Family Information Form
Kindergarten / Year 1
Fast Track Project Technical Report
Cynthia Rains
November 4, 2003

Table of Contents

Citations

Reference
　　　　Hollingshead, A.B. (1975). *Four Factor Index of Social Status*. Unpublished manuscript. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University.

Instrument
　　　　Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group (CPPRG). (1990). *Family Information Form.*

Report
　　　　Rains, C. (2003). *Family Information Form* (Fast Track Project Technical Report). Available from the Fast Track Project website: http://www.fasttrackproject.org

Sources
Raw:　　　　P1B

Scored:　　　FIF1

I.   **Scale Description**

The Family Information Form is part of the summer interview given to parents after the school year was over. The Family Information Form (CPPRG, 1990) in year 1 was used for deriving demographic information, information concerning family structure, and socioeconomic status. Gradually, as the measure was used over the next 12 years, more and more items were added to the measure to include the target child's experience with adult male figures, the family yearly history of medical, mental health, drug and alcohol illnesses/difficulties for parents, the target child's siblings, and information for tracking families in the event of a move.

II.   **Report Sample**

These exploratory analyses were conducted with the first cohort on the high-risk sample (n=310) and on the normative sample (n=387, N=618 with overlap) from the first year of administration of this study. One intervention student from Durham was missing the entire measure.

III.   Scaling

Three scores were created for this dataset. One score was the *Socioeconomic Status Continuous Code* (PxBSES), whose scoring was based on a formula derived by Hollingshead (1975). The score is "calculated by multiplying the scale value for an occupation by a weight of five and the scale value for education by a weight of three" (Hollingshead, 1975). These scores are then added together. The score may then be divided by two if both parents work. The values for both the occupations and for education level are based on Hollingshead's work (see Appendix). For example, with a family in which only one parent works, the *Socioeconomic Status Continuous* Code is calculated as such:

	Scale Score	Factor Score	Score x Weight
Occupation	6	5	30
Education	5	3	15
		Total Score =	45

For a family where both parents work, the same calculations would be made for each parent. Then, the total score for each parent would be added together and then divided by two to create a final *Socioeconomic Status Continuous Code* for that family.

A second score was the *Socioeconomic Status Categorical Code (PxBSESC)*. This score was created by categorizing the adults' scores for the *Socioeconomic Status Continuous Code* (PxBSES) into 5 categories:

Socioeconomic Status Categorical Code (PxBSESC)		
Computed Score	**Range**	**Social Strata**
P1BSESC = 1	$54 < PxBSES \leq 66$	Major business & professional
P1BSESC = 2	$39 < PxBSES \leq 54$	Medium business, minor professional, technical
P1BSESC = 3	$29 < PxBSES \leq 39$	Skilled craftsmen, clerical, sales workers
P1BSESC = 4	$19 < PxBSES \leq 29$	Machine operators, semiskilled workers
P1BSESC = 5	$6 \leq PxBSES \leq 19$	Unskilled laborers, menial service workers

The last score created was the *Family Occupation Code (PxBFAMOC)*. This code is derived as follows:

Family Occupation Code (PxBFAMOC)		
Family Type	**Conditions**	**FAMOC**
Adult Female and Adult Male	If both parents are present and the female's occupation code > male's occupation code	FAMOC = Female's Occupation Code
Adult Female Only	If an adult female is present and an adult male is not	FAMOC = Female's Occupation Code
Adult Female and Adult Male	If both parents are present and the male's occupation code > female's occupation code	FAMOC = Male's Occupation Code
Adult Male Only	If an adult male is present and an adult female is not	FAMOC = Male's Occupation Code

Also, a variable called *Time Together* was created to reflect the number of years the adult male and adult female had been married or living together. The measure had collected separate data for

the number of years (*PxB20)* and number of months (*PxB21*) that the adult male and adult female had been married or living together. These two variables were combined to create the new *Time Together* variable.

IV. Subsets

Due to the extensive amount of data, the report is grouped into several sections: A) data dealing specifically with the child, B) data dealing specifically with the female head of household, and C) data dealing with the male head of household. Tests dealing with the differences between groups are in the next section of the report, entitled, "Differences between Groups."

A. Child Data

The following tables describe the students in the control, intervention, and normative samples:

Target Children's Gender*						
	Control Sample		Intervention Sample		Normative Sample	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Male	113	73%	116	75%	198	51%
Female	42	27%	38	25%	189	49%

*One intervention record was missing this information.

Target Children's Race*						
	Control Sample		Intervention Sample		Normative Sample	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Anglo descent (0)	79	51%	75	49%	198	51%
African descent (1)	68	44%	75	49%	164	42%
Hispanic descent (2)	3	2%	1	0.6%	6	2%
Asian descent (3)	0	0	0	0	3	1%
Native American descent (4)	0	0	0	0	3	1%
Other (5)	5	3%	3	2%	13	3%

*One intervention record was missing this information.

Grade attended last year*						
	Control Sample		Intervention Sample		Normative Sample	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Kindergarten	133	86%	135	88%	356	93%
1st Grade	22	14%	19	12%	28	7%

*Three normative records and 1 intervention record were missing these data.

Grade target child will attend next year*						
	Control Sample		Intervention Sample		Normative Sample	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
1st Grade	154	99%	154	100%	385	99.7%
2nd Grade	1	1%	0	0	1	0.3%

*One intervention child and 1 normative child were missing these data.

B.   Female Head of Household Data

This section reports the data collected on the female head of household. Information includes data on race, marital status, job information, and education. During analyses of the data, problems were found in the reporting of the data for the female head of household. Some respondents who said there was no female head of household for their family gave responses to items indicating that there was a female head for the family. To correct this problem, a forced skip pattern was used in the analyses of these data to eliminate those female heads that were not actually present in the household. The following tables, therefore, describe only those households where a female head was indicated as being present.

1.   Personal Data

The first question asked about the adult female was whether there was a female head of the household. The "yes" responses are as follows for each sample: 383 (99%) for the normative sample, 153 (98%) for the control sample, and 151 (97%) for the intervention sample.

Race of Female Head of Household*						
	Control Sample		Intervention Sample		Normative Sample	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Anglo descent (0)	83	54%	76	50%	205	54%
African descent (1)	65	42%	73	48%	156	41%
Hispanic descent (2)	3	2%	1	1%	6	2%
Asian descent (3)	0	0	0	0	3	1%
Native American descent (4)	0	0	0	0	3	1%
Other (5)	2	1%	1	1%	8	2%

*These data were missing for 1 intervention record and 2 normative records.

Relationship of Female Head of Household to Target Child*						
	Control Sample		Intervention Sample		Normative Sample	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Biological Parent (1)	139	94%	141	96%	362	97%
Step Parent (2)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adoptive Parent (3)	1	1%	1	0.7%	2	1%
Other Relative (4)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Foster Parent (5)	5	3%	4	3%	5	1%
Friend of Parent (6)	0	0	1	0.7%	1	0.3%
Other (7)	3	2%	0	0	5	1%

*These data were missing for 5 control records, 5 intervention records, and 8 normative records.

Marital Status of Female Head of Household*						
	Control Sample		Intervention Sample		Normative Sample	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Married (1)	61	44%	62	44%	195	55%
Separated/Divorced (2)	40	29%	38	27%	71	20%
Widowed (3)	2	1%	1	1%	2	1%
Never Married (4)	36	26%	39	28%	85	24%

*These data were missing for 12 intervention records and 30 normative records.

2.   Job Information

Kind of Job of Female Head of Household *						
	Control Sample		Intervention Sample		Normative Sample	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Housewives/Welfare Recipients/ Unemployed (0)	73	48%	69	46%	167	44%
Farm Laborers/Service Workers (1)	6	4%	3	2%	9	2%
Unskilled Workers (2)	12	8%	11	7%	31	8%
Machine Operators/Semi-skilled Workers (3)	16	10%	16	11%	43	11%
Skilled Manual Workers/ Craftsmen/Noncommissioned Military (4)	13	9%	21	14%	26	7%
Small Business Owners/Clerical/Sales (5)	14	9%	9	6%	44	11%
Technicians/Semi-professionals (6)	9	6%	11	7%	32	8%
Medium Business Owners/Group C Professionals/Entertainers/Artists (7)	7	5%	7	5%	20	5%
Large Business Owners/Commissioned Military/Group B Professionals/ Administrative Officers (8)	2	1%	4	3%	9	2%
Executives/Upper ranks Commissioned Military/Major Gov't Officials/Group A Professionals (9)	1	1%	0	0	2	1%

*One intervention record was missing this information.

Work Hours/Week for Female Head of Household*						
	Control Sample		Intervention Sample		Normative Sample	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
0 Hours	41	30%	38	28%	101	29%
1-20 Hours	12	9%	9	7%	43	12%
21-45 Hours	69	50%	65	49%	164	47%
46+ Hours	17	12%	22	16%	41	12%

*These data were missing for 14 control records, 18 intervention records, and 34 normative records.

The mean for hours worked in a week by a control female head of household was 29.32 (SD = 26.27). The mean for hours worked in a week by an intervention female head of household was 30.82 (SD = 25.50). The mean for hours worked in a week by a normative female head of household was 28.21 (SD = 24.86).

Work Schedule for Female Head of Household*						
	Control Sample		Intervention Sample		Normative Sample	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Does not Work	57	41%	56	40%	131	38%
Day (8am-5pm)	58	41%	56	40%	155	45%
Evening (after 5pm)	12	9%	12	9%	26	7%
Night (after 11pm)	3	2%	5	4%	11	3%
Variable	10	7%	12	9%	25	7%

*These data were missing for 13 control records, 11 intervention records, and 35 normative records.

3. Education Background

Last Grade Completed for Female Head of Household*						
	Control Sample		Intervention Sample		Normative Sample	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
1-6 Years (1)	0	0	0	0	0	0
7-9 Years (2)	18	12%	17	11%	34	9%
10-11 Years (3)	32	21%	36	24%	66	17%
12 Years (4)	74	48%	64	42%	176	46%
13-15 Years (5)	23	15%	23	15%	75	20%
16-17 Years (6)	5	3%	7	5%	26	7%
18+ Years (7)	1	1%	4	3%	6	2%

*One intervention record was missing this information.

B. Male Head of Household Data

This section reports the data collected on the male head of household. Information includes data on race, marital status, job information, and education. During analyses of the data, problems were found in the reporting of the data for the male head of household. Some respondents who said there was no male head of household for their family gave responses to items indicating that there was a male head for the family. To correct this problem, a forced skip pattern was used in the analyses of these data to eliminate those male heads that were not actually present in the household. The following tables, therefore, describe only those households where a male head was indicated as being present.

1. Personal Data

The first question asked about the adult male was whether there was a male head of the household. The "yes" responses are as follows for each sample: 233 (60%) for the normative sample, 82 (53%) for the control sample, and 77 (50%) for the intervention sample.

Race of Male Head of Household						
	Control Sample		Intervention Sample		Normative Sample	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Anglo descent (0)	59	71%	53	70%	160	70%
African descent (1)	20	24%	20	26%	54	23%
Hispanic descent (2)	2	2%	0	0	5	2%
Asian descent (3)	0	0	1	1%	1	0.4%
Native American descent (4)	0	0	0	0	2	1%
Other (5)	2	2%	2	3%	8	3%

*These data were missing for 2 intervention records and 4 normative records.

Relationship of Male Head of Household to Female Head of Household						
	Control Sample		Intervention Sample		Normative Sample	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Married (1)	60	74%	62	83%	191	82%
Unmarried Couple (2)	18	22%	11	15%	35	15%
Relative (3)	0	0	0	0	2	1%
Friends/Other (4)	3	4%	2	3%	4	2%

*These data were missing for 2 control records, 3 intervention records, and 2 normative records.

The mean for the number of years the male and female were married or had lived together in the control sample was 8.15 (SD = 4.33). The mean for the number of years the male and female were married or had lived together in the intervention sample was 8.87 (SD = 5.83). The mean for the number of years the male and female were married or had lived together in the normative sample was 8.96 (SD = 4.43). The sample sizes for this item were quite small: 41 control records, 29 intervention records, and 97 normative records.

Relationship of Male Head of Household to Target Child*						
	Control Sample		Intervention Sample		Normative Sample	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Biological Parent (1)	5	8%	1	2%	10	5%
Step Parent (2)	50	78%	41	65%	168	84%
Adoptive Parent (3)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Relative (4)	9	14%	19	30%	19	9%
Foster Parent (5)	0	0	1	2%	0	0
Friend of Parent (6)	0	0	1	2%	3	1%
Other (7)	0	0	0	0	1	1%

*These data were missing for 19 control records, 15 intervention records, and 1 normative record.

It should be noted that, in year 1 for cohort 1, an error was noted for item P1B24, "How is the male related to the target child?" Analysis for this item showed a high percentage of males who are stepparents to the target child while showing very few males being the biological parent of the target child. This pattern held true across all three samples, with a particularly high percentage (84%) of stepparents in the normative sample. This error did not occur in the data collection for the other cohorts for year 1 or in other years for

this measure. It is possible that the two responses (biological parent and stepparent) were reversed on the 1991 form, but the Data Center has not yet found definitive evidence either way.

Marital Status of Male Head of Household*					
	Control Sample		Intervention Sample		Normative Sample
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Married (1)	58	70%	60	79%	188	81%
Separated/Divorced (2)	10	12%	7	9%	13	6%
Widowed (3)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Never Married (4)	15	18%	9	12%	32	14%

*These data were missing for 2 intervention records and 1 normative record.

2. **Job Information**

Kind of Job of Male Head of Household *					
	Control Sample		Intervention Sample		Normative Sample
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Housewives/Welfare Recipients/ Unemployed (0)	11	13%	17	22%	14	6%
Farm Laborers/Service Workers (1)	2	2%	2	3%	3	1%
Unskilled Workers (2)	15	18%	16	21%	40	17%
Machine Operators/Semi-skilled Workers (3)	18	22%	7	9%	44	19%
Skilled Manual Workers/ Craftsmen/Noncommissioned Military (4)	23	28%	19	25%	60	26%
Small Business Owners/Clerical/Sales (5)	5	6%	5	6%	19	8%
Technicians/Semi-professionals (6)	5	6%	3	4%	22	9%
Medium Business Owners/Group C Professionals/Entertainers/Artists (7)	2	2%	6	8%	14	6%
Large Business Owners/Commissioned Military/Group B Professionals/ Administrative Officers (8)	0	0	2	3%	7	3%
Executives/Upper ranks Commissioned Military/Major Gov't Officials/Group A Professionals (9)	2	2%	0	0	10	4%

*These data were missing for 1 intervention record and 1 normative record.

Work Hours/Week for Male Head of Household*					
	Control Sample		Intervention Sample		Normative Sample
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
0 Hours	7	9%	10	13%	9	4%
1-20 Hours	3	4%	0	0	11	5%
21-45 Hours	48	60%	38	51%	139	61%
46+ Hours	22	28%	27	36%	68	30%

*These data were missing for 3 control records, 3 intervention records, and 7 normative records.

The mean for hours worked in a week by a control male head of household was 40.86 (SD = 17.76). The mean for hours worked in a week by an intervention male head of household was 43.95 (SD = 23.72). The mean for hours worked in a week by a normative male head of household was 42.63 (SD = 15.42).

Work Schedule for Male Head of Household*					
	Control Sample		Intervention Sample		Normative Sample	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Does not Work	9	11%	9	13%	14	6%
Day (8am-5pm)	53	65%	37	54%	154	67%
Evening (after 5pm)	6	7%	5	7%	20	9%
Night (after 11pm)	2	2%	5	7%	7	3%
Variable	11	14%	13	19%	34	15%

*These data were missing for 2 control records, 9 intervention records, and 5 normative records.

3.   Education Background

Last Grade Completed for Male Head of Household*					
	Control Sample		Intervention Sample		Normative Sample	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
1-6 Years (1)	3	4%	1	1%	4	2%
7-9 Years (2)	8	10%	4	5%	14	6%
10-11 Years (3)	14	17%	16	21%	28	12%
12 Years (4)	39	47%	37	48%	108	46%
13-15 Years (5)	15	18%	10	13%	47	20%
16-17 Years (6)	1	1%	8	10%	19	8%
18+ Years (7)	3	4%	1	1%	14	6%

*One intervention record was missing this information.

IV.   Differences between Groups

A series of t-tests between the high-risk sample and the normative sample indicated significant differences for six items and scores: the last grade completed for both the female and the male, the number of hours worked per week for the male, the *Socioeconomic Status Continuous Code*, the *Socioeconomic Status Categorical Code*, and the *Family Occupation Code*. For five of these items and scores--the last grade completed for both the female and the male, the number of hours worked per week for the male, the *Socioeconomic Status Continuous Code*, and the *Family Occupation Code*—the mean for the normative sample was greater than the mean for the control sample*;* this was not true for the *Socioeconomic Status Categorical Code.*

No significant differences between the control and intervention samples for the items and scores were found.

Generally, these findings seem to suggest that parents in the normative sample had more education and had jobs classified at a higher status level than parents in the high-risk sample. Also, men in the normative sample worked more hours per week than the men in the high-risk sample. It also appears that families in the high-risk sample had a higher *Socioeconomic Status Categorical Code* than did parents in the normative sample, indicating that the parents in the high-risk sample had greater socioeconomic status.

Family Information Form—Items and Scores, Normative vs. High-Risk

Variable	Normative Sample		High-Risk Sample		DF	t Value	Pr > |t|
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev			
Number of Hours Employed per Week, Female Head (P1B15)	29.48	25.13	30.16	26.06	556	0.31	0.7553
Female Head-Last Grade Completed (P1B17)	4.12	1.06	3.83	1.06	607	-3.46	0.0006
Number of Hours Employed per Week, Male Head (P1B15)	38.68	19.06	34.07	25.05	416	-2.13	0.0336
Male Head-Last Grade Completed (P1B17)	4.31	1.22	3.92	1.15	367	-3.21	0.0015
Socioeconomic Status Continuous Code (P1BSES)	27.81	13.24	23.55	12.99	615	-4.04	<.0001
Socioeconomic Status Categorical Code (P1BSESC)	3.62	1.18	3.96	1.13	614	3.73	0.0002
Family Occupation Code (P1BFAMOC)	3.89	2.46	2.93	2.46	615	-4.86	<.0001
Time Together	9.05	4.50	8.45	4.98	148	-0.78	0.4380

Family Information Form—Items and Scores, Control vs. Intervention

Variable	Control Sample		Intervention Sample		DF	t Value	Pr > |t|
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev			
Number of Hours Employed per Week, Female Head (P1B15)	29.32	26.27	31.02	25.92	273	-0.54	0.5900
Female Head-Last Grade Completed (P1B17)	3.79	0.99	3.86	1.12	302	-0.58	0.5637
Number of Hours Employed per Week, Male Head (P1B15)	34.32	22.32	33.82	27.53	196	0.14	0.8892
Male Head-Last Grade Completed (P1B17)	3.82	1.20	4.01	1.09	163	-1.07	0.2877
Socioeconomic Status Continuous Code (P1BSES)	23.32	12.89	23.77	13.13	307	-0.30	0.7613
Socioeconomic Status Categorical Code (P1BSESC)	4.00	1.13	3.93	1.13	306	0.56	0.5793
Family Occupation Code (P1BFAMOC)	2.92	2.42	2.94	2.52	307	-0.09	0.9279
Time Together	8.15	4.33	8.87	5.83	68	-0.59	0.5574

Means analysis and chi square tests noted differences for the three socioeconomic scores.

The mean for each of the samples for the *Socioeconomic Status Continuous Code (SES)* was as follows:

	Mean	**Standard Deviation**
Control Sample	23.32	12.89
Intervention Sample	23.77	13.13
Normative Sample	26.45	13.30

The frequency distribution of the *Socioeconomic Status Categorical Code (SESC)* among the high-risk and normative samples was:

Table of Group by P1BSESC						
Group	**P1BSESC Socioeconomic Status Categorical Code Y1)**					
Frequency Row Percent	**Major Business/ Professional 1**	**Medium Business/ Minor Professional/T echnical 2**	**Skilled Craftsmen/ Clerical/ Sales 3**	**Machine Operators/ Semiskilled Workers 4**	**Unskilled Laborers /Menial Service Workers 5**	**Total**
High-Risk	6 1.95	36 11.69	57 18.51	73 23.70	136 44.16	308
Normative	12 3.90	54 17.53	62 20.13	92 29.87	88 28.57	308
Total	18	90	119	165	224	616 100.00
Frequency Missing = 2						

With χ^2 (4, N = 616) = 18.2837, p< 0.0011, the hypothesis of independence between risk category (normative or high-risk) and *Socioeconomic Status Categorical Code* was rejected for these data.

The frequency distribution of the *Family Occupation Code* among the high-risk and normative samples was:

Table of Group by P1BFAMOC			
Group	**P1BFAMOC (Family Occupation Code Y1)**		
Frequency Row Percent	**0 (Coded as 0 = Non-Working)**	**1 (Coded as 1 = Any Other Occupation Code)**	**Total**
High-Risk	95 30.74	214 69.26	309
Normative	51 16.56	257 83.44	308
Total	146	471	617 100.00
Frequency Missing = 1			

With χ^2 (1, N = 617) = 17.1844, p< 0.0001, the hypothesis of independence between risk category (normative or high-risk) and *Family Occupation Code* was rejected for these data.

Chi-squared tests of independence indicated significant differences between the normative and the high-risk samples for both the *Socioeconomic Status Categorical Code* and the *Family Occupation Code.* A higher percentage of normative families were more likely to be working at higher social strata jobs and to be employed as compared to the high-risk sample families. High-risk families were more likely to be either unskilled laborers or menial service workers and to be unemployed.

Chi square tests were also run on several variables focusing on the relationship between the target child and his/her parents and between the parents themselves.

The frequency distribution of the female head's relationship with the target child among the high-risk and normative samples was:

Table of Group by P1B11						
Group	**P1B11 (2e. Relation of Female Head to TC)**					
Frequency Row Percent	**Biological Parent 1**	**Adoptive Parent 3**	**Foster Parent 5**	**Friend of Parent 6**	**Other 7**	**Total**
High-Risk	280 94.92	2 0.68	9 3.05	1 0.34	3 1.02	295
Normative	288 96.64	2 0.67	5 1.68	1 0.34	2 0.67	298
Total	568	4	14	2	5	593 100.00
Frequency Missing = 16						

With χ^2 (4, N = 593) = 1.4404, p< 0.8371, the hypothesis of independence between risk category (normative or high-risk) and the female head's relationship with the target child was not rejected for these data.

The frequency distribution of the female head's marital status among the high-risk and normative samples was:

Table of Group by P1B12					
Group	**P1B12 (2f. Marital Status of Female Head)**				
Frequency Row Percent	**Married 1**	**Separated/ Divorced 2**	**Widowed 3**	**Never Married 4**	**Total**
High-Risk	123 44.09	78 27.96	3 1.08	75 26.88	279
Normative	168 59.79	51 18.15	1 0.36	61 21.71	281
Total	291	129	4	136	560 100.00
Frequency Missing = 49					

With χ^2 (3, N = 560) = 15.0442, p< 0.0018, the hypothesis of independence between risk category (normative or high-risk) and the female head's marital status was rejected for these data.

The frequency distribution of the male head's relationship to the female head among the high-risk and normative samples was:

Table of Group by P1B19					
Group	**P1B19 (3c. Relation of Male Head to Female Head)**				
Frequency Row Percent	**Married 1**	**Unmarried 2**	**Relative 3**	**Friends/ Other 4**	**Total**
High-Risk	122 78.21	29 18.59	0 0.00	5 3.21	156
Normative	164 84.10	26 13.33	2 1.03	3 1.54	195
Total	286	55	2	8	351 100.00
Frequency Missing = 7					

With χ^2 (3, N = 351) = 4.5544, p< 0.2075, the hypothesis of independence between risk category (normative or high-risk) and the male head's relationship to the female head was not rejected for these data.

The frequency distribution of the male head's relationship to the target child among the high-risk and normative samples was:

Table of Group by P1B24							
Group	**P1B24 (3g. Relation of Male Head to TC)**						
Frequency Row Percent	**Biological Parent 1**	**Step Parent 2**	**Other Relative 4**	**Foster Parent 5**	**Friend of Parent 6**	**Other 7**	**Total**
High-Risk	6 4.72	91 71.65	28 22.05	1 0.79	1 0.79	0 0.00	127
Normative	7 4.00	147 84.00	17 9.71	0 0.00	3 1.71	1 0.57	175
Total	13	238	45	1	4	1	302 100.00
Frequency Missing = 56							

With χ^2 (5, N = 302) = 11.6063, p< 0.0406, the hypothesis of independence between risk category (normative or high-risk) and the male head's relationship to the target child was rejected for these data.

The frequency distribution of the male head's marital status among the high-risk and normative samples was:

Table of Group by P1B25				
Group	**P1B25 (3h. Male Head Marital Status)**			
Frequency Row Percent	**Married 1**	**Separated/Divorced 2**	**Never Married 4**	**Total**
High-Risk	118 74.21	17 10.69	24 15.09	159
Normative	162 82.65	11 5.61	23 11.73	196
Total	280	28	47	355 100.00
Frequency Missing = 3				

With χ^2 (2, N = 355) = 4.4129, p< 0.1101, the hypothesis of independence between risk category (normative or high-risk) and the male head's marital status was not rejected for these data.

Differences in familial relationships were assessed by chi-squared tests of independence. Significance tests indicated that female heads in the normative group were more likely to be married (60% vs. 44%) and female heads in the high-risk sample were more likely to be separated or divorced (28% vs. 18%). Males in the high-risk sample were more likely to be the biological parents of the target child (5% vs. 4%) and more likely to be another relative of the child (22% vs. 10%) while male heads in the normative sample were more likely to be stepparents to the target child (84% vs. 72%).

No significant differences were noted for the relationships between the female head and the target child, between the male head and the female head, or for the male head marital status.

V.   Recommendation for Use

The Fast Track Project created this form to collect general data about the target child and the target child's family. The majority of the items for this measure were designed to be single-use items and do not necessarily reflect a pattern within the data or a scale construct. Analysts should also note that several problems were noted in the analyses of this data:

- Some respondents who said there was no female head of household for their family gave responses to items indicating that there was a female head for the family. To correct this problem, a forced skip pattern was used in the analyses of the data about the female head to eliminate those females who were not actually present in the household.
- Also, some respondents said there was no male head of household for the family, yet gave responses to items indicating that there was a male head for the family. As was done with the data for the female heads, a forced skip pattern was then used to analyze only the data for the male heads who were noted as being present in the household.
- Finally, a probable coding error was discovered for item T1C24, "How is the male head of household related to the target child?" The majority of responses for all of the samples indicated that most men were stepparents of the target child, rather than biological fathers. This error did not occur in the data collection for the other cohorts for year 1 or in other years for this measure. It is possible that the two responses (biological parent and stepparent) were reversed on the 1991 form, but the Data Center has not yet found definitive evidence either way.