## Where's Daddy?

#### Challenges in the measurement of men's fertility

Lindsay M. Monte, PhD

Jason M. Fields, PhD

U.S. Census Bureau

PAA Annual Meeting, 2021

May 6, 2021

This work is released to inform interested parties of ongoing research and to encourage discussion of work in progress. Any views or opinions expressed in the paper are the authors' own and do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of the U.S. Census Bureau.



## Survey of Income & Program Participation (SIPP)

- Nationally representative survey of the civilian, non-institutionalized population
- Panel survey, following respondents over 4 years
- Premier source of information on income and social program receipt
- Collects complete fertility history from both men and women
  - Childlessness
  - Total CEB
  - Multiple partner fertility
  - Grandparenthood



#### Table 1. Fertility Indicators: 2014

	Women aged 15 and over		Men aged 15 and over			
Characteristic	Number (in thousands)	Percent	Margin of error (±) <sup>1</sup>	Number (in thousands)	Percent	Margin of error (±) <sup>1</sup>
All adults	130,253	100.0	0.0	121,836	100.0	0.0
Have biological children	89,523	68.7	0.4	72,151	50.2	0.4
Do not have biological children	40,730	31.3	0.4	49,685	40.8	0.4
Children ever born						
None	40,730	31.3	0.4	49,685	40.8	0.4
One	20,603	15.8	0.4	17,634	14.5	0.4
Two	33,916	26.0	0.4	27,843	22.9	0.4
Three or more	35,004	26.9	0.5	26,674	21.9	0.4
Age at first birth <sup>2</sup>						
Under 20	19,338	21.6	0.6	5,890	8.2	0.4
20–24	33,285	37.2	0.6	22,355	31.0	0.6
25–29.	21,227	23.7	0.5	21,842	30.3	0.7
30–34.	10,944	12.2	0.4	14,057	19.5	0.6
35–39	3,875	4.3	0.2	5,636	7.8	0.4
40 and over	854	1.0	0.1	2,371	3.3	0.2
Multiple Partner Fertility <sup>2</sup>						
Does not have children with multiple partners	74,618	82.4	0.4	61,653	95.4	0.5
Has children with multiple partners	14,905	16.6	0.4	10,498	14.6	0.5



SOURCE: Survey of Income and Program Participation 2014, Wave 1, as published in the Fertility Research Brief (2017), U.S. Census Bureau.

#### Table 1. Fertility Indicators: 2014

	Wom	en aged 15 and	over	Men aged 15 and over		
Characteristic	Number (in thousands)	Percent	Margin of error (±)1	Number (in thousands)	Percent	Margin of error (±) <sup>1</sup>
All adults					100.0	0.0
Have biological children	90 500	60.7	0.4	70 151	50.2	0.4
Do not have biological children				Ň	40.8	0.4
Children ever born						
None					40.8	0.4
One LOg	ically, the o	only way	that a la	rger	14.5	0.4
Two				:• : <b>f</b> +  • •	22.9	0.4
Three or more percent	age of me	n can be	cnilaless	is if the	21.9	0.4
men M	ho ARE fat	thers hav	o thoir cl	hildron		
Age at first birth.			e then t	maren		
Under 20	with m	ultiple w	omen.		8.2	0.4
20-24			omem		31.0	0.6
20-28					30.3	0.7
35_39					7.8	0.0
40 and over					3.3	0.4
Multiple Partner Fertility <sup>2</sup>					0.2	
Does not have children with multiple partners 74,618 834 61,653				85.4	0.5	
Has children with multiple partners	14,905	16.6		10,498	14.6	0.5



SOURCE: Survey of Income and Program Participation 2014, Wave 1, a published in the Fertility Research Brief (2017), U.S. Census Bureau.

Higher childlessness in one sex requires the parents of that sex to have higher MPF.





# Higher childlessness in one sex requires the parents of that sex to have higher MPF.



# The Big Picture

When data are comprehensive, the problems are evident



# Parameterizing the Problem



Having complete fertility information from both men and women allows us to triangulate down to numbers of unique childbearing partners:

Total fathers = reported fathers – duplicated fathers

= number of women's childbearing unions – duplicated fathers

= number of women's childbearing unions x (1 – men's MPF)



### Competing reports of childbearing

(Numbers in thousands)

	Number of mothers	Number of fathers	Number of children of these parents	MPF rate for parents
<b>Men's reports</b> (N=121,245)	<b>70,835</b> (Men's # childbearing unions x (1-women's % MPF)	72,151	173,800	<b>14.6%</b> (~85,040 unions reported)
Women's reports (N=129,645)	89,518	<b>92,050</b> (Women's # childbearing unions x (1-men's % MPF)	221,300	<b>16.7%</b> (~107,800 unions reported)



SOURCE: US Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation, 2014 Panel, Wave 1 Numbers in blue are derived, not reported.

### Competing reports of childbearing

(Numbers in thousands)

				Men's MPF would have to be		
	Number of mothers	Number of far 72,151		twice as high as reported for women's total number of		
Men's reports	70,835			fathers to match the number of fathers in sample.		
Women's reports	89,518	<i>92,050</i>		221,300		



SOURCE: US Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation, 2014 Panel, Wave 1 Numbers in blue are derived, not reported

### Competing reports of childbearing

(Numbers in thousands)

	Number of mothers	Number of fathers	Number of children of these parents
Men's reports	70,835	72,151	-173,800
Women's reports	89,518	92,050	221,300
Children's reports			<b>194,323</b> respondents with a living father <b>223,467</b> respondents with a living mother



SOURCE: US Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation, 2014 Panel, Wave 1

Competing The discrepancy between (Numbers in sampled fathers' reported children and children's reported living						
	fathers suggests that account for roughly childron's fath	t we fail to 20 million	Number of children of these parents			
Men's reports	70,835	72,151	-173,800			
Women's reports	89,518	92,050	221,300			
Children's reports			<b>194,323</b> respondents with a living father <b>223,467</b> respondents with a living mother			



SOURCE: US Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation, 2014 Panel, Wave 1

## So how many dads are we missing?



#### Estimating missing dads using children's reports

Children's (all ages) Living Fathers =

(Men in the survey universe x the number of children they have had)

+

(Men outside the survey universe x the number of children they have had)



If we assume that the missing men's parity follows the same distribution as reporting men's parity...

(Numbers in thousands)

	(A) Proportion of men's children at each parity (REPORTED)	(B) If the children whose fathers are not captured in the SIPP sample are distributed by omitted father's parity in the same distribution as sampled fathers, how many children at each parity level are we missing?	(C) Men's single partner fertility at each parity (REPORTED)	NUMBER OF FATHERS MISSED ((B / parity) * C)
1 child	10.1%	2,082	100%	2,082
2 children	32.0%	6,576	90.2%	2,966
3 children	26.4%	5,424	78.1%	1,412
4+ children	31.4%	6,443	61.3%	808
TOTAL	100.0%	20,523 (REPORTED)	100.0%	7,268



SOURCE: US Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation, 2014 Panel, Wave 1

#### Estimating missing dads using mothers' reports

Fathers =

(Reported total number of fathers at each level of women's parity if each union represented unique fathers

Χ

Ratio of unique fathers to all unions at each level of women's parity)



## Estimating missing dads using mothers' reports

(Numbers in thousands)

Women's parity	Reported total number of fathers if each union represented unique fathers (REPORTED)	Ratio of unique fathers to all unions (DERIVED)	Adjusted estimates of the total number of fathers discounting the impact of multiple partner fertility
1	20,599	.960	19,780
2	38,371	.892	34,563
3	25,752	.744	19,151
4+	22,720	.548	12,440
TOTAL	107,800		85,933
Number of fathers missed from reported 72,151			85,933 - 72,151 = 13,782





Bureau

20



non-institutionalized fathers. How many ~72 million fathers (SIPP men) dads? Using children's Using women's reports, we reports, we estimate an estimate an undercount of ~7.3 undercount of United States® million dads. ~13.8 million dads.

Bureau

Our best guess is that the SIPP sample is

missing between 5-12 million civilian,

#### 22

#### What does it all mean?

- Is it a sample issue or is it a data issue?
  - Sampled men report their fertility with confidence
  - We tried reweighting the existing sample to reflect these two parameters
    - The data continued to violate a logical relationship between men's and women's paternity and multiple partner fertility
  - We tried reweighting to a midpoint while overweighting MPF dads
    - The data no longer violated paternity/MPF relationships, but still didn't quite align to children's or mothers' reports
- Our missing men are fundamentally different from the men who responded to the SIPP
  - ➤More likely to be fathers
  - ➤More likely to be MPF fathers



#### Conclusion

We know we have a man problem in survey research, but the SIPP data suggest that it is most prevalently a missing dad problem, and specifically dads who have had their children in multiple unions.

However, it is NOT that these men are not in the sampling frame. Instead, it is that they are non-respondents to the survey.

Unfortunately, non-response adjustments do not account for paternity. This means that the responding men – who less likely to be fathers AND less likely to be MPF fathers – are upweighted to replace the missing fathers, resulting in problematic estimates.

However, this is not a problem that is unique to the SIPP. Ultimately, these data do not suggest a need for better questions or better sampling frames, or any improvement specific to the SIPP, but they do suggest a need for more non-response analyses such as this one to determine the root causes of our data discrepancies so that we can map a way forward.

