Norms/culture : Caribbean acculturation questions, race socialization, exposure to media

### V. FUNDING AGENCIES : National Institute of Aging

National Institute on Drug Abuse

---

\*See also the National Survey of Black Americans. The information in this summary was provided exclusively by the principal investigators of the data. The Family Connections Across Generations and Nations URL active in April 2007 was <http://sitemaker.umich.edu/3genstudy/home>.

## NATIONAL SURVEY OF FAMILIES AND HOUSEHOLDS (NSFH)

**WEBSITE** : <http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/nsfh.design.htm>

### I. DESIGN

- Data type : Longitudinal Survey on U.S. Populations
- Dates collected : Wave 1: 1987-1988  
Wave 2: 1992-1994  
Wave 3: 2001-2002

- # of waves : 3 waves

#### A Sample

- Target population : Noninstitutionalized persons aged 19 and older, living in a household and able to be interviewed in English or Spanish
- Sample design : Multistage area probability sample of households
- Primary sampling unit : ISR's 100 Primary Sampling Unit (PSU) National Sampling Frame that is based on 1985 population projections. The PSU consist of self representing areas (SMSA or Standard Consolidated Areas with a population of 2 million or more) and the rest of the country (SMSA or a combination of adjacent counties with a populations of 150,000 or more)
- Achieved N : Wave 1: 9,643 respondents in the main sample and 3,374 respondents in the over sample who were either the primary respondent or the spouse or cohabiting partner of the primary respondent  
Wave 2: 10,007 primary respondents from Wave 1; 5,624 spouses or cohabiting partners of primary respondent at Wave 2; 789 former spouses or partners who were interviewed at Wave 1; 1,415 focal children ages 10 to 17; 1,090 focal children ages 18 to 23, 802 proxy reports on spouses or cohabiting partners who were interviewed at Wave 1 but died in between waves, 3,348 randomly selected parent of primary respondent  
Wave 3: 4,073 primary respondents with a child eligible for focal child interviews at Wave 2; 2,793 spouses or cohabiting partners irrespective of the current status of their union with a child eligible for focal child interviews at Wave 2; 4,128 children eligible for focal child interviews ages 18 to 33; 4,914 primary respondents ages 45 and older without a child eligible for the focal child interviews at Wave 2; and 2,643 spouses or cohabiting partners of primary respondents interviewed at Wave 1 ages 45 or older without a child eligible for focal child interviews at Wave 2
- Respondents : Wave 1: one randomly selected adult in the household and their spouse or cohabiting partner at the time of the interview  
Wave 2: the original respondent, current spouse or current cohabiting partner, former spouse or partner interviewed at Wave 1, focal child ages 10 to 17 and ages 18 to 23, and one randomly selected parent of primary respondent.  
Wave 3: For those with a focal child eligible for the NSFH2 focal-child interview, NSFH3 telephone interviews include: original respondents, NSFH1 spouses or cohabiting partners, eligible focal "children," now ages 18-33, irrespective of whether they were interviewed at NSFH2. For those with no focal children eligible for the NSFH2 focal-child interviews, NSFH3 telephone interviews include: original respondents age 45 or older, NSFH1 spouses or cohabiting partners of primary respondents age 45 or older at NSFH3

- Geographic scope : Nationally representative
- Mode of data collection : Face-to-face interviews, self-administered questionnaires, telephone interviews
- Over-sampled populations : Blacks, Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, single-parent families, families with step-children, cohabiting couples and recently married persons
- Retrospective histories : Retrospective histories on marriage, cohabitation, education, employment, fertility, living arrangements in childhood, and departures and returns to/from their parental home
- Response rates : Baseline response rates are defined as the number of completed interviews over the number of successful screens minus the screens where they were not eligible for interviews. In Waves 2 and 3, response rates were defined as the number of completed self and proxy reports over the total sample size with the subtraction of all deceased respondents.  
Wave 1- screening rates: 88% (main sample), 94% (oversample), 91%(total)  
Wave 1- response rates: 74% (main sample), 77% (over-sample), 74% (total)  
Wave 2: 94% of NSFH 1 respondents were located and 87% of those located were successfully interviewed for an overall response rate of 82%  
Wave 3: 55% of NSFH 2 respondents completed self reports, 71% of primary respondents that completed Wave 2, 22% of primary respondents who completed the interview at Wave 1 and not in Wave 2, 68% of spouses who completed the survey at Wave 2, and 48% of focal children\*
- Source : <http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/nsfh/wave3/fieldreport.doc> (p. 42)

**B Type of information gathered for inter/intragenerational relationships**

- Multi-generational : Primary respondent, parents, and focal children are represented by self and/or proxy reports. Also includes questions on primary respondent's grandparents
- Co-residential & biological orientation : Sampled with a focus on co-residential relationships, but also includes information on biological relationships including parents and children who may not reside with the primary respondent

**II. CONTENT**

- A Main focus** : Primary respondent
- Mode of reporting : Self reports in all waves and proxy reports collected in Wave 3 from NSFH 1 spouses if primary respondent was too ill
  - Socio-demographic data : Race/ethnicity, sex, age
  - Education : Highest level of school completed, educational history
  - Family background : Asks whether primary respondent lived with biological parents from time of birth to age 19. Parent calendar sequence section details primary respondent's living arrangement histories including age at which respondent lived with biological parents, step parents, and others
  - Marital history : Current marital status, current dating status, marital history, cohabitation history
  - Fertility history : Full fertility history including information on number of biological, adopted, and step children, co-resident and non-resident children, number of children by age and sex
  - Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current labor force, employment, and unemployment status, full-time/part-time job, number of hours worked per week, work history, change of occupation between waves, most recent or current occupation
  - Assets/earnings : Homeownership, debts, wage rate, gross salary before deductions, income
  - Health : Self reports on primary respondent's general health, height, weight
- B Secondary focus** : Current spouse or cohabiting partner (current spouse)  
In Wave 1, the current spouse is asked to complete a short questionnaire; however, in Wave 2, current spouses are interviewed with questions that are almost identical to those of the primary respondent
- Mode of reporting : Self and proxy reports

- Socio-demographic data : Race/ethnicity, age, date of birth
- Education : Highest grade completed, school enrollment status during first year of marriage,
- Family background : Asks whether current spouse lived with both parents from the time they were born until they left home to be on their own, identification of ages when spouse lived with biological mother/father
- Marital history : Age at first marriage, marital status, cohabitation prior to current marriage, date of marriage
- Fertility history : Fertility histories including information on the number of children prior to and during their marriage to the primary respondent, future birth intentions
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current labor force, employment, and unemployment status, full-time/part-time job, number of hours worked per week, work history, change of occupation between waves, most recent or current occupation
- Assets/earnings : Total earnings from a diverse array of sources including wages, tips, farm business in previous year, gross salary in previous year
- Health : Self-rated health
- C Other focus** : Former spouse if they responded to Wave 1 interviews and split with primary respondent after Wave 1 interviews. In Wave 2, current spouse is interviewed with questions that are almost identical to those of the primary respondent.
- Mode of reporting : Self and proxy reports
- Socio-demographic data : Race/ethnicity, age, date of birth
- Education : Highest grade completed, highest degree obtained, degrees obtained between waves, current school enrollment, full-time and part-time school enrollment status
- Family background : Family structure at 14
- Marital history : Dates of marriages, separations, divorces, and widowhood since Wave 1, dates of beginning and ending cohabitations since Wave 1
- Fertility history : Fertility histories, number of children prior to and during marriage, future birth intentions
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current labor force, employment, and unemployment status, full-time/part-time job, number of hours worked per week, work history, change of occupation between waves, most recent or current occupation
- Assets/earnings : Total earnings
- Health : Self-rated health
- D Other focus** : Parent or in-laws of primary respondent
- Mode of reporting : Self and proxy reports
- Socio-demographic data : Race/ethnicity, sex, asks whether they are still living, age if alive, year of death if dead
- Education : Highest grade completed
- Marital history : Current marital status, number of times married, marital histories
- Fertility history : Number of biological and adopted children
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Whether they were employed in the last 12 months, occupation of father or step parent at 16, retirement
- Assets/earnings : Homeownership
- Health : Self-rated health, depression scale, alcohol use, hospitalization, memory
- E Other focus** : Child of primary respondent
- Mode of reporting : Self report from focal child and proxy reports provided by primary respondent and primary respondent's spouse or cohabiting partner
- Socio-demographic data : Whether the child is alive, sex, age, date of birth
- Education : Current school enrollment, highest level of education completed, grade in school, achieved grade (A, B,...,F) in Wave 2, educational histories
- Family background : Whether child is living with two biological parents, living arrangement history, time when separated with biological mother or father for a period of six months or more)

- Marital history : Current marital status, marital history, cohabitation history, and dating history for focal children 18 years and older
- Fertility history : Current pregnancy, number of children, date of birth of each child, living arrangement of each child for focal children older than 18
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Employment status, number of hours worked, work history, current or most recent occupation
- Health : Emotional health, physical health, injuries, illness
- F Other focus** : Siblings of primary respondent
- Mode of reporting : Proxy interviews
- Socio-demographic data : Relative age (older or younger than respondent), sex, relationship with respondent (full, half, and step siblings)
- G Other focus** : Includes information on the educational attainment of current and former spouse's parent, includes information on the focal child's parents if they are not primary respondent's current or former spouse or cohabiting partner

### III. INFORMATION ON INTER/INTRA-GENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

#### A Intergenerational transfers

- Financial transfers : Whether primary respondent or spouse gave/received financial assistance to/from their children/ parents in the last 12 months
- Time/caregiving : Number of hours primary respondent or spouse spent helping parents or in-laws, number of hours respondent spends with children, frequency with which primary respondent performs activities, such as eating breakfast or engaging in leisure activities with his/her children, number of nights primary respondent's grandchildren spent the night in respondent's home without their parents
- Co-residence between adult children and parent : Age at which respondent left parents' home for more than 4 months, start and end date of parents' residence in primary respondent's home after respondent was on their own, Whether respondent's adult children or step children are still living at primary respondent's home
- Proximity : Distance between child's place of residence and respondent's place of residence, distance between parent/in-law's and respondent's place of residence
- Social contact : Frequency of primary respondent's contact with their parents, focal child's contact with biological parents, including information on the frequency of contact between focal child and non-resident parents in the last 12 months
- Quality of ties : Quality of relationship between primary respondent and parents, quality of relationship between focal child and parents, including the number of disagreements between the focal child and the parent, primary respondent is asked to rate his/her relationship with biological or step children
- Expectations/obligations : General questions about attitudes about obligation and expectations for help, advice

#### B Intragenerational transfers

- Financial transfers :
- Time/caregiving : Amount of time focal child spends with siblings
- Co-residence between siblings : Household roster information on co-residential status between adult siblings
- Proximity : Distance between respondent's and sibling's place of residence
- Social contact : Frequency of social contact between primary respondent and siblings
- Quality of ties : Focal child is asked to describe how well his/her siblings get along compared to other families
- Expectations/obligations : Likelihood that focal child will seek advice from any sibling if they are depressed or making a major decision

#### C General questions on transfers

- Financial transfers : Whether respondent received any gifts or loans over \$1000 dollars in the last 12 months

- Time/caregiving : from relatives  
: Asks whether respondent provided care to a household member requiring assistance in the last 12 months, year of first assistance, identification of relative who provided childcare during respondent's working hours
- Co-residence between relatives and respondent : Household roster available and partial residential histories
- Expectations/obligations : Existence of relatives or friends respondent can count on for advice

**D Transfers with other individuals/organizations**

**Government**

- Financial transfers : Whether respondent or family members received public assistance, amount of transfers from government, histories of public assistance, public assistance received by household members

**Friends**

- Social contact : Number of close friends by sex

**IV. GENERAL ATTITUDES ON THE FAMILY**

- Division of labor within family : Perception on the effect of mother's work on children's well-being
- Parenting : Attitudes on parenting and step parenting
- Family function : Norms on family obligation including question on whether adult children care for their elderly parents
- Norms on fertility : Number of additional children by child's gender, ideal family size, general reasons for desiring more children
- Norms/culture : Attitudes about cohabitation, attitudes about divorce

**V. SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FILES**

- List of supplemental files :

**VI. FUNDING AGENCIES**

- : National Institute of Child Health and Human Development  
National Institute of Aging

**VII. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AVAILABLE FROM THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS**

- The PI indicated that updated response rates for focal children may be available. The response rates are listed here are based on the field reports cited above.

## NATIONAL STUDY OF MIDLIFE DEVELOPMENT IN THE UNITED STATES (MIDUS)\*

**WEBSITE** : <http://midus.wisc.edu/>  
<http://midmac.med.harvard.edu./tech.html> (technical report)

### I. DESIGN

- Data type : Longitudinal Survey on U.S. Populations
- Dates collected : Wave 1: 1994-1995, Wave 2: 2004-2005
- # of waves : 2 waves\*
- A Sample**
- Target population : Nationally representative sample of non-institutionalized, English speaking adults in the U.S. between the ages of 25 and 74
- Sample design : Random digit dial sample of noninstitutionalized, English speaking adults aged 25-74 selected from working telephone banks in the coterminous U.S.
- Sampling frame : List of telephones from working telephone banks in coterminous U.S.
- Achieved N : Wave 1- Main sample: 4,242 adults ages 25 to 74, Sibling sample: 951, Twin Sample: 1,996
- Respondents : Adults ages 25 to 74 and their (twin) siblings
- Geographic scope : Nationally representative sample of the U.S.
- Mode of data collection : Telephone interviews and self administered questionnaires by mail
- Over-sampled populations : Older men, sibling pairs, twin pairs, 5 metropolitan areas (Boston, Atlanta, Chicago, Phoenix, San Francisco)
- Special feature : Sibling and twin samples
- Retrospective histories : Partial retrospective histories on employment and marriage; maternal and paternal affection, discipline, and generosity in childhood
- Response rates : In Wave 1, the response rate for the main sample collected through random digit dialing was 70%. Of those who completed telephone interviews, 86% completed self-administered questionnaires yielding an overall response rate of 61%

### **B Type of information gathered for inter/intragenerational relationships**

- Multi-generational : Respondent provides proxy reports on his/her parents and children
- Co-residential & biological orientation : MIDUS collects information on co-residential relationships. Oversample is based on biological relationships including twin and sibling samples, but

### II. CONTENT

- A Main focus** : Adults ages 25 to 74 (main respondent)
- Mode of reporting : Self reports
- Socio-demographic data : Age, sex, ethnicity, whether respondent lived in an institutionalized setting
- Education : Highest grade completed, highest degree received
- Cognitive ability : Adults are administered the word list recall test and Wave 2 includes telephone administered speed of information processing assessments
- Family background : Whether respondent lived with both biological parents at 16, whether lived in a female headed household while growing up, reasons for not living with both biological parents, identification of male household head during respondent's childhood, number of siblings while respondent was growing up
- Marital history : Current marital or cohabitation status, number of times married, incomplete marital histories including date of entry into first and current marriage, date of separation from first and current marriage
- Fertility history : Number of biological children, date of birth of each child

- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Description of work situations now and 10 years ago including employment status, retirement, schooling, incomplete educational histories, current occupation, full-time or part-time status, current occupation, supervisory role, number of overnight shifts  
For current job: work hours can be derived from start/end times for work and work scheduling is available for respondent and spouse
  - Assets/earnings : Assets, absence of telephone at home in the past 5 years, debts, household income in the last 12 months, pension plan, respondent rates their current financial situation
  - Health : Self-rated health, self-rated emotional health, illness, disabilities, health behaviors, height, weight, medical care, smoking and alcohol consumption in the last 12 months, health insurance, biomarkers collected to determine level of functioning on immune system, cardiovascular processes, medical histories, brain electrical activity collected to determine levels of stress
- B Secondary focus** : Spouse of main respondent
- Mode of reporting : Proxy reports by adult between 25 and 74 years old
  - Socio-demographic data : Date of birth, date of death if deceased, whether parents were born in the US
  - Education : Highest level of education completed
  - Marital history : Current marital or cohabitation status
  - Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current employment status, unemployment in the last 12 months, reasons for quitting
  - Assets/earnings : Personal earnings income, pension income, social security income
  - Health : Respondent rated physical and emotional health, disability, and illness
- C Other focus** : Parent of main respondent
- Mode of reporting : Proxy reports by main respondent
  - Socio-demographic data : Year of birth, sex, whether still alive, age, respondent's age when mother/father died if deceased
  - Education : Highest level of education mother completed
  - Marital history : Date of separation between parents in case of a divorce
  - Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Whether mother worked during respondent's childhood, mother's occupation during respondent's childhood, mother's job characteristics including if she was a supervisor, roles, father's occupation when respondent was growing up
  - Assets/earnings : Current financial health compared to parents when parents were respondent's age
  - Health : Main respondent reports on their parent's health

### III. INFORMATION ON INTER/INTRA-GENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

#### A Intergenerational transfers

- Quality of ties : Respondent rates his/her relationship with mother and father figure when respondent was growing up; retrospective report of psychological and physical violence during childhood from mother, father, brother, sister; retrospective report of maternal and paternal affection, discipline, and generosity during childhood

#### B General questions on transfers

- Financial transfers : Amount of money per month given to/received from parents, in-laws, children
- Time/caregiving : Number of hours per month spent helping/receiving assistance from spouse, children, parents, in-laws, other relatives, friends, neighbors, time diaries provide further information on the amount of assistance received/given
- Co-residence : Co-residence in the past 12 months with adult children, parents, and other relatives
- Social contact : Frequency of contact with parents, children, relatives, friends

#### C Transfers with other individuals/organizations

##### Government

- Financial transfers : Whether respondent's family was on welfare or AFDC for a period of over 6 months during respondent's childhood and adolescence

**Charity**

- Financial transfers : Dollars per month given to other individuals (not kin), religious groups, political organizations; dollars per month received from religious groups, non-government orgs
- Time/caregiving : Hours per month spent in nursing homes, school, volunteer work, church

**IV. GENERAL ATTITUDES ON THE FAMILY**

- Division of labor within family : Relationship between pay and division of labor in households, gender equality at home
- Family function : Importance of marriage, effect of marital dissolution for children, difficulties of single parenthood, work to family and family to work perceived positive and negative spillover
- Norms/culture : Altruism, normative obligation to primary and secondary kin and friends; civic responsibility; gender attitudes, quality of ties with partner, children, sexuality

**V. SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FILES**

- List of supplemental files : (1) Biomarker data collected to determine functioning in hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis, the autonomic nervous system, the immune system, cardiovascular system, metabolic processes, and brain electrical activity measures including (EEG, fMRI)

**VI. FUNDING AGENCIES**

- : John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation  
National Institute of Aging  
Institute of Aging at the University of Wisconsin, Madison

**VII. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS**

- Health : Daily stressors (work overload, family arguments), chronic stressors (caregiving, work-family spillover), acute stressors (divorce, remarriage, job change)
- List of supplemental files : (1) Life event history collects information on age and effect of assaults, parental drinking, difficulty with in-laws, infidelity, family death, child accident/injury, welfare  
(2) Data on psycho-social factors includes information on personality traits, well-being, sense of control, coping strategies, goal orientations, perceived discrimination, social support, social well-being, generativity  
(3) Data on religion and spirituality includes information on religious identification, religious practices, religious support, religious coping, spiritual experiences, mindfulness

---

\*For wave 2, only the questionnaires were available when the information in this summary was compiled.

## NEW IMMIGRANT SURVEY (NIS)\*

- WEBSITE** : <http://nis.princeton.edu/index.html>
- I. DESIGN**
- Data type : Longitudinal Survey of U.S. Populations
  - Dates collected : NIS-Pilot: 1996  
NIS-2003-1: June 2003 to June 2004  
Second round planned for Summer 2007
  - # of waves : NIS-Pilot completed, NIS-2003 baseline completed, and follow-up rounds planned
- A Sample**
- Target population : Nationally representative sample of adult immigrants admitted to legal permanent residence during a specified period and two types of child immigrants (adopted orphan and child of U.S. citizen) who would not be found in the households of adult immigrants
  - Sample design : Stratified random sample
  - Sampling frame : Electronic administrative records compiled for new immigrants by the U.S. government
  - Achieved N : NIS-Pilot: 1,984 immigrants (1,839 adult and 145 child immigrants)  
NIS-2003-1: 9,383 immigrants (8,573 adult and 810 child immigrants)
  - Respondents : Sampled adult immigrants, sponsor-parents of sampled child immigrants, spouses of sponsor parents, sampled children, and other children living in the household of sampled adult and child immigrant
  - Geographic scope : 85 Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs) and 38 counties with high representation of immigrants who have been admitted to legal permanent residence
  - Mode of data collection : NIS-Pilot: telephone interviews  
NIS-2003-1: Face-to-face interviews, cognitive assessments, and telephone interviews
  - Special feature : Several variables based on INS records. Although these variables are collapsed or recoded for confidentiality reasons, this feature may allow linkage with INS records
  - Over-sampled populations : Principals who entered the U.S. with employment visas are sampled twice the rate of others. Principals who entered the U.S. with diversity visas are sampled three times the rate of others
  - Retrospective histories : Retrospective histories on education, employment, migration, marriage, and fertility
  - Response rates : NIS-Pilot: 62% of those sampled (Jasso et al., 2000)  
NIS-2003-1: 69% in Adult Sample
- B Type of information gathered for inter/intragenerational relationships**
- Multi-generational : Interviews were conducted for adult respondents and children living in the household of the sampled adult and child immigrants (Jasso et al., 2005)
  - Co-residential & biological orientation : Interviews with co-resident spouses
- II. CONTENT**
- A Main focus**
- Mode of reporting : Self reports in Adult Sample, proxy reports from parents for the Child Sample, and use of immigration record
  - Socio-demographic data : Age, month and year of birth, sex, country of birth, country of citizenship
  - Education : Current enrollment status, highest level of schooling completed, highest level of schooling completed in the U.S., educational histories
  - Marital history : Current marital status, marital history including information on number of times married
  - Fertility history : Number of biological and adopted children, date of birth and sex of each child
  - Labor force participation/ : Employment status at each wave, pre-immigration and post-immigrant employment

- employment/occupation : histories include information on hours worked per week in each job, occupation
- Assets/earnings : Homeownership, value of business, earnings in the past 12 months, wage rate, various sources of income in the last 12 months
- Health : Self rated health, health compared to a year ago, illness, disability, smoking, alcohol use, depression
- B Secondary focus** : Spouse of sampled adult immigrant, sponsor-parents of sampled child immigrant
- Mode of reporting : Self reports from adult immigrants and proxy reports from sponsor parent for child immigrants
- Socio-demographic data : Year of birth, country of birth
- Education : Current enrollment status, highest level of schooling completed, highest level of schooling completed in the US, educational histories
- Marital history : Current marital status
- Fertility history :
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current employment status, full- and part-time status, job search over the past 4 weeks, employment histories, current occupation
- Assets/earnings : Homeownership, value of business, earnings in the past 12 months, wage rate, various sources of income in the last 12 months
- Health : Self-rated health, health compared to a year ago, illness, disability, smoking, alcohol use, depression
- C Other focus** : Children in the households of sampled adult and child immigrants
- Mode of reporting : Self and proxy reports by adult respondents
- Socio-demographic data : Sex, age, year of birth, place of birth, whether still alive, year of entry into the U.S.
- Education : Current enrollment in school, current enrollment in ESL programs
- Cognitive ability : Woodcock Johnson Test for Achievement, Digit Span Attention Tests
- Family background : Household roster available
- Health : Parental reports on child's health, limitations, year when child was afflicted with limitation, illness, hospitalization due to illness

### III. INFORMATION ON INTER/INTRA-GENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

#### A Intergenerational transfer

- Financial transfers : Amount of financial assistance that sampled adult gave to/received from parents, in-laws, and children in the previous 12 months, value of non-financial assistance in the form of goods and services given to/received from parents, in-laws, and children
- Time/caregiving : School activities performed by sampled adult or spouse or sponsor-parent and spouse such as attending a school meeting or speaking to a counselor
- Co-residence with adult : Household roster available
- Quality of ties :

#### B Intragenerational transfer

- Financial transfers :
- Time/caregiving :
- Co-residence with adult : Household roster available
- siblings

#### C General questions on transfer

- Financial transfers : Number of relatives who work in the family business
- Time/caregiving : Time scheduled by a family member to take children to museum, outing, etc. in the past 12 months
- Co-residence between relatives and respondent : Household roster available

#### D Transfers with other individuals/organizations

- **Friends**
- Financial transfers : Amount of financial assistance to and from friends

- Frequency of social contact :

**IV. SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FILES**

- List of supplemental files : Possible linkage with files from U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

**V. FUNDING AGENCIES**

- : National Institutes of Health (NIH)
- : National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD)
- : National Institute on Aging (NIA)/Office of Behavioral and Social Science Research
- : National Science Foundation (NSF)
- : U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, U. S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
- : Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE), HHS
- : Pew Charitable Trusts

**VI. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS**

- Retrospective histories : Retrospective histories on language and religion

---

\*The information in this summary was compiled using the documentation for the NIS-Pilot and NIS-2003 baseline surveys. All information in the summary pertains to NIS-2003 unless explicitly noted.

## PANEL STUDY OF INCOME DYNAMICS (PSID)\*

<b>WEBSITE</b>	:	<a href="http://psidonline.isr.umich.edu/data/">http://psidonline.isr.umich.edu/data/</a>
<b>I. DESIGN</b>		
- Data type	:	Longitudinal Survey on U.S. Populations
- Dates collected	:	Survey was collected annually between 1968 and 1996 and biennially since 1997
- # of waves	:	34 Waves
<b>A Sample</b>		
- Target population	:	Individuals who were members of a nationally representative sample of families in the U.S. in 1968 plus national sample of low-income families from Survey of Economic Opportunity (SEO) study and their offspring
- Background	:	At its origin, the PSID consisted of 2 samples: a cross-sectional nationally representative sample (SRC) and a national sample of low income families (SEO). The individuals in families sampled in these two samples in 1968 are said to have the "PSID gene" and they are interviewed and re-interviewed in every year whether or not they live in the same dwelling or with the same people. Individuals with the PSID gene "transmit" this gene to their biological (or legally adopted) offspring. Thus when a child with the PSID gene that was sampled in 1968 -- or, more generally, a biological (or adopted) offspring of someone with the PSID gene subsequently -- form their families/household of destination as adults, these families/households are said to have "split off" from their original families/households of origin and, in principle, are followed by the PSID in subsequent waves of the Study.
- Sample design	:	The Survey Research Center (SRC) sample in 1968 is an equal probability sample of families from 48 states in 1968 The Survey of Economic Opportunity (SEO) sample in 1968 is an equal probability sample of low families with heads under the age of 60 in Standard Metropolitan Areas and non-Standard Metropolitan Areas in the South in 1968
- Primary sampling unit	:	SRC sample: 48 states SEO sample: Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA) and non-Standard Metropolitan Areas in the South in 1968
- Special features	:	In 1990, 2,000 Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban households were added and then dropped in 1995. In 1997, 441 Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban families were added again to the sample. Also, in 1997, the low income sample was trimmed by dropping two-thirds of the SEO sample, but a portion of the dropped sample of families headed by an African American who had at least 1 child below the age of 12 were re-instated in the sample. In 1997/1999 a refresher sample of 511 post 1968 immigrant families was added. Most family heads in the immigrant sample identify their race as Latino (52.4%), followed by Asian (21.1%), white (11.7%), black (7.8%), and other (6.8%).
- Respondents	:	Heads of families interviewed in 1968, heads of families containing a member of the family originally sampled in 1968, and, more generally, the biological (or adopted) children that have the PSID gene
- Achieved N	:	1968: 18,230 individuals in 4,820 families; 1969: 17,211 individuals in 4,460 families; 1970: 17,350 individuals in 4,645 families; 1971: 17,590 individuals in 4,840 families; 1972: 18,051 individuals in 5,060 families; 1973: 18,236 individuals in 5,285 families; 1974: 18,395 individuals in 5,517 families; 1975: 18,625 individuals in 5,725 families,

1976: 18,768 individuals in 5,862 families; 1977: 18,998 individuals in 6,007 families; 1978: 19,140 individuals in 6,154 families; 1979: 19,443 individuals in 6,373 families; 1980: 19,747 individuals in 6,533 families; 1981: 19,796 individuals in 6,620 families; 1982: 20,112 individuals in 6,742 families; 1983: 20,329 individuals in 6,852 families; 1984: 20,393 individuals in 6,918 families; 1985: 20,680 individuals in 7,032 families; 1986: 20,437 individuals in 7,018 families; 1987: 20,486 individuals in 7,061 families; 1988: 20,506 individuals in 7,114 families; 1989: 20,451 individuals in 7,114 families; 1990: 28,197 individuals in 9,371 families; 1991: 27,845 individuals in 9,363 families; 1992: 29,275 individuals in 9,829 families; 1993: 29,726 individuals in 9,977 families; 1994: 31,546 individuals in 10,765 families; 1995: 29,884 individuals in 10,401 families; 1996: 21,810 individuals in 8,511 families; 1997: 19,760 individuals in 6,748 families; 1999: 20,514 individuals in 6,997 families; 2001: 21,396 individuals in 7,406 families; 2003: 22,290 individuals in 7,822 families; 2005: N/A

- Geographic scope : Coterminous states in the U.S.
- Mode of data collection : Face-to-face interviews, telephone interviews, and self-administered questionnaires
- Over-sampled populations : Low-income households, Puerto Rican, Cuban, and Mexican households, and households headed by new immigrants
- Retrospective histories : Retrospective and prospective histories on living arrangements, marriage, fertility, employment, and occupation
- Response rates : 1968: 76% of sampled families, 1969: 89%, 1970+: 97%-99% 1988: 56% cumulative
- Special modules : PSID has collected multiple special topic modules: Activity Saving Files 1984-1989 and 1989-1994; Estimating Risk Tolerance 1996; Family Income Plus Files 1994-2001; Health Care Burden File 1993; Other Family Unit Member Income Detail File 1993; Hours of Work and Wage Files 1994-2001; Wealth Files 1984, 1989, 1994, 1999, 2001; Time and Money Transfer File 1988; Self-Administered Health Supplement 1990; Telephone Health Supplement 1990; Parent Health Supplement 1991; Childbirth and Adoption History File 1985-2001; Marriage History File 1985-2001; Relationship File 1968-1985; Geocode Match Files;

**B Type of information gathered for inter/intragenerational relationships**

- Multi-generational : Information is collected on the household head, their children, their grandchildren, and on occasion, great-grandchildren. Note that some of this information is collected directly from those in subsequent generations to the household head due to the PSID gene following rule noted above. Furthermore, the PSID Child Supplement specifically samples respondents and their children
- Co-residential & biological orientation : PSID was initially sampled at the household level, and therefore, it was sampled with an orientation toward co-residential relationships. However, the inheritance of the PSID gene across generations and the formation of split-off families ensures that the PSID sample has a strong orientation toward biological ties and can be linked across generation regardless of co-residence

**II. CONTENT**

- A Main focus** : Household head
- Mode of reporting : Self reports
- Socio-demographic data : Race/ethnicity, age, sex
- Education : Enrollment in school at each wave, highest level of education completed, on-the-job training
- Marital history : Marital status at each wave, marital history includes information on the number of marriages, start and end date of each marriage
- Fertility history : Whether head ever had children, fertility history includes information on when head's first child was born
- Labor force participation/ : Labor force and employment status at each wave, employment history includes

employment/occupation	information on main occupation, number of years head worked for present employer, number of jobs that head has had in the ten years prior to the interview, whether head has been laid off from work for more than a month due to illness in the year prior to the interview at each wave, number of days head was unemployed in the year prior to the interview at each wave, number of days head was sick in the year prior to the interview at each wave, whether head is a member of a labor union at each wave
- Assets/earnings	: Homeownership, present value of their house, whether family owns a car, whether family has any debt, amount of principal and secondary mortgage, total family income in the year prior to the interview at each wave
- Health	: Current health status, health status from birth to the age of 16, health conditions including hypertension and arthritis, limitation to daily activities, use of health care, illness, accidents, smoking, alcohol use, dietary knowledge
<b>B Secondary focus</b>	: Spouse of head
- Mode of reporting	: Proxy report by head
- Socio-demographic data	: Age
- Education	: Highest level of education completed by each wave, whether spouse has a college degree, whether spouse obtained any informal schooling by each wave
- Marital history	: Marital history includes information on number of times spouse got married, start and end date of different marriages
- Fertility history	: Child and adoption history details information on year of birth of spouse's child with head
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation	: Labor force and employment status in the year prior to the interview date at each wave, number of annual hours spouse worked for pay in the year prior to the interview at each wave, number of annual hours of work spouse lost due to illness in the year prior to the interview at each wave
- Assets/earnings	: Homeownership, amount of wife's income by source of income in the year prior to interview at each wave
- Health	: Illness, disability, health behaviors, health care access
<b>C Other focus</b>	: Head's parent or in-law (head's parent)
- Mode of reporting	: Proxy report by female head or wife in 1991 Parent Health Supplement
- Socio-demographic data	: Whether head's mother/father is still alive, date of parent's death if deceased
- Marital history	: Whether parents are married to each other, marital or cohabitation status in 1991, marital history includes information on start and end date of marriage, move in/out date for cohabitation
- Assets/earnings	: Whether head's parent has a net worth exceeding 25,000 dollars, 100,000 dollars, amount of debt, whether head's parent has an annual income exceeding 20,000 dollars, 50,000 dollars
- Health	: Whether parent has cancer, angina, allergies, and other illnesses, whether parent is not able to live independently due to illness
<b>D Other focus</b>	: Head's child
- Mode of reporting	: Proxy reports by head
- Socio-demographic data	: Race/ethnicity, sex, age, age at death if deceased recorded in the Child Birth Supplement
- Education	: Whether head's child stopped attending school in the survey year at each wave, highest level of education completed by the survey year at each wave, highest level of education head expects child to complete at each wave
- Family background	: Whether head's child under 25 does not live with household head at the time of the interview at each wave, socio-demographic information on head's child such as age, sex, school enrollment are provided at each wave

- Health : Birth weight
- E Other focus** : Child between 0 and 12 years of age in a PSID family in 1997 sampled for the PSID Child Development Supplement (CDS child)
- Mode of reporting : Self report by child 8 years or older, proxy reports by primary caregiver, child assessments
- Socio-demographic data : Race/ethnicity, age, sex
- Education : Enrollment in school at CDS 1 and CDS 2, enrollment in a gifted program at CDS 1 and 2, type of school CDS child attends (Public, Religious, Private), whether child has ever been expelled from school, whether child has ever been held back from school
- Cognitive ability : Woodcock-Johnson Revised Tests of Achievement and the WISC Digit Span Test for Memory was administered to the child
- Family background : Whether child lives with biological father at the time of CDS 1 and 2, date when non-resident father last lived with the child
- Health : Primary care giver rates CDS child's health, medical diagnosis of illness such as epilepsy, diabetes, number of hospitalizations, year of hospitalizations, date last seen a doctor or nurse due to injury in the last 12 months, number of school days missed in the last 12 months due to illness or injury, health insurance coverage

### III. INFORMATION ON INTER/INTRA-GENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

#### A Intergenerational transfer

- Financial transfers : Whether head/spouse gave/received financial assistance to/from parents/in-laws, amount of financial assistance given/received, identification of person who gave/received financial assistance as reported in the Time and Money Transfer Files
- Time/caregiving : Non-financial transfer received from/given to respondent's parents/in-laws, activities performed with CDS child in the past 12 months (wash/fold clothes, wash dishes together, go to the store, do yard work together)
- Co-residence between adult children and parent : Household roster available
- Proximity : Whether CDS child's non-resident father/mother lives in the same neighborhood, same city, and same state as CDS child, geocodes for place of residence available on all PSID gene members in a family
- Social contact : Frequency of contact between CDS child and non-resident father/mother either in person, via e-mail, via telephone in the past 12 months as reported by primary caregiver

#### B General questions on transfers

- Financial transfers : Financial burden assumed due to immediate or extended family's health care costs
- Time/caregiving : Whether CDS child was taken care of by relative on a regular basis, date of childcare, age of CDS child when they were taken care of by a relative on a regular basis
- Co-residence between relatives and respondent : Household roster information available
- Proximity : Proximity of respondent's residence with that of friends and relatives, number of relatives and friends that live in the same neighborhood as respondent
- Quality of ties : Number of CDS child's closest friends that the primary caregiver knows by sight, number of CDS child's closest friends' parents primary caregiver knows by sight, primary caregiver reports frequency of conflict between themselves and non-resident father on CDS child's leisure, religious, and school organized activity

#### C Transfers to/from other individuals/organizations

##### Government

- Financial transfers : Whether family received food stamps, AFDC/TANF, SSI, unemployment compensation, VA pension in the year prior to the interview

- Time/caregiving : Whether CDS child was in childcare provided by Head Start program, date when CDS child was enrolled in the Head Start program

**Charities**

- Time/caregiving : Whether head participates in social clubs or other organizations at each wave, amount of time spent per week doing volunteer work

**IV. GENERAL ATTITUDES ON THE FAMILY**

- Division of labor within family : Performance of household chores by husband and wife
- Parenting : Parenting, employed mother and relationship to children
- Norms/culture : Attitudes for/against cohabitation

**V. SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FILES**

- List of supplemental files : PSID Child Supplement collects additional information on parents and children between the ages of 0 and 12 in 1997. It can be linked to the Department of Education's Common Core Data to obtain information about the child's school environment; Death Files permit linkage to the National Death Index; Medical Care File permit linkage to files in Medicare.

**VI. FUNDING AGENCIES**

- : Office of Economic Opportunity
- Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation of the Department of Health Education and Welfare (now Health and Human Services)
- Departments of Labor and Agriculture
- National Science Foundation
- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development
- National Institute of Aging
- Ford Foundation
- Sloan Foundation
- Rockefeller Foundation

**VII. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS**

- Respondents : A knowledgeable proxy may also respond
- Health of head and spouse : Information on mental health, whether respondent exercises
- Special modules: : Mortality File

---

\*Documentation for the 2005 PSID was unavailable when the information in this summary was compiled.

## SURVEY OF HEALTH, AGEING, AND RETIREMENT IN EUROPE (SHARE)

- WEBSITE** : <http://www.share-project.org>
- I. DESIGN**
- Data type : Longitudinal Survey on Foreign-Born Elderly Populations
  - Dates collected : Austria- Core Sample: May 2004 to October 2004  
Denmark- Core Sample: May 2004 to October 2004  
France- Core Sample: October 2004 to November 2004  
Vignette Sample: June 2005 to July 2005  
Germany- Core Sample: May 2004 to October 2004  
Vignette Sample: May 2004 to October 2004  
Greece- Core Sample: May 2004 to October 2004  
Vignette Sample: January 2005 to March 2005  
Italy- Core Sample: May 2004 to October 2004  
Vignette Sample: August 2004 to December 2004  
Netherlands- Core Sample: May 2004 to October 2004  
Vignette Sample: August 2005 to December 2005  
Spain- Core Sample: May 2004 to October 2004  
Vignette Sample: November 2004 to December 2004  
Sweden- Core Sample: May 2004 to December 2004  
Vignette Sample: November 2004 to December 2004  
Supplementary Sample: November 2004 to December 2004  
Switzerland- Core Sample: May 2004 to October 2004
  - # of waves : 1 wave in each country
- A Sample**
- Target population : Varies by country  
Austria: All German speaking residents born in 1954 or earlier and their spouses/partners at the time of the interview excluding individuals who live in prison  
Denmark: All Danish speaking residents born in 1954 or earlier and their spouses/partners at the time of the interview excluding individuals who live in prison  
France: All individuals older than 50 excluding all individuals living in institutions  
Germany: All German speaking residents born in 1953 or earlier and their spouses/partners at the time of the interview excluding individuals who live in prison  
Greece: All Greek speaking residents born in 1954 or earlier and their spouses/partners at the time of the interview excluding individuals who live in prison  
Italy: All Italian speaking residents born in 1954 or earlier and their spouses/partner at the time of the interview excluding individuals who live in institutions  
Netherlands: All Dutch speaking residents born in 1954 or earlier and their spouse/partners at the time of the interview excluding individuals who live in prison  
Spain: All Spanish speaking residents born in 1954 or earlier and their spouses/partners at the time of the interview excluding individuals who live in prison  
Sweden: All Swedish speaking residents born in 1954 or earlier and their spouses/partners at the time of the interview excluding individuals who live in prison  
Switzerland: All French, German, or Italian speaking residents born in 1954 or earlier and their spouses/partners at the time of the interview excluding individuals who live in institutions

- **Sample design** : Varies by country  
Austria: Multistage stratified random sample using a CD-ROM of telephone numbers  
Denmark: Simple random sample  
France: Multistage stratified probability sample  
Germany: Multistage stratified random sample  
Greece: Multistage stratified random sample using a telephone directory  
Italy: Multistage stratified probability sample  
Netherlands: Multistage stratified random sample  
Spain: Multistage stratified random sample  
Sweden: Stratified random sample  
Switzerland: Stratified random sample using the telephone directory of Switzerland
  - **Primary sampling unit** : Varies by country  
Austria: Municipalities and political district areas  
Denmark: Households  
France: List of dwellings in a master sample  
Germany: Municipalities  
Greece: Nomos (Greek prefectures)  
Italy: Municipalities  
Netherlands: Municipalities  
Spain: Municipalities  
Sweden: All residents registered in the population registry NAVET of the Swedish tax authority  
Switzerland: Telephone numbers in the Swiss phone directory
  - **Achieved N** : Austria: 1,957 interviews out of 4,347 sampled individuals  
Denmark: 1,699 interviews out of 2,872 sampled individuals  
France: 1,746 interviews out of 2,533 sampled individuals  
Germany: 2,350 interviews out of 4,478 sampled individuals  
Greece: 2,131 interviews out of 3,845 sampled individuals  
Italy: 2,023 interviews out of 4,603 sampled individuals  
Netherlands: 2,350 interviews out of 4,338 sampled individuals  
Spain: 1,813 interviews out of 4,900 sampled individuals  
Sweden: 2,116 interviews out of 5,121 sampled individuals  
Switzerland: 997 interviews out of 2,979 sampled individuals
  - **Respondents** : Individuals over 50 and their spouses/partners at the time of the interview
  - **Geographic scope** : Continental Europe
  - **Mode of data collection** : Face-to-face interviews and self-administered questionnaires
  - **Over-sampled populations** : None
  - **Retrospective histories** : Partial retrospective histories on marriage, employment, medical condition
  - **Response rates** : Detailed explanations on how the response rates were computed are available in [http://www.share-project.org/new\\_sites/Documentation/TheSurvey.pdf](http://www.share-project.org/new_sites/Documentation/TheSurvey.pdf)  
Overall individual response rates: 48%, Austria: 45%, Denmark: 59%, France: 69%, Germany: 52% Greece: 55%, Italy: 44%, Netherlands: 54%, Spain: 37%, Sweden: 41%, Switzerland: 33% (Table 9.14 in above mentioned document; Also see additional information provided by PI.)
- B Type of information gathered for inter/intragenerational relationships**
- **Multi-generational** : Collects information on respondent's parents, in-laws, respondent, and their children

- Co-residential & biological orientation : The surveys are sampled at the household level. It is sampled with an orientation toward co-residential relationship, but also includes questions on biological relationships

## II. CONTENT

- A Main focus** : Individuals 50 years or older, spouse or partner
- Mode of reporting : Self reports and physical health assessments
- Socio-demographic data : Date of birth, country of birth, respondent's parity at birth (oldest, youngest, middle child)
- Education : Highest level of education completed
- Cognitive ability : Respondents rate their cognitive ability including their reading and writing skills, tests such as ten word learning delayed recall test and numeracy tests are administered to assess respondent's cognitive skills
- Marital history : Current marital status, partial marital history including information on the year of current marriage and year of registered partnership for current union, year of separation from last spouse or partner
- Fertility history : Number of biological children that are still alive, age and sex of each child
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current employment status, number of hours worked per week during past year, partial employment history including start and end date of employment
- Assets/earnings : Homeownership, value of property, savings, debt, total family income, pre-tax income, income from capital gains in the past 12 months, pension income in the past 12 months
- Health : Self-rated health, long-term illness, partial medical history including the age when respondent was first diagnosed with an illness, disability, smoking, alcohol use, health insurance coverage, walking speed test administered to assess respondent's functionality
- B Other focus** : Parents and in-laws
- Mode of reporting : Proxy reports
- Socio-demographic data : Whether biological mother/father is still alive, age, age of death if deceased
- Fertility history : Whether ever had siblings, number of siblings who are alive, respondent's birth order
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Last occupation prior to retirement or death
- Health : Respondent rated parent's health
- C Other focus** : Child
- Mode of reporting : Proxy reports
- Socio-demographic data : Age, year of birth, sex, child's relationship to respondent (biological, adopted, or step), date of birth
- Education : Highest level of education completed
- Marital history : Current marital status, whether child has a cohabiting partner
- Fertility history : Number of children
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current employment status, job characteristics such as full-time/part-time status, self employment, current occupation, whether child is currently on parental leave, whether child has retired
- Health :

## III. INFORMATION ON INTER/INTRA-GENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

### A Intergenerational transfers

- Financial transfers : Whether respondent gave/received financial assistance to/from parents or children in the past 12 months, amount of financial assistance respondent or spouse/partner gave/received to/from parents or children in the past 12 months, whether respondent received/gave an inheritance or large gift, identification of the person who gave/received the inheritance or large gift year when respondent gave/received an inheritance or a large gift, amount of

- inheritance
- Time/caregiving : Whether respondent gave/received help with daily activities to/from a child or parent in the past 12 months, amount of time respondent or respondent's spouse/partner spent giving/receiving help in the past 12 months, type of help respondent gave to/received from child or parent (help with dressing, bathing, using the toilet), whether respondent provided child care for grandchildren in the past 12 months, frequency with which respondent provides childcare (almost every day, once a week, infrequently), number of hours per week respondent typically spent providing childcare in the past 12 months
  - Co-residence between adult children and parent : Whether respondent's children live in the same house as respondent
  - Proximity : Distance between respondent's place of residence and select child's/ parent's place of residence
  - Social contact : Frequency of contact between respondents and parents/children per week in the past 12 months via e-mail, telephone, or in person
  - Quality of ties : Respondent is asked to report the frequency with which they have disagreements with parents, in-laws, children for a subsample
  - Expectations/obligations : Expectations of receiving/leaving an inheritance totaling 150,000 € or more
- B General questions on transfers**
- Financial transfers : Whether respondent and respondent's spouse/partner gave/received help to/from relatives, neighbors, and friends in the past 12 months, identification of people who gave/received financial assistance, amount of financial assistance given/received in the past 12 months
  - Time/caregiving : Whether respondent gave/received help with personal care to/from relatives, or friends in the past 12 months, number of times per week respondent gave/received help to/from relatives in the past 12 months, number of hours per week respondent spent giving/receiving help to/from relatives, neighbors, and friends in the past 12 months
  - Quality of ties : Respondent is asked to report the frequency with which they have disagreements with spouse/partner, other family members, friends

#### IV. GENERAL ATTITUDES ON THE FAMILY

- Division of labor within the family : Respondents are asked to indicate who should bear the main responsibility for earning money, cleaning, cooking, taking care of the elderly
- Parenting : Respondents report whether they agree with the statements that it is the parents' duty to do what is best for the child even at their own expense; grandparents must contribute toward the economic security of grandchildren or their families
- Family function :
- Norms/culture : Respondents indicate whether they feel it is the duty of the family or the State to bear the financial responsibility for older persons who are in need

#### V. SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FILES

- List of supplemental files :

#### VI. FUNDING AGENCIES

: European Commission's Research Directorate  
 U.S. National Institute on Aging  
 The Austrian Science Fund  
 Belgian Science Policy Office  
 Swiss Federal Office of Education and Science

#### VII. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED BY PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS

- Response rates : PIs also report the following response rates  
 Overall: 62%, Austria: 58%, Denmark: 63%, France: 74%, Germany: 63%  
 Greece: 61%, Italy: 55%, Netherlands: 61%, Spain: 53%, Sweden: 50%

Source	: Switzerland: 37%
	: Table 9.1 in <a href="http://www.share-project.org/new_sites/Documentation/TheSurvey.pdf">http://www.share-project.org/new_sites/Documentation/TheSurvey.pdf</a>
- Intergenerational Proximity	: Categories on the distance between parents and children include categories between less than 1 kilometer away to more than 500 kilometers
- Social contact with parents/ children	: Frequency of social contact is described using 7 categories ranging from daily to never
- Other information	: Belgium participated in data collection, but is experiencing delays in supplying the data. They will be included in the 2nd release.

---

## WISCONSIN LONGITUDINAL STUDY (WLS)

**WEBSITE** : <http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/wlsresearch/>

### I. DESIGN

- Data type : Longitudinal Survey on U.S. population
  - Dates collected : Survey data on original respondents and parents: 1957, 1964, 1975, 1993, 2004  
Survey data on selected siblings: 1977, 1994, 2005  
Survey data on the spouse of the original respondent: 2004  
Survey data on spouse of the selected sibling: 2005
  - # of waves : Original Respondents: 5 waves  
Selected Siblings: 3 waves
- A Sample**
- Target population : 1957 high school graduates in Wisconsin (Graduates)
  - Sample design : 1/3 Random sample of all 1957 high school graduates
  - Primary sampling unit : Individuals
  - Achieved N : 10,317 men and women who graduated from Wisconsin high schools in 1957. Later waves include interviews with current spouse, and a randomly selected sibling of the graduate and the sibling's spouse.
  - Respondents : Graduates, parents, selected siblings, spouse of graduate, spouse of selected sibling
  - Geographic scope : At each wave of the survey 2/3 of graduates lived in WI, and about 1/3 lived elsewhere in the U.S. or abroad.
  - Mode of data collection : Telephone interviews, self-administered questionnaires via mail, administrative data linkages
  - Special modules : Brain imaging, anthropomorphic measures, bio-indicators and content analyses on interviews
  - Over-sampled populations :
  - Retrospective histories : Retrospective histories on marriage, job, fertility
  - Response rates : The rates below describe retention rates for original respondents (1957 HS graduates)  
Wave 2 (1964): 81%; Wave 3 (1975): 89%, Wave 4 (1977): 86%,  
Wave 4 (1992-1993): 87%, Wave 5 (1993-1994): 80%, Wave (2004-2005): 88%

**B Type of information gathered for inter/intragenerational relationships**

- Multi-generational : Collects data on graduate, graduate's parent, graduate's current spouse, siblings, and adult children. For some items, multiple participants are asked the same question.
- Co-residential & biological orientation : Sample based on biological and co-residential relationships including questions on non-resident biological family members

### II. CONTENT

- A Main focus** : Graduates
- Mode of reporting : Self reports by graduates and proxy reports from parents, siblings, and spouses
  - Socio-demographic data : Race, sex, age, living status
  - Education : Highest level of education attained, total years of schooling, current school enrollment, educational history
  - Cognitive ability : Range of cognitive test scores including IQ score mapped from data collected on raw Henmon-Nelson test score, IQ measured in multiple years
  - Family background : Family structure at age 16
  - Marital history : Current marital status, marital history, date when current marriage began, date

- Fertility history : when last marriage ended
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Fertility history including up to 10 children
- Assets/earnings : Job history including information on employment status, unemployment spells, retirement plans, current occupation, first occupation, and expected occupation after graduation from high school
- Health : Homeownership, value of home, savings, debt, income in the previous 12 months, earnings, wage rates, frequency of pay
- Health : Self-rated health, health compared to others, BMI, height, weight, disability, health insurance coverage
- B Secondary focus** : Spouse of graduate
- Mode of reporting : 2004 telephone interview with the graduate's current spouse, earlier information on the spouse is available from proxy reports given by the graduate in earlier waves. Information below is based on the proxy reports from before 2004.
- Socio-demographic data : Race, age of current spouse, date of death if deceased
- Family background : Reports on the current spouse's family structure when they were 16 years of age including whether they were in an intact, single father, single mother, or other family type
- Marital history : Year current marriage began, number of times current spouse was married prior to marriage with graduate
- Fertility history : Number of children from current marriage
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Current labor force and employment status of spouse, current occupation of spouse
- Assets/earnings : Earnings
- Health : Health compared to others, BMI, height, weight, disability, health insurance
- C Other focus** : Children of graduate
- Participant in survey : Proxy reports provide some information on all children, but they provide more detailed information on a randomly selected child
- Socio-demographic data : Sex and date of birth for all children
- Education : Highest level of education attended by all children, information on college enrollment, educational aspiration for randomly selected child
- Marital history :
- Fertility history : Number of children
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Child's current and past activities, current employment status, current occupation of randomly selected child
- Assets/earnings :
- Health : Disability
- D Other focus** : Parents of graduate
- Mode of reporting : Proxy data by graduates; self reports in 1975
- Socio-demographic data : Graduate reports whether his/her parents are alive, date of death if deceased
- Education : Highest degree obtained by parents
- Family background :
- Marital history : Asks whether parents are still married to each other in Wave 4
- Fertility history : Number of graduate's siblings
- Labor force participation/employment/occupation : Mother's occupation, father's occupation, occupation of household head in 1975
- Assets/earnings : Parent's income in last 12 months in earlier waves, home ownership of parents or in-laws in later waves
- Health : Graduate rates parents' health
- E Other focus** : Siblings of graduates of 1957
- Mode of reporting : Proxy reports by graduates. Self reports by selected siblings (one per graduate) who

provide the same information as that provided by the graduates. The data include IQ scores for selected siblings. The information below is based exclusively on the proxy reports

- Socio-demographic data : Gender, age, age at death if deceased
- Education : Highest level of education completed
- Cognitive ability :
- Family background :
- Marital history :
- Fertility history :
- Labor force participation/ employment/occupation :
- Assets/earnings :
- Health :

### III. INFORMATION ON INTER/INTRA-GENERATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

#### A Intergenerational transfers

- Financial transfers : Respondents report whether they or their spouses received gifts/bequests worth \$1000 from parents or in-laws, the total value of the gift/bequest, identifies the parent or in-law who gave the respondent the gifts/bequests, the total value of the gifts/bequests, why they received the gifts/bequests (e.g., educational expenses, down-payment of home, etc.), most recent year when parent/in-law gave the bequests, whether they gave gifts over \$1,000 to parents/adult children, identify the parent/child who received the gift, total amount of the gift, main reason for receiving the gift, year when gift was made. Select surveys ask whether the bequest was evenly divided between the graduate and their siblings. In 2003 info obtained on largest inheritance of \$10,000 or more
- Time/caregiving :
- Co-residence between adult children and parent : Household roster available
- Proximity : Reports whether graduate's parent lives in the same household as graduate
- Social contact : Frequency of contact between graduate and randomly selected child
- Quality of ties : Closeness between graduates and parents, parents' influence on graduate's future plans. Closeness between respondent and randomly selected child

- Expectations/obligations :

#### B Intragenerational transfers

- Financial transfers : Respondents report whether they gave to/received from their siblings a gift worth more than \$1000, amount of help given, main reason for giving/receiving help, identifies the siblings that received or gave the most help
- Time/caregiving :
- Co-residence between adult siblings : Household roster available
- Proximity :
- Social contact : Frequency of contact between respondent and sibling via mail, visits, or telephone
- Quality of ties : Closeness between respondent and selected sibling
- Expectations/obligations :

#### C General questions on transfers

- Financial transfers : Respondent reports whether they or their spouses received gifts/bequests worth \$1000, the total value of the gift/bequest, identifies who gave the gifts/bequests, the total value of the gifts/bequests, main purpose of the gifts/bequests (e.g., educational expenses, down-payment of house, etc.), respondent report whether they gave gifts over \$1000, identification of the individual that received the gift, total amount of the gift, year when gift

- Time/caregiving : was made (See entry for intergenerational transfers)  
: Care given to/received by respondent or spouse for more than one month in duration over the last twelve months, reasons for giving/receiving care, length of time giving/receiving help to/from relatives or family members
- Co-residence : Household based information on co-residence between spouse and respondent is available
- Proximity :
- Social contact : Number of times respondent has gathered together with family, friends, etc.
- Quality of ties :

**D Transfers with other individuals/organizations**

**Government Support**

- Financial transfers : Asks whether graduate received financial transfers from government, income from public assistance

**Friends**

- Financial transfers : Frequency of contact with friends

**Charities**

- Financial transfers : Graduate reports whether they made any charitable contributions over \$500, the amount of contributions

**IV. SPECIAL LIST OF SUPPLEMENTAL FILES**

- List of supplemental files : Tax records, content analysis on recorded files, year-book study, school records, brain imaging

**V. FUNDING AGENCIES**

- : National Institute on Aging
- : Vilas Estate Trust
- : National Science Foundation
- : Spencer Foundation
- : Graduate School of the University of Wisconsin-Madison

**VI. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED BY PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS**

- Health : Diagnoses of specific conditions
- In 2004 interviews were conducted with spouse/widow of the original graduate respondent and the spouse/widow of the selected sibling. These data include information that parallels much of that obtained information from the graduate and sibling respondents, including IQ.

**Appendix B: Questions asked of Data Collectors Concerning Data Strengths and Weaknesses, Future Needs and Potential Innovations for Research on Generational Family Structure and Relationships**

NICHD Explaining Family Change  
and Variation Project  
Generations Working Group  
December 17, 2006

**Questions Concerning Data Collection for  
Explaining Change and Variation in  
Intra- and Inter-generational Family Relationships**

**I. Strengths and Weaknesses of your data collection efforts with respect to research on intra- and inter-generational of families:**

- A. What do you consider to be the 3-4 major strengths of your data for analyzing intra- and inter-generational issues?
- B. What do you consider to be the 3-4 major deficiencies of your data for analyzing intra- and inter-generational issues?

**II. Please identify and describe key data needs, now and in the future, that you foresee to improve our understanding of the following issues related to the family and their behaviors:**

- A. *Changes over time in intra-generational relationships of family members*
- B. *Changes over time in inter-generational relationships of family members*
- C. *Differences across subgroups (i.e., racial, ethnic, immigrant, etc., subgroups) in intra-generational relationships among family members.*
- D. *Differences across subgroups (i.e., racial, ethnic, immigrant, etc., subgroups) in inter-generational relationships among family members.*

**III. Potential Innovative Data Collection Strategies and Data Content for studying change and subgroup variation in intra- and intergenerational relationships**

- A. New and innovative strategies for sampling frames?
- B. Data gathering methods, e.g., surveys by Internet, administrative data sources and/or linking of such data, mixed modes of data collection?

- C. New data content, e.g., strategies for getting more reliable and dynamic information on interactions and the quality of relationships within and between generations of a family or for gathering data on preferences, attitudes, values, etc.
  
- D. For any of the above innovations, we would be very interested in descriptions of innovations that you contemplated for your data collection efforts but decided not to undertake and why you did not undertake them, e.g., they were too burdensome for respondents, they were too expensive to implement, they involved risks to subject confidentiality, etc. You might also comment on what you think would have been required to make such innovations feasible in the near future.

Once completed, please email to: [efc\\_generations\\_group@ccpr.ucla.edu](mailto:efc_generations_group@ccpr.ucla.edu)