MARITAL INSTABILITY OVER THE LIFE COURSE

METHODOLOGY REPORT FOR

SIXTH WAVE PANEL, 2000 CROSS-SECTION AND COMPARISON

Alan Booth, Professor

Paul Amato, Professor

Stacy Rogers, Professor

Pennsylvania State University

David R. Johnson, Professor

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

2001

Inquiries should be directed to Alan Booth, Department of Sociology, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16803. Phone (814) 863-1141, Email axb24@psu.edu.

PREFACE

The purpose of this report is to provide information on the technical aspects of the data collected in 2000. Four data sets were collected in 2000: (1) sixth wave of interviews (referred to as the adult panel) with a national sample of persons who were married in 1980 and interviewed in 1980, 1983, 1988, 1992, and 1997, (2) a short mail survey (referred to as the offspring panel) administered to the offspring panel respondents who participated either in 1992 or 1997, (3) a nationwide random digit dialing (RDD) cross-section of currently married persons between the ages of 19 and 55, (referred to as the cross-section) designed as a replicate of the original cross-section study completed in 1980, and (4) a comparison sample of persons who would have been eligible for the original panel study conducted in 1980, (referred to as the comparison sample) eligible respondents for this group had to be persons married in 1980 and between the ages of 39 and 75.

Entitled "Marital Instability Over the Life Course 1980-1998," data and methodology reports on the first five waves are available from Data Archivist, Population Research Institute, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802 (darragh@pop.psu.edu) and Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI 48106. The sixth wave was funded, in part, by grant number 1 R01 AG16346-02 from the National Institute on Aging.

The theoretical framework guiding the sixth wave of investigation may be found in the proposal in Appendix A. The purpose of the sixth wave was to continue examining the relationship between life course and marital instability. The study focuses on three issues. First, considerable debate centers on the question of whether marital quality has changed in recent decades. The present study informs this debate by examining changes in marital quality between 1980 and 2000 and identifying factors accounting for these changes. Second, changes in marriage and family life

have consequences for the health and longevity of the middle-aged and elderly; however, only a few aspects of marriage and family life have been studied in this context, and the mechanisms are not well understood. The results of this study will provide a comprehensive picture of the impact of family and marital history on health. Third, the number of family and life course scholars employing longitudinal designs has increased in recent years, yet we know little about the ways in which panel attrition affects the accuracy of findings. The present study will compare cross-sectional and longitudinal data to gain a better understanding of panel attrition, as well as how biases resulting from attrition might be corrected. The remainder of the report describes the following activities in detail: tracking procedures, selecting the cross-section sample, interview schedule construction and pretest, obtaining the interviews, response rates, representativeness of the 2000 interview, and management of the study.

Table of Contents

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

Tracking Members of the Panel. To maintain the integrity of the panel, respondents were tracked in the fall of 1999. Letters were sent to all respondents giving them a progress report on the study (Appendix C). The letters were sent with "Address Correction Requested" so that study staff were informed of address changes and bad addresses where the letter could not be delivered. Those individuals were tracked and lists of addresses and telephone numbers updated.

All offspring respondents that participated in either 1992 or 1997 were sent a letter in the spring of 2000 updating them on the study. Also included was a short survey asking about changes in their work/family life since 1997. A postcard reminder followed by an identical survey were sent to those respondents who had not yet returned the short survey (Appendix C). Several surveys came back unopened due to incorrect addresses; therefore, a substantial amount of tracking was conducted. Tracking consisted of searching the internet for updated addresses and telephone numbers, contacting references offered by the respondent in the last wave of data collection, and contacting the offspring respondent's parent who participated in the adult panel survey.

Selecting respondents for the cross-section sample. A random digit dialing (RDD) procedure was utilized to select the 2000 cross-section and comparison samples. The sampling frame for the cross-section was designed to replicate the selection of respondents used in 1980. To be eligible for the cross-section, respondents had to be 19-55 years old, currently married and living with their spouse. The comparison sample was designed to select respondents who would have been eligible for the original 1980 study. To be eligible for the comparison sample, respondents had to be 39-75 years old, married and living with their spouse in 1980. The comparison sample screening was omitted from waves 8 and 9 because a large enough sample of people married in 1980 was already obtained from waves 1-7.

When a household was contacted, the interviewer asked how many adults between 19 and

75 years of age permanently resided in that household. (This screening process was changed for waves 8 and 9, where households were asked how many residents were between 19 and 55.) Once the interviewer entered the number of adults, the computer randomly selected the designated respondent. This person was then designated as the only person in that household to be interviewed. Once the designated respondent was on the telephone, a few screening questions were asked. Respondents were asked which age category they belonged, then based on that answer they were asked if they were currently married and living with their spouse (asked if between 19-55) and/or if they were married and living with their spouse in 1980 (asked if between 39-75). If the respondent fit into either category, they were administered the survey (the cross-section and comparison sample were administered the same survey). If they did not fit into either category, they were screened out of the study and that household was considered ineligible.

Interview Construction and Pre-test. Three surveys were created for 2000 data collection. Using most of the scaled individual items from 1997, the 2000 adult panel survey was similar to the 1997 one. Another survey was created for the 2000 RDD cross-section and the comparison sample, a close replicate of the original 1980 survey with some additional items that appeared in subsequent waves. Items included in both surveys are marital quality measures, household division of labor, employment experience, residential mobility, attitudes towards divorce, factors judged to keep the marriage together, extent to which the individual's spouse met his/her expectations, mental/physical health, adjustment among the divorced and permanently separated, locus of control, and items assessing people**'**s evaluation of the timing of their retirement (Appendices F, H, and I). The adult panel survey also includes changes in household composition and fertility, and changes in marital situation. A few new sets of questions were added to the questionnaire in the sixth wave after being pre-tested: organized lifestyle, alcohol and tobacco use, health problems, physical limitations, and mattering (concern for and from spouse). Appendix D lists the questions that were pre-tested. Skip

patterns were created and a few items were dropped after analyzing the pre-test data.

A third survey was created for the offspring panel. This survey included a short report of changes that occurred since 1997, demographic questions such as age, income, education, employment, and a few additional attitudinal questions. See Appendix C for the mail survey format and Appendix G for the frequencies.

Computer aided telephone interviewing was used for the adult panel and the new cross-section and comparison sample surveys. Interviewing manuals are found in Appendix J. The offspring survey was created as a mail survey; however, in an effort to increase the response rate, some interviews were collected through telephone calls.

Obtaining the Interview. Every effort was made to re-interview the adult panel respondents. Respondents who had relocated outside the United States were called or sent the interview schedule by mail. Respondents who could not be reached because the telephone was no longer in service or because someone else had been assigned the number were turned over to trackers. We contacted the personal references of respondents who we were unable to track by internet, mail or telephone for forwarding addresses or new telephone numbers. People who initially refused to be re-interviewed were called back by another interviewer. Due to the resistance we found with doing the long interview over the telephone, a mail survey was offered as an option for reluctant respondents. As a result, 105 respondents completed the entire survey via mail. There were still a substantial number of panel respondents who did not return the original mail survey; therefore, a new shorter version of the survey was created. This survey was sent through the mail to all non-respondents (Appendix C). The response to this short mail survey was poor, so additional efforts were made to obtain these interviews. All non-respondents were called and asked to do the short survey over the telephone. If they did not want to complete the survey over the telephone, they were asked to return the mail survey that they had already been sent. The short survey produced an additional 47 interviews (25

by telephone and 22 by mail).

The offspring panel was sent a short survey through the mail (Appendix C). All bad addresses were tracked using the internet, contacting their parents, or personal references provided by the respondent during the last wave. Respondents were offered the option of completing the survey over the internet; however, only one respondent did so. After trying to conduct the mail survey by sending the survey, a postcard reminder, and a follow-up survey, the response rate was less than 60%. In order to improve the response rate, all non-respondents were called and asked to do the survey over the telephone. Collecting additional data over the telephone increased the response rate to 86%. Because the offspring panel is made up of young adults who relocate often, it is likely that the remaining non-respondents are offspring who never received the survey because we could not locate them.

To address the challenges associated with obtaining data from a new cross-section of married persons nationwide, pre-notification incentives were implemented for the cross-section and comparison samples. Pre-notification incentives were not part of the original study design; however, we found that our response rate was low for the first three waves of sample, so we added pre-notification letters to the design in an effort to increase the response rate. Starting with the fourth wave, the sample telephone numbers were reverse matched with the name and address of the person assigned to that telephone number. Pre-notification letters were sent to all names and addresses that matched our sample telephone numbers (Appendix C). Part of the wave four matches were also sent a $2 bill along with their letter as an added incentive (Appendix C). We found that sending the pre-notification letter along with the $2 bill was the most successful at increasing the response rate; therefore, sample waves five through nine were all reverse matched, and all matches were sent a pre-notification letter with a $2 bill incentive. In addition, refusals from the first three waves were also reverse matched. The first set of refusals, which included refusals

that occurred during the first month of data collection were reverse matched and then mailed a pre-notification letter. Another batch of refusals that occurred after the first month were also reverse matched, and then they were mailed a pre-notification letter along with a $2 bill incentive. As another incentive, while trying to convert refusals, some were offered $10 upon completion of the interview, but this option was only accepted by 44 respondents.

In addition to offering incentives to respondents, an alternative data collection method was offered. Some respondents were unwilling to do the survey over the phone, but were receptive to the idea of completing the survey on their own time using a computer. The survey was too long and complicated to put on the internet or to make a paper copy, so the survey was put onto a disk and then mailed to the respondents. The respondent was then able to insert the disk into their home computer and complete the survey on the disk and then mail it back to us (Appendix C). Of the 102 disk surveys mailed out, 36 (35.3%) were returned as completed interviews.

Response Rate Estimates. Of the 1,066 people who were interviewed in 1997,* we succeeded in re-interviewing 962 (90.2%) of the adults (Table 1).

Table 1. Disposition of Attempts to Interview 1997 Adult Panel Respondents.

Disposition	Number	Percent
Completed Telephone Interview	809	75.9
Completed Long Mail Interview	105	9.8
Completed Short Interview	47	4.4
Partial interview	1	0.1
Refusal	43	4.0
Respondent deceased	18	1.7
Could not be located	12	1.1
Mail survey never returned	24	2.2
Too sick to be interviewed	5	0.5
Other	2	0.2
TOTAL	1066	100

* We did not attempt to re-interview respondents who partially completed the 1997 interview, but refused to finish.

All offspring who were interviewed either in 1992 or 1997 were sent a short survey through the mail. Offspring were eligible in 1992 if they lived with their interviewed parent in 1980 and were 7 years of age or older in that year. Offspring were eligible in 1997 if they lived with their interviewed parent in 1980 and were between the ages of 2 and 6 in that year. Table 2 shows the estimated response rates of offspring panel respondents. We succeeded in re-interviewing 595 (86.1%) of the offspring panel. This survey was designed as a mail survey, but calling the respondents and having them do the survey over the phone increased the response rate by 27.9%. Most of the remaining respondents were cases that never returned their survey, which included several respondents that we were unable to track, so several did not receive the survey at all.

Table 2. Disposition of Attempts to Interview Offspring from 1992 and/or 1997.

Disposition	Number	Percent
Mail survey	401	58.0
Telephone survey	193	27.9
Internet	1	0.1
Refused	10	1.4
Respondent deceased	7	1.0
Mail survey never returned/tracking	79	11.4
TOTAL	691	100.0

Before analyzing the response rates for the cross-section RDD sample, a couple of unique problems associated with the RDD sample used in this study will be briefly discussed. Determining an exact response rate is difficult to produce using an RDD sample because it is sometimes impossible to determine a final outcome for each telephone number included in the sample. Due to the RDD sample design, several numbers in the sample are not working numbers. While many non-working numbers reach a message that explains the status of that telephone number, such as being disconnected or unassigned, a substantial number of non-working numbers remain without a final

outcome because they never reach a message recording. The telephone numbers that are not assigned a final outcome typically are numbers that produce a ring with no answer or a fast busy signal. These numbers are called several times, but often remain without a final outcome.

Groves and Kahn (1979) examined these types of telephone numbers and found that a large proportion of the numbers were unassigned. Through researching efforts to determine why these numbers ring, they discovered that many of these numbers were switched to ringing machines rather than voice recording machines (that explain the status of that number), due largely to central offices not being able to afford enough voice recordings to handle all of the unassigned telephone numbers.

In addition to non-working telephone numbers, another problem encountered when determining response rates for this sample is the screening process used to select eligible respondents. Not all working household numbers were eligible to participate in this study. The household member randomly selected had to be either currently married and between that ages of 19 and 55 or married in 1980 and between the ages of 39 and 75. (For waves 8 and 9, the respondent had to fit into the 19 to 55 currently married category.) The cross-section and comparison sample shared the same sample database. Since we do not know which telephone numbers have eligible respondents in which eligibility group, it is impossible to calculate individual response rates, so the cross-section and comparison sample response rates are calculated together.

Table 3 presents the outcome of all the calls included in the RDD sample. Out of all the telephone numbers included in the sample, 3428 (11.9%) were known eligible households where the randomly selected respondent was eligible for the study. This number only includes those cases that eligibility was determined, which means the respondent answered a few questions to determine eligibility. A few of the other categories (refusals, non-response, and no resolution) also probably

include some eligible telephone numbers; however, these households were never asked the screening questions to determine eligibility. Of the cases that were asked the screening questions, 44.7% were found to be eligible for the study. A similar proportion of eligible respondents is expected to be found among the "refusal," "non-response," and the "no resolution, working number" categories where eligibility was not determined. The remaining category that may contain some eligible cases, "no resolution, unknown if working number," falls into the type of telephone numbers investigated by Groves and Kahn (1979). Based on their analysis, our estimate of working numbers in that category is 10%. Of that 10% working numbers, the same proportion of eligible respondents (44.7%) used for the other categories previously mentioned would be applied.

Table 3. Disposition of All Calls made from RDD Sample.

Category	Number	Percent
Eligible Households	3428	11.9
Household, not eligible for study	4246	14.7
Refusal, eligibility not known	3345	11.6
Unassigned number	7523	26.1
Non-residential number	5747	19.9
Wrong number	124	0.4
2nd line/teen line	417	1.4
Number changed	394	1.4
Non-response, eligibility not known	594	2.1
No resolution, working #, eligibility not known	401	1.4
No resolution, not known if working #	2625	9.1
TOTAL	28844	100.0

Table 4 presents the dispositions of all households that were determined to be eligible for the study. Of the 3428 known eligible households, 3092 (90.2%) resulted in a completed interview, with an additional 136 (4.0%) resulting in a partially completed interview. Refusals make up most of the remaining eligible households with 153 (4.5%). Most of the initial refusals were called back

by another interviewer in an attempt to convert, of which 483 were converted into a completed interview. The 35 "no resolution" cases include eligible respondents who we were still trying to complete the interview with; we had already determined their eligibility, but the data collection period ended before we could conduct the survey with them. Finally, the "non-interview" cases are those in which eligibility was determined, but the respondent was found to be unable to complete the interview because of language difficulties or health problems.

Table 4. Disposition of Eligible Households in RDD Sample.

Category	Number	Percent
Completed Telephone Interviews	3056	89.2
Completed Computer Disk Interviews	36	1.1
Partially Completed Interviews	136	4.0
Refusal	153	4.5
No Resolution	35	1.0
Non-Interview - Other reasons	12	0.3
TOTAL	3428	100.0

A few different response rates were calculated for the 2000 cross-section/comparison survey. Unfortunately, the sample consists of telephone numbers rather than specific persons; therefore, the response rate can be interpreted in two ways. Table 5 shows the various formulas used to calculate the response, cooperation, and refusal rates; and Table 6 shows the calculated rates.

The first interpretation is considering the response rate of cooperation among all possible working household telephone numbers regardless of eligibility for the study. To calculate this, the total number of interviews (completed, partially completed, and screen-out interviews) is divided by the sum of the number of interviews, the number of non-interviews (refusals, non-response, and no resolution working telephone numbers), and the number of all telephone numbers where working status is unknown. Response rate 1A (51.1%) calculates this rate by estimating that all of the no

resolution telephone numbers are possible working household numbers. Response rate 1B (60.9%) is different by assuming that only 10% of the no resolution telephone numbers whose working status is unknown are actually working household numbers. Grove and Kahn (1979) found a large proportion of those type of telephone numbers to be non-working; however an exact proportion was not provided. We believe an estimate of 10% is a relatively conservative estimate of working numbers in this category.

The other interpretation is calculating the response rate only for eligible numbers, that is, working household numbers with an eligible designated respondent. All working household telephone numbers where the designated respondent does not qualify for the study would be considered ineligible. Response rate 2 (58.9%) is calculated by dividing the number of eligible interviews (completed and partially completed) by the sum of the number of eligible interviews, eligible refusals, eligible non-response, eligible no resolution, plus the proportion of eligibility (number of eligible households divided by the number of eligible household plus the number of households determined to be ineligible) multiplied by refusals, non-response, and no resolution cases where eligibility is not known plus the estimate of working numbers falling in the no resolution, unknown working status category.

The cooperation rate determines the rate of cooperation among eligible units (known working telephone numbers in the sample). The cooperation rate (62.2%) is calculated by dividing the number of interviews (completed, partially completed, and screen-out interviews) by the number of interviews plus the number of non-interviews (refusals, non-response, and no resolution working telephone numbers). The cooperation rate is similar to the response rate, but it omits those numbers with an unknown working status.

The refusal rate is calculated similar to the response rates. Refusal rate 1A (23.9%) is calculated by dividing the number of refusals (both eligible and unknown eligibility) by the sum of

Table 5. Formulas for Calculating Response, Cooperation, and Refusal Rates for 2000 Cross-Section/Comparison Sample.

I = Completed interview (N=3092)
P = Partially completed interview (N=136)
S = Screen-out (N=4246)
ER = Eligible refusals (N=153)
EUR = Unknown eligibility refusals (N=3345)
EN = Eligible non-response (unable because language, health, etc.) (N=12)
EUN = Unknown eligibility non-response (unable because language, health, etc.) (N=594)
ENR = Eligible no resolution (N=35)
EUNR = Unknown eligibility no resolution, known working # (N=401)
UNR = No resolution, unknown working # (N=2625)
e1 = Estimated proportion of working household telephone numbers (10%)
e2 = Estimated proportion of eligible household telephone numbers (44.7%)

Response rate 1A: $\frac{I+P+S}{I+P+S+ER+EUR+EN+EUN+ENR+EUNR+UNR}$

Response rate 1B: $\frac{I+P+S}{I+P+S+ER+EUR+EN+EUN+ENR+EUNR+e1(UNR)}$

Response rate 2: $\frac{I+P}{I+P+ER+EN+ENR+(e2((EUR+EUN+EUNR)+e1(UNR)))}$

Cooperation rate: $\frac{I+P+S}{I+P+S+ER+EUR+EN+EUN+ENR+EUNR}$

Refusal rate 1A: $\frac{ER + EUR}{I+P+S+ER+EUR+EN+EUN+ENR+EUNR+UNR}$

Refusal rate 1B: $\frac{ER + EUR}{I+P+S+ER+EUR+EN+EUN+ENR+EUNR+e1(UNR)}$

Table 6. Response, Cooperation, and Refusal Rates for 2000 Cross-Section/Comparison by Pre-notification Incentive.

	TOTAL N=14639	no pre-notification N=10210	pre-notification letter N=478	pre-notification letter with $2 N=3951
Response Rate 1A	51.1%	44.1%	64.0%	67.4%
Response Rate 1B	60.9%	55.9%	67.2%	70.8%
Response Rate 2	58.8%	52.5%	70.1%	70.1%
Cooperation Rate	62.2%	57.6%	67.5%	71.2%
Refusal Rate 1A	23.9%	25.0%	25.1%	21.0%
Refusal Rate 1B	28.5%	31.6%	26.3%	22.0%

the number of interviews (completed, partially completed, and screen-out interviews), the number of non-interviews (refusals, non-response, and no resolution working telephone numbers), and the number of all telephone numbers where working status is unknown. Refusal rate 1B (28.5%) is calculated using the estimate that only 10% of the no resolution, unknown working status telephone numbers are valid working numbers.

Analyzing the response rates for the various levels of pre-incentives shows that all approaches increased the response rate. Table 6 also shows the response, cooperation, and refusal rates for each pre-notification incentive group. There is a difference of 15-23% in response rates between those that were sent pre-notification letters with $2 and those that were not sent pre-notification letter or incentive.

Table 7 shows the effects of letters and incentives sent as a method of converting refusals for the first three waves of sample. The pre-notification system was not utilized until wave four of the sample, so after respondents from the first three waves initially refused, their telephone numbers were reverse matched. All of these matches were then sent a pre-notification letter or a pre-notification letter and a $2 bill as an attempt to convert the refusals. Converting refusals was more successful when they were sent some type of pre-notification; there was a 6-20% difference between converting refusals who did not receive any type of refusal conversion pre-notification and those who did. The $2 incentive, however, did not appear to have any more of an effect than the pre-notification letter alone.

Table 7. Response and Refusal Rates for Waves 1 through 3 Refusal Conversions.

	TOTAL N=2090	no refusal conversion incentive N=1065	refusal conversion letter N=331	refusal conversion letter with $2 N=694
Response Rate 1A	36.7%	33.5%	39.9%	39.8%
Response Rate 2	34.4%	24.7%	45.3%	41.4%
Refusal Rate 1A	62.0%	65.0%	59.8%	58.6%

Representativeness. To understand how attrition affected our panel sample, the 1980 characteristics of the individuals interviewed in 2000 were compared with the characteristics of the entire sample in 1980. For comparisons with intermediate waves, the reader may consult "Marital Instability Over the Life Course Methodology Report and Code book for Fifth Wave Panel Study, 1998." The left half of Table 8 shows the comparisons in characteristics among the original 1980 panel respondents and the 1980 characteristics of the panel respondents re-interviewed in 2000. The right half of table 8 shows the comparisons in current characteristics of the remaining panel respondents interviewed in 2000 and the current characteristics of the 2000 comparison sample, made up of persons nationwide that would have been eligible for the original 1980 cross-section.

In general, the characteristics of those we were able to re-interview in 2000 are similar to those in the 1980 sample. Attrition did occur in predictable categories, namely; those who were in the youngest and oldest age categories, blacks, males, renters, those households where the husband did not have any college education, southern residents, and those residing in metropolitan areas. In all cases the differences are very slight, most less than 4%.

The comparison of the 2000 current panel characteristics with the 2000 comparison sample suggests that most basic demographic characteristics are similar in both data sets (Table 8). The characteristic suggesting the greatest bias is single person households; the comparison sample suggests that the number of one person households is 9.2% higher than the panel data suggest. This may suggest that attrition has been highest among panel respondents who are living alone. There are differences in representation of the southern region (9.6%) and metropolitan areas (12.1%); however, it is important to note that the percentages used to characterize the 2000 panel is drawn from the 1980 data because region and metropolitan residence were not determined for panel respondents re-interviewed in 2000. It is possible that some panel respondents have moved during the past 20 years; however, the trend of decreased representation among those living in the southern

Table 8. Comparison of 1980 Sample with those Re-interviewed in 2000 and with the 2000 Comparison sample

	1980 Sample N=2033	1980 Characteristics of those Re-interviewed in 2000 N=962		2000 Characteristics of those Re-interviewed in 2000 N=962	2000 Comparison Sample N=1741
Husband's Age			Husband's Age		
14-24	8.1	7.6	30-44	8.3	12.7
25-34	37.7	39.8	45-54	39.9	35.9
25-44	28.1	29.4	55-64	29.2	25.7
45+	26.1	23.2	65+	22.6	25.7
Wife's Age			Wife's Age		
14-24	14.3	11.8	30-44	12.7	17.6
25-34	39.5	43.2	45-54	42.2	36.7
35-44	29.0	29.2	55-64	29.8	25.2
45+	17.2	15.8	65+	15.3	20.5
Race			Race		
White (& Hispanic)	93.4	96.2	White (& Hispanic)	96.3 (1980 char.)	92.6
Black	4.8	2.7	Black	2.7 (1980 char.)	4.9
Other	1.8	1.0	Other	1.0 (1980 char.)	2.6
Sex			Sex		
Male	40.4	36.5	Male	36.5	41.1
Female	59.6	63.5	Female	63.5	58.9
Household Size			Household Size		
2	23.2	23.7	1	8.5	17.7
3	23.5	22.2	2	52.9	49.6
4	30.4	33.7	3	18.0	14.2
5	15.0	14.6	4	12.8	11.9
6	4.8	3.4	5	4.5	4.5
7	3.0	2.4	6	3.3	2.2
Tenure			Tenure		
Own/Buying	76.7	82.2	Own/Buying	91.4	87.5
Rent/Other	23.3	17.8	Rent/Other	8.5	12.5
Husband s Education			Husband s Education		
Elementary, 0-8	3.9	1.7	Elementary, 0-8	1.4	3.4
High School, 1-3	8.6	4.8	High School, 1-3	3.6	6.5
High School, 12	32.3	29.7	High School, 12	26.6	30.7
College, 1-3	25.0	27.3	College, 1-3	27.8	25.3
College, 4+	30.2	36.5	College, 4+	40.7	34.2
Region			Region		
Northeast	21.9	22.3	Northeast	22.3 (1980 char.)	18.4
North Central	27.7	30.2	North Central	30.2 (1980 char.)	28.2
South	31.1	26.4	South	26.4 (1980 char.)	36.0
West	19.2	21.0	West	21.0 (1980 char.)	17.4
Presence of Children			Presence of Children		
Under 18	70.9	71.3	Under 18	20.9	22.1
12-17 Years	30.7	32.2	12-17 Years	18.5	18.7
6 -11 Years	34.8	35.6	6 -11 Years	6.2	6.0
Under 6 Years	33.5	31.7	Under 6 Years	0.9	1.9
Metropolitan/Non			Metropolitan/Non		
Metropolitan	62.8	60.3	Metropolitan	60.3 (1980 char.)	72.4
Non-metropolitan	37.2	39.7	Non-metropolitan	39.7 (1980 char.)	27.6

region and in metropolitan areas was also illustrated in the comparison of the 1980 sample characteristics with the current panel respondents' 1980 characteristics. Similar to the difference in husband's education found in the 1980 characteristic comparison, the 2000 data comparison suggests that the representation of college educated husbands is higher (9%) in the panel data than the comparison sample. Nearly all of the remaining differences between the 2000 panel data and the 2000 comparison sample data are less than 5%.

Logistic analysis was used to test whether some demographic and marital quality variables affect the probability of not being included in the sixth wave of interviews. Two analyses are shown in table 9. The top panel tests whether 1997 demographic characteristics affect the probability of a re-interview in 2000. All of the variables were entered into the equation at the same time. None of the 1997 demographic variables had significant effects on the probability of a re-interview in 2000.

Table 9. 1997 Characteristics Predicting Adult Panel Re-interview in 2000.

	B	Sig.
Age	-.015	.272
Gender l=male 2=female	.302	.157
Tenure l=own 2=rent	-.070	.849
Education	.054	.158
Children present	-.218	.371
Marital Happiness	-.006	.825
Marital Interaction	-.008	.845
Marital Disagreement	.044	.444
Marital Problems	-.002	.961
Marital Instability	.386	.346

The bottom panel shows the effect of five 1997 marital quality indicators on the probability of being re-interviewed in 2000 while controlling for respondent**'**s age, gender, tenure, and education, as well as whether children were present in the household. Each marital quality variable

was estimated separately. None of the 1997 variables significantly predicted a re-interview in 2000. These results suggest that obtained estimates will not be biased against any particular group, and any conclusions made from the sample will, for the most part, be representative of the target population.

To understand the factors that influenced whether or not an offspring interview was obtained, we used logistic regression to test whether 1997 parent demographic and marital quality variables affected the probability of a re-interview. The top panel of table 10 shows the influence of the demographic factors and in the bottom panel, the influence of the quality of the parent*s marriage. Again, each of the marital quality variables were estimated separately.

Table 10. 1997 Characteristics Predicting Re-interview with Offspring Panel.

	B	Sig
Age	.043	.000
Gender l=male 2=female	-.005	.972
Tenure l=own 2=rent	.074	.754
Education	-.026	.254
Children present	.029	.845
Parent divorce 80-92 l=divorce 0=no divorce	-.285	.103
Marital Happiness	.026	.974
Marital Interaction	.045	.050
Marital Disagreement	-.057	.076
Marital Problems	-.053	.065
Marital Instability	-.432	.049

Variables that had a significant effect on re-interview were age of interviewed parent, parental marital interaction, and parents' marital instability. Based on offspring's parental characteristics, we were less likely to obtain an offspring interview of younger adult panel

respondents, adult respondents with less marital interaction, and adult respondents with more unstable marriages.

The new cross-section sample was intended to be representative of married persons (living with their spouse) between the ages of 19 and 55. The sample was limited to persons living in households within the contiguous United States and having telephones. This representation is a replicate of the designated population in the original 1980 cross-section. Weighting was applied to the original 1980 sample with regard to region and metropolitan residence; however, since we were able to access more accurate representations of people fitting in this population for 1980, a new weight was created for the 1980 sample to make it more accurately represented. In addition, a weight was created for the 2000 cross-section. Table 11 shows the representativeness of U.S. married persons under the age of 55 according to the Current Population Surveys for both 1980 and 2000. In addition, the table shows the representativeness of both the 1980 and 2000 cross-sections samples before and after weighting.

The samples were evaluated on the following characteristics: age, race, sex, household size, tenure, education, region, presence of children, and metropolitan residence. To make the 1980 cross-section more accurately representative, a new weight was created. The final weight consisted of weighting by the number of adults in the household, sex of respondent, race of respondent, education of respondent, metropolitan residence, age of respondent, household size, and then by race again. A weight was also created for the 2000 cross-section; it consisted of weighting by the number of adults in the household, sex of respondent, race of respondent, education of respondent, presence of children in the household, region, age of respondent, race a second time, household size, and then by region again. After applying the weights, all characteristics are within 2.9% of the representations offered by the Current Population Survey, with most characteristics within 1%.

Table 11. Representativeness of 1980 and 2000 cross-section samples before and after weighting.

	1980 U.S.	1980 Cross-section	1980 Weighted	2000 US	2000 Cross-section	2000 Weighted
Male Age						
14-25	11.7	11.4	12.4	4.5	5.1	4.6
26-35	33.9	37.2	34.2	26.7	28.3	26.4
36-45	29.1	29.1	28.1	37.8	38.2	37.3
46-55	25.3	22.4	25.4	31.1	28.4	31.6
Female Age						
14-25	18.3	18.5	19.0	7.9	6.7	7.7
26-35	36.2	38.3	36.0	30.4	28.2	30.1
36-45	28.4	28.8	27.7	38.5	38.5	37.9
46-55	17.1	14.4	17.3	23.2	26.6	24.4
Male Race						
White	84.9	88.7	84.9	75.8	85.4	75.9
Black	7.2	4.4	7.2	8.2	6.0	8.1
Other	2.0	2.3	2.0	4.9	4.3	4.9
Spanish Origin	5.9	4.6	5.9	11.1	4.2	11.1
Female Race						
White	85.4	87.7	85.5	75.6	84.5	75.6
Black	7.0	5.1	7.0	7.8	6.4	7.7
Other	2.2	1.5	2.2	5.4	4.2	5.6
Spanish Origin	5.4	5.7	5.4	11.2	4.9	11.1
Sex						
Male	50.0	40.4	50.0	50.0	43.9	50.2
Female	50.0	59.6	50.0	50.0	56.1	49.8
Household Size						
2	21.3	23.2	21.3	23.9	29.6	23.9
3	24.1	23.5	24.1	23.0	22.7	23.0
4	29.5	30.4	29.5	30.7	30.0	30.7
5+	25.2	22.9	25.1	22.4	17.7	22.5
Tenure						
Own/Buying	76.6	76.7	75.7	77.6	81.8	79.9
Rent, Other	23.4	23.3	24.3	22.4	18.2	20.1
Male Education						
0-high school, 1-3	19.5	12.5	17.6	9.8	6.7	9.9
High School, 4	36.5	32.3	36.4	31.9	24.6	31.4
College, 1-3	19.6	25.0	20.3	26.8	25.8	26.4
College, 4+	24.5	30.2	25.7	31.5	42.9	32.3
Female Education						
0-high school, 1-3	17.9	10.4	16.8	9.0	4.4	8.6
High School, 4	47.5	43.2	47.5	32.8	27.2	31.7
College, 1-3	18.8	26.1	19.2	29.1	31.5	29.5
College, 4+	16.0	20.3	16.5	29.1	36.9	30.2
Region						
Northeast	20.9	21.9	21.9	18.0	17.2	18.0
North Central	27.2	27.7	27.9	24.2	27.1	24.2
South	33.0	31.1	31.7	35.5	36.2	35.5
West	18.9	19.2	18.5	22.4	19.5	22.4
Presence of Children						
% with Children, Under 18	71.3	70.9	68.9	66.7	61.3	64.4
% with Children, 12-17	32.5	30.7	31.0	29.8	27.9	29.9
% with Children, 6-11	34.0	34.8	31.3	33.3	29.5	30.8
% with Children, Under 6	34.4	33.5	31.8	31.7	27.0	28.8
% with No Children, Under 18	28.7	29.1	31.1	33.3	38.7	35.6
Metro/Nonmetropolitan						
Metropolitan	68.1	62.8	67.6	80.0	77.6	78.6
Nonmetropolitan	31.9	37.2	32.4	20.0	22.4	21.4

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2000. "Current Population Survey Annual Demographic File" (computer file). Washington, D.C., Department of Commerce (producer) 2000. Ann Arbor, MI, Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (distributer) 2000.

Management of the Study. The procedures for managing the study were almost identical to those used in 1997 and 1992. Computer aided interviewing was again used in 2000. The process of managing the interviewers and the interviews, the quality control measures through verification, methods for data cleaning, data entry and coding were the same, as were the procedures for merging the adult and offspring data with the first five waves. The reader may want to consult the wave four methodology report for details.

Lists of responses to open ended items are shown in Appendix K. Scales for key variables were constructed in much the same manner as in prior years. How they were constructed can be found in Appendix L, and their frequency distributions appear in Appendices F, G, H, and I. Appendix E shows the skip patterns used for the adult panel and cross-section/comparison surveys by showing the eligibility requirements for each question included on the surveys. A list of the variables in the merged panel file and in the cross-section/comparison files is contained in Appendix M, and a list of study staff may be found in Appendix B.

REFERENCES

Groves, R. and R. Kahn. 1979. Surveys by Telephone: A National Comparison with Personal Interviews. New York: Academic Press.