

[DRAFT]

Who Really Lives here and does it Matter? Household Composition Trajectories for Children  
Living with Other Adults in the Home.

Nola du Toit

Jennifer Brown

Catherine Haggerty

NORC at the University of Chicago

Paper presented at the 2013 Annual Meeting of the  
Population Association of America.

## **ABSTRACT**

Researchers often examine how types of households affect child well-being. But these studies focus on relationships of parents (married, cohabiting, single, or step), often neglecting other adults that may live in the home. We found that 30% of low-income households with children contained an adult who is not the child's parent; 16% included at least one grandparent, 11% had an extended family member, 12% had an adult sibling of the child, and 6% include a non-related adult. We also found that in 10% of homes the child's parent was not present. Using three waves of data from the *Making Connections* Survey spanning eight years, we examine the trajectories that low-income children may experience when household structures include these other adults (N=672). Our findings show that only 44% of children experienced stable trajectories across all three waves (i.e. no adult moving in or out of the home at any time). That is, more than half experienced some kind of change in household structure brought about by some adult moving in and out of the home at some point. Moreover, 17% of children experienced change in household structure at all three waves of data collection. We find that nearly half of children (48%) will at some point share their home with an adult who is not their parent. We also find that 14% of children will spend a portion of their childhood living in a home without their parents. That is, they will live in a home where neither their mother nor father is present. In addition, we find that children living with other adults in the home who are not their parents have a greater risk of experiencing change in their household structure than those who start off in single-parent-only or two-parent-only homes. Finally, we find that these changes in household structure matter for income per capita available to the child as well as measures of economic hardship.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Social changes such as increased divorce, cohabitation, and unmarried fertility have resulted in children living in many different types of families (Cherlin 2006). Research often focuses on the relationship of parents – married, cohabiting, single - and how these affect children (Meadows, McLanahan, & Knab, 2009; Manning & Brown, 2006). Comparatively less emphasis, if any, is placed on other adults - grandparents, extended family members, and non-related people - living in the home with children. Moreover, studies do not examine how changes in household composition brought about by these other people moving in and out of the home can influence the lives of children.

Using longitudinal data from the *Making Connections* Survey spanning eight years, we present a household typology that considers not only parents but all people living in the home with children, i.e. uncles, aunts, grandparents, roommates, and so on. We examine these households to determine the multitude of trajectories that children may experience when sharing living arrangements with other adults as well as how much instability children experience as a result of other adults moving in and out of their home. Finally, we present findings that illustrate the importance of this typology for studies on child well-being.

This research is important for a few reasons. First, most studies only focus on parents and the relationships of parents when examining child well-being. We find that over their childhood

nearly half of low-income children will live with an adult who is not a parent. This research presents a more nuanced approach to household structure by including other adults living in the home. Second, we provide evidence that the presence of these other adults affects the well-being of children in a few ways. First they increase the risk of children experiencing change or instability in their household structure and, second, the change brought about by these other adults affects the economic well-being of children.

## **BACKGROUND**

Due to increases in unmarried fertility, cohabitation, and divorce, there have been dramatic changes in household composition over the last few decades (Cherlin, 2004). Consequently, researchers examine how different types of households affect the well-being of families with children. Studies abound on the distinction between married, cohabiting, and single parent homes, as well as biological, non-biological, and step-parent families and their effect on children. Moreover, many studies consider how changes in these household compositions, such as marriage or divorce, influence children living in the home (Meadows, McLanahan, & Knab, 2009; Manning & Brown, 2006).

Studies that examine differences in household composition usually focus on the relationships of parents. This is understandable as parents play a vital role in the lives of children and there are significant differences in child well-being depending on whether parents are married, cohabiting, single, and step-parents (Manning and Brown 2006, McLanahan and Sandefur 1994). However, few studies examine the “other” people living in the home along with the children and their parents. Researchers often seem to neglect the grandparents, adult siblings, aunts, uncles, and roommates living in the home with the child.

Most homes do not include adults other than the child’s parents (CITE). However, current trends suggest a resurgence of people living with their extended families (Glick, Bean, & Van Hook, 1997), especially within the African American community (Goldscheider & Bures, 2003; Pagnini & Morgan, 1996). While literature has started to recognize the effects of grandparents and extended family members on child well-being (Griggs et al 2010), these studies do not always differentiate between those living in the home or up the street. Relatively little research has been done on, first, the presence of other household members, such as grandparents, aunts and uncles, or boarders and roommates, in the household, and second, changes in household composition that are not related to unions among parents but rather the movement in and out of the home caused by other people. In addition, we know little about how these other people affect the well-being of children living in the home.

[MORE]

In other work we extended current research on household composition that focuses on the relationship of parents to include other people (du Toit, Bachtell, and Haggerty 2011; 2012). Using data from two waves of the *Making Connections* Survey we examined low-income households with children and developed in-depth household composition typologies based on both the number of parents (two or single) and the relationship of other adults in the home to the

household child (grandparent, extended family member, non-related adult). We found that 45% of households included another adult who was not the parent of the child. In fact, among households with children, 22% included at least one grandparent, 12% had some type of extended family member, 12% contained an adult sibling (over age 18) of the child, and 6% had a non-related adult in the home.<sup>1</sup> We also found that 10% of these homes did not include a parent. That is, children were living in the home without a parent present.

We found significant differences in terms of economic measures of child well-being between these different types of households. In short, household composition did not matter for income per capita when other factors such as race and employment were considered. However, household structure did matter for public assistance usage and economic hardship with *two-parent-only* homes less likely to use public assistance and experience economic hardship than those with other adults present.

We also examined changes in household composition over time by considering these other people in the home. That is, between two waves of the data (or a 3 year period), we examined whether the household changed from, for example, a *single-parent-only* to a *parent-grandparent-only* home by the single parent taking in a grandparent. When considering movement of other non-parent people in or out of the child's home, we found that half of our households experienced some kind of change in composition. Furthermore, the various types of households experienced different levels of change. Only about 38% of *single-parent-only* and *two-parent-only* homes experienced change in composition. However, 58% of *parent-any-combination*, 63% of *parent-grandparent-only*, and 83% of *non-parent* homes experienced a change in structure with some adult moving in or out of the home. Also, these changes in composition resulted in significant changes in the income per capita, economic hardship, and public assistance usage as compare to households that did not change in structure.

We examined non-economic factors, such as having someone in the home to read to the child and school readiness. Again, we found noteworthy differences between the types of households. Compared to *two-parents-only*, being a *single-parent-plus* or *two-parent-plus* household significantly increased the odds of having someone read to the child, while *non-parent* households and *single-parents-only* were not significantly different from *two-parent-only* homes. In terms of school readiness, none of the types differed significantly from *two-parent-only* group.

Our previous findings suggest two things. First, there are many types of households in which children live that are not captured when we focus only on the relationships of parents. As Judith Stacey writes, "Americans today have crafted a multiplicity of family and household arrangements, which we inhabit uneasily and reconstitute frequently in response to changing personal and occupational circumstances" (1992, 93). Much of the current research on child well-being does not represent the rich diversity of family and household compositions that are especially prevalent in low income neighborhoods. Second, the presence of these other adults

---

<sup>1</sup> We did not examine the relationship of the non-related adult to the child's parent. Some of these may be the parent's spouse or cohabiting partner. Then again, they may be roommates or boarders. We focused on the relationship of the adult *to the child*. Thus, if the adult was not the child's reported parent, a parent's spouse or cohabiting partner would be coded the same as any other non-related adult.

matter for child well-being. We found significant impact on households with children in terms of both economic and non-economic factors. Moreover, these other adults increase the amount of change in household composition experienced by children. More research should explore the extent to which households with children are affected by these other adults in the home and illuminate the pathways through which they are either beneficial or harmful to children. This current study will expand upon our research by examining the various types of household compositions that children experience over a longer period of time.

## **CURRENT STUDY**

We use longitudinal data from the *Making Connections* Survey to examine the types of trajectories that low income children experience once we classify households in terms of the other adults living in the home. We extend our previous work by looking at three waves of data.

We consider the following research questions. First, *which trajectories are most common for low income families with children?* Allowing for a household typology that includes other adults, we examine the types of trajectories that children experience over a three wave (7 to 8 year) time period. We examine the Wave 1 household structures at each subsequent wave and consider change (i.e. *instable trajectory*) to have occurred if the household typology was not consistent. If the structure was the same then it is a *stable trajectory*.

Second, *which Wave 1 household structures experience the most trajectories?* That is, for children starting out in different households at time 1, we examine which structures are related to more instable trajectories.

Third, *how does change in structure (i.e. instable trajectories) affect child well-being?* We use decrease in income per capita and increase in economic hardship as measures of child well-being. We examine how these measures compare for children who experience change in structure and those who do not.

Our study will capture different trajectories and the frequency of each. We will also explore the most common trajectories, focusing on their effect on the various measures of child well-being mentioned above. This study is important as it will extend our previous work by creating a better picture of the reality in which low-income children live.

## **METHOD**

### **Data**

The data come from a three wave longitudinal study conducted in low-income neighborhoods in ten cities across the U.S. (Des Moines, IA; Indianapolis, IN; Denver, CO; San Antonio, TX; Seattle, WA; Milwaukee, WI; Oakland, CA; Hartford, CT; Providence, RI; and Louisville, KY) (<http://mcstudy.norc.org>). Baseline survey data were gathered in 2002/2004 and Wave 2 was completed in 2005/2007. Between 2008 and 2011 Wave 3 of data collection was completed in seven of the ten sites. Data on the respondent and the respondent's spouse were collected, as well as information on all children living in the household. In addition, a household roster was

recorded with demographic characteristics (age, sex, employment) for all adults and children in the home as well as his or her relationship to the respondent and a randomly selected focal child.

## **Focal Variables**

Household Typology: The survey asks respondents to list the relationship of all adults in the home to the focal child. Responses include parent, in-law, grandparent, uncle or aunt, niece or nephew, son or daughter, sibling, foster child, roommate or boarder, other non-related person. Using data on the relationship of adults in the home to the focal child, as well as number of parents in the home, we created a household typology. The typology classifies households based on whether there is one parent (single-parent) or two parents (two-parent) as well as the presence of other adults in the home. There are five groups:

- *Single-parent-only (SO)*: These households have only one adult and it is the child's mother or father.
- *Single-parent-plus (SP)*: In these cases there is only one parent, but there are other adults in the household. These can include grandparents, extended family members, and other non-related adults.
- *Two-parent-only (2O)*: These households have two parents in the home and no other adults.
- *Two-parent-plus (2P)*: Here the child lives in a home with both parents as well as other adults.
- *Non-parent (NP)*: In these cases the child lives with at least one adult but there is no parent in the home. That is, the child is being raised by a grandparent, uncle or aunt, or other adult.

Limitation of Household Typology: This typology does not consider adult siblings living in the home nor does it recognize the presence of other children, such as cousins or the children of roommates. The focus of the typology is the presence of parents as well as other adults who are not typically in the "traditional" nuclear family household. In addition, the typology does not classify by type of other adult. Therefore extended family members and non-related adults, such as roommates, are grouped together. These distinctions may be important, but would result in too many groupings. Also, sample size does not allow for more distinctions. Another limitation is that the spouse or cohabiting partner of the parent is classified as non-related adult. The typology is based on how the adult is related to the child. If the adult is not classified as the child's parent, even if the adult is married or cohabiting with the child's parent, then the classification is non-related adult. On the other hand, a designation of parent does not denote biological parenthood. It is a subjective classification of the relationship between adult and child by the respondent.

Household Trajectories: Trajectories recognize the five groups of the typology and how they change at each wave. For example, in Wave 1 a household with a single mother and no other adults is categorized as single-parent-only (SO). At the second wave, if another adult who is not

also a parent (e.g. grandparent or uncle or roommate) joined the household then it would be classified as single-parent-plus (SP). If at the third wave, the second parent returned to the home, and the other adults were still there, the home would be two-parent-plus (2P). Across three waves of data there are 125 possible trajectories.

### **Dependent Variables**

*Income per Capita:* We used self-reported household income along with number of people in the home to create income per capita. This captures the amount of income available to the child.

*Change in Income per Capita:* To determine if the trajectories result in a negative effect on child well-being, we created variable to measure a decrease in income per capita available to the child. We compared the Wave 1 income per capita to Wave 3 income per capita. If Wave 1 was greater than Wave 3 we designated the case as experiencing a decline in income per capita and assigned a code of 1. Cases in which the income per capita stayed the same or increased were assigned to the 0 category.

*Limitation of Change in Income per Capita:* A limitation of this measure is that the change in income per capita can be very small. Thus, a change of a few dollars is assigned to the same category as a larger change in income per capita. Also, we do not account for cost of living changes in income. This results in a more conservative measure of decline in income per capita and possibly undercounts the number of households that have lower income per capita at Wave 3 than Wave 1.

*Economic Hardship:* We use five items from the survey to measure economic hardship. The survey asks respondents if, in the past 12 months, the household ever had too little money to pay rent/mortgage, prescriptions, utilities, phone, or food. Each items contributed 1 to the scale. The scale ranged from 0 (no hardship) to 5 (all hardships).

*Change in Economic Hardship:* We compared economic hardship in Wave 1 to Wave 3. If the number of hardships experienced in Wave 3 were greater than Wave 1 then we flagged the case as seeing an increase in hardship (1). All other cases were flagged as 0 (no change or decline in hardship).

*Limitation to Change in Economic Hardship:* A problem is that change can be small (from 1 to 2 types) or large (1 type to 5 types).

*Instable Trajectories:* Stable trajectories are those that do not change in any wave. For example, if the home stays the same with a single mother being the only adult in the home at all three points in time, or SOSOSO, then it is a stable trajectory. There are two types of instable trajectories –*instable* and *very instable*. First, those in which there is any change in the Wave 1 household structure across the other two waves are considered *instable*. This variable is measured 1 for cases that experienced change in at least one wave and 0 if the household did not change across waves. Second, there are some instable trajectories where there was change in the Wave 1 structure at both Wave 2 and Wave 3 – these are considered *very instable*. That is, there was *change in all waves*. This variable is flagged as 1 if cases changed at both Wave 2 and again at Wave 3 and 0 for everyone else.

*Limitations of Trajectories:* A limitation of the trajectories is that change occurs when the typology changes at each wave but it does not capture change between waves. That is, it is possible for people to be moving in and out of the home between waves. These changes are not captured by the trajectories. Also, the trajectories do not capture compositional change, such as an uncle moving out and an aunt moving in. The designation would stay the same and it would not indicate change. Moreover, change as a result of a grandparent may not be the same as a roommate. We do not distinguish by the type of other adult moving in or out. Finally, the trajectories do not indicate the extent of change. A move from single-parent-only to single-parent-plus would look the same if one adult or five adults moved in with the single mother. This level of detail can be determined by the data, but would make for cluttered analysis.

## **Control Variables**

We control for variables often associated with family structure: race/ethnicity and education (CITE).

*Race and Ethnicity:* The survey asks about respondent race and ethnicity. We use these data to create a race/ethnicity variable with the following categories: *non-Hispanic White* (reference group), *non-Hispanic black*, *Non-Hispanic Other*, and *Hispanic*.

*Education at Wave 1:* The survey asked respondents their level of education. We used education at Wave 1 to create the categories: *less than high school*, *high school or GED* (reference group), and *BA and higher*.

[MORE ON CONTROL VARIABLES]

## **Missing Data**

We imputed data for cases missing the income variable. First, if respondents did not provide their household income we used the median from their responses to income tree questions, “Was your income greater than \$x?” [MORE] If values were still missing, we imputed the mean income.

If data on race was missing from Wave 1 we imputed these data from race variables in the other waves.

For education, missing cases were assigned to the modal group, “High School or GED.”

## **Analytic Sample**

Households with children that participated in all three waves were included in analysis. Also, the focal child and respondent had to be the same in each wave.<sup>1</sup> Cases had to include valid data for the relationship variables in all three waves. There are 672 households with children in the final analytic subset of cases.

*Limitation of Sample:* Using three waves of data limits the number of cases we can use for analysis. However, it allows us to examine a greater number of trajectories. Also, three waves



of data cover seven years of the time spent in childhood instead of only three years. This allows us to examine a more accurate picture of instability across childhood. It should also be noted these data are for the focal child. There are more children in the home. We have data on all children in the home and our future analysis will examine these trajectories for all children.

### Analytic Strategy

Our analytic strategy is different for each research question. First, to find which trajectories are most common for low income families with children we present the proportion of households with children in each trajectory. Second, we perform logistic regression to discover which Wave 1 households have the greatest odds of experiencing an *instable* trajectory over the three waves of data collection (that is, any change in structure over the three waves) controlling for education and race/ethnicity. We present the frequency of *very unstable* trajectories (that is, change in both Wave 2 and 3) but do not perform more robust analysis because of the low number of cases that experienced change in all waves. Third, to test how change in structure (i.e. instable trajectories) affects child well-being, we examine the odds of seeing a decline in income per capita and an increase in economic hardship between *stable* and *instable* trajectories.

## RESULTS

Table 1 shows the distribution of typologies at Wave 1. At baseline, 45% of children were living in nuclear family structures and 28% were living with only a single parent. However, more than one quarter of children (26%) were living in homes with other adults present.

Table 1. Wave 1 Household Structure.

	Unweighted N	Weighted %
Single-parent-only	220	28%
Single-parent-plus	88	12%
Two-parent-only	272	45%
Two-parent-plus	50	9%
Non-parent	42	5%
N	672	100%

Table 2 shows results for the stable and instable trajectories across all three waves. Overall, 78 of the 125 possible trajectories were found among Wave 1 households. Only the instable trajectories that affected 2% or more of the cases are shown on the table. Table 2 shows that less than 45% of the households with children experienced a stable trajectory over the three points in time. One quarter of households stayed two-parent-only (2P2P2P) over the seven to eight years of data collection. Fewer (15%) were stable single-parent-only (SOSOSO). Very few cases (4%) were stable single-parent-plus or two-parent-plus trajectories. There were no stable non-parent household trajectories.

Table 2. Stable Trajectories and Common Instable Trajectories (2% and higher) between Wave 1 and Wave 2 and Wave 3 (N=672).

	Trajectory	Weighted %
Stable Trajectories	2O2O2O	25%
	SOSOSO	15%
	SPSPSP	2%
	2P2P2P	2%
	NPNPNP	0%
Instable Trajectories*	2O2OSO	5%
	SPSOSO	4%
	2OSOSO	4%
	2P2O2O	3%
	SOSOSP	2%
	SPSPSO	2%
	SO2O2O	2%
	2ONP2O	2%

\*Note: Only instable trajectories that present 2% and higher are presented on the table. Overall, 78 of 125 possible trajectories were found in the data.

Table 2a shows the percentage of Wave 1 household structures in stable trajectories and the number of trajectories experienced among children in those homes. Also shown are the two most common instable trajectories for each type of household structure. It is evident that children single-parent-only and two-parent-only homes exercise a lot fewer trajectories or instability in structure than those with other adults.

Table 2a. Number of Trajectories and Most Common Type for Wave 1 Household Typology.

	Single-parent-only (SO)	Single-parent-plus (SP)	Two-parent-only (2O)	Two-parent-plus (2P)	Non-parent (NP)
Unweighted N	220	88	272	50	42
Number of trajectories experienced	19	16	20	10	13
% Stable trajectory	53%	18%	55%	22%	9%
Two most common instable trajectories and their percentage	SOSOSP 9%	SPSOSO 35%	2O2OSO 12%	2P2O2O 31%	NOSOSO 22%
	SO2O2O 8%	SPSPSO 19%	2OSOSO 9%	2P2P2O 12%	NP2O2O 14%

Table 3 shows the proportion of households with children that experienced change in structure over the three waves of data collection. More than half of these households experienced some kind of change in structure over the seven to eight years of data collection. Among low income households with children, 17% experienced change in household structure, or instability, at each wave.

Table 3. Percentage Experiencing Change across Wave 1 and Wave 2 and Wave 3.

	Weighted %
No Change in Structure (stable trajectories)	44%
Any Change in Structure (instable trajectories)	56%
Different in all 3 Waves (very instable trajectories)	17%

Table 4 presents findings for the types of living arrangements children experience across the three waves. Our findings show that almost half of children in low-income households will at some point in time share their home with at least one adult who is not their parent (48%). We find that 60% of our focal children will spend time in a home with a single parent and more than half will live in single-parent-only homes at some time. Of the children in our sample, 64% will spend time with both parents in the home and more than half (59%) will live in two-parent-only homes.

We also find that all low-income-children will live with their parents at some point in time. However, 14% will spend part of their childhood in a home where neither parent lives. That is, more than one in ten children will live without their parents for some time in their childhood.

Table 4. Percentage Ever Living with Parents and Other Adults

	Weighted %
Ever with Other Adults	48%
Ever Single Parent	60%
Ever Single Parent Only	52%
Ever Two Parent	64%
Ever Two Parent Only	59%
Never with Parents	0%
Ever with No Parents	14%

Table 5 presents the odds ratios for Wave 1 structure experiencing any instable trajectories between waves. We only present the ratios for the full models that include the control variables. Each column presents the findings with a different Wave 1 structure reference group. We find that the odds for Wave 1 parent households that have other adults (single-parent-plus and two-

parent-plus) as well as non-parent households have significantly greater odds of experiencing any change in structure between waves than those that start out as single-parent-only or two-parent-only.

Table 5. Odds of W1 Structure Experiencing Instable Trajectory: Any Change Across Three Waves (N=672)

	SO (ref)	SP (ref)	2O (ref)	2P (ref)	NP (ref)
Intercept	0.725 ***	3.740 ***	0.674 ***	2.778 ***	8.748 ***
Single Parent Only (SO)	--	0.194 ***	1.076 *	0.261 ***	0.083 ***
Single Parent Plus(SP)	5.157 ***	--	5.552 ***	1.346 ***	0.428 ***
Two Parent Only (2O)	0.929 *	0.180 ***	--	0.243 ***	0.077 ***
Two Parent Plus (2P)	3.830 ***	0.743 ***	4.123 ***	--	0.318 ***
Non Parent (NP)	12.061 ***	2.339 ***	12.983 ***	3.149 ***	--
Less than HS (ref HS)	0.943	0.943	0.943	0.943	0.943
BA degree+ (ref HS)	0.545 ***	0.545 ***	0.545 ***	0.545 ***	0.545 ***
NH Black (ref NH White)	1.235 ***	1.235 ***	1.235 ***	1.235 ***	1.235 ***
NH Other (ref NH White)	1.165 **	1.165 **	1.165 **	1.165 **	1.165 **
Hispanic (ref NH White)	1.569 ***	1.569 ***	1.569 ***	1.569 ***	1.569 ***
-2 Log Likelihood	22676.948	226.76.948	22676.948	22676.948	22676.948
<i>df</i>	9	9	9	9	9

\* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ .

We also examine how change in structure will affect the income per capita available to the focal child as well as an increase in economic hardship. Table 6 presents findings for the odds of a decrease in income per capita and an increase in economic hardship between Waves 1 and 3.

Table 6. Effect of Instable Trajectory W123: Change in Income Per Capita and Economic Hardship W123 (N=672)

	Decrease in Income Per Capita	Increase in Economic Hardship
Intercept	0.318 ***	0.421 ***
Instable Trajectory (any change)	1.588 ***	1.608 ***
Less than HS (ref HS)	1.430 ***	1.094 **
BA degree+ (ref HS)	1.344 ***	0.545 ***
NH Black (ref NH White)	0.645 ***	0.909
NH Other (ref NH White)	0.887 *	0.964
Hispanic (ref NH White)	0.809 ***	1.031
-2 Log Likelihood	21471.708	23335.320
<i>df</i>	6	6

\* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ .

Overall, households that have any change in structure have significantly greater odds of seeing a decrease in the proportion of household income available to the child. These households also have greater odds of having more economic hardship in Wave 3 than Wave 1. So, households in which the structure changed over the course of the eight years of the study had greater odds of seeing their income per capita reduced and their economic hardships increased.

## **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

We examined household structure at three waves of data collection and found that many households with children include other adults in the home that are not the parent. We also found that households with other adults have greater odds of experiencing change in household structure or instable trajectories than those who do not start out with other adults in the home. Finally, we found that the change brought about by other adults moving in or out significantly increases the odds of children seeing a decline in the income per capita available to them as well as an increase in economic hardship.

[MORE]

These findings are important for a few reasons. There are many children living with non-parent adults. Over time, almost half of low income children will live with other adults in the home. Also, these other adults bring about much instability in household structure as households that include these other adults are more likely to experience change than homes in which there is only a single parent or two parents. This instability has detrimental effects on the economic well-being of children in that these children are at greater risk of seeing their income per capita reduced or experiencing more economic hardship. These are important findings as most studies only examine the presence or absence of parents and their marital status. There are many other household compositions not captured by more common measures of household structure, and more importantly, these other household types matter for child well-being.

## **REFERENCES**

- Cherlin, Andrew. November 2004. "The Deinstitutionalization of American Marriage." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66(4): pp. 848-861.
- Goldscheider, Frances and Regina Bures. 2003. "The Racial Crossover in Family Complexity in the United States." *Demography* 40(3): pp. 569-587.
- Griggs, Julia; Tan, Jo-Pei; Buchanan, Ann; Attar-Schwartz, Shalhevet; and Eirini Flouri. 2010. "They've Always Been There for Me': Grandparental Involvement and Child Well-Being." *Children & Society* 24: pp. 200-214.
- Manning, W.D. 2001. "Childbearing and cohabiting unions: Racial and ethnic differences." *Family Planning Perspectives* 33(5):217-223.
- Martin S.P. 2004. "Women's education and family timing: outcomes and trends associated with age at marriage and first birth." In Neckerman KM, editor. *Social Inequality*. Russell Sage Foundation; New York: 2004. pp. 79-118.

- Manning, Wendy and Susan Brown. 2006. "Children's Economic Well-Being in Married and Cohabiting Parent Families." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 68: pp. 345-362.
- Meadows, Sarah; McLanahan, Sara; and Jean Knab. 21 August 2009. "Economic Trajectories in Non-Traditional Families with Children." Working Paper. RAND Population Research Center.
- McLanahan, S. 2004. "Diverging destinies: How children are faring under the second demographic transition." *Demography* 41(4):607-627.
- McLanahan S. and Sandefur G. 1994. "Growing Up with a Single Parent: What Hurts, What Helps." Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
- Pagnini, Deanna, and Philip Morgan. 1996. "Racial Difference in Marriage and Childbearing: Oral History Evidence from the South in the Early Twentieth Century." *American Journal of Sociology* 101(6): pp. 1694-1718.

---

<sup>i</sup> Read more about sample selection here: <http://mcstudy.norc.org/study-design/>.