Multiplied Disadvantage:
Multiple Partner Fertility and Economic Wellbeing into the Great Recession[1]
(prepared for PAA 2014)

Lindsay M. Monte
U.S. Census Bureau

INTRODUCTION

The Great Recession, which officially lasted from late 2007 into 2009, is known to have had a detrimental effect on the economic wellbeing of many American families. However, we also know that certain sub-populations were more affected by the recession than others (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). In this analysis, I ask whether multiple partner fertility families were one such group. I use the 2004 and 2008 Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) panels to examine correlates of economic wellbeing, particularly differences in poverty and program use, before and during the Great Recession. I ask whether, controlling for other factors, families with multiple partner fertility were more susceptible to the negative repercussions of the Great Recession than were other families.

Multiple partner fertility (MPF) is defined as having children with more than one partner, and is much more prevalent among low-income parents than it is among other parents. About a third of all parents have MPF, while about 60 percent of low-income parents do (Carlson & Furstenberg, 2006). We know that fertility, and particularly MPF, has implications for economic outcomes (Lichter, 1997; Monte, 2011). However, we also know that many of the same factors that predict poverty predict MPF (see, for example, Guzzo & Furstenberg, 2007b). Given this, it is perhaps unsurprising that MPF and poverty are so highly correlated. What we do not know is whether MPF puts families at disproportionate risk when confronted with economic shocks. In this analysis, controlling for the demographic correlates of both poverty and MPF, I explore whether the Great Recession was disproportionately associated with higher rates of poverty and social program uptake for MPF families than for single partner fertility (SPF) families within a nationally representative sample.

[1] The views expressed on statistical, methodological, technical, or operational issues are those of the author and not necessarily those of the U.S. Census Bureau.

PRIOR LITERATURE

We know that MPF is more common among low-income parents than it is among higher income parents (Carlson & Furstenberg, 2006; Guzzo & Furstenberg, 2007; Mincy, 2002), and what we know about disadvantage and fertility more generally suggests that the relationship between the two in the context of multiple partners could operate from either direction. More disadvantaged individuals have less stable relationships, perhaps due to economic pressures (Lewin, 2005). It may be that the difficulty of maintaining a first childbearing relationship with few resources disproportionately puts poor women in the MPF risk set. Similarly, women who begin childbearing early, a population that is overwhelmingly poor, are both less likely to remain involved with their first partners and face a longer childbearing window (Morgan & Rindfuss, 1999), both of which put poor women at greater risk of entering MPF than their wealthier counterparts.

However, MPF itself may also cause economic problems. For example, MPF is associated with larger family size (Carlson & Furstenberg, 2006), which may mean that MPF parents face greater strain on their resources than do other parents. MPF also means that custodial parents are likely relying on child support from absent parents, and child support is a less efficient means of economic support than a shared household budget (Bartfeld, 2000). Additionally, we know that MPF is associated with less involved or available social networks (Harknett & Knab, 2007), meaning that MPF families may have fewer people on whom they can call for help.

In the context of a recession, existing evidence suggests that financial wellbeing could become even more tenuous for MPF families. Many custodial MPF parents are reliant on child support for some of their income (Meyer, Cancian, & Cook, 2005), and if the non-coresident parent is unable to pay, the custodial family's income is compromised. Conversely, MPF parents may have financial obligations outside the household (Sinkewicz & Garfinkle, 2009) - including, but not limited to, child support - and these obligations may reduce family resources already strained by the recession. Although an examination of these potential causal pathways is outside the scope of the proposed analysis, this paper will provide a foundation for later exploration of these potential causes.

ABOUT THE DATA

I use data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation's (SIPP) 2004 and 2008 panels. The SIPP is a longitudinal survey based on a nationally representative sample of the civilian, non-institutionalized population. It is administered by the US Census Bureau at four-month intervals. Each interview or "wave" of the SIPP asks about economic wellbeing and program participation, including employment, income, and the receipt of cash and non-cash benefits from both means-tested and non-means-tested programs. However, each wave also includes different supplemental questions on a variety of topics, which provide an assortment of point-in-time measures to supplement the longitudinal economic measures. Called "topical modules," these supplemental question batteries include such things as a relationship matrix, collecting the relationships of all members of a household to each other, as well as marital history, fertility history, and child support payment and receipt, among many other things.[2]

Interviews for the 2004 panel began in February of 2004. In order to capture economic wellbeing prior to the start of the Great Recession, I utilize data from only the first eight waves to establish a baseline for program utilization in both MPF families and SPF families in the pre-recession years. This means that observations from the 2004 panel extend from October of 2003 to August of 2006.[3]

The 2008 panel interviews began in September of 2008, and continued through December of 2013, for a total of 16 waves.[4] I use all currently available data from the 2008 panel (the first 14 waves, covering May of 2008 to April of 2013) to examine the same economic indicators for these types of families during the years of, and following, the official recession.[5] I look at whether patterns of TANF and food stamp utilization, as well as poverty, changed similarly during the recession for both family types, or whether parents in MPF families were more likely to experience these markers of economic disadvantage.

[2] For information on sampling and nonsampling error in the SIPP, see <http://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/sipp/tech-documentation/source-accuracy-statements.html>

[3] This sample decision also allows the full sample to be used, as the sample cut that occurred in the 2004 panel did not happen until Wave 9; for more information about the 2004 sample cut, see pages 29-30 of the book, "Reengineering the Survey of Income and Program Participation," edited by C. Citro and J.K. Scholz.

[4] The longer period of interviewing in the 2008 panel was to allow the 2008 data to overlap with tests of the redesigned SIPP instrument.

[5] I use 14 waves because economic evidence shows continuing stagnation, even after the "official" end of the recession in 2009 (Wingfield, 2010).

My sample is limited to adult women, age 18 to 55, who are the biological mother of at least two children, and who are living with at least one child under 18 at the time of the Wave 2 survey.[6] The sample limitations result from a variety of sources, both strategic and due to data limitations. For example, I limit the sample to women for two reasons: first, because women are more likely than men to live with their children (Grall, 2011) which makes the determination of MPF status more likely, and second, so that the outcomes, which are family level, are not duplicated across two members of a couple. Although this likely omits a small number of single, custodial fathers, prior research suggests that such cases are likely to be few, and I account for partnered men's fertility information by adding it to the mothers' records. I employ the age cap in order to capture the life cycle stage in which women are most likely to be living with children, and limit the sample to women with at least two children because the mothers of only one child are not in the risk set for MPF. I further limit the sample to women with at least one biological child in the household due to data limitations; I am unable to determine MPF for most women who do not live with a biological child.

Of the roughly 49 million women who meet my sample criteria, I am able to determine the presence or absence of MPF for 92 percent of them, for a sample of roughly 45.6 million women. Unfortunately, although the excluded sample is relatively small, the excluded women are significantly different from the included women on a number of important measures (see Appendix Table 2). For example, the excluded sample is less likely to be White or Asian, and more likely to be Black or some other race(s); they are also more likely to be Hispanic. The excluded sample is also older, less well educated, and more likely to be a single parent at the time of the Wave 2 survey. Their youngest child is generally older, and they are more likely to be poor, or to receive food stamps or TANF. Despite the small size of the excluded sample, these differences likely limit the generalizability of my results in unknown ways.

[6] Appendix Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of the two samples. Notably, the rates of multiple partner fertility are not statistically different across the two panels, and the two panels are also not racially or ethnically different.

METHODS

In this paper, I examine the implications of MPF for a household's economic wellbeing within the context of the Great Recession. Difference-in-difference models are used to explore changes over time, from pre-recession, to the years of the recession and beyond, for MPF and SPF families. Specifically, combining the two SIPP panels, I divide the sample into four groups defined by their panel and their fertility. I then compare the difference in economic wellbeing between the MPF samples from 2004 (pre-recession) and 2008 (during and post-recession). I do the same for the SPF families, and model the difference between the two differences using an OLS regression including an interaction term for panel and fertility.

Three separate models are run, each estimating the difference-in-differences for three different outcome measures, each estimating pervasive economic wellbeing. For each respondent, in each month in which they were a sample member, the SIPP includes measures of TANF receipt, food stamps receipt, as well as both family income and the poverty threshold for a family of that size in that month. As proxies for economic wellbeing, the three outcomes I use are the percentage of time, across all observed months for each individual respondent, that that respondent (and their family) were (1) receiving TANF, (2) receiving food stamps, or (3) were poor. This means that if a person appeared in four waves (16 months) of the survey, and received TANF in eight of those observed months, they would have a rate of TANF receipt of 50 percent.; the same would be true of someone who appeared only in the Wave 2 interview (4 months), and received TANF in two of those months. This ratio was applied to all three outcomes – percentage TANF receipt, percentage food stamps receipt, and percentage of the time with family income below the individually-adjusted poverty line – and allows me to compare respondents with different survey attrition rates.

The predictor of interest is a measure of whether the respondent or her spouse/partner or the father of at least one of her children has MPF. Because the 2004 and 2008 SIPP panels do not ask directly about MPF, I use a number of other means to determine parents' fertility status. My primary source of data is the Wave 2 relationship matrix topical module, which ascertains the relationships between all members of the household. From the relationship matrix data, I can ascertain half-sibling relationships between children, as well as which parent is the MPF parent. I also use parent data to identify biological parents for all sample members, and by comparing

across individuals, I am able to identify more half-sibling dyads. Additionally, I use the fertility history topical module (also Wave 2) to compare fertility across partners, for both married and unmarried parents; that is, if the biological mother of two shared children reports that those are her only children, but the biological father reports that he has three children, then I am able to determine that the father has MPF.

I further use information from both the fertility topical module and the marital history topical module to ascertain fertility for women who have ever been married. Because men are not asked about their fertility history in the 2004 and 2008 panels, I am unable to use these data to ascertain the MPF status of men. For women, however, I can use the timing of their first and last births in the context of the timing of marriages to determine MPF. For example, if a woman has been married once and had all of her children during that marriage,[7] then I code her as not having MPF. Alternately, if a woman had a first birth within her first marriage, but a subsequent birth after the termination of that marriage, then I presume that she has MPF.

Finally, I also use information from the child support topical modules asked routinely throughout the panels. In 2004, these modules were asked at Waves 3 and 6, while in the 2008 panel, they were asked in Waves 4, 7, and 10. In order to make information gleaned at subsequent waves correspond to information found in Wave 2, I stipulate that responses to child support questions can only be used if the respondent has the same spouse in both Wave 2 and whichever Child Support Topical Module is being referenced. If the respondent had the same spouse in both waves (and that spouse was present in all months of the wave), and the respondent had biological children with that spouse in the household, and the respondent reported having had a minor child living elsewhere "with their other parent" at some time during the panel, then I presume that respondent to have MPF.

Each model uses the same set of controls. Because MPF is more prevalent among Blacks, I include controls for race (White alone (omitted), Black alone, Asian alone, and all other races or race combinations; Carlson & Furstenberg, 2006). I also control for Hispanic origin, independent of race. Because individuals' economic circumstances tend to become more secure as they age (Danziger & Haveman, 2001), I include a measure of the mother's age, in years, as of

[7] This time span would be either from the start of that marriage to time of survey, if she is still married, or from the start of that marriage to its termination if that marriage ended.

the Wave 2 survey. I further control for educational attainment, which is also highly correlated with employment and earnings (less than high school, high school diploma or GED, some college, and BA and above; BLS, 2014). Because MPF is correlated with larger family size (Carlson & Furstenberg, 2006), I control for the number of children the woman has given birth to. I also include measures to control for the adult composition of the household as a proxy for available earners. I control for whether the woman had a spouse or cohabiting partner at the time of the Wave 2 survey, and I include a measure of the number of adults (age 18+) who resided in the household at Wave 2 and who were neither the woman nor her spouse or partner. I further control for the age of the woman's youngest coresident child at Wave 2, as the presence of very young children may inhibit a woman's ability to work, or influence her decisions about whether to seek outside assistance (Crittenden, 2001).

In the interest of parsimony, I do not include partners' characteristics in the model. Instead, I assume homogamy[8] and use only the mother's characteristics to represent both herself and her partner. However, I include fathers' MPF in determining family fertility, and if a married mother does not have MPF but I am unable to determine whether the father has MPF, that couple is excluded from the sample due to insufficient data (see Appendix Table 2 for descriptive information on the excluded sample). All observations use the mother's Wave 2 person weight.

RESULTS[9]

Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of respondents with and without MPF. In line with the findings of other studies (Carlson & Furstenberg, 2006), about a third of the SIPP families have MPF. As expected based on prior literature, MPF mothers are more likely to be Black, have lower rates of college completion, and have larger families (ibid; Guzzo & Furstenberg, 2007).[10] However, they are also more likely to have stepchildren in the household, as well as additional adults beyond themselves and their spouse or partner. This suggests that

[8] See Stevens (1991) for a review of the literature on homogamy.

[9] The estimates in this report (which may be shown in text, figures, and tables) are based on responses from a sample of the population and may differ from actual values because of sampling variability or other factors. As a result, apparent differences between the estimates for two or more groups may not be statistically significant.

[10] All comparative statements in this report have undergone statistical testing, and, unless otherwise noted, all comparisons are statistically significant at the 5 percent significance level.

MPF is not the sole source of family complexity for many MPF families. Table 1 also shows that MPF families are more likely to be receiving TANF, more likely to be receiving food stamps, and more likely to be poor at the time of the Wave 2 survey than are SPF families, suggesting that MPF families face higher levels of disadvantage.

Table 2 shows the cross-sectional programmatic and poverty changes observed between Wave 2 of the 2004 panel and Wave 2 of the 2008 panel. Very few families are receiving TANF in either panel, and the rates of receipt are not significantly different between the third quarter of 2004 and the first quarter of 2008.[11] However, both food stamp receipt and poverty increased significantly between over the same period.

Table 3 shows the regression results for all three modeled outcomes. I find significantly greater increases in the rates of poverty (Model 3) and food stamp receipt (Model 2) for MPF families than for SPF families from the pre-recession era into, and past, the Great Recession. However, I do not find a temporal relationship between MPF and TANF receipt (Model 1).

Very few families are receiving TANF in either the 2004 or the 2008 panels (see Table 2). Given this, it is perhaps unsurprising that I do not see differences in TANF receipt by MPF status, or over time (see Table 3). In contrast, the model for food stamps shows a number of significant results (Model 2, Table 3). Not only are MPF families more likely to receive food stamps in general, but there is an increase for all families between the years before the recession and the years of, and following, the Great Recession. Moreover, in the coefficient for the interaction between panel and family type, we see that despite a higher baseline, and a national increase in food stamps uptake, the increase in receipt of food stamps during the Great Recession was significantly larger for MPF families than for SPF families.

The story for poverty is slightly more complex. Despite the fact that MPF families are often found to be more disadvantaged than SPF families, I do not find a difference in the proportion of time during the panel spent in poverty between MPF and SPF families, net of a host of demographic controls. However, the Great Recession did prove to be a financial hardship for many families, and we see that effect in the coefficient for the panel difference. And, notably, I find that the increase in time spent in poverty was significantly higher for MPF families than for SPF families.

[11] These are the respective months of the Wave 2 surveys in each panel.

DISCUSSION

The Great Recession of 2007-2009 was associated with economic difficulties for a large number of families in the United States. However, the Great Recession did not affect all families equally; for example, men and those in manufacturing jobs had more difficulty during the recession than did women or those in white collar jobs, respectively (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). MPF families are already known to face more and different challenges than do SPF families (Carlson & Furstenberg, 2006; Guzzo & Furstenberg, 2007; Harknett & Knab, 2007). In this paper, I asked whether the Great Recession and its aftermath were experienced differently by MPF families than they were by SPF families.

This analysis affirms the greater financial hardship facing MPF families that has been found in other literature, but also suggests that MPF families did experience disproportionate difficulties during the Great Recession. I find significantly larger increases across the years of the Great Recession in both time spent receiving food stamps and time spent in poverty for MPF families, suggesting that the Great Recession had a more negative effect on these families than it did on SPF families.

Interestingly, I do not find an effect for TANF, but this may be due to the small number of recipients during the period observed. In fact, despite the recession, I do not see an increase in TANF receipt between the pre-recession era and the years of, and subsequent to, the official recession. This suggests that TANF may no longer be the safety net it once was. If families struggling during the recession did not turn to TANF as a means of support, then its efficacy as a social welfare program is reduced.

In contrast, as more families have turned to food stamps to supplement their income from other sources, food stamps have emerged as one of the primary social welfare programs of the TANF era (Tiehen, Jolliffe, & Smeeding, 2013), increasing by almost 50 percent between December of 2008 and December of 2013.[12] That MPF families utilize food stamps more than SPF families is perhaps unsurprising, given the link between MPF and poverty. And the overall increase in food stamps uptake between the pre-recession era and the years of, and immediately following, the Great Recession is also unsurprising given what we know about higher and more pervasive hardship during the recession (Taylor et. al., 2010). However, the greater increase in

[12] See http://frac.org/pdf/2014_03_07_snap_december2013.pdf

food stamps receipt for MPF families, net of controls that should account for a great deal of the economic disparity between families, suggests that there is something about MPF, in particular, that put families at a disadvantage during the recession.

Of course, it could also be argued that MPF parents might be disproportionately willing to utilize social welfare programs, and that this could account for both higher baseline food stamp receipt, as well as greater increases over the years of the recession. However, the results for poverty weaken the strength of this argument. Net of demographic and familial controls associated economic wellbeing, MPF families do not spend more time in poverty than SPF families. Additionally, while poverty increased for all families across the years of the recession, and SPF families and MPF families did not have different baseline levels of poverty, MPF families did have a larger increase in poverty over the years of the recession than did SPF families. This further supports the suggestion that there is something about MPF that was associated with elevated disadvantage in the Great Recession.

Unfortunately, the SIPP data are not up to the task of disentangling the reasons why MPF families might have fared worse. However, there are many possibilities. For example, if the disproportionate impact of the Great Recession on men affected noncustodial fathers' ability to pay child support, custodial MPF mothers would have reduced income, even if their own employment situation did not change (Meyer, Cancian, & Cook, 2005; Maldonado, 2006). Alternately, if men's earned income dropped but they continued to pay a static level of child support for children outside the household, the entire impact of that reduced income would be felt in the focal MPF households.

Child support is not the only potential mechanism, however. MPF mothers have been found to have less involved or available social networks (Harknett & Knab, 2007). As low-income families often rely on relatives for childcare (Laughlin, 2013), MPF mothers may have fewer childcare options. In the context of a tight job market, a lack of childcare may have cost some mothers their jobs. Similarly, the recession forced many families to share resources (Taylor et. al., 2010), and if MPF families had fewer people on whom they could call, this could also result in disproportionate difficulty.

Again, however, an exploration of the mechanisms that explain this relationship is beyond the scope of current SIPP data. Future research, using more comprehensive and exact

measures of MPF, will be needed to understand the disproportionate impact of economic shocks on the wellbeing of MPF families.

Works Cited

Blank, R. (1997). It Takes a Nation: A New Agenda for Fighting Poverty. New York, NY: Russell Sage.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2014). Employment Projections: Earnings and Unemployment Rates by Educational Attainment. Downloaded March 20, 2014 from: http://www.bls.gov/emp/ep_chart_001.htm

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2012). BLS Spotlight on Statistics: The Recession of 2007–2009. Downloaded August 20, 2013, from http://www.bls.gov/spotlight/2012/recession/pdf/recession_bls_spotlight.pdf.

Carlson, M., & Furstenberg, F. (2006). The Prevalence and Correlates of Multipartnered Fertility Among Urban U.S. Parents. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68: 718–732.

Crittenden, A. (2001). *The Price of Motherhood: Why the most important job in the world is still the least valued*. New York, NY: Henry Holt and Company LLC.

Danziger, S., & Haveman, R. (Eds.). (2001). *Understanding Poverty*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Grall, T. (2011). Custodial Mothers and Fathers and their Child Support: 2009. Current Population Reports, P60-240. Washington, D.C., US Census Bureau.

Guzzo, K., & Furstenberg, F. (2007). Multipartnered Fertility Among American Men. *Demography*, 44(3), 583-601.

Guzzo, K., & Furstenberg, F. (2007b). Multipartnered Fertility Among Young Women with a Nonmarital First Birth: Prevalence and Risk Factors. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 39(1), 29-38.

Harknett, K. and Knab, J. (2007), More Kin, Less Support: Multipartnered Fertility and Perceived Support Among Mothers. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69: 237–253.

Laughlin, L. (2013). "Who's Minding the Kids? Child Care Arrangements: Spring 2011." Household Economic Studies Report #P70-135. Washington, DC: US Census Bureau.

Lichter, Daniel T. Poverty and Inequality Among Children. *Annual Review of Sociology* Vol. 23, (1997), pp. 121-145.

Maldonado, S. (2006). Deadbeat or Deadbroke: Redefining Child Support for Poor Fathers. *University of California at Davis Law Review, 39*(3), 991-1023.

Meyer, D., Cancian, M., & Cook, S. (2005). Multiple-Partner Fertility: Incidence and Implications for Child Support Policy. *The Social Service Review*, 79(4): 577-58.

Monte, L. (2011). The Chicken and the Egg of Economic Disadvantage and Multiple Partner Fertility: Which comes first in a sample of low-income women? *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 35(1): 53-66

Sinkewicz, M., Garfinkle, I. (2009). Unwed Fathers' Ability to Pay Child Support: New Estimates Accounting for Multiple-Partner Fertility. *Demography*, 46(2): 247-263.

Stevens, G. (1991). Propinquity and Educational Homogamy. Sociological Forun, 6(4): 715-726.

Taylor, P., Morin, R., Kochhar, R., Parker, K., Cohn, D., Lopez, M.H., …Espinoza, S. (2010). How the Great Recession has Changed Life in America. Pew Research Center. Downloaded March 1, 2014 from: www.pewsocialtrends.org/files/2010/11/759-recession.pdf

Tiehen, L, Jolliffee, D., & Smeeding, T. (2013). The Effects of SNAP on Poverty. IRP Discussion Paper, No. 1415-13: University of Wisconsin - Madison.

Wingfield, B. (2010). "The End of the Great Recession? Hardly." Forbes Magazine. Retrieved March 22, 2014 from: http://www.forbes.com/sites/brianwingfield/2010/09/20/the-end-of-the-great-recession-hardly/

TABLE 1: Sample Demographics, by Multiple Partner Fertility Status

(Numbers in thousands)

	Full Sample		Single Partner Fertility Sample		Multiple Partner Fertility Sample	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
TOTAL	45,577	100.0	32,876	100.0	12,701	100.0
MULTIPLE PARTNER FERTILITY						
No	32,876	72.1	32,876	100.0	NA	
Yes	12,701	27.9	NA		12,701	100.0
PANEL						
2004 sample	23,273	51.1	16,800	51.1	6,473	51.0
2008 sample	22,305	48.9	16,077	48.9	6,228	49.0
RACE						
White alone	36,837	80.8	26,565	80.8	10,272	80.9
Black alone	5,527	12.1	3,847	11.7	1,680	13.2
Asian alone	1,718	3.8	1,482	4.5	236	1.9
All other races, race combinations	1,496	3.3	983	3.0	513	4.0
HISPANIC ORIGIN (regardless of race)	8,975	19.7	6,350	19.3	2,625	20.7
AGE						
15 to 19 years old	109	0.2	69	0.2	40	0.3
20 to 24 years old	2,012	4.4	1,403	4.3	610	4.8
25 to 29 years old	5,424	11.9	3,761	11.4	1,662	13.1
30 to 34 years old	8,655	19.0	6,218	18.9	2,437	19.2
35 to 39 years old	10,775	23.6	7,866	23.9	2,909	22.9
40 to 44 years old	9,866	21.7	7,228	22.0	2,638	20.8
45 to 49 years old	6,348	13.9	4,643	14.1	1,705	13.4
50 to 55 years old	2,388	5.2	1,688	5.1	699	5.5
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT						
Less than HS	6,305	13.8	4,332	13.2	1,973	15.5
High School diploma or GED	10,492	23.0	6,859	20.9	3,633	28.6
Some college	16,633	36.5	11,451	34.8	5,182	40.8
BA or more	12,147	26.7	10,234	31.1	1,912	15.1
MARITAL STATUS						
Ever Married	41,169	90.3	29,598	90.0	11,571	91.1
Married	35,187	77.2	25,431	77.4	9,755	76.8
Widowed	364	0.8	262	0.8	102	0.8
Divorced	4,057	8.9	2,719	8.3	1,338	10.5
Separated	1,561	3.4	1,185	3.6	376	3.0
Never Married	4,408	9.7	3,279	10.0	1,129	8.9
HAS SPOUSE/PARTNER IN HH AT W2	36,815	80.8	25,574	77.8	11,242	88.5
CHILDREN EVER BORN						
Two	25,376	55.7	19,650	59.8	5,726	45.1
Three	13,018	28.6	9,000	27.4	4,018	31.6
Four or more	7,183	15.8	4,227	12.9	2,956	23.3
AGE OF YOUNGEST CHILD						
Newborn or 1 year old	7,830	17.2	5,508	16.8	2,322	18.3
2 to 4	10,058	22.1	7,352	22.4	2,706	21.3
5 to 9	12,424	27.3	9,057	27.6	3,367	26.5
10 to 14	10,313	22.6	7,333	22.3	2,980	23.5
15 to 17	4,952	10.9	3,626	11.0	1,326	10.4
# CORESIDENT CHILDREN						
One	3,167	7.0	1,306	4.0	1,861	14.7
Two	26,412	58.0	20,053	61.0	6,359	50.1
Three	11,251	24.7	8,166	24.8	3,085	24.3
Four or more	4,747	10.4	3,352	10.2	1,395	11.0
HAS STEPCHILDREN IN HH	956	2.1	51	0.2	905	7.1
# OTHER ADULTS (NOT SPOUSE/PARTNER)						
None	33,555	73.6	24,495	74.5	9,060	71.3
One	8,199	18.0	5,694	17.3	2,505	19.7
Two	2,683	5.9	1,947	5.9	736	5.8
Three	804	1.8	512	1.6	293	2.3
Four or more	336	0.7	228	0.7	107	0.8
RECEIVING TANF AT W2	554	1.2	360	1.1	195	1.5
RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS AT W2	6,131	13.5	4,072	12.4	2,060	16.2
FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY AT W2	8,385	18.4	5,798	17.6	2,587	20.4

SOURCE: SIPP 2004 panel (Wave 2) and 2008 panel (Wave 2)

TABLE 2: Economic Change between 2004 and 2008 SIPP Panels

(Numbers in thousands)

	Full Sample		2004 Panel		2008 Panel	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
TOTAL	45,577	100.0	23,273	100.0	22,305	100.0
RECEIVING TANF AT W2						
No	45,023	98.8	23,000	98.8	22,023	98.7
Yes	554	1.2	273	1.2	281	1.3
RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS AT W2						
No	39,446	86.6	20,568	88.4	18,878	84.6
Yes	6,131	13.5	2,705	11.6	3,426	15.4
FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY AT W2						
No	37,192	81.6	19,347	83.1	17,845	80.0
Yes	8,385	18.4	3,926	16.9	4,459	20.0

SOURCE: SIPP 2004 panel (Wave 2) and 2008 panel (Wave 2)

TABLE 3: Multiple Partner Fertility and Markers of Disadvantage Before and After the Great Recession (2004-2006 vs. 2008-2013)

	Model 1: TANF RECIPIENCY		Model 2: FOOD STAMPS RECIPIENCY		Model 3: POVERTY	
	B	SE	B	SE	B	SE
Variables of Interest						
At least one parent has Multiple Partner Fertility	0.24	0.18	1.90 *	0.63	1.18	0.64
Year difference, 2004 to 2008	-0.15	0.14	4.90 ***	0.47	3.87 ***	0.47
Interaction of MPF and year	0.45	0.26	5.12 ***	0.89	2.24 *	0.89
Age						
R's age at W2 in years	-0.10 ***	0.01	-0.91 ***	0.04	-0.64 ***	0.04
Race, Hispanic Origin						
R is White alone	(Omitted)		(Omitted)		(Omitted)	
R is Black alone	1.17 ***	0.19	9.88 ***	0.65	7.69 ***	0.65
R is Asian alone	0.22	0.31	0.07	1.06	3.09 *	1.07
R is some other race or race combination	0.69 *	0.33	4.48 ***	1.12	2.98 *	1.13
R is Hispanic (regardless of race)	-0.17	0.16	-1.34 *	0.56	5.78 ***	0.57
Educational Attainment						
R has less than a HS diploma / GED	(Omitted)		(Omitted)		(Omitted)	
R has a HS diploma / GED	-0.83 ***	0.21	-10.98 ***	0.71	-14.70 ***	0.72
R has some college	-1.54 ***	0.20	-16.81 ***	0.69	-22.09 ***	0.69
R has at least a BA	-1.51 ***	0.23	-20.02 ***	0.77	-26.18 ***	0.78
Family Demographics						
Number of children ever born to R	0.43 ***	0.06	3.73 ***	0.21	3.69 ***	0.21
R has a spouse or partner in the home at W2	-2.93 ***	0.16	-26.00 ***	0.55	-21.21 ***	0.55
Number of additional adults (18+) beyond R and (where applicable) spouse/partner	-0.11	0.08	-1.50 ***	0.28	-4.19 ***	0.28
Age of youngest coresidential child at W2 (in years)	-	0.02	-0.09	0.06	-0.28 ***	0.06

SOURCE: SIPP 2004 panel (Waves 1-8) and 2008 panel (Waves 1-14)

- Rounds to zero

NOTE: * Significant at the 5% level

** Significant at the 1% level

*** Significant at the .1% level

APPENDIX TABLE 1: Demographic Comparison of the 2004 and 2008 SIPP Panels
(Numbers in thousands)

	Full Sample		2004 Sample		2008 Sample	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
TOTAL	45,577	100.0	23,273	100.0	22,305	100.0
MULTIPLE PARTNER FERTILITY						
No	32,876	72.1	16,800	72.2	16,077	72.1
Yes	12,701	27.9	6,473	27.8	6,228	27.9
RACE & HISPANIC ORIGIN						
White alone	36,837	80.8	18,843	81.0	17,994	80.7
Black alone	5,527	12.1	2,810	12.1	2,717	12.2
Asian alone	1,718	3.8	848	3.6	870	3.9
All other races, race combinations	1,496	3.3	772	3.3	724	3.3
HISPANIC ORIGIN (regardless of race)	8,975	19.7	4,450	19.1	4,525	20.3
AGE						
15 to 19 years old	109	0.2	48	0.2	62	0.3
20 to 24 years old	2,012	4.4	1,204	5.2	808	3.6
25 to 29 years old	5,424	11.9	2,641	11.4	2,782	12.5
30 to 34 years old	8,655	19.0	4,573	19.7	4,082	18.3
35 to 39 years old	10,775	23.6	5,388	23.2	5,387	24.2
40 to 44 years old	9,866	21.7	5,227	22.5	4,639	20.8
45 to 49 years old	6,348	13.9	3,121	13.4	3,227	14.5
50 to 55 years old	2,388	5.2	1,070	4.6	1,318	5.9
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT						
Less than HS	6,305	13.8	3,273	14.1	3,033	13.6
High School diploma or GED	10,492	23.0	5,600	24.1	4,892	21.9
Some college	16,633	36.5	8,654	37.2	7,979	35.8
BA or more	12,147	26.7	5,745	24.7	6,401	28.7
MARITAL STATUS						
Ever Married	41,169	90.3	21,202	91.1	19,966	89.5
Married	35,187	77.2	18,168	78.1	17,019	76.3
Widowed	364	0.8	187	0.8	177	0.8
Divorced	4,057	8.9	2,042	8.8	2,015	9.0
Separated	1,561	3.4	806	3.5	755	3.4
Never Married	4,408	9.7	2,070	8.9	2,338	10.5
HAS SPOUSE/PARTNER IN HH AT W2	36,815	80.8	18,914	81.3	17,901	80.3
CHILDREN EVER BORN						
Two	25,376	55.7	12,977	55.8	12,398	55.6
Three	13,018	28.6	6,679	28.7	6,339	28.4
Four or more	7,183	15.8	3,616	15.5	3,567	16.0
AGE OF YOUNGEST CHILD						
Newborn or 1 year old	7,830	17.2	4,056	17.4	3,774	16.9
2 to 4	10,058	22.1	5,020	21.6	5,038	22.6
5 to 9	12,424	27.3	6,363	27.3	6,061	27.2
10 to 14	10,313	22.6	5,304	22.8	5,009	22.5
15 to 17	4,952	10.9	2,529	10.9	2,423	10.9
# CORESIDENTIAL CHILDREN						
One	3,167	7.0	1,611	6.9	1,556	7.0
Two	26,412	58.0	13,530	58.1	12,882	57.8
Three	11,251	24.7	5,785	24.9	5,466	24.5
Four or more	4,747	10.4	2,346	10.1	2,401	10.8
HAS STEPCHILDREN IN HH	956	2.1	492	2.1	463	2.1
# OTHER ADULTS (NOT SPOUSE/PARTNER)						
None	33,555	73.6	17,161	73.7	16,393	73.5
One	8,199	18.0	4,186	18.0	4,014	18.0
Two	2,683	5.9	1,373	5.9	1,311	5.9
Three	804	1.8	391	1.7	413	1.9
Four or more	336	0.7	162	0.7	174	0.8

SOURCE: SIPP 2004 panel (Wave 2) and 2008 panel (Wave 2)

APPENDIX TABLE 2: Demographic Comparison of the Used and Excluded Samples

(Numbers in thousands)

	Full Sample		Excluded sample (MPF Status Unknown)		Sample used (MPF Status Determined)	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
TOTAL	49,688	100.0	4,111	100.0	45,577	100.0
PANEL						
2004 sample	25,248	50.8	1,975	48.1	23,273	51.1
2008 sample	24,440	49.2	2,135	52.0	22,305	48.9
RACE						
White alone	39,532	79.6	2,695	65.6	36,837	80.8
Black alone	6,653	13.4	1,127	27.4	5,527	12.1
Asian alone	1,792	3.6	75	1.8	1,718	3.8
All other races, race combinations	1,711	3.4	215	5.2	1,496	3.3
HISPANIC ORIGIN (regardless of race)	9,905	19.9	930	22.6	8,975	19.7
AGE						
15 to 19 years old	116	0.2	7	0.2	109	0.2
20 to 24 years old	2,099	4.2	86	2.1	2,012	4.4
25 to 29 years old	5,727	11.5	303	7.4	5,424	11.9
30 to 34 years old	9,104	18.3	450	10.9	8,655	19.0
35 to 39 years old	11,566	23.3	791	19.2	10,775	23.6
40 to 44 years old	10,986	22.1	1,120	27.2	9,866	21.7
45 to 49 years old	7,184	14.5	836	20.3	6,348	13.9
50 to 55 years old	2,906	5.9	518	12.6	2,388	5.2
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT						
Less than HS	7,254	14.6	949	23.1	6,305	13.8
High School diploma or GED	11,561	23.3	1,069	26.0	10,492	23.0
Some college	18,251	36.7	1,618	39.4	16,633	36.5
BA or more	12,622	25.4	475	11.6	12,147	26.7
MARITAL STATUS						
Ever Married	44,308	89.2	3,139	76.4	41,169	90.3
Married	36,977	74.4	1,790	43.5	35,187	77.2
Widowed	452	0.9	88	2.1	364	0.8
Divorced	4,914	9.9	857	20.9	4,057	8.9
Separated	1,965	4.0	404	9.8	1,561	3.4
Never Married	5,380	10.8	972	23.6	4,408	9.7
HAS SPOUSE/PARTNER IN HH AT W2	38,734	78.0	1,918	46.7	36,815	80.8
HOUSEHOLD SIZE						
One	15	0.0	8	0.2	7	0.0
Two	1,194	2.4	632	15.4	562	1.2
Three	7,094	14.3	1,359	33.1	5,735	12.6
Four or more	41,385	83.3	2,112	51.4	39,273	86.2
CHILDREN EVER BORN						
Two	26,607	53.6	1,231	29.9	25,376	55.7
Three	14,381	28.9	1,363	33.2	13,018	28.6
Four or more	8,700	17.5	1,517	36.9	7,183	15.8
AGE OF YOUNGEST CHILD						
Newborn or 1 year old	8,071	16.2	242	5.9	7,830	17.2
2 to 4	10,541	21.2	483	11.8	10,058	22.1
5 to 9	13,290	26.8	866	21.1	12,424	27.3
10 to 14	11,652	23.5	1,339	32.6	10,313	22.6
15 to 17	6,133	12.3	1,181	28.7	4,952	10.9
# CORESIDENTIAL CHILDREN						
One	5,259	10.6	2,092	50.9	3,167	7.0
Two	27,601	55.6	1,189	28.9	26,412	58.0
Three	11,836	23.8	585	14.2	11,251	24.7
Four or more	4,992	10.1	245	6.0	4,747	10.4
HAS STEPCHILDREN IN HH	1,072	2.2	116	2.8	956	2.1
# OTHER ADULTS (NOT SPOUSE/PARTNER)						
None	36,298	73.1	2,744	66.8	33,555	73.6
One	9,096	18.3	897	21.8	8,199	18.0
Two	3,034	6.1	351	8.5	2,683	5.9
Three	884	1.8	80	1.9	804	1.8
Four or more	375	0.8	39	1.0	336	0.7
RECEIVING TANF AT W2	721	1.5	166	4.1	554	1.2
RECEIVING FOOD STAMPS AT W2	7,296	14.7	1,165	28.3	6,131	13.5
FAMILY INCOME BELOW POVERTY AT W2	9,735	19.6	1,349	32.8	8,385	18.4

SOURCE: SIPP 2004 panel (Wave 2) and 2008 panel (Wave 2)