FAMILY FORMATION IN FLORIDA

Ш



Ш

и и и

Ц

2003 Baseline Survey of Attitudes, Beliefs, and Demographics Relating to Marriage and Family Formation

By

Benjamin R. Karney Cynthia Wilson Garvan Michael S. Thomas

University of Florida

Draft December 19, 2003

Table of Contents

I. E	I. Executive Summary		
А.	Describing Family Formations in Florida	6	
В.	Attitudes Towards Marriage and Family Issues	8	
С.	Correlates of Healthy Intimate Relationships	10	
D.	Obstacles to Marriage	12	
Е.	Beliefs and Attitudes Regarding Marital and Family Interventions	13	
<i>F</i> .	Implications	14	
II. I	ntroduction	15	
А.	Why Family Relationships Matter	15	
В.	Rationale for the Florida Family Formation Survey	17	
С.	Overview of the Florida Family Formation Survey	17	
D.	How to Read This Report	19	
III.	Describing Family Formations in Florida	20	
А.	Current Relationship Status (Table 1)	20	
В.	Age at Marriage, Length of Marriage, and Length of Courtship (Table 2)	21	
С.	Cohabitation (Table 3)	22	
D.	Parenthood (Table 4)	22	
Е.	Household Arrangements (Table 5)	24	
F.	Summary and Discussion	25	
IV.	Attitudes Towards Marriage and Family Issues	26	
А.	Attitudes and Intentions Towards Marriage (Table 6 and Table 7)	26	
В.	Attitudes Towards Divorce and Prior Relationships (Table 8 and Table 9)	27	
С.	Attitudes Towards Premarital Sex and Cohabitation (Table 10)	28	
D.	Attitudes Towards Unmarried Parenthood (Table 11)	28	
Е.	Attitudes Towards Traditional Gender Roles (Table 12)	29	
F.	Summary and Discussion	29	
V.	Correlates of Healthy Intimate Relationships		
А.	About Measuring Relationship Satisfaction	30	

В.	Relationship Satisfaction by Relationship Status (Table 13)	31
С.	Relationship Satisfaction and Environmental Demands/Support (Table 14)	31
D.	Relationship Satisfaction and Individual Differences (Table 15)	
Е.	Reports of Physical Aggression by Gender and Relationship Status (Table 16)	34
<i>F</i> .	Sources of Difficulty in Relationships (Table 17)	35
<i>G</i> .	Summary and Discussion	35
VI.	Obstacles to Marriage	36
А.	Reasons for Not Pursuing Marriage (Table 18)	36
В.	Expectations for Marriage Among the Unmarried (Table 19)	38
С.	Summary and Discussion	38
VII.	Beliefs and Attitudes Regarding Marital and Family Interve	ntions39
А.	The Experience of Premarital Education (Table 20)	
В.	Rates and Perceived Impact of Relationship Counseling (Table 21)	
С.	Attitudes Towards and Awareness of Marriage and Family Initiatives (Table 22)	40
D.	Summary and Discussion	40
VIII.	Conclusions and Implications	41
VIII. <i>A</i> .	Conclusions and Implications	
	-	41
А.	Evaluation of Specific Aims	41 42
А. В.	Evaluation of Specific Aims Limitations and Strengths of This Survey	41 42 43
А. В. С.	Evaluation of Specific Aims Limitations and Strengths of This Survey Implications For Policy And Intervention	41 42 43 44
А. В. С. D.	Evaluation of Specific Aims Limitations and Strengths of This Survey Implications For Policy And Intervention Conclusion	41 42 43 43 44
А. В. С. D. IX. X.	Evaluation of Specific Aims Limitations and Strengths of This Survey Implications For Policy And Intervention Conclusion References	41 42 43 43 44 45 45
А. В. С. D. IX. X. <i>Tab</i>	Evaluation of Specific Aims Limitations and Strengths of This Survey Implications For Policy And Intervention Conclusion References Main Tables	41 42 43 44 45 45 47 48
А. В. С. D. IX. X. <i>Tab</i> <i>Tab</i>	Evaluation of Specific Aims Limitations and Strengths of This Survey Implications For Policy And Intervention Conclusion References Main Tables le 1: Current Relationship Status	41 42 43 44 45 45 47 48 48 49
А. В. С. D. IX. X. <i>Tab</i> <i>Tab</i> <i>Tab</i>	Evaluation of Specific Aims Limitations and Strengths of This Survey Implications For Policy And Intervention Conclusion References Main Tables le 1: Current Relationship Status le 2: Marital Statistics	41 42 43 44 45 45 45 47 48 49 49
А. В. С. D. IX. X. Таb Таb Таb	Evaluation of Specific Aims Limitations and Strengths of This Survey Implications For Policy And Intervention Conclusion References Main Tables le 1: Current Relationship Status. le 2: Marital Statistics.	41 42 43 44 45 45 47 48 49 49 49 49 50
А. В. С. D. IX. X. Таb Таb Таb Таb	Evaluation of Specific Aims Limitations and Strengths of This Survey Implications For Policy And Intervention Conclusion References Main Tables le 1: Current Relationship Status le 2: Marital Statistics le 3: Cohabitation le 4: Parenthood	41 42 43 44 45 45 47 48 49 49 49 49 50 51

Tab	le 8: Attitudes Towards Divorce	54
Tab	le 9: Attitudes Towards Prior Relationships That Ended	55
Tab	le 10: Attitudes Towards Premarital Cohabitation and Premarital Sex	56
Tab	le 11: Attitudes Towards Unmarried Parenthood	57
Tab	le 12: Attitudes Towards Traditional Gender Roles	58
Tab	le 13: Relationship Satisfaction by Relationship and Parental Status	59
Tab	le 14: Relationship Satisfaction and Environmental Demands/Support	60
Tab	le 15: Relationship Satisfaction and Individual Differences	61
Tab	le 16: Physical Aggression by Gender and Relationship Status	62
Tab	le 17: Sources of Difficulty in Relationships	63
Tab	le 18: Reasons For Not Pursuing Marriage	64
Tab	le 19: Beliefs About What Marriage To The Current Partner Would Be Like	65
Tab	le 20: The Experience of Premarital Education	66
Tab	le 21: Rates and Perceived Impact of Relationship Counseling	67
	le 22: Attitudes Towards and Awarness of Marriage and Family Initiatives	
Tab	le 23: Demographics	69
XI.	Acknowledgements	70
XII.	About the Authors	71
XIII.	The Research Advisory Board	72
XIV.	About the University of Florida Survey Research Center	74
XV.	Appendix A: Methods	75
А.	Sampling Frame and Sampling Procedure	75
В.	Response Rates and Cooperation Rates	76
С.	Who Participated?	77
D.	The Survey Instrument	78
Е.	Weighting the Data	78
XVI.	Appendix B: Comparisons with other states	80
	Appendix B: Comparisons with other states	

Table 25: Marital Statistics	81
Table 26: Cohabitation	82
Table 27: Parenthood	82
Table 28: Household Arrangements	83
Table 29: Attitudes Towards Marriage	84
Table 30: Intentions to Marry	85
Table 31: Attitudes Towards Divorce	86
Table 32: Attitudes Towards Prior Relationships That Ended	87
Table 33: Attitudes Towards Premarital Cohabitation and Premarital Sex	88
Table 34: Attitudes Towards Unmarried Parenthood	89
Table 35: Attitudes Towards Traditional Gender Roles	90
Table 36: Relationship Quality by Relationship and Parental Status	91
Table 37: Relationship Satisfaction and Environmental Demands/Support	92
Table 38: Relationship Satisfaction and Individual Differences	93
Table 39: Reports of Physical Aggression by Gender and Relationship Status	94
Table 40: Sources of Difficulty in Relationships	95
Table 41: Reasons For Not Pursuing Marriage	96
Table 42: Beliefs About What Marriage To The Current Partner Would Be Like	97
Table 43: The Experience of Premarital Education	98
Table 44: Rates and Perceived Impact of Relationship Counseling	
Table 45: Attitudes Towards and Awareness of Marriage and Family Initiat ives	99

I. Executive Summary

The Florida Family Formation Survey had three specific aims: (1) to describe the range of family structures in Florida, (2) to describe the attitudes of Florida residents towards family issues, and (3) to identify correlates of healthy family relationships. Towards these ends, 4508 residents of Florida 18 years old or older were interviewed over the phone regarding these and related topics.

Responses to the survey were analyzed in three ways. First, the data were weighted and combined to derive total estimates that describe the state of Florida as a whole. Second, responses were broken down and examined by race/ethnicity (e.g., white, black, Hispanic, and other ethnic groups). Third, responses were broken down and examined by household income (e.g., high-, middle -, and low-income households). Recipients of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) were examined separately in all analyses.

A. Describing Family Formations in Florida

- 53% of Florida residents are married, and 80% have been married at least once.
 - Blacks are far <u>less</u> likely to be married (37%) or to have been married at least once (63%) than whites, Hispanics, or other ethnic groups.
 - Residents of low-income households are far <u>less</u> likely to be married (36%) than are residents of high-income households (68%).
 - TANF recipients are the <u>least</u> likely to be currently married (24%).
- 35% of Florida residents have been divorced; 47% of these individuals have remarried.
 - Among blacks and Hispanics experiencing a divorce, 37% and 36% respectively have remarried, compared to over 50% remarriage rates in whites and other ethnicities.
 - Residents of low-income households who have experienced divorce are just over <u>half</u> as likely to have remarried (31%) than are residents of high-income households (60%).
 - TANF recipients are <u>especially likely</u> to have experienced a divorce (39%) and the <u>least</u> likely to have remarried (20%).
- Among Florida residents who live with their partners, 14% are cohabiting (i.e., are not currently married).
 - Blacks are more likely to be cohabiting (21%), whereas Hispanics are somewhat less likely (11%).
 - Rates of cohabitation are <u>nearly twice as high</u> in low-income households (23%) as in high-income households (12%).
 - Among TANF recipients, over a third (35%) are cohabiting.
- 76% of Florida residents have had at least one biological child of their own.
 - This figure does not vary substantially across ethnic groups.
 - The rate of parenthood is higher in low-income households (79%) than in high-income households (73%).

- 60% of all Florida residents live either with their own or their partner's children.
 - This figure does not differ substantially across ethnicities or income levels, but it is substantially higher among TANF recipients (83%).
- 28% of all Florida households consist of a married couple raising their biological offspring; among households containing children, half (46%) contain a married couple raising their biological offspring.
 - Blacks are far less likely (15%) to be married and raising their biological children than whites (30%), Hispanics (30%), or members of other ethnic groups (21%).
 - Residents in low-income households are far less likely (16%) to be married and raising their biological children than residents of high-income households (36%).
- 16% of Florida households consist of "blended" families, i.e., married couples raising children from multiple relationships.
 - The proportion of married couple households that can be described in this way does not vary substantially across ethnic or income groups.
- 10% of Florida households consist of a single adult raising children.
 - Blacks are far more likely (21%) to be raising children as single parents than whites (6%), Hispanics (11%), or other ethnic groups (12%).
 - Residents of low-income households are several times more likely (19%) to be raising children in as single parents than residents of high-income households (4%).
- 9% of Florida households consist of cohabiting couples; 53% of those couples are raising children.
 - Cohabiting blacks and members of other ethnic groups are more likely (both 68%) to be raising children than cohabiting whites (51%) or Hispanics (49%).
 - Cohabiting couples in low-income households are nearly twice as likely (67%) to be raising children than cohabiting couples in high-income households (37%).

Intimate relationships, marriage, and parenthood figure into the lives of almost all adults residing in Florida. However, consistent with results obtained from census data and other national studies, the structure of people's families varies considerably, and much of that variance is associated with ethnicity and income.

Whites and residents of high-income households appear to experience more success at forming relationships and more success at maintaining them. That is, members of these groups are more likely to be married, more likely to remarry after divorce, and least likely to never marry. Perhaps as a result, they are more likely to be living with a partner, more likely to be married to that partner, and more likely to be raising children that are solely the product of a union with that partner. In contrast, blacks and residents of low-income households appear to experience more difficulty forming and maintaining relationships. Members of these groups less likely to be married, less likely to remarry after divorce, and more likely to have never married at all. Perhaps as a result, they are more likely to live without a romantic partner,

more likely to be raising children as single parents, and more likely to be raising children from multiple partners. Hispanics, on average, appear to fall somewhere between whites and blacks on most of the dimensions assessed here.

The effects of income and ethnicity are not independent. Rather, income and ethnicity are highly associated (i.e., non-whites are on average far more likely to live in low -income households than whites). In prior studies of family structure drawing from national data sets, the effects of income tend to account for most of the effects of race or ethnicity (e.g., Trent & Crowder, 1997).

Despite the powerful associations among family structure, income, and ethnicity, several noteworthy trends emerged across all of the subgroups examined here. First, the traditional "nuclear" family, defined as married parents raising their biological children under one roof, now characterizes just over a quarter of the state, and just under half of the family households in the state.

Second, just under a fifth of the state is now living in "blended" or "step" families, where children from multiple relationships are raised under one roof. This increasingly common family form presents unique challenges that are as yet understudied (Darden & Zimmerman, 1992), but that policy-makers will need to take into account.

Third, despite the great attention devoted to understanding cohabiting couples (Popenoe & Whitehead, 1999), in Florida such couples make up a relatively small percentage of people who live with their partners. Only 9% of Florida residents are cohabiting, and 35% of those are currently engaged to be married. Among married couples, 40% cohabited before marriage, but over half of those (56%) lived together only after they were engaged to be married. Thus, for the majority of people, cohabiting seems to be a step towards marriage, rather than an end in itself. On the other hand, when it occurs, cohabitation is often associated with parenthood, as children are present in over half of all cohabiting couple households.

B. Attitudes Towards Marriage and Family Issues

- 92% of Florida residents agree or strongly agree that "a happy healthy marriage is one of the most important things in life."
 - Agreement with this statement does not vary substantially by race/ethnicity or household income.
- 65% of unmarried residents would like to be married some day, and 39% of unmarried respondents have specific plans to marry within two years.
 - Unmarried blacks (84%), Hispanics (82%), or other ethnic groups (94%) are substantially <u>more</u> interested in getting married someday compared to whites (56%).
 - Residents in low-income households are <u>more</u> likely to desire a marriage (72%) than residents in high-income households (61%).
 - TANF recipients are the <u>most</u> likely to desire a marriage (85%) and the most likely to have specific plans to marry within the next two years (55%).
- 73% of Florida residents agree that "Divorce can be a reasonable solution to an unhappy marriage."
 - Blacks express somewhat <u>less</u> agreement (67%) than other groups.

- 14% of residents who have been divorced wish "that it had been more difficult from a legal standpoint to get a divorce."
 - The desire for additional legal barriers to divorce is <u>lower</u> among blacks (3%) and Hispanics (7%) than among whites (15%) or other ethnic groups (17%).
- 52% of Florida residents agree or strongly agree that "It is okay for couples who are not married to live together.
 - Blacks are substantially <u>less</u> accepting of cohabitation (40%) than other ethnic groups.
 - Residents of middle-income (50%) or low-income (50%) households are <u>less</u> accepting of cohabitation than residents of high-income households (62%).
- 47% of Florida residents agree or strongly agree that "Couples should wait to have sex until they are married."
 - Blacks stand out as being especially <u>in favor</u> of abstinence prior to marriage (60%) compared to whites (45%), Hispanics (45%), and other ethnic groups (44%).
 - Residents of middle-income households (51%), low-income households (54%), and TANF recipients (54%) all support abstinence before marriage <u>more</u> than residents of high-income households (35%).

• 80% of Florida residents agree or strongly agree that "Children do better when their parents are married.

- Agreement is consistent across race/ethnicity, with the exception of blacks, who are <u>less</u> likely to agree (70%).
- Agreement did not vary according to household income, but TANF recipients are <u>less</u> likely to agree (67%).
- 72% of Florida residents disagree or disagree strongly with the idea that "The important decisions should be made by the man of the house."
 - Blacks are <u>less</u> likely to disagree (58%) than whites (75%), Hispanics (68%), and other ethnic groups (86%).
 - Residents of low-income groups are <u>less</u> likely to disagree (68%) than residents of high-income households (77%).

If there is a marriage and family crisis in the state of Florida, there is no evidence that the crisis is related to a decline in the value of marriage. Regardless of ethnicity or income, the vast majority of residents of Florida believe that "a happy healthy marriage is one of the most important things in life." Furthermore, the majority of unmarried people hope to be married someday, and a substantial minority have specific plans to marry within the next two years. Combined with the fact that over 80% of the state has been married at some point, these data suggest that residents of Florida maintain a strong confidence in the institution of marriage. Moreover, that confidence appears to be strongest among those groups experiencing the most difficulties forming and maintaining marital relationships. Non-whites and residents of low-income households were substantially more hopeful about marriage than were whites and high-income residents. TANF recipients, the group with the lowest likelihood of being married, on

average expressed the highest desire to marry and the most frequently observed intentions to marry within the next two years. Thus, the difficulties faced by these groups in their family relationships do not appear to be associated with their less positive feelings about marriage. On the contrary, and more poignantly, members of disadvantaged groups appear to be facing difficulties despite their fervent desires to create lasting and healthy family structures for themselves.

The consensus on the value of marriage does not prevent a similar consensus that divorce is an acceptable option when a marital relationship is unsatisfying. By a wide margin, the majority of residents of Florida believe that divorce can be a reasonable solution to an unhappy marriage. More telling, few people who have experienced a divorce wish that it had been more difficult to obtain one. Thus, residents of Florida do not appear to favor any plans that would prevent individuals from ending their relationships if they feel compelled to do so.

It is worth noting that, when asked their opinions about cohabitation, premarital sex, and traditional gender roles, members of those groups with the least traditional family structures expressed the most traditional attitudes. Thus, for example, although blacks have higher levels of pre-marital parenthood than other ethnic groups, they also express substantially more approval for premarital abstinence. Similarly, although blacks and TANF recipients are more likely to cohabit and more likely to raise children in single parent households, they express the most negative attitudes towards cohabitation and the most approval for traditional gender roles within the family.

As a whole, these data on the attitudes of Florida residents have two implications. First, the groups experiencing the most difficulties maintaining stable and healthy family structures have received and understood the message that families matter. Second, attitudes alone are insufficient to account for the range of family structures that people experience. What people feel about marriage and family in the abstract does not always translate into the choices and decisions they make in their own lives. On the contrary, many people do not attain the outcomes they most value, suggesting that their choices may be constrained in ways that they cannot overcome.

C. <u>Correlates of Healthy Intimate Relationships</u>

- Satisfaction with an intimate relationship is associated with ethnicity and household income.
 - Blacks rated their relationships as less satisfying on average, than whites, Hispanics, or other ethnic groups.
 - Residents of low-income households and TANF recipients rated their relationships as less satisfying on average than residents of high- or middle-income households.
- Relationship satisfaction is <u>higher</u> in married relationships than in unmarried relationships.
- Within unmarried relationships, relationship satisfaction is <u>higher</u> for those who are cohabiting than for those who are not cohabiting.
- Compared to those in moderately satisfying or less satisfying relationships, Florida residents in the most satisfying relationships:
 - Experience less financial strain.
 - Spend more time with their partners.

- Have experienced fewer difficult life events in the last year.
- Have more sources of social support outside the relationship.
- Have fewer problems with substance abuse.
- Have better mental health.
- Are more religious.
- Men report being hit or slapped by their partners more than women.
- The frequency of physical aggression within intimate relationships is associated with ethnicity and household income.
 - Physical aggression is <u>more common</u> among blacks (8% of men and 2% of women) than among whites (2% of men and 1% of women) or Hispanics (3% of men and 3% of women).
 - Residents of low-income households experience <u>higher</u> rates of physical aggression (5% of men and 4% of women) than residents of high-income households (3% of men and 1% of women).
 - TANF recipients experience the <u>highest</u> rates of physical aggression (10% of men and 7% of women).

• Unmarried women experience higher rates of physical aggression than married women.

Healthy families require more than intact relationships. For a family to be healthy, the relationship between the two adults at its core must be satisfying and fulfilling (Kiecolt-Glaser & Newton, 2001). This survey reveals that relationship satisfaction, like family structure, is associated with ethnicity and household income, such that relationships among members of disadvantaged groups (i.e., blacks and residents of low-income households) are less satisfying than they are for members of advantaged groups (i.e., whites and residents of high-income households). This difference holds true in married and unmarried couples, and in cohabiting and non-cohabiting couples. Thus, this survey joins an increasing body of research demonstrating that relationship outcomes are associated with ethnicity and socioeconomic status (Bramlett & Mosher, 2002).

Why might it be harder to maintain the health of an intimate relationship within low-income households? By examining the life circumstances of individuals reporting the most and least satisfaction with their relationships, this survey suggests some preliminary answers to this question. In particular, these results indicate that, on average and within each of the subgroups examined here, the presence of a less than satisfying relationship is part of a constellation of negative circumstances and challenges that some individuals face. Compared to those in the most satisfying relationships, those in the least satisfying relationships experience more financial strain, experience greater numbers of difficult life events, are more likely to have required government assistance, and have fewer sources of social support than individuals in the most satisfying relationships. Furthermore, those in the least satisfying relationships have poorer mental health and higher levels of substance abuse than those in the most satisfying relationships, those in the most satisfying relationships, those in the most satisfying relationships and have fewer sources of social support than individuals in the most satisfying relationships. Furthermore, those in the least satisfying relationships have poorer mental health and higher levels of substance abuse than those in the most satisfying relationships, those in the most satisfying relationships spend an average of 22 fewer hours a week in the presence of their partners.

Together, these results have two implications for understanding and promoting healthy relationships. First, they suggest that, when people's lives are constrained in ways that make the emotional, intimate processes of healthy family life more difficult, their relationships are likely to be less satisfying. Clear communication, effective support, and constructive problem-solving all take time and require energy. Couples that are simultaneously coping with severe demands outside of the relationship, or couples who simply lack time in each other's presence (i.e., due to work or the requirements of child

care) will have fewer opportunities to engage in these behaviors, even if they have adequate skills at performing them.

Second, these results suggest that members of disadvantaged groups may be especially likely to experience less satisfying relationships because members of these groups are at greater likelihood of experiencing the environmental and personal challenges that detract from maintaining a relationship. To the extent that residents of low-income households are more likely to experience chronic and acute stressors, and to the extent that residents of low-income households possess fewer resources for dealing with those stressors, it makes sense that residents of low-income households have more difficulty navigating the challenges of an intimate relationship compared to residents of high-income households.

D. Obstacles to Marriage

- 56% of unmarried residents in current romantic relationships report being happy with the status quo as a major reason why they are not planning to get married.
 - Whites are <u>more</u> likely to be satisfied with the status quo (60%) than blacks (42%) and Hispanics (47%).
 - Individuals in high-income households are <u>more</u> likely to be satisfied (61%) than individuals in low-income households (46%).
- 31% of unmarried residents indicate that they do not plan to marry their current partners due to concerns that the marriage would end in divorce.
 - Blacks (43%), Hispanics (38%) and other ethnic groups (39%) endorse this reason more frequently than whites (27%).
 - Individuals in low-income households and TANF recipients are <u>more</u> likely to cite this reason (42% and 40% respectively) than individuals in high-income households (26%).

• 16% of unmarried residents indicate that they do not plan to marry their current partners because they do not belie ve in marriage.

- Blacks (10%) and other ethnic groups (11%) cite a lack of belief in marriage less frequently than whites (13%), but Hispanics (38%) cite it more frequently.
- Residents of low-income households are <u>more likely</u> to endorse a lack of belief in marriage (17%) than are residents of high-income households (14%).
- TANF recipients are <u>least likely</u> to cite this as a reason for avoiding or postponing marriage (10%).
- Groups at greatest risk of divorce are more likely to cite financial constraints, lack of trust in the partner, and domestic violence as reasons for postponing or avoiding marriage to a current partner.
- The majority of unmarried residents do <u>not</u> believe that their lives would be any better if they were to marry.

Some have argued that lower rates of marriage stem from a culture that does not sufficiently value marriage. These data do not support such a view. In previous sections of this report, analyses

revealed that members of groups with the lowest rates of marriage express the strongest desires for marriage and the most frequent intentions to marry. The data described in this section show that very few unmarried residents in Florida cite a lack of belief in marriage as the reason they remain unmarried. On the contrary, one of the most frequently cited reasons for remaining unmarried is the fear that a marriage to the current partner would end in divorce. Together, the results of this survey suggest that respect for marriage is alive and well. Indeed, a sizable proportion of unmarried individuals respect the institution of marriage so highly that they are unwilling to enter into a marriage that they perceive to be at risk of ending in divorce.

How then can we understand the fact that, despite positive feelings about the institution of marriage, many people who are in relationships choose to remain unmarried? It appears that those who elect to remain unmarried perceive significant and tangible obstacles that make marriage to a currently available partner undesirable, despite general enthusiasm for marriage as an institution. Many of these obstacles are consistent with those identified by Edin (2000) in her research on attitudes towards marriage in low-income unmarried mothers. For example, the mothers in Edin's study expressed concerns that they could not afford to marry, indicating their belief that a successful marriage required a degree of financial security they did not yet possess. Low-income residents of Florida express similar concerns, citing a lack of savings, inability to afford a shared residence, and simply not making enough money as reasons for avoiding or postponing marriage. The mothers in Edin's study described concerns about respectability, explaining their reluctance to enter a marriage unless they felt sure that it would not end in divorce. Low-income respondents in the current study express similar concerns, and indeed the fear of divorce is one of the leading reasons for postponing or avoiding marriage to the current partner. In Edin's study, mothers felt that they could not trust their partners, and many described serious fears of domestic violence. Similar themes emerge in the reasons cited by low-income residents in the current study, who are more likely than high-income residents to cite questions about the partner's trustworthiness and domestic violence as reasons for postponing or avoiding marriage.

Thus, for members of groups most likely to remain unmarried, postponing or avoiding marriage seems to be a response to a multifaceted set of concrete challenges and obstacles. In general, unmarried individuals in Florida want to get married, but do not feel that they have the resources to do so, and do not feel that a marriage to the current partner would be the stable, life-long bond that they seek. Policies and programs that reduce these obstacles, or help people to address them, are likely to increase rates of family formation.

E. Beliefs and Attitudes Regarding Marital and Family Interventions

- 35% of married Florida residents received relationship preparation prior to marriage.
- Among those who have received premarital preparation, 77% believe that it affected the relationship positively or somewhat positively.
 - Blacks and Hispanics are <u>more likely</u> to say that preparation affected them very positively or somewhat positively (85% in both groups) than are whites (74%).
 - Residents of low-income households and TANF recipients are <u>more likely</u> to say that preparation affected them very positively or somewhat positively (82% and 86% respectively) than are residents of high-income households (74%).
- 79% of Florida residents would consider using relationship education to strengthen their own relationships.

- 67% of Florida residents think that the government developing programs to strengthen marriages and reduce divorces is a good or very good idea.
 - Blacks (77%), Hispanics (90%), and other ethnic groups (65%) are substantially <u>more</u> enthusiastic about government initiatives than are whites (60%).
 - Residents of low-income households and TANF recipients are <u>more</u> enthusiastic about the prospect (77% and 90%, respectively) than are residents of high-income households (61%).
- 15% of Florida residents are aware of current government efforts to strengthe n marriages and reduce divorce.
- 70% of Florida residents are aware of efforts by religious and community-based organizations to strengthen marriage and reduce divorce.

Premarital preparation and relationship counseling are familiar and acceptable ideas to residents of Florida. The vast majority of the state would consider using relationship education to strengthen their own relationships. Over a third of Florida residents have already received some sort of preparation before they were married, and over three-quarters of people who have received these interventions are happy with the experience, believing that the interventions improved their relationships. Enthusiasm for these programs is generally high, but it is highest among those groups that are being especially targeted by marriage and family initiatives, i.e., low-income families and recipients of government assistance.

The majority of people also believe it would be a good idea for the government to develop programs that support marriages and help reduce divorce rates. However, most people are not aware of any existing government programs toward this end, even though such programs exist and have been law in the state of Florida for five years. Instead, most Florida residents see support for marriages and families coming from local community and religious organizations, and these are where the great majority of current marriage preparation is taking place.

F. <u>Implications</u>

The complex results described here suggest no straightforward or simple ways of promoting healthy families and fulfilling relationships. Yet they do have clear implications for the general directions that effective family initiatives may take.

First, no single approach to supporting healthy families is likely to be effective for all families. Many of the challenges faced by the most vulnerable segments of the population are virtually unseen in the less vulnerable segments. Thus, even though all segments of the state cite communication and money as areas of difficulty in their relationships, the content of those issues may differ substantially between low-income and high-income families, and so may require different kinds of coping. Conflict over how to spend money, for example, is different from conflict over not having enough money. Conflict that involves physical aggression has different implications from conflict that does not. Although parenting figures into the lives of 60% of all residents, parenting issues in blended families may be categorically different from the issues faced by families in which all children are biological offspring of the same couple. Programs and policies that target families will have to take the unique needs of different kinds of families into account.

Second, programs that merely promote the value of marriage and stable families are unlikely to change behaviors. A theme that emerges again and again in these results is that those segments of the population at greatest risk of remaining unmarried and having children before marriage are also those in which attitudes towards marriage are the most positive and disapproval of premarital sex is highest. Thus, the segments of the population who would be primary targets of efforts to promote marriage and reduce unmarried birth already espouse values and attitudes that are highly consistent with those goals. In light of these results, it is difficult to justify allotting further resources towards activities solely directed at communicating pro-marriage values. Rather, those resources might more effectively be devoted toward helping individuals overcome the obstacles that may prevent them from acting in accordance with the values they already possess.

Third, relationship preparation, education, and counseling must take the circumstances of people's lives into account. The results described here suggest that the quality of a relationship is connected to the broader quality of people's lives. When those lives contain multiple sources of stress and few sources of support, then it may be more difficult for couples to engage in the activities of relationship maintenance. Programs that focus solely on relationship maintenance skills like communication and problem-solving may not be effective for those segments of the population that lack the time and energy to practice those skills. For those segments of the population, supporting families will require programs and policies that target processes within the family <u>and</u> the environments in which those processes unfold.

Fourth, any programs and policies that improve the general quality of people's lives are likely to improve the quality of their marital and family relationships as well. A theme throughout the results reported here, and one that emerges across other national studies of family issues, is that the health of families is closely tied to the health of the economy. Whereas the challenges that families face are often perceived as personal and private, many of their sources may lie in the public sphere. Thus, it may be possible to develop programs and policies that significantly improve the lives of families even though they do not target families directly, simply by promoting a better quality of life for all.

Fifth, avenues for implementing programs directed at supporting families and relationships already exist in the form of religious and community organizations. Most Florida residents would take advantage of programs that might strengthen their own relationships, and a significant majority believes that government should take an active role in developing such programs. Currently, most people's experiences with programs directed at promoting healthy relationships are through local community and religious organizations. These organizations therefore represent an existing means through which new programs and policies might be implemented. Taking advantage of these organizations would facilitate developing policies to be tailored to the specific needs of communities, and would make new policies more likely to reach their target populations by presenting them through institutions that families have already been looking to for support.

II. Introduction

A. <u>Why Family Relationships Matter</u>

A stable, fulfilling relationship between two adults can be the cornerstone of a healthy family. When that relationship is in place, as in a satisfying marriage, both partners live longer (House, Landis, & Umberson, 1988), they are healthier (Kiecolt-Glaser & Newton, 2001), and they recover from stressful events more quickly (Waltz, Badura, Pfaff, & Schott, 1988). Moreover, satisfying intimate relationships contribute more to a person's overall life satisfaction than any other variable that has been measured, more than physical health, professional success, or financial stability (Glenn & Weaver, 1981), whereas difficulties in relationships are the leading reason why people seek therapy or counseling

(Veroff, Kulka, & Douvan, 1981). Children raised by parents in a loving relationship are better adjusted (Grych & Fincham, 1990) and experience better health and better relationships as adults (Amato & Keith, 1991; Booth & Amato, 2001). In contrast, when a healthy relationship is absent, as in the case of divorce, or when that relationship is unfulfilling, as in the case of a distressed marriage, the consequences for partners and their children are severe. Unhappy marriages in particular have well-demonstrated negative consequences for spouses' physical health (Kiecolt-Glaser & Newton, 2001), their emotional health (Beach, 2001), and their children's well-being (Booth & Amato, 2001).

Given the benefits associated with happy, stable relationships, it is not surprising that in the United States 97% of people get married at some point in their lives (Kreider & Fields, 2001) (Bjorksten & Stewart, 1984). Even among those whose marriages end in divorce, approximately 80% remarry (Kreider & Fields, 2001). Thus, people in this country seem to believe in marriage. Even people whose own experiences of marriage have been negative appear to retain confidence in the institution of marriage and the promise that it holds for healthy family relationships.

Yet despite this promise, maintaining healthy family relationships is a difficult thing to do. Maintaining a marriage, for example, grew increasingly hard in the United States during the 1970s and 1980s, a period during which divorce rates nearly doubled. By the time divorce rates peaked in the mid-1980s, it was estimated that 63% of couples marrying for the first time would end their marriages in divorce or permanent separation (Castro-Martin & Bumpass, 1989). Remarriages were common but were significantly more likely to dissolve (Cherlin, 1992). Over the last two decades, the situation has stabilized somewhat (Singh, Matthews, Clarke, Yannicos, & Smith, 1995), but current estimates still suggest that 50% of first marriages will end in divorce or permanent separation (Bramlett & Mosher, 2002). Although divorce and marital instability affect all strata of society, their effects are felt disproportionately by the poor and the non-white, among whom divorce rates are up to twice as high as the divorce rates of white or upper income Americans (Bramlett & Mosher, 2001).

In addition to high divorce rates, substantial numbers of people each year start down the road towards family formation by giving birth and raising children outside of marriage. In the United States, data from the National Center for Health Statistics indicate that rates of unmarried births, like rates of divorce, increased dramatically during the 1980s, going from 18% of all live births in 1980 to 30% of all live births by 1992. During the rest of the 90s through today, the rate of increase in unmarried birth has leveled off substantially, reaching 33.2% in 2000 (Martin, Hamilton, Ventura, Menacker, & Park, 2002). Like divorce rates, rates of unmarried birth also vary consistently by race and ethnic group, with rates for blacks about twice as high as for whites and Hispanics.

As challenging as it may be to maintain healthy, stable family relationships throughout the country, the challenges appear to be particularly acute in the state of Florida. Even as rates of divorce and unmarried births have risen across the nation, rates in Florida tend to be about 50% higher than the national average. This places Florida near the top of the country in terms of unstable families. For example, as of 2001, Florida was tied with Mississippi for 6th highest divorce rate, and ranked 7th in the nation for most births to unmarried mothers. Perhaps as a consequence, Florida also ranks at 7th in the nation for number of children living in single -parent homes. According to the 2000 Census, over one quarter (26.5%) of children under the age of 18 in Florida live in single -parent households, compared to 23.3% in the United States as a whole.

Together, these data suggest that a family structure where two partners in a committed relationship raise their children together is increasingly difficult to achieve for many people, and this is more true in Florida than elsewhere in the nation.

B. Rationale for the Florida Family Formation Survey

Why are the challenges facing marriages and families a matter of interest to the government? The recent movement to involve communities and government in the lives of families may stem in part from the recognition that families do not exist in a vacuum. Whereas family interactions often occur in private, they have public implications for the use of health and social services, public education, and community well-being. Moreover, communities and governments affect families in turn, providing the context within which individuals de velop their relationships and raise their children. Thus, all social policies are likely to affect family relationships in some way, whether these effects are intentional or not. The current attention to families by policy makers may be an attempt to make explicit the effects that have heretofore been implicit. Rather than ignore the consequences of public policy for families, it makes sense to design policies with their effects on families in mind.

In Florida, efforts to design legislation that supports healthy family functioning have been underway for several years. For example, in 1998, the Florida legislature passed the "Marriage Preparation and Preservation Act", a collection of measures designed to make marital education available to high school students and couples considering marriage. In 2003, the Florida legislature approved the creation of the Commission on Marriage and Family Support Initiatives, an 18-member body charged with developing recommendations for new policies directed at supporting marriages and families. Thus, the institutional infrastructure and the political will appear to be in place to promote an environment that supports healthy family functioning.

Missing from the current environment are the data to guide these efforts. Although the need to support families has been well-documented, the avenues for doing so have not. What sorts of support do families need, exactly? What are the specific challenges that individuals face in trying to maintain healthy families and fulfilling relationships? How best should local, state and federal governments allocate their limited resources?

Existing data go only so far in addressing these questions. The national census, for example, provides thorough data on the prevalence of marria ge and divorce, but offers no data on other family structures (e.g., cohabiting, unmarried parents) that have been shown to be increasingly prevalent and influential in other national research (McLanahan et al., 2003). The census identifies children born to unmarried mothers, but does not describe the reasons that those mothers remain unmarried or whether they even perceive marriage as a viable option. Nor does the census provide information on relationship quality, arguably the crucial variable in identifying healthy families. In the absence of these data, little is known about the range of diverse family forms in the United States, or the unique challenges that people living in different kinds of families may face. Certainly no data have been collected to address these issues specifically in the state of Florida.

Without data on crucial variables, and without data specific to Florida, how can legislators develop policies that are effective and efficient? Developing an initiative to support healthy families requires, as a preliminary step, accurate and up-to-date information that may inform the initiative. To assemble those data, Jerry Regier, the Secretary of the Florida Department of Children and Families (DCF), under the leadership of Governor Jeb Bush and his Strengthening Families Initiative, commissioned a state-wide survey of family experiences and attitudes in Florida, so that future policy decisions might rest on a foundation of solid research describing family relationships in this state.

C. Overview of the Florida Family Formation Survey

The Florida Family Formation Survey was conducted through the Department of Psychology and the Survey Research Center at the University of Florida. Data were collected through telephone

interviews with individuals 18 years old or older, conducted between July and November of 2003. Participation in the survey was completely voluntary, and all participants were told that they could choose not to answer any question.

<u>Sampling</u>. The total survey consisted of 6012 interviews spread across five separate and independent samples. The primary sample of interest consisted of 4008 residents of Florida identified through random-digit dialing. To ensure that this sample included adequate numbers of representatives from several subgroups of particular interest, the sampling was stratified to oversample blacks, Hispanics, and low-income groups. Furthermore, at the request of the Department of Children and Families, 500 of the surveys were conducted in each of the four major metropolitan areas within Florida (Miami, Orlando, Tampa, and Jacksonville) so that state officials may be able to describe and form recommendations tailored specifically to those populous areas. In reporting these data, appropriate adjustments for the oversampled subgroups were applied so that final estimates are representative of the state as a whole.

A second sample of 500 Florida residents consisted entirely of current recipients of federal assistance in the form of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). These participants consisted of individuals randomly sampled from the department's roster of current TANF recipients. The goal of targeting this group specifically was to allow comparisons between groups that are and are not receiving federal cash assistance, and to identify the unique challenges faced by families receiving welfare so as to better tailor programs and polic ies towards their needs.

Finally, three additional samples consisted of randomly-selected residents of three other states with populations comparable to Florida. Specifically, this sample gathered telephone interview data from 500 residents of California, 502 residents of New York, and 502 residents of Texas. The purpose of gathering these data was to examine whether generalizations that describe the state of Florida might reasonably describe other populous, diverse states. Similarities across states would support the idea that programs that proved effective in Florida might prove similarly effective elsewhere, and that programs found to be effective in other states might be imported to Florida.

Design Issues. The design of the Florida Family Formation Survey was guided by three assumptions.

First, people are the best source of information on their own experiences and attitudes. Although participants in the survey were asked about their general attitudes towards families and marriages, by far the majority of the interview asked people to describe their own experiences in and values about relationships.

Second, the range of responses to this survey is likely to be more useful than any average response. At the outset, we expected that these data would reveal great diversity in responses to almost every question. An average can be misleading in that it suggests that a single response characterizes the population, rather than a range of responses. In reporting these results, we have attempted whenever possible to emphasize the range of responses across different subgroups in addition to the central tendency of the state.

Third, when it comes to identifying "healthy" families, the quality of the relationship is likely to be more important than the structure of the relationship. For example, research suggests that when two-parent, non-married families are happy, they can function as well as married couple families, and that children can do as well in these families as they do in families where both parents are married to each other (Brown & Booth, 1996; Seltzer, 2000). Thus, all questions about whether people feel understood, supported, and loved by their partners were phrased in such a way that anyone in a romantic relationship could answer them, regardless of whether that relationship was an established marriage or not. Of course, respondents were also asked about the structure of their relationships (e.g., married, divorced, separated, cohabiting, engaged), and these data are also described throughout this report.

Goals and Specific Aims. The overarching goals of this survey were:

- To provide the Department of Children and Families and the state of Florida with accurate, up-to-date, and detailed information on families and marriages throughout this state, and
- To establish a baseline against which the effects of future policies and programs might be measured.

Within those broad goals, the survey had three specific aims:

- 1. To describe the range of family forms and family experiences among residents of Florida.
- 2. To describe the range of beliefs and attitudes towards marriage and family among residents of Florida.
- 3. To identify correlates of relationship quality among residents of Florida.

D. How to Read This Report

The text of this report is organized around the 22 tables that present the main results. The tables share a common structure. In every table, the first column of data (labeled "Total") presents responses that describe the state of Florida as a whole. The figures in this first column are based on the responses of all respondents in the Florida resident sample, weighted to adjust for the oversampling of specific subgroups. Reading only the data reported in the first columns of these tables provides a picture that represents the state of Florida. For all estimates based on data from the total sample, we can say with 95% confidence that the estimates have a margin of error of plus or minus 0.75%.

The subsequent columns in each table break down the responses in different ways to facilitate comparisons between specific subgroups. For example, the next five columns in each table provide the same responses broken down by geographical region (i.e., the four major metropolitan centers and everywhere else). Reading only the data in this set of columns allows comparisons among the major metropolitan areas, and between those areas and the rest of the state. The text of this report will not address these comparisons in detail, but the data are provided in the tables for interested readers.

The next four columns present the same responses again, this time broken down by the ethnicity of the respondent (i.e., white, black, Hispanic, and other). By examining these columns, a reader may easily notice similarities and differences among ethnic groups in their responses to the interview.

The next three columns break down the total responses by the household income of the respondents (i.e., low income, middle income, and high income). To define these three groups, we first examined respondents' answers to interview questions about household income (i.e., "How much was your total family income from all sources last year before taxes and other deductions?") and questions about the number of members of the household. Based on the answers to these questions, we assigned all respondents to either low-, middle-, or high-income groups, using thresholds from the National Census Bureau that vary according to the size of the household. By examining these columns together, readers

may notice how experiences of and attitudes towards families and marriage vary according to income level.

Whereas all of the table columns described so far represent different ways of breaking up data from the primary sample of 4008 respondents, the last column in each table presents data from the independent sample of 500 TANF recipients. This sample included equal numbers of male and female respondents (250 females and 250 males), but, as of 2003, the population of TANF recipients in Florida is in fact 86.4% female. The figures presented in this table were therefore adjusted for the sampling strategy so that they describe the TANF population as a whole.

Most questions in the interview, (e.g., all of the questions about attitudes towards marriage and family issues) were presented to every respondent. Other questions were presented only under certain conditions. For example, the questions about potential obstacles to marriage were presented only to respondents who were unmarried but currently a partner in an intimate relationship. Similarly, the questions about parenthood were only presented to respondents with children. As a result, although the tables report results based on every respondent who answered every question, the number of respondents who received each question varies across the tables. A note at the bottom of each table specifies which respondents provided the data for that table. Estimates for the main subgroups examined here (i.e., the metropolitan areas, race/ethnicity, and income level) all have a margin of error of less than plus or minus 2.5%. Estimates based on smaller subsets of those groups have wider margins of error.

III. Describing Family Formations in Florida

The primary goal of this project was to describe the diversity of family forms in Florida. To that end, participants in the survey were asked about their current relationship status, their relationship history, their experiences with cohabitation and parenthood, and their current household arrangements. Tables 1 through 5 provide data on respondents' answers to these questions.

A. <u>Current Relationship Status (Table 1)</u>

• 53% of adults in Florida are married, and 80% have been married at least once.

Marriage is common among adult residents of Florida. Of currently married adults, 69% are in a first marriage, with the remaining 31% in a remarriage. (The ever-married include these groups, plus those respondents reporting that they have been divorced or widowed.) Rates of marriage in Florida are comparable to national rates estimated from census data (Kreider & Fields, 2001).

Yet, consistent with census data and other national studies, the average tendency in Florida masks substantial variability across ethnicity and income level. With respect to ethnicity, blacks are far less likely to be married (37%) or to have been married at least once (63%) than whites, Hispanics, or other ethnic groups. The source of this difference does not seem to be a higher rate of divorce among blacks. Rather, blacks are substantially more likely to have never married (37%) compared to whites (15%), Hispanics (22%) or other ethnic groups (28%).

Rates of being married also decline with household income, such that residents of high- income households are almost twice as likely to be married (68%) than are residents of low-income households (36%). TANF recipients are the least likely to be currently married (24%).

• An additional 18% of Florida residents report being in a non-marital intimate relationship.

This group describes themselves as currently unmarried and responds yes when asked whether they have "a main romantic involvement, a man or woman you think of as a steady, a lover, a partner, or the like". Combined with the married group, these data indicate that an intimate relationship is part of the lives of 71% of Florida residents.

As might be expected, rates of being in a non-marital intimate relationship vary to correspond with rates of being married, such that subgroups that are less likely to be married (i.e., blacks and low-income) are more likely to be in non-marital intimate relationships. However, the presence of non-marital intimate relationships does not compensate for the lower rates of marriage in these groups. That is, even through blacks and low-income individuals have higher rates of non-marital intimate relationships, they are still more likely than other subgroups to report no relationship at all. For example, 36% of blacks report not being in any kind of intimate relationship (marital or non-marital) compared to less than 30% for all other ethnic groups. Similarly, 42% of individuals in low-income households and 46% of TANF recipients report not being in any kind of intimate relationship, compared to 16% in high-income households.

• 35% of Florida residents have been divorced; 47% of these individuals have remarried.

In contrast to rates of marriage, which differ substantially across ethnic groups, rates of divorce are more similar across ethnic groups. Rates of remarriage, however, do differ among ethnic groups. Among blacks and Hispanics experiencing a divorce, 37% and 36% respectively have remarried, compared to over 50% remarriage rates in whites and other ethnicities. Together, these data support the idea that the relatively low marriage rates in blacks are due to unique obstacles in forming marriages, rather than unique obstacles in maintaining them.

Rates of remarriage also covary with household income. Whereas low -income individuals (35%) are just as likely to report experiencing divorce as high-income individuals (36%), residents of low - income households who have experienced divorce are half as likely to have remarried (31%) than are residents of high-income households (60%). TANF recipients are especially likely to have experienced a divorce (39%) and the least likely to have remarried (20%).

The powerful association between relationship status and income observed in these data replicate similar findings using national census data (Bramlett & Mosher, 2002, Figure 26). The strong association between divorce and economic variables may be part of the reason that divorce rates are higher than average in Florida where, according to the 2000 census, 17.6% of children under 18 live below poverty (compared to 16.6% in the United States). Across the 45 states currently reporting their divorce statistics, the correlation between the median family income and the divorce rate in each state is -.35, a significant correlation (p = .02). In other words, the higher the median family income in a state, the fewer marriages in that state that are likely to end in divorce.

B. Age at Marriage, Length of Marriage, and Length of Courtship (Table 2)

• Over two-thirds of all married individuals are in first marriages.

This figure describes the population of married people across ethnicities and income levels. Among married Hispanics, over 80% are in first marria ges, possibly due to a relatively high rate of marriage and a relatively low rate of remarriage after divorce.

• The average age at first marriage is 24; the average age at remarriage is 37.

Age at first marriage does not differ substantially across subgroups. Age at remarriage does differ across ethnic groups, however, such that non-whites remarry at a younger age than whites. Given that the reported length of courtship before remarriage is not substantially shorter in these groups, the age

difference at remarriage may be the result of shorter first marriages, as opposed to shorter courtships. Likely for the same reasons, the average age at remarriage among TANF recipients (30 years old) is substantially younger than the average age at marriage for all other income levels (36 years old or older).

• The average length of courtship before marriage is 2.0 years; the average length of courtship before remarriage is 1.7 years.

It might have been expected that the length of courtship before remarriage would differ from the length of courtship before first marriage, but the differences observed in Florida were small and inconsistent across subgroups.

C. <u>Cohabitation (Table 3)</u>

• 85% of Florida residents who are currently in an intimate relationship live with their spouse or romantic partner.

Within this report, the words cohabitation and cohabiting are used to refer to unmarried couples that are living together in an intimate relationship. Thus, for these analyses, the number of Florida residents who are living with their partner includes married and cohabiting couples. It is important to note that this question was asked only of those Florida residents who indicated that they were currently married or involved in an intimate relationship.

Blacks, perhaps because they are substantially less likely to be married, are substantially less likely to be living with their spouse or romantic partner as well (69% compared to over 80% for all other ethnic groups). Likely for similar reasons, there is also a slight association between living with a partner and household income, such that individuals in low-income households are less likely to be living with their spouse or partner (78%) than individuals in high-income households (90%). TANF recipients are least likely to be living with their partner (64%).

• Among Florida residents who live with their partners, 14% are cohabiting (i.e., are not currently married).

Put another way, 86% of people who live with a partner are married to that partner. Furthermore, even among cohabiting couples, 34% are currently engaged to be married. Thus, less than 10% of individuals who are currently living with a partner are unmarried and plan to remain that way.

These figures do differ across ethnicity and income groups. Blacks are more likely to be cohabiting (21%), whereas Hispanics are somewhat less likely (11%). Rates of cohabitation increase as household income decreases, with rates of cohabitation nearly twice as high in low-income households (23%) as in high-income households (12%). Among TANF recipients, over a third (35%) are cohabiting.

• Of currently married people, 40% cohabited before marriage, but 42% of those cohabited only after they were engaged to be married.

Put another way, 23% of married people lived together before they were engaged to be married. This figure is lower for Hispanics (16%) than for other ethnic groups, but it does not vary substantially across income groups. TANF recipients who are married are most likely to have lived together before marriage (63%).

D. Parenthood (Table 4)

• 76% of Florida residents have had at least one biological child of their own.

These figures do not vary substantially across ethnic groups, but there is a slight tendency for the rate of parenthood to increase as household income decreases, such that the rate of parenthood is higher in low-income households (79%) than in high-income households (73%). Among TANF recipients, rates of parenthood are especially high (97%). This is to be expected, given the requirements for receiving TANF.

• Of all parents, 62% are currently married, 20% are divorced, and 8% have never been married.

This is a case where the general tendency in the state masks important differences among ethnicities and income groups. For example, although the majority of parents in the state of Florida are married, less than half of black parents (44%) are married, a figure consistent with findings from the census and other national data sets (Martin et al., 2002). Similarly, whereas 4% of white parents have never been married, 24% of black parents have never been married.

There is also a strong association between relationship status among parents and income. Among parents, the likelihood of being married decreases as household income decreases, such that parents in low-income households are substantially less likely to be married than parents in high-income households (43% vs. 78%). Among individuals receiving TANF, the likelihood of being married is even lower (24%). Consistent with analyses of national data sets like the National Survey of Family Growth (Musick, 2002), never married parenthood is very infrequent among high-income individuals (3%). In contrast, the rate of never married parenthood in low-income individuals is 15% and among TANF recipients the rate is 40%. Indeed, other research confirms that less than 5% of all unmarried births happen to women with a college education (Musick, 2002). Rather, it is adolescents who perceive the fewest educational opportunities who are the most willing to consider having a child outside of marriage (Abrahamse, Morrison, & Waite, 1988). Differences in socioeconomic status account for most of the ethnic group differences that have been observed (Trent & Crowder, 1997).

It is important to note that these figures do not mean that parents are necessarily married to the parent of their children.

• The average parent has two children.

This figure is somewhat higher among black parents (2.3), and is moderately associated with household income, such that the number of children in low-income households is higher than the number in high-income households (2.3 vs. 1.6). Among TANF recipients, the average number of children is close to three.

• The average parent has had children with a single partner.

Again, the number of partners with whom one has had children is slightly higher among blacks (1.5) and among low-income individuals (1.4) and TANF recipients (1.5).

• The average parent had a first child at 24 years old.

This figures varies somewhat across ethnicities and income groups. Compared to other ethnic groups, blacks tend to have their first children two years earlier (22 years vs. 24 years). Compared to parents in high-income households, parents in low-income households tend to have their first children three years earlier (23 years vs. 26 years). Among TANF recipients, the average age at first parenthood is 21.

It is worth noting that, on average across the state, the age of first parenthood is similar to the average age at first marriage (see Table 2). However, the degree of similarity varies substantially across groups. For whites and Hispanics, first marriage tends to precede first parenthood on average, although not by much. For blacks, first parenthood tends to precede first marriage by nearly three years. With respect to household income, those in high-income households tend to wait over a year after marriage to have a first child, whereas those in low-income households tend to have children a year prior to marriage.

E. Household Arrangements (Table 5)

• The average Florida resident shares a household with one or two other people.

With respect to ethnicity, this figure is closer to one for whites (1.4) and closer to two for blacks (1.9), Hispanics (2.2), and other ethnic groups (2.0). With respect to household income, this figure tends to rise as income declines, such that individuals in high-income households tend to live with fewer people (1.3) than individuals in low-income households (2.0). For TANF recipients, the figure is closer to three.

• 60% of all Florida residents live either with their own or their partner's children.

This figure does not differ substantially across ethnicities or income levels, but it is substantially higher among TANF recipients (83%). Thus, parenting plays a role in the lives of a majority of Florida residents.

• 28% of Florida households consist of a married couple raising their biological offspring.

This is the strict definition of the "nuclear" family, and it characterizes just over a quarter of households in Florida. If the analysis is restricted solely to households containing children, then nearly half (46%) contain two biological parents who are married to each other.

Regardless of which analysis is examined, the proportion of residents living in this type of household varies according to ethnicity and income level. With respect to ethnicity, blacks are far less likely (15%) to be married and raising their biological children than whites (30%), Hispanics (30%), or members of other ethnic groups (21%). With respect to household income, residents in low-income households are far less likely (16%) to be married and raising their biological children than residents of high-income households (36%). TANF recipients are the least likely to be living in this type of household (11%).

• 16% of Florida households consist of "blended" families, i.e., married couples raising children from multiple relationships.

Given high rates of divorce and remarriage, it is likely that more and more families will include children from one or both partners' prior relationships, in addition to children from the current relationship. At this time, the proportion of married couple households that can be described in this way does not vary substantially across ethnic or income groups.

• 10% of Florida households consist of a single adult raising children.

This is another case where the average tendency in the state masks important variability across ethnicities and income levels. With respect to ethnicity, blacks are far more likely (21%) to be raising children as single parents than whites (6%), Hispanics (11%), or other ethnic groups (12%). With respect to household income, residents of low-income households are several times more likely (19%) to be raising children in as single parents than residents of high-income households (4%). Due to the

requirements of TANF, it comes as no surprise that 50% of TANF recipients are in single-parent households.

• 9% of Florida households consist of cohabiting couples; 53% of those couples are raising children.

This analysis uses a slightly different analysis to confirm the relatively low rates of cohabitation reported in Table 3. In this analysis, however, it is possible to distinguish between cohabiting couples who are and are not raising children. The proportion of cohabiting couples who are raising children varies across ethnic and income groups. With respect to ethnicity, cohabiting blacks and me mbers of other ethnic groups are more likely (both 68%) to be raising children than cohabiting whites (51%) or Hispanics (49%). With respect to household income, cohabiting couples in low -income households are nearly twice as likely (67%) to be raising children than cohabiting couples in high-income households (37%). Rates of couples headed by cohabiting couples are highest among TANF recipients (12%), and the rate of parenthood among these couples is also the highest (90%).

• 9% of Florida residents live with their parents or their partner's parents.

This figure varies according to ethnicity and income. With respect to ethnicity, whites are less likely to be living with parents (6%) than blacks (16%), Hispanics (15%), or other ethnic groups (16%). With respect to income, the likelihood of living with parents increases and household income declines such that residents of high-income households are less likely to be living with parents (4%) than residents of low-income households (13%). Among TANF recipients, 25% live with their own or their partner's parents.

F. Summary and Discussion

Intimate relationships, marriage, and parenthood figure into the lives of almost all adults residing in Florida. However, consistent with results obtained from census data and other national studies, the structure of people's families varies considerably, and much of that variance is associated with ethnicity and income.

Whites and residents of high-income households appear to be more successful at forming relationships and more successful at maintaining them. That is, members of these groups are more likely to be married, more likely to remarry after divorce, and least likely to never marry. Perhaps as a result, they are more likely to be living with a partner, more likely to be married to that partner, and more likely to be raising children that are solely the product of a union with that partner. In contrast, blacks and residents of low-income households appear to have more difficulty forming and maintaining relationships. Members of these groups less likely to be married, less likely to remarry after divorce, and more likely to have never married at all. Perhaps as a result, they are more likely to live without a romantic partner, more likely to be raising children as single parents, and more likely to be raising children from multiple partners. Hispanics, on average, appear to fall somewhere between whites and blacks on most of the dimensions assessed here.

The effects of income and ethnicity are not independent. Rather, income and ethnicity are highly associated (i.e., non-whites are on average far more likely to live in low -income households than whites). In prior studies of family structure drawing from national data sets, the effects of income tend to account for most of the effects of race or ethnicity (e.g., Trent & Crowder, 1997).

Despite the powerful associations among family structure, income, and ethnicity, several noteworthy trends emerged across all of the subgroups examined here. First, the traditional "nuclear" family, defined as married parents raising their biological children under one roof, now characterizes just over a quarter of the state, and just under half of the family households in the state.

Second, just under a fifth of the state is now living in "blended" or "step" families, where children from multiple relationships are raised under one roof. This increasingly common family form presents unique challenges that are as yet understudied (Darden & Zimmerman, 1992), but that policy-makers will need to take into account.

Third, despite the great attention devoted to understanding cohabiting couples (Popenoe & Whitehead, 1999), in Florida such couples make up a relatively small percentage of people who live with their partners. Only 14% of people who live with their partners are cohabiting, and 35% of those are currently engaged to be married. Among married couples, 40% cohabited before marriage, but over half of those (56%) lived together only after they were engaged to be married. Thus, for the majority of people, cohabiting seems to be a step towards marriage, rather than an end in itself. On the other hand, when it occurs, cohabitation does seem to be associated with parenthood, as children are present in over half of all cohabiting couple households.

IV. Attitudes Towards Marriage and Family Issues

The second goal of this project was to describe how residents of Florida make sense of the complex issues surrounding family life. To that end, participants in this survey were asked about their attitudes, beliefs, and intentions regarding a number of aspects of family relationships. Tables 6 through 12 provide data on respondents' answers to these questions.

A. <u>Attitudes and Intentions Towards Marriage (Table 6 and Table 7)</u>

• 92% of Florida residents agree or strongly agree that "a happy healthy marriage is one of the most important things in life."

The proportion of residents who agree with this statement does not differ substantially across any of the subgroups analyzed here.

• Florida residents believe that supporting each other through difficult times, being able to communicate effectively, and spending time together are very important elements of a good marriage.

There was a high degree of consensus across ethnic and income groups about what makes for a successful marriage. On average, all groups rated the three elements listed above as "very important", and all groups rated "being of the same race or ethnic group" as least important.

• 65% of unmarried residents would like to be married some day, and 39% of unmarried respondents have specific plans to marry within two years.

These figures mask noteworthy differences between ethnic and income groups. With respect to ethnicity, unmarried whites are substantially less interested in getting married someday (56%) compared to blacks (84%), Hispanics (82%), or other ethnic groups (94%). Furthermore, whites are less likely to have specific plans to marry (33%) compared to blacks (52%) and Hispanics (47%), although they are more likely to have specific plans than other ethnic groups (29%).

With respect to household income, residents in high-income households are less likely to desire a marriage (61%) than residents in low-income households (72%). Furthermore, residents in high-income households are less likely to have specific plans to marry (35%) compared to residents of middle - and

low-income households. Compared to all other income groups, TANF recipients are the most likely to desire a marriage (85%) and the most likely to have specific plans to marry within the next two years (55%). Data from the Fragile Families study are consistent with these results (Gibson, Edin, & McLanahan, 2003). In that study, interviews with unmarried, low-income couples that had just had their first baby revealed that over 80% of new mothers and fathers planned to marry each other.

Residents who have never been married are more likely to desire marriage (78%) than those who have previously married and divorced or been widowed (48%), and residents who are currently living together are more likely to have specific plans to marry (46%) than those who are not living together (33%). Both of these differences hold true across almost all of the subgroups analyzed here.

B. Attitudes Towards Divorce and Prior Relationships (Table 8 and Table 9)

• 73% of Florida residents agree that "Divorce can be a reasonable solution to an unhappy marriage."

The proportion of residents who agree with this sentiment did not vary substantially across any of the subgroups analyzed here, with the exception of blacks, who expressed somewhat less agreement (67%) than other groups. Two other questions on the survey revealed similarly high levels of tolerance for divorce. For example, 73% of Florida residents disagree with the idea that "When there are children in the family, parents should stay married even if they no longer love each other." In the same vein, 77% disagree with the statement: "When a husband and wife divorce it reflects badly on them as people."

• Florida residents are split on whether "When parents are arguing a lot, it is better for the children if they divorce."

Whereas Florida residents generally agree that divorce should be an option for unhappy marriages and that there is no shame to either partner when divorce occurs, there is disagreement about the threshold at which divorce is the best option. On average, 41% of residents agree or strongly agree with this statement, suggesting a belief that children should be prevented from being exposed to high levels of conflict between their parents. In contrast, 45% of residents disagree or strongly disagree with this statement, suggesting a belief that divorce in the face of conflict is not in the best interests of children. This split was relatively consistent across subgroups, with the exception of blacks, who were more inclined to disagree (58%) than to agree (30%).

• The majority of people do not regret the end of their prior relationships.

Several questions on the survey address this point. For example, when asked if they wished they had worked hard to save their last relationships, 79% say no, and this figure does not vary substantially across the subgroups analyzed here. Along the same lines, when asked about their feelings regarding the end of their previous relationship, most divorced residents (62%) indicate that they are glad that the relationship is over. This figure differs across ethnic and income groups. With respect to ethnicity, divorced blacks are more likely to be glad that the previous relationship ended (77%), compared to whites (62%), Hispanics (51%), and other ethnic groups (60%). With respect to household income, residents of low-income households are *less* likely to feel glad about the end of their previous relationship (53%), compared to residents of high-income households (64%). TANF recipients are the least likely to feel neutral about the end of their prior relationships – they more likely to be glad (26%) and more likely to experience regret (64%) than other groups.

On average, those who have never been divorced are less likely to be glad that their previous relationship ended (48%), and this figure does not differ substantially across any of the subgroups examined here.

• 14% of residents who have been divorced wish "that it had been more difficult – from a legal standpoint – to get a divorce."

This figure does not vary much by household income, but it does vary by ethnicity. The desire for additional legal barriers to divorce is lower among blacks (3%) and Hispanics (7%) than among whites (15%) or other ethnic groups (17%).

C. Attitudes Towards Premarital Sex and Cohabitation (Table 10)

• 52% of Florida residents agree or strongly agree that "It is okay for couples who are not married to live together."

On average, an additional 11% of residents are neutral on this issue. The level of acceptance of cohabitation is consistent across ethnic groups, with the exception of blacks, who are substantially less accepting of cohabitation (40%) than other ethnic groups (all above 50% agreement). Acceptance of cohabitation also varies with household income, such that residents of high-income households are more accepting of cohabitation (62%) than residents of middle -income (50%) or low -income (50%) households.

• 47% of Florida residents agree or strongly agree that "Couples should wait to have sex until they are married."

On average, an additional 16% of residents are neutral on this issue. Attitudes toward premarital sex vary in a similar way to attitudes about unmarried cohabitation. Among ethnic groups, blacks stand out as being especially in favor of abstinence prior to marriage (60%) compared to whites (45%), Hispanics (45%), and other ethnic groups (44%). Among income groups, residents of middle -income households (51%), low-income households (54%), and TANF recipients (54%) all support abstinence before marriage more than residents of high-income households (35%).

D. <u>Attitudes Towards Unmarried Parenthood (Table 11)</u>

• 80% of Florida residents agree or strongly agree that "Children do better when their parents are married."

• 66% of Florida residents agree or strongly agree that "People who have children together ought to be married."

The difference in levels of agreement for these two statements is telling. Although a vast majority of Florida residents believe that children are better off when their parents are married, substantially fewer residents agree that parents consequently *ought* to be married. The word "ought," implying that parents have a responsibility to marry, appears to have weakened agreement with the idea. In general, rates of agreement with these statements are consistent across subgroups, with the exception of blacks, who are somewhat less likely to agree with the first statement (70%) and with the second (57%). Agreement with these statements did not vary according to household income, but it was different among TANF recipients, who were the most supportive of single parenthood.

• 49% of Florida residents agree or strongly agree that "Most mothers living alone can bring up their children as well as married couples."

Agreement with this statement is higher among blacks (66%) than among whites (44%), Hispanics (54%), or other ethnic groups (42%), and higher among residents of low-income households (57%) and TANF recipients (55%) than among residents of high-income households (43%). Thus, belief in the abilities of single mothers is highest in the groups that contain more single mothers (see Table 4 and Table 5).

It might seem to be contradictory that blacks on average agree that children do better when their parents are married, yet also agree that single mothers can raise their children as effectively as married couples. In fact, a close reading of the two statements reveals no contradiction. It is perfectly consistent to believe that, whereas children generally *do* experience better outcomes when raised by married parents, single mothers *can* raise their children just as effectively.

E. Attitudes Towards Traditional Gender Roles (Table 12)

• 72% of Florida residents disagree or disagree strongly with the idea that "The important decisions should be made by the man of the house."

The majority of Florida residents reject a view of men as leaders of the household. This general tendency holds true within each of the subgroups examined here as well. Within that general context, however, levels of disagreement varies with ethnicity and household income. With respect to ethnicity, blacks are less likely to disagree (58%) than whites (75%), Hispanics (68%), and other ethnic groups (86%). With respect to income, residents of low-income groups are less likely to disagree (68%) than residents of high-income households (77%). TANF recipients, in contrast to low-income residents not on government assistance, disagree with this statement as strongly as high-income residents (75%).

• 53% of Florida residents disagree or disagree strongly that "It is better for a family if the man earns a living and the woman takes care of the home."

In general, most Florida residents do not believe that a man's role is to work outside the home and a woman's is to work within the home. However, it is worth noting that Florida residents were more tolerant of this division of labor than of the idea of male decision-making power within the home. Levels of disagreement did not vary substantially by ethnicity but they did vary by household income, such that residents of low-income households were less likely to disagree (49%) than were residents of high-income households (59%). Again, in contrast to low-income residents not on government assistance, TANF recipients disagreed with this statement as strongly as high-income residents (57%).

F. Summary and Discussion

If there is a marriage and family crisis in the state of Florida, there is no evidence that the crisis is related to a decline in the value of marriage. Regardless of ethnicity or income, the vast majority of residents of Florida believe that "a happy healthy marriage is one of the most important things in life." Furthermore, the majority of unmarried people hope to be married someday, and a substantial minority have specific plans to marry within the next two years. Combined with the fact that over 80% of the state has been married at some point, these data suggest that residents of Florida maintain a strong confidence in the institution of marriage. Moreover, that confidence appears to be strongest among those groups experiencing the most difficulties forming and maintaining marital relationships. Non-whites and residents of low-income households were substantially more hopeful about marriage than were whites and high-income residents. TANF recipients, the group with the lowest likelihood of being married, on average expressed the highest desire to marry and the most frequently observed intentions to marry within the next two years. Thus, the difficulties faced by these groups in their family relationships do not appear to be associated with their less positive feelings about marriage. On the contrary, and more poignantly,

members of disadvantaged groups appear to be facing difficulties despite their fervent desires to create lasting and healthy family structures for themselves.

The consensus on the value of marriage does not prevent a similar consensus that divorce is an acceptable option when a marital relationship is unsatisfying. By a wide margin, the majority of residents of Florida believe that divorce can be a reasonable solution to an unhappy marriage. More telling, the majority of those who have experienced marriages and relationships that have ended express no regrets about the end of those relationships and few people who have experienced a divorce wish that it had been more difficult to obtain one. Thus, residents of Florida do not appear to favor any plans that would prevent individuals from ending their relationships if they feel compelled to do so.

It is worth noting that, when asked their opinions about cohabitation, premarital sex, and traditional gender roles, members of those groups with the least traditional family structures expressed the most traditional attitudes. Thus, for example, although non-whites have higher levels of pre-marital parenthood than whites, they also express substantially more approval for premarital abstinence. Similarly, although blacks and TANF recipients are more likely to cohabit and more likely to raise children in single parent households, they express the most negative attitudes towards cohabitation and the most approval for traditional gender roles within the family.

As a whole, these data on the attitudes of Florida residents have two implications. First, the groups experiencing the most difficulties maintaining stable and healthy family structures have received and understood the message that families matter. Second, attitudes alone are insufficient to account for the range of family structures that people experience. What people feel about marriage and family as concepts does not always translate into the choices and decisions they make in their own lives. On the contrary, many people do not attain the outcomes they most value, suggesting they may be facing obstacles they cannot overcome.

V. Correlates of Healthy Intimate Relationships

For optimum health and well-being, it is not sufficient merely to possess family relationships; rather those relationships must be satisfying and fulfilling (Kiecolt-Glaser & Newton, 2001). The third goal of this project was to examine some of the correlates of healthy intimate relationships among Florida residents. To this end, participants in the survey were asked about their perceptions of various aspects of relationship satisfaction, and then about other aspects of their lives that have been associated with relationship satisfaction in prior research. Tables 13 through 17 provide data on respondents' answers to these questions.

A. About Measuring Relationship Satisfaction

Because relationship satisfaction is one of the most important and most complex constructs addressed by the survey, it is worth describing in detail how it was measured. The survey included 12 questions relevant to respondents' feelings about the quality of their current intimate relationship. Of these items, two asked respondents to describe their general feelings about the relationship (e.g., "Taking things altogether, how would you describe your current romantic relationship?" and "All in all, how satisfied are you with your relationship?"). Another four items asked respondents to describe specific aspects of the relationship (e.g., feelings about trust, support, communication, and understanding). Three additional items asked respondents had ever considered ending the relationship.

Analyses of the answers to these individual questions revealed that responses tended to be similar across questions (coefficient alpha for the standardized items = .89). That is, individuals who indicated

feeling highly satisfied with the relationship as a whole tended to respond to all of the other questions more or less positively and individuals who indicated feeling unsatisfied with the relationship as a whole tended to respond to all of the remaining questions more or less negatively. Because each item offered a similar view of the relationship, the items were standardized and combined to form a single index of relationship satisfaction. Scores on this index were transformed so that the maximum score that any individual could receive was 100, indicating a perfectly satisfying relationship in all respects.

B. <u>Relationship Satisfaction by Relationship Status (Table 13)</u>

• Relationship satisfaction is associated with ethnicity and household income.

Although most people report that they are relatively satisfied with their current relationship, there were systematic differences across the subgroups examined here. With respect to ethnicity, blacks rated their relationships as less satisfying on average, than whites, Hispanics, or other ethnic groups. This difference held true for ratings of marital relationships and for ratings of non-marital relationships. With respect to income, residents of low-income households and TANF recipie nts rated their relationships as less satisfying than residents of high- or middle-income households. This difference also held true across relationship type. Thus, ethnicity and income appear to be associated not only with family structures but with the quality of family relationships as well.

• Relationship satisfaction is higher in married relationships than in unmarried relationships.

Out of 100 possible points, married individuals rate their relationships 87, compared to unmarried individuals who rate their relationships 76. This difference held true across all of the subgroups examined here. Furthermore, average relationship quality did not differ between first marriages and remarriages, both of which were rated as more satisfying than unmarried relationships on average.

• Within unmarried relationships, relationship satisfaction is higher for those who are cohabiting than for those who are not cohabiting.

Unmarried individuals who cohabit with their partners rate their relationships 78, whereas individuals who do not cohabit rate their relationships 74. The magnitude of this difference is roughly the same across all of the subgroups examined here, with the exception of unmarried Hispanics, who are no happier on average when they cohabit than when they do not.

C. <u>Relationship Satisfaction and Environmental Demands/Support (Table 14)</u>

Why should relationship satisfaction be associated with household income? Prior research on the components of healthy intimate relationships suggests that adverse condit ions more frequently encountered by low-income households (e.g., financial strain, health problems, stressful life events) may make satisfying relationships in those households more difficult to maintain. To address this possibility in detail, participants in this survey were asked about their financial strain, the number of hours per week they spend with their partners, the number of difficult events they have had to face recently, their experiences with government assistance, and the availability of support in their lives. In Table 14, the responses to these questions are presented for participants who ranked in the top third, middle third, and bottom third of the sample in terms of relationship satisfaction. Comparing responses across rows of this table addresses the question: what are the circumstances that characterize more or less satisfying relationships in this state?

• Florida residents in satisfying relationships <u>experience less financial strain</u> than residents in moderately satisfying or less satisfying relationships.

Financial strain was assessed with a single question that asked respondents about the extent to which they have enough money to make ends meet each month. On average, those in the most satisfying relationships report the least amount of financial strain and those in the least satisfying relationships report the most. It is noteworthy that this association holds true across ethnic groups and for middle - and low-income households. Only among high-income households and TANF recipients is there no relationship between financial strain and relationship satisfaction, possibly because levels of financial strain does not vary much within those groups.

• Florida residents in satisfying relationships <u>spend more time with their partners</u> than residents in moderately satisfying or less satisfying relationships.

This is a powerful association that holds true within each of the specific subgroups examined here. On average, individuals reporting the least satisfaction in their relationships spend 45 waking hours per week with their partners. In contrast, individuals reporting the most satisfaction in their relationships spend 68 waking hours per week with their partners. The magnitude and direction of this difference is roughly the same across ethnic and income groups.

The association between time spent together and relationship quality may help to explain why individuals in low-income households experience more difficulties in their relationships. A variety of research specifically targeting low-income families has described several ways that the time of lowincome individuals is more constrained than that of middle - or high-income families. For example, members of low-income families are more likely than middle and high income families to be forced to work nonstandard hours (H. B. Presser, 1995; Harriet B. Presser & Cain, 1983). In other words, during the evenings and weekends, when members of middle and high income families are free to communicate, share intimacy, or share leisure time, low income families more likely to be at their jobs. Analyses of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth have similarly revealed that working poor families are less likely to have paid sick leave, vacation leave, or flexible work hours than middle - or high-income families (Heymann, 2000). Because they are less free to choose when their available time will be, low-income couples may be less able to devote time to communication, supporting each other, or any of the other activities that make relationships fulfilling and healthy. Perhaps as a result, a lack of shared leisure time is a powerful predictor of divorce (Hill, 1988). All couples need time to interact, be intimate, and share their feelings with each other. Children need time to spend playing with their parents. Poor families are less likely to have this sort of time, and thus it makes sense that they are less likely to experience satisfying relationships.

• Florida residents in satisfying relationships <u>have experienced fewer difficult life events</u> in the last year than residents in moderately satisfying or less satisfying relationships.

All participants in this survey were presented with a list of 10 difficult life events and then asked to indicate whether each one had occurred to them in the past year. Events included experiencing a serious health problem, being robbed or mugged, and experiencing the death of a close friend or relative. On average, individuals in the least satisfying relationships experienced the most difficult life events over the previous year, and individuals in the most satisfying relationships experienced the fewest. This finding is consistent with prior research demonstrating significant negative associations between stress and relationship quality (Tesser & Beach, 1998).

Like the previous result, this finding may help to explain the relationship difficulties faced by couples in low-income households. A number of studies document the fact that poor families not only have less time to spend together, they also experience more demands on the time they do have. For example, poor working mothers are twice as likely to have a child with a chronic health condition

(Heymann & Earle, 1999). The working poor also spend more time caring for disabled and elderly family members (Heymann, Boynton-Jarrett, Carter, Bond, & Galinsky, 2002). Together with the previous finding, this result suggests how challenges and demands external to families may affect processes within families and between partners.

- Florida residents in satisfying relationships <u>are less likely to have ever received public</u> <u>assistance</u> than residents in moderately satisfying or less satisfying relationships.
- Florida residents in satisfying relationships are less likely to be currently receiving public assistance than residents in moderately satisfying or less satisfying relationships.

Although the proportion of respondents with experiences on government assistance varies considerably across ethnic and income groups, the association between the experience of government assistance and relationship satisfaction is consistent across groups.

• Florida residents in satisfying relationships <u>have more sources of social support outside</u> <u>the relationship</u> than residents in moderately satisfying or less satisfying relationships.

The environment of a family can drain the family's resources, or it can provide sources of support and assistance. To evaluate the supportive elements of the environment, respondents were asked whether there were people they could count on to assist with child care, health care, housing, and finances. On average across groups, individuals in the least satisfying relationships have the fewest sources of social support, and individuals in the most satisfying relationships have the most. It is worth noting, however, that this association was among the weakest and most inconsistent of those reported here.

D. <u>Relationship Satisfaction and Individual Differences (Table 15)</u>

• Florida residents in satisfying relationships <u>have more problems with substance abuse</u> than residents in moderately satisfying or less satisfying relationships.

Substance abuse was evaluated with four questions asking about symptoms of substance abuse exhibited over the past 12 months. Although rates of substance abuse were generally low, individuals in the least satisfying relationships on average report three times as many symptoms of substance abuse as individuals in the most satisfying relationships. This difference is roughly consistent across each of the subgroups examined here.

• Florida residents in satisfying relationships <u>have better mental health</u> than residents in moderately satisfying or less satisfying relationships.

Mental health was assessed with six questions asking about the experience of negative or anxious moods. These questions were scored so that higher scores indicate better mental health. The positive association between mental health and relationship satisfaction holds true within each of the specific subgroups examined here. Evidence for this association is consistent with prior research indicating that partners' mental health can be both a cause and a consequence of healthy intimate relationships (Beach, 2001).

• Florida residents in satisfying relationships <u>are more religious</u> than residents in moderately satisfying or less satisfying relationships.

Religiosity was assessed with two questions asking about frequency of attendance at religious services and degree of religious feelings. On average and within each of the subgroups examined here, individuals in the most satisfying relationships are more religious than individuals in the least satisfying relationships. Although this is a small effect, it is noteworthy given the null findings reported in prior research on religiosity and relationship quality (Sullivan, 2001; Young, Denny, Luquis, & Young, 1998).

E. <u>Reports of Physical Aggression by Gender and Relationship Status (Table 16)</u>

Physical aggression within families is a severe social problem, with potentially life-threatening consequences for adults and children (Johnson, 1995). Furthermore, physical aggression among newlywed couples is a powerful predictor of divorce, more powerful even than communication and problem-solving skills (Rogge & Bradbury, 1999). In this survey, a single question addressed physical aggression within intimate relationships. Specifically, respondents were asked: "How often does your partner hit or slap you when he/she is angry?" Table 16 reports the percentage of people who report a frequency higher than never. Because the consequences of physical aggression depend greatly on the gender of the person acting aggressively, responses to this question were exa mined separately for males and females.

• Men report being hit or slapped by their partners more than women.

Among people currently in romantic relationships, 4% of men report being hit or slapped by their partners, compared to 2% of women. This difference holds true across types of relationships (i.e., married, unmarried, cohabiting, non-cohabiting) and across most of the subgroups examined here. The fact that men report being on the receiving end of physical aggression may at first seem counter-intuitive, as male violence against women has been described as the larger social problem. In fact, these data do not bear directly on the severity of the aggression or its consequences. The fact that men report higher frequencies of receiving aggression does not suggest that they suffer similar consequences of that aggression as women do. Rather, it is likely that when men report being slapped or hit by their partners, the consequences are on average far less serious than when women report the same thing. Give n that aggression against women is likely to be more severe, it makes sense that it is reported more rarely than aggression against men.

• The frequency of physical aggression within intimate relationships is associated with ethnicity and household income.

With respect to ethnicity, physical aggression is more common among blacks (8% of men and 2% of women) than among whites (2% of men and 1% of women) or Hispanics (3% of men and 3% of women). With respect to household income, residents of low-income households experience higher rates of physical aggression (5% of men and 4% of women) than residents of high-income households (3% of men and 1% of women). TANF recipients experience the highest rates of physical aggression (10% of men and 7% of women).

• Unmarried women experience higher rates of physical aggression than married women.

For men, differences in aggression between marital and non-marital relationships are small and inconsistent. For women, however, those who are in non-marital relationships are at greater risk of experiencing physical aggression (3%) than those who are married (1%), and this difference holds true across most of the subgroups examined here.

• Among unmarried males, those in cohabiting relationships experience <u>more</u> physical aggression (6%) than those who are not cohabiting (2%). Among unmarried females, those in cohabiting relationships experience <u>less</u> physical aggression (2%) than those who are not cohabiting (4%).

Although these difference are small, they hold true within most of the specific subgroups analyzed here. Among TANF recipients, the association is reversed, such that men receive more aggression when they are in non-cohabiting relationships, and women receive more aggression when they are in cohabiting relationships. It is not clear why the association between cohabitation and physical aggression should vary by gender.

• Reports of physical aggression and interpersonal behavior are strongly associated with relationship satisfaction.

Not surprisingly, individuals in the least satisfying relationships are more likely to report experiencing physical aggression (6%) than individuals in the most satisfying relationships (1%). Those in less satisfying relationships also report the least positive interpersonal behaviors from their partners. These associations hold true within each of the specific subgroups examined here.

F. Sources of Difficulty in Relationships (Table 17)

To evaluate what people perceive as the significant challenges in their intimate relationships, respondents were presented with a list of 10 potential challenges and asked to rate the extent to which each is a source of disagreement within the current relationship.

• Money is the most frequent source of disagreement in the relationships of Florida residents, followed by spending time together, communication, and sex.

Each of these topics is cited as a source of disagreement by over 33% of the state as a whole, with money cited as source of disagreement by 62% of the state. About these four topics there is a high degree of consensus among the specific subgroups analyzed here. However, other topics were cited differentially across different subgroups. For example, whites and residents of high-income households are more likely to describe parenting as a source of difficulty than non-whites and residents of low-income households. In contrast, being faithful, although on average an infrequent source of disagreement, was substantially more likely to be cited by blacks and Hispanics than by whites or other ethnic groups, and was also more likely to be cited by residents of low-income households and TANF recipients than by residents of high-income households.

G. Summary and Discussion

Healthy families require more than intact relationships. For a family to be health y, the relationship between the two adults at its core must be satisfying and fulfilling (Kiecolt-Glaser & Newton, 2001). This survey reveals that relationship satisfaction, like family structure, is associated with ethnicity and household income, such that relationships among members of disadvantaged groups (i.e., blacks and residents of low-income households) are less satisfying than they are for members of advantaged groups (i.e., whites and residents of high-income households). This difference holds true in married and unmarried couples, and in cohabiting and non-cohabiting couples. Thus, this survey joins an increasing body of research demonstrating that relationship outcomes are associated with ethnicity and socioeconomic status (Bramlett & Mosher, 2002).

Why might it be harder to maintain the health of an intimate relationship within low-income households? What are the obstacles that low-income families may face that middle - and high-income

families do not? By examining the life circumstances of individuals reporting the most and least satisfaction with their relationships, this survey suggests some preliminary answers to these questions. In particular, these results indicate that, on average and within each of the subgroups examined here, the presence of a less than satisfying relationship is part of a constellation of negative circumstances and challenges that some individuals face. Compared to those in the most satisfying relationships, those in the least satisfying relationships experience more financial strain, experience greater numbers of difficult life events, are more likely to have required government assistance, and have fewer sources of social support than individuals in the most satisfying relationships. Furthermore, those in the least satisfying relationships have poorer mental health and higher levels of substance abuse than those in the most satisfying relationships, those in the least satisfying relationships. Most tellingly, compared to those in the most satisfying relationships, those in the least satisfying relationships spend an average of 22 fewer hours a week in the presence of their partners.

Together, these results have two implications for understanding and promoting healthy relationships. First, they suggest that, when people's lives are constrained in ways that make the emotional, intimate processes of healthy family life more difficult, their relationships are likely to be less satisfying. Clear communication, effective support, and constructive problem-solving all take time and require energy. Couples that are simultaneously coping with severe demands outside of the relationship, or couples who simply lack time in each other's presence (i.e., due to work or the requirements of child care) will have fewer opportunities to engage in these behaviors, even if they have adequate skills at performing them.

Second, these results suggest that members of disadvantaged groups may be especially likely to experience less satisfying relationships because members of these groups are at greater likelihood of experiencing the environmental and personal challenges that detract from maintaining a relationship. To the extent that residents of low-income households are more likely to experience chronic and acute stressors, and to the extent that residents of low-income households possess fewer resources for dealing with those stressors, it makes sense that residents of low-income households have more difficulty navigating the challenges of an intimate relationship compared to residents of high-income households.

VI. Obstacles to Marriage

Table 1 and Table 7 revealed that unmarried individuals in groups with the lowest rates of marriage also report the strongest intentions to marry. Furthermore, individuals in groups with lower rates of marriage believe in the importance of marriage as strongly as any other group, and are less tolerant of premarital sex and unmarried cohabitation than other groups. Then why do so many in these groups remain unmarried? The success of current efforts to promote marriage requires answers to this question.

To this end, unmarried respondents currently in romantic relationships were asked if they had plans to marry within the next two years (responses to this question were presented in Table 7). Those who indicated no plans to marry were presented with a list of 17 potential obstacles to marriage and were asked to indicate whether each one played a role in their plans. The items on this list were derived from qualitative research on attitudes towards marriage among unmarried mothers (Edin, 2000).

A. <u>Reasons for Not Pursuing Marriage (Table 18)</u>

• 56% of residents in current romantic relationships report being happy with the status quo as a major reason why they are not planning to get married.

Satisfaction with the status quo is the most frequently endorsed reason for postponing or avoiding marriage. Degree of satisfaction with the status quo is associated with ethnicity and household income. With respect to ethnicity, unmarried whites are more likely to be satisfied with the status quo (60%) than blacks (42%) and Hispanics (47%), but less likely than members of other ethnic groups (65%). With respect to household income, satisfaction with the status quo declines as income declines, such that individuals in high-income households are more likely to be satisfied (61%) than individuals in low-income households (46%).

- 31% of residents in current romantic relationships indicate that they do not plan to marry their current partners due to concerns that the marriage would end in divorce.
- 16% of residents in current romantic relationships indicate that they do not plan to marry their current partners because they do not believe in marriage.

On average, concerns about divorce are the second most frequently cited reason for postponing or avoiding marriage to the current partner. Among blacks, it is the most frequently cited reason (43%), with Hispanics (38%) and other ethnic groups (39%) also endorsing it more frequently than whites (27%). Endorsement of this reason is also associated with household income, such that individuals in low-income households and TANF recipients are more likely to cite this reason (42% and 40% respectively) than individuals in high-income households (26%).

In contrast, a lack of belief in marriage is cited less frequently by blacks (10%) and other ethnic groups (11%) than by whites (13%), although it is cited more frequently by Hispanics (38%). Residents of low-income households are more likely to endorse a lack of belief in marriage (17%) than are residents of high-income households (14%), but TANF recipients are least likely to cite this as a reason for avoiding or postponing marriage (10%).

Together, these findings suggest that decisions to postpone or avoid marriage stem more frequently from a fear of divorce than from a lack of interest in marriage. Indeed, a sizable proportion of unmarried individuals appear to respect the institution of marriage so highly that they are unwilling to enter into a marriage that they perceive to be at risk of ending in divorce. This is consistent with prior research on unwed mothers, of whom Edin wrote: "It is not that mothers held marriage in low esteem, but rather the fact that they held it in such high esteem that convinced them to forgo marriage" (Edin, 2000, p. 120). For some, concerns about divorce appear to be based on accurate perceptions of vulnerability, as the subgroups most likely to list this as a concern (blacks, TANF recipients, and residents of low-income households) are indeed the ones at greatest risk of experiencing divorce (Kreider & Fields, 2001).

• Groups at greatest risk of divorce are more likely to cite financial constraints, lack of trust in the partner, and domestic violence as reasons for postponing or avoiding marriage to a current partner.

On average, reasons for not marrying that focus on finances, trust, or violence are endorsed by relatively few people. However, variability in rates of endorsement across subgroups may help to explain differential rates of marriage across subgroups. For example, of the four reasons addressing financial constraints on marriage ("Your partner does not make enough money", "You do not make enough money", "You cannot afford a place to live together", and "Not enough money in savings"), all are endorsed more frequently by non-whites than whites, and all are endorsed more frequently by residents of low-income households and TANF recipients than by residents of high-income households. Non-whites, residents of low-income households, and TANF recipients are also most likely to endorse "Questions about whether your partner is trustworthy", "Drugs or alcohol" and "Domestic violence or abuse".

Together these data suggest that, for the groups most likely to postpone or avoid marriage, the obstacles to marriage are concrete and multifaceted. For many, the decision not to marry appears to be a

response to real challenges, a lack of suitable partners, and even a fear for personal safety. Edin (2000) reported similar themes emerging in her interviews with low-income unwed mothers: concerns about affordability, lack of trust in their partners, and fears of domestic violence were leading reasons why women who valued the institution of marriage believed that they could not reasonably enter into marriage themselves.

B. Expectations for Marriage Among the Unmarried (Table 19)

• The majority of unmarried residents do not believe that their lives would be any better if they were to marry.

Florida residents who indicated that they were in an intimate relationship but had no plans to marry within the next two years were asked several questions about how they believed their lives would change if they married their current partners. Across all of the specific subgroups examined here, more than half expressed the belief that their married lives would likely be the same or worse in terms of financial security, freedom, control over money, sex, children, and overall happiness.

How can we reconcile the observation that most people want and expect to get married with this observation that the majority of people do not believe that a marriage to the current partner would improve their lives? The difference in the average answers to the two sorts of questions suggests that resistance to marriage is a function of doubting the current partner, rather than doubting the value of marriage as an institution. Together these data suggest that, on average, people who are unmarried wish to marry eventually, but they do not wish to marry the partner that is currently available to them.

C. Summary and Discussion

Some have argued that lower rates of marriage stem from a culture that does not sufficiently value marriage. These data do not support such a view. In previous sections of this report, analyses revealed that members of groups with the lowest rates of marriage express the strongest desires for marriage and the most frequent intentions to marry. The data described in this section show that very few unmarried residents in Florida cite a lack of belief in marriage as the reason they remain unmarried. On the contrary, one of the most frequently cited reasons for remaining unmarried is the fear that a marriage to the current partner would end in divorce. Together, the results of this survey suggest that respect for marriage is alive and well, and may be even stronger among the unmarried as among the married.

How then can we understand the fact that, despite positive feelings about the institution of marriage, many people who are in relationships choose to remain unmarried? It appears that those who elect to remain unmarried perceive significant and tangible obstacles that make marriage to a currently available partner undesirable, despite general enthusiasm for marriage as an institution. Many of these obstacles are consistent with those identified by Edin (2000) in her research on attitudes towards marriage in low-income unmarried mothers. For example, the mothers in Edin's study expressed concerns that they could not afford to marry, indicating their belief that a successful marriage required a degree of financial security they did not yet possess. Low-income residents of Florida express similar concerns, citing a lack of savings, inability to afford a shared residence, and simply not making enough money as reasons for avoiding or postponing marriage. The mothers in Edin's study described concerns about respectability, explaining their reluctance to enter a marriage unless they felt sure that it would not end in divorce. Low-income respondents in the current study express similar concerns, and indeed the fear of divorce is one of the leading reasons for postponing or avoiding marriage to the current partner. In Edin's study, mothers felt that they could not trust their partners, and many described serious fears of domestic violence. Similar themes emerge in the reasons cited by low-income residents in the current study, who are more likely than high-income residents to cite questions about the partner's trustworthiness and domestic violence as reasons for postponing or avoiding marriage.

Thus, for members of groups most likely to remain unmarried, postponing or avoiding marriage seems to be a response to a multifaceted set of real challenges and obstacles. In general, unmarried individuals in Florida want to get married, but do not feel that they have the resources to do so, and do not feel that a marriage to the current partner would be the stable, life-long bond that they seek. Policies and programs that reduce these obstacles, or help people to address them, are likely to increase rates of family formation.

VII. Beliefs and Attitudes Regarding Marital and Family Interventions

Programs to support healthy family functioning are unlikely to have an impact unless the intended targets are aware of those programs and choose to participate. To address the acceptability of government-sponsored policies directed at promoting healthy families, participants in the survey were asked about attitudes toward and experiences of premarital education, relationship counseling, and government interventions in general. Responses to these questions are presented in Tables 20 through 22.

A. The Experience of Premarital Education (Table 20)

• 35% of married Florida residents have received relationship preparation prior to marriage.

This proportion is fairly consistent across whites, blacks, and Hispanics, but it does vary according to household income, such that residents of high-income households are more likely to have received premarital preparation (39%) than residents of low-income households (29%). TANF recipients resemble high-income residents in having relatively high rates of premarital preparation (37%). Those in first marriages are more likely to have received premarital preparation (39%) than those who are remarried (26%), a difference that holds true across all of the specific subgroups examined here. For all groups, the vast majority of premarital preparation (95% for first marriages and 87% for remarriages) takes place in religious settings. The average length of premarital preparation is 11 hours, but increases to 17 hours for TANF recipients.

• Among those who have received premarital preparation, 77% believe that it affected the relationship positively or somewhat positively.

Evaluations of premarital preparation vary by ethnicity and household income. With respect to ethnicity, blacks and Hispanics are more likely to say that preparation affected them very positively or somewhat positively (85% in both groups) than are whites (74%). With respect to household income, residents of low-income households and TANF recipients are more likely to say that preparation affected them very positively or somewhat positively (82% and 86% respectively) than are residents of high-income households (74%).

B. <u>Rates and Perceived Impact of Relationship Counseling (Table 21)</u>

• 79% of Florida residents would consider using relationship education to strengthen their own relationships.

This proportion is very consistent across all of the specific subgroups examined here, and highest among TANF recipients (87%).

• 34% of Florida residents have received relationship counseling.

The likelihood of having received relationship counseling varies with ethnicity and household income. With respect to ethnicity, whites are more likely to have received counseling (37%) than are blacks (24%), Hispanics (25%) or other ethnic groups (33%). With respect to income, residents of high - income households are more likely to have received counseling (44%) than are residents of low -income households (25%) or TANF recipients (26%).

• Among those who have received relationship counseling, 76% believe that it affected them positively or somewhat positively.

Enthusiasm for relationship counseling is fairly consistent across the specific subgroups examined here, with the exception of residents of low-income households, who are less likely (70%) to report very positive or somewhat positive effects.

C. Attitudes Towards and Awareness of Marriage and Family Initiatives (Table 22)

• 67% of Florida residents think that the government developing programs to strengthen marriages and reduce divorces is a good or very good idea.

Enthusiasm for government-sponsored marriage initiatives varies by ethnicity and household income. With respect to ethnicity, blacks (77%), Hispanics (90%), and other ethnic groups (65%) are substantially more enthusiastic about government initiatives than are whites (60%). With respect to household income, residents of low-income households and TANF recipients are more enthusiastic about the prospect (77% and 90%, respectively) than are residents of high-income households (61%).

- 15% of Florida residents are aware of current government efforts to strengthen marriages and reduce divorce.
- 12% of Florida residents are aware of the Marriage Preparation and Prevention Act of 1998.
- 70% of Florida residents are aware of efforts by religious and community-based organizations to strengthen marriage and reduce divorce.

In 1998, the Florida State Legislature signed into law the marriage Preparation and Preservation Act, one of the first pieces of legislation in the country to create programs designed explicitly to promote healthy marriages. Five years later, few residents of Florida appear to remember this legislation, and not many more are aware of current efforts on the part of the government to promote and support healthy families. Instead, the majority of Florida residents see promoting marriages and families as an activity that religious and community organizations engage in. These patterns do not differ substantially across any of the specific subgroups examined here. It is worth noting that the activities of many religious and community organizations are in fact sponsored by the government, suggesting that on average Florida residents are familiar with government programs even though they do not recognize them as such.

D. Summary and Discussion

Premarital preparation and relationship counseling are familiar and acceptable ideas to residents of Florida. The vast majority of the state would consider using relationship education to strengthen their own relationships. Over a third of Florida residents have already received some sort of preparation before

they were married, and a third have already had some experience with relationship counseling. Furthermore, over three-quarters of people who have received these interventions are happy with the experience, believing that the interventions improved their relationships. Enthusiasm for these programs is generally high, but it is highest among those groups that are being especially targeted by marriage and family initiatives, i.e., low -income families and recipients of government assistance.

The majority of people also believe it would be a good idea for the government to develop programs that support marriages and help reduce divorce rates. However, most people are not aware of any existing government programs toward this end, even though such programs exist and have been law in the state of Florida for five years. Instead, most Florida residents see support for marriages and families coming from local community and religious organizations, and these are where the great majority of current marriage preparation is taking place.

VIII. Conclusions and Implications

A. Evaluation of Specific Aims

The Florida Family Formation Survey had three specific aims: to describe the diversity of family forms within the state, to describe attitudes towards family issues among Florida residents, and to identify correlates of healthy, satisfying family relationships. Pursuing each of these goals resulted in important insights into the nature of family formation in Florida.

With respect to describing family forms, this survey revealed that marriage and parenthood figure importantly in the lives of the majority of residents of this state. On average, 80% of adults in Florida are or have been married and 60% live either with their own or with a partner's children. Yet, despite this general trend, these data also revealed that rates of marriage, divorce, and parenthood vary widely across different populations within the state. Specifically, family structure is powerfully associated ethnicity and income, such that whites and residents of high-income households are more likely to be living and raising children in married two-parent families, whereas non-whites and residents of low-income households are more likely to be divorced or never married and raising children in single -parent families. Unmarried cohabitation, a phenomenon that receives a great deal of attention in the media, is a relatively uncommon occurrence in Florida. Only 9% of Florida residents are cohabiting, and many of those are engaged to be married. In contrast, blended families, where children from multiple partners are raised in one household, account for 16% of Florida residents, but have received comparatively little attention from researchers or policy-makers.

With respect to describing attitudes towards family issues, this survey revealed that Florida residents from all walks of life believe strongly in the importance of healthy marriage. Although divorce is generally an accepted option when a marriage is no longer fulfilling, stable marriage appears to be an ideal that most aspire to, even if they have been divorced before. Most poignantly, and perhaps surprisingly, attitudes towards marriage are substantially more positive among subgroups in which forming and maintaining healthy marriages has been the most difficult. Low rates of marriage are not associated with a lack of value for marriage. On the contrary, groups with the lowest rates of marriage express the most positive attitudes toward marriage, the most explicit plans to marry themselves, and the least tolerance for premarital sex and cohabitation, suggesting that positive attitudes and values are not sufficient to support and maintain healthy marriages and families. For most Florida residents, valuing marriage is associated with a willingness to participate in programs aimed at strengthening their relationships, and indeed those that have taken advantage of existing programs are pleased with the

experience. There is widespread agreement that government has a role to play in supporting healthy families, although few are aware of any efforts on the part of the government to do so.

With respect to identifying correlates of healthy family relationships, this survey revealed that the presence of a satisfying relationship is associated in important ways with the broader quality of people's lives. Within high-income households, and when partners experience few stressful events and have time to spend together, relationships are relatively more satisfying. Within low -income households, when partners face more difficult events outside of the relationship and spend little time together, relationships are relatively less satisfying. Thus relationships appear to be more satisfying in environments likely to allow and encourage relationship maintenance, and less satisfying in environments that constrain or detract from such activities.

B. Limitations and Strengths of This Survey

Although this survey is an ambitious first step towards understanding families in Florida, several important limitations nevertheless suggest caution in drawing strong conclusions. First, all of the data reported here are cross-sectional, i.e., they were collected at a single moment in time. Such data offer a useful snapshot of families in the state, but they do not address how different variables affect each other or develop over time. Certainly, given an observed association between two variables, some effects are more plausible than others (i.e., it is more likely that financial strain leads to less satisfying relationships than vice versa). Nevertheless, specifying the causes of satisfying or unsatisfying family relationships requires longitudinal follow-up data, so that the relative power of different variables to predict later family outcomes can be observed. Longitudinal data would have the added benefit of allowing policy-makers to evaluate the effects of new programs and interventions by comparing follow -up data to the baseline provided by the data described here.

Second, all of these data were collected through telephone interviews, a widely-used procedure that nevertheless carries several limitations of its own. For example, because respondents in this survey were contacted through random-digit dialing, households without a phone and households relying exclusively on cellular phones were not included in this sample.

Third, whereas the analyses described in this report examined responses to the survey by ethnicity and income, there are many other important ways of looking at these data that might suggest different patterns. Most notably, the trends reported here may differ according to gender and age. Indeed, it seems likely that the challenges and obstacles reported by males and females do differ, and that family relationships have different costs and benefits at different stages of life. These are questions were not addressed in this report, but that could be addressed by future analyses of these data.

Fourth, although this survey asked participants about a wide range of topics, there were many more questions that might have been asked given additional time for each interview. For example, domestic violence, a variable with serious implications for relationship quality and decisions to enter marriage, was assessed by a single item in this interview. A more detailed assessment of this issue might have revealed a richer picture of how the frequency and severity of aggression between partners affects family outcomes. With respect to relationship quality, this survey focused exclusively on the quality of intimate relationships between adults. A complete understanding of families would require an assessment of parent-child and sibling relationships as well.

Despite these limitations, however, several strengths of the current survey enhance confidence in the specific conclusions drawn here. Most notable among these strengths was the sample of respondents. In size, diversity, representativeness, and response rate, the sample analyzed here compares favorably to other national studies of these issues, allowing a detailed description not only of the state as a whole but

of typically underrepresented groups like blacks, Hispanics, and low-income residents. In addition, what the survey lacked in depth it partially made up for in breadth. By examining family structures, relationship quality, and external circumstances together in a representative sample, this survey offers a window into the interactions between the private and public sphere that has rarely been offered in prior research. Finally, the fact that several of the results reported here replicate findings that have been established with national data sets lends credence to those results that have not been examined in prior research.

C. Implications For Policy And Intervention

The complex results described here suggest no straightforward or simple ways of promoting healthy families and fulfilling relationships. Yet they do have clear implications for the general directions that effective family initiatives may take.

First, no single approach to supporting healthy families is likely to be effective for all families. Many of the challenges faced by the most vulnerable segments of the population are virtually unseen in the less vulnerable segments. Thus, even though all segments of the state cite communication and money as areas of difficulty in their relationships, the content of those issues may differ substantially between low-income and high-income families, and so may require different kinds of coping. Conflict over how to spend money, for example, is different from conflict over not having enough money. Conflict that involves physical aggression has different implications from conflict that does not. Although parenting figures into the lives of 60% of all residents, parenting issues in blended families may be categorically different from the issues faced by families in which all children are biological offspring of the same couple. Programs and policies that target families will have to take the unique needs of different kinds of families into account.

Second, programs that merely promote the value of marriage and stable families are unlikely to change behaviors. A theme that emerges again and again in these results is that those segments of the population at greatest risk of remaining unmarried and having children before marriage are also those in which attitudes towards marriage are the most positive and disapproval of premarital sex is highest. Thus, the segments of the population who would be primary targets of efforts to promote marriage and reduce unmarried birth already espouse values and attitudes that are highly consistent with those goals. In light of these results, it is difficult to justify allotting further resources towards activities solely directed at communicating pro-marriage values. Rather, those resources might more effectively be devoted toward helping individuals overcome the obstacles that may prevent them from acting in accordance with the values they already possess.

Third, relationship preparation, education, and counseling must take the circumstances of people's lives into account. The results described here suggest that the quality of a relationship is connected to the broader quality of people's lives. When those lives contain multiple sources of stress and few sources of support, then it may be more difficult for couples to engage in the activities of relationship maintenance. Programs that focus solely on relationship maintenance skills like communication and problem-solving may not be effective for those segments of the population that lack the time and energy to practice those skills. For those segments of the population, supporting families will require programs and policies that target processes within the family <u>and</u> the environments in which those processes unfold.

Fourth, any programs and policies that improve the general quality of people's lives are likely to improve the quality of their marital and family relationships as well. A theme throughout the results reported here, and one that emerges across other national studies of family issues, is that the health of families is closely tied to the health of the economy. Whereas the challenges that families face are often perceived as personal and private, many of their sources may lie in the public sphere. Thus, it may be possible to develop programs and policies that significantly improve the lives of families even though they do not target families directly, simply by promoting a better quality of life for all.

Fifth, avenues for implementing programs directed at supporting families and relationships already exist in the form of religious and community organizations. Most Florida residents would take advantage of programs that might strengthen their own relationships, and a significant majority believes that government should take an active role in developing such programs. Currently, most people's experiences with programs directed at promoting healthy relationships are through local community and religious organizations. These organizations therefore represent an existing means through which new programs and policies might be implemented. Taking advantage of these organizations would facilitate developing policies to be tailored to the specific needs of communities, and would make new policies more likely to reach their target populations by presenting them through institutions that families have already been looking to for support.

D. Conclusion

Every day, individuals struggle to form and maintain family relationships in the face of challenges large and small. The fact that many families thrive despite these challenges demonstrates the enduring value that Florida residents place in their marital and family relationships. Nevertheless, many families fail to thrive despite their best efforts and intentions. In a world of unlimited time and resources, serving the needs of such families would not require this survey. A society interested in supporting and strengthening families could afford to pursue every possible intervention, and then wait and observe which ones worked. In the real world, however, time and resources are severely limited. When funding particular programs means not funding others, then policy makers have a responsibility to base their decisions as much as possible on an accurate understanding of the scope of the problem and the most likely avenues for effective intervention. It is to the credit of Governor Jeb Bush and Secretary Jerry Regier of the Florida Department of Children and Families that this survey was commissioned, so that future initiatives to support and strengthen families might rest on a solid foundation of data on families in different segments of the population. The result may be programs and policies that are more informed, more responsive, and hopefully more effective in helping individuals to fulfill the promise of healthy families.

IX. References

- Abrahamse, A. F., Morrison, P. A., & Waite, L. J. (1988). Teenagers willing to consider single parenthood: Who is at greatest risk? *Family Planning Perspectives*, 20, 13-18.
- Amato, P. R., & Keith, B. (1991). Parental divorce and adult well-being: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53, 43-58.
- Beach, S. R. H. (2001). *Marital and family processes in depression: A scientific foundation for practice*. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.
- Bjorksten, O., & Stewart, T. J. (1984). Contemporary trends in American marriage. In C. C. Nadelson & D. C. Polonsky (Eds.), *Marriage and divorce: A contemporary perspective* (pp. 3-59). New York: Guilford.
- Booth, A., & Amato, P. R. (2001). Parental predivorce relationships and offspring postdivorce well-being. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 63, 197-212.
- Bramlett, M. D., & Mosher, W. D. (2001). *First marriage dissolution, divorce, and remarriage: United States* (Advance data from vital and health statistics No. no. 323). Hyattsville, Maryland: National Center for Health Statistics.
- Bramlett, M. D., & Mosher, W. D. (2002). *Cohabitation, marriage, divorce, and remarriage in the United States* (Vital and Health Statistics No. Series 23, Number 22). Hyattsville, Maryland: National Center for Health Statistics.
- Brown, S. L., & Booth, A. (1996). Cohabitation versus marriage: A comparison of relationship quality. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 58,* 668-678.
- Castro-Martin, T., & Bumpass, L. (1989). Recent trends in marital disruption. Demography, 26, 37-51.
- Cherlin, A. J. (1992). Marriage, divorce, remarriage (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Darden, E. C., & Zimmerman, T. S. (1992). Blended families: A decade review, 1979 to 1990. *Family Therapy*, 19, 25-31.
- Edin, K. (2000). What do low-income single mothers say about marriage? Social Problems, 47(1), 112-133.
- Gibson, C., Edin, K., & McLanahan, S. (2003). *High hopes but even higher expectations: The retreat from marriage among low-income couples* (No. Workling Paper #03-06-FF). Princeton, NJ: Center for Research on Child Well-Being.
- Glenn, N. D., & Weaver, C. N. (1981). The contribution of marital happiness to global happiness. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43, 61-68.
- Grych, J. H., & Fincham, F. D. (1990). Marital conflict and children's adjustment: A cognitive-contextual framework. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 267-290.
- Heymann, S. J. (2000). *The widening gap: Why America's working families are in jeopardy and what can be done about it.* New York: Basic Books.
- Heymann, S. J., Boynton-Jarrett, R., Carter, P., Bond, J., & Galinsky, E. (2002). Work-family issues and low-income families. Retrieved June 1, 2003, 2003, from http://www.lowincomeworkingfamilies.org/
- Heymann, S. J., & Earle, A. (1999). The impact of welf are reform on parents' ability to care for their children's health. *American Journal of Public Health*, 89(4), 502-505.
- Hill, M. A. (1988). Marital stability and spouses' shared time. Journal of Family Issues, 9, 427-451.
- House, J. S., Landis, K. R., & Umberson, D. (1988). Social relationships and health. Science, 241(4865), 540-545.
- Johnson, M. P. (1995). Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: Two forms of violence against women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 57, 283-294.
- Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., & Newton, T. L. (2001). Marriage and health: His and hers. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(4), 472-503.
- Kreider, R. M., & Fields, J. M. (2001). Number, timing, and duration of marriages and divorces: Fall 1996. In *Current Population Reports* (pp. 70-80). Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Martin, J. A., Hamilton, B. E., Ventura, S. J., Menacker, F., & Park, M. M. (2002). Births: Final Data for 2000. In *National Vital Statistics Reports* (Vol. 50, No. 5). Hyattsville, Maryland: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics.
- McLanahan, S., Garfinkel, I., Reichman, N., Teitler, J., Carlson, M., & Audigier, C. N. (2003). *The Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study: Baseline National Report (Revised)*. Princeton, NJ: Center for Research on Child Wellbeing.
- Musick, K. A. (2002). Planned and unplanned childbearing among unmarried women. *Journal of Marriage & Family*, 64(4), 915-929.

- Popenoe, D., & Whitehead, B. D. (1999). Should we live together? What young adults need to know about cohabitaiton before marriage: A comprehensive review of recent research. New Brunswick, New Jersey: The National Marriage Project, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.
- Presser, H. B. (1995). Job, family, and gender: Determinants of nonstandard work schedules among employed Americans in 1991. *Demography*, *32*, 577-598.
- Presser, H. B., & Cain, V. S. (1983). Shift work among dual-earner couples with children. *Science*, 219(4586), 876-879.
- Rogge, R., & Bradbury, T. N. (1999). Till violence does us part: The differing roles of communication and aggression in predicting adverse marital outcomes. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67, 340-351.
- Seltzer, J. A. (2000). Families formed outside of marriage. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62, 1247-1268.
- Singh, G. K., Matthews, T. J., Clarke, S. C., Yannicos, T., & Smith, B. L. (1995). Annual summary of births, marriages, divorces, and deaths: United States, 1994 (Monthly Vital Statistics Report No. Vol. 43, No. 13). Atlanta, GA: National Center for Health Statistics.
- Sullivan, K. T. (2001). Understanding the relationship between religiosity and marriage: An investigation of the immediate and longitudinal effects of religiosity on newlywed couples. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 15(4), 610-626.
- Tesser, A., & Beach, S. R. H. (1998). Life events, relationship quality, and depression: An investigation of judgment discontinuity in vivo. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 36-52.
- The American Association for Public Opinion Research. (2000). *Standard definitions: Final dispositions of case codes and outcome rates for surveys*. Lenexa, Kansas: AAPOR.
- Trent, K., & Crowder, K. (1997). Adolescent birth intentions, social disadvantage and behavioral outcomes. *Journal* of Marriage & the Family, 59(3), 523-535.
- Veroff, J., Kulka, R. A., & Douvan, E. (1981). *Mental health in America: Patterns of helpseeking from 1957 to 1976.* New York: Basic.
- Waltz, M., Badura, B., Pfaff, H., & Schott, T. (1988). Marriage and the psychological consequences of a heart attack: A longitudinal study of adaptation to chronic illness after 3 years. *Social Science and Medicine*, 27, 149-158.
- Young, M., Denny, G., Luquis, R., & Young, T. (1998). Correlates of sexual satisfaction in marriage. *Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, 7(2), 115-127.

X. Main Tables

Table 1: Current Relationship Status

			Geographic Region						Race	Ethnicity		Inco	ome Le	vel	
		Totals	Tampa	Orlando	Miami	JAX	Other	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	High	Middle	Low	TANF
Married	(%)	52.9	57.5	62.8	49.7	64.7	52.7	56.1	36.7	56.2	49.2	67.5	53.4	36.3	23.5
First		36.4	37.0	40.8	37.1	44.3	35.9	36.5	26.6	46.1	31.7	45.8	38.3	25.4	15.6
Remarriage		16.5	20.5	22.0	12.5	20.4	16.8	19.6	10.1	10.1	17.4	21.7	15.2	10.9	8.0
Divorced/Separated	(%)	18.3	19.9	15.8	21.8	14.4	18.0	18.6	17.1	18.3	16.7	14.2	18.6	24.5	31.3
No Relationshi p		12.1	11.4	10.3	16.0	10.0	11.7	12.0	11.6	13.3	10.1	7.4	11.2	18.4	22.9
Relationship															
Engaged		1.7	2.7	1.9	1.8	0.7	1.7	1.7	1.6	2.0	1.1	1.9	3.0	0.9	3.0
Not Engaged		4.5	5.8	3.7	3.9	3.7	4.6	4.9	3.9	3.0	5.4	5.0	4.4	5.2	5.4
Never Married	(%)	20.0	11.7	15.0	23.1	15.6	20.0	15.4	36.8	21.6	28.0	14.5	21.1	27.0	41.6
No Relationship		3.8	3.6	7.6	10.4	7.9	8.7	6.8	15.8	10.1	10.7	5.2	9.8	12.2	20.6
Relationship															
Engaged		2.9	2.4	2.8	3.8	2.3	2.9	1.9	6.9	2.8	5.6	1.6	3.3	4.9	5.4
Not Engaged		8.3	5.7	4.6	9.0	5.4	8.4	6.7	14.1	8.7	11.7	7.7	8.0	9.9	15.7
Widowed	(%)	8.8	10.9	6.5	5.4	5.3	9.3	10.0	9.5	4.0	6.2	3.7	6.9	12.2	3.6
No Relationship		7.7	9.7	5.3	4.6	4.9	8.2	8.8	8.3	3.8	5.7	3.1	5.6	11.1	2.5
Relationship															
Engaged		0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.4
Not Engaged		1.0	1.3	1.2	0.7	0.3	1.1	1.2	1.1	0.2	. 0.5	0.6	1.3	1.0	0.7

Table 2: Marital Statistics

			G	eograp	nic Re	egior	۱		Race	Ethnicity	'	Inco	ome Le	evel	
		Totals	Tampa	Orlando	Miami	JAX	Other	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	High	Middle	Low	TANF
First Marriage	(%)	68.8	64.4	65.0	74.8	68.5	68.2	65.0	72.5	82.1	64.5	67.8	71.6	70.0	66.1
Age at marriage	(mean in years)	23.9	23.0	23.5	24.7	23.8	3 23.8	23.6	24.9	24.1	25.3	24.6	23.3	3 23.7	22.3
Length of marriage	(mean in years)	21.8	26.5	25.7	20.0) 21.2	21.9	24.5	16.6	16.9	15.7	20.5	21.5	5 19.8	12.2
Length of relationship before marriage	(mean in years)	2.0	2.0	1.8	1.8	3 2.0) 2.0	1.9	3.0	1.8	2.0	2.3	1.9	9 1.9	2.3
Remarriage	(%)	31.2	35.6	35.0	25.3	31.5	31.8	35.0	27.5	17.9	35.5	32.2	28.4	30.0	33.9
Age at marriage	(mean in years)	36.8	37.8	37.1	34.8	36.7	37.0	37.6	34.0	33.7	33.4	36.6	36.2	2 37.5	30.2
Length of marriage	(mean in years)	13.9	13.2	12.3	14.3	3 13.1	14.0	14.3	14.3	11.6	11.4	13.2	12.7	y 14.1	9.3
Length of relationship before marriage	(mean in years)	1.7	2.6	2.0	2.3	3 2.0) 1.6	1.6	2.5	1.6	1.2	1.6	1.3	3 2.3	1.9

Means in this table summarize data from married respondents in the Florida resident and TANF samples.

Table 3: Cohabitation

			G	eograph	ic Re	gion			Race	Ethnicity	,	Inco	ome Level	1
		Totals	Tampa	Orlando	Miami	JAX	Other	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	High	Middle Low	TANF
Do you currently live with your spouse/partner?	(% yes)	85.3	86.7	90.9	82.7	90.5	85.4	89.0	69.1	85.1	82.3	90.5	83.8 78.1	1 63.8
Percent of those living together who are:														
Cohabiting (currently unmarried)		14.4	13.3	11.5	14.9	8.5	14.6	13.9	20.8	11.4	17.5	12.3	13.9 22.7	7 35.1
Engaged		5.1	6.0	5.2	4.2	3.4	5.2	4.6	9.0	4.3	5.4	3.8	6.8 7.4	4 16.1
Not engaged		9.3	7.4	6.3	10.7	5.1	9.4	9.3	11.8	7.1	12.1	8.5	7.1 15.	3 19.0
Married, cohabited first		34.1	37.4	35.7	32.6	34.7	34.1	33.7	37.9	32.5	37.1	36.6	30.8 35.8	3 41.2
Before engagement		19.7	23.1	20.3	16.6	18.4	20.0	20.8	19.7	14.4	23.4	24.0	14.5 20.1	1 17.5
After engagement		14.4	14.4	15.5	16.0	16.3	14.1	12.9	18.2	18.1	13.8	12.6	16.3 15.0	6 23.8
Married, did not cohabit first		51.5	49.2	52.8	52.5	56.8	51.3	52.4	41.3	56.1	45.4	51.1	55.4 41.6	6 23.7

This table includes data from all respondents in the Florida resident and TANF samples who are married or engaged in a current intimate relationship.

Table 4: Parenthood

			0	Geograp	hic Re	gion			Race	Ethnicity		Inco	ome Le	vel	
		Totals	Tampa	Orlando	Miami	JAX	Other	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	High	Middle	Low	TANF
Rate of Parenthood	(%)	76.3	82.0	81.8	72.0	78.7	76.6	76.5	77.6	76.4	69.3	73.1	76.4	79.0	97.0
Percent of parents who are:	(%)														
Married		61.9	61.4	70.7	59.8	73.2	61.7	64.9	44.0	67.0	59.5	78.3	63.9	43.0	23.8
Divorced/Separated		19.8	21.6	16.4	23.6	15.3	19.5	19.2	20.2	20.6	22.4	14.7	20.8	27.1	32.3
Never Married		7.6	5.4	5.2	10.0	4.8	7.4	3.7	23.7	8.1	10.8	2.7	7.6	14.8	40.2
Widowed		10.7	11.6	7.7	6.6	6.8	11.4	12.2	12.1	4.4	7.3	4.4	7.8	15.1	3.7
Number of own children	(mean)	2.0	2.3	2.2	1.8	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.3	1.9	1.9	1.6	2.0	2.3	2.8
Number of different partners with	whom had children (mean)	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.5	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.4	1.5
Age when first child was born	(mean)	24.1	23.4	24.0	25.0	24.8	24.0	24.5	22.2	24.2	24.6	25.8	23.9	22.7	20.9

Means in this table summarize data from all parents in the Florida resident and TANF samples.

Table 5: Household Arrangements

			G	Geograp	hic Re	gion			Race	Ethnicity		Inc	ome Le	evel	
		Totals	Tampa	Orlando	Miami	JAX	Other	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	High	Middle	Low	TANF
Number of other people in house	(mean)	1.6	1.5	1.6	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.4	1.9	2.2	2.0	1.3	1.8	2.0	2.7
Rate of married couple households	(%)	53.0	57.5	62.9	50.0	64.3	52.8	56.1	37.1	56.2	49.1	67.5	53.5	36.1	23.6
Without children		6.8	8.3	7.1	7.9	8.1	6.6	7.0	3.8	8.5	8.5	11.4	5.2	3.9	1.7
Children from current relationship only		27.5	27.3	33.5	26.4	37.3	27.2	29.9	15.1	30.3	21.2	35.5	29.0	16.4	11.1
Children from own prior relationship(s) only		1.6	4.0	2.4	0.6	3.8	1.7	2.0	0.6	1.1	2.0	2.9	1.1	1.0	0.9
Children from partner's prior relationship(s) only		1.3	2.1	2.0	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.3	0.9	1.8	0.0	0.9	1.0	1.5	0.0
Children from both partners' prior relationship(s)	only	5.8	4.8	5.9	2.7	4.8	6.3	7.3	3.1	1.9	9.5	6.5	6.3	3.9	1.3
Children from both prior and current relationships	5	9.9	10.9	12.0	10.9	8.9	9.7	8.6	13.7	12.6	8.0	10.4	10.9	9.4	8.6
Rate of cohabiting couple households	(%)	8.9	9.3	8.0	8.4	6.0	9.0	9.0	9.6	7.1	10.8	9.5	8.6	10.5	12.3
Without children		4.1	3.6	2.5	3.9	3.0	4.2	4.4	3.1	3.6	3.5	6.0	3.9	3.5	1.2
Children from current relationship only		0.7	0.5	1.7	1.2	1.0	0.7	0.5	0.5	1.3	3.5	0.5	0.6	i 1.5	2.4
Children from own prior relationship(s) only		0.7	1.0	0.9	0.4	0.2	0.8	0.9	0.5	0.4	1.3	1.3	0.1	0.9	1.2
Children from partner's prior relationship(s) only		0.5	1.3	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.7	0.0
Children from both partners' prior relationship(s)	only	1.6	0.8	1.6	5 1.5	1.1	1.7	1.7	2.5	0.8	1.3	1.2	2.6	i 1.4	1.6
Children from both prior and current relationships	5	1.2	2.0	0.8	1.0	0.2	1.2	1.0	2.5	0.6	0.6	0.3	1.1	2.4	6.0
Rate of single adult households	(%)	38.2	33.3	29.1	41.6	29.7	38.2	34.9	53.3	36.7	40.1	23.0	38.0	53.5	64.1
Without children		28.6	25.7	23.4	31.0	22.6	28.7	28.5	32.4	25.0	28.4	19.3	29.2	34.1	14.2
With children		9.5	7.6	5.7	10.7	7.1	9.6	6.5	20.9	11.7	11.8	3.7	8.8	19.4	49.9
Number of children under the age of 18	in household (mean)	0.9	0.7	0.9	0.8	1.0	0.9	0.7	1.2	1.1	0.9	0.6	1.0	1.2	2.1
Age of youngest child	(mean)	10.0	11.6	9.9	10.9	9.4	9.8	10.6	8.6	9.4	11.0	10.4	9.6	9.4	6.3
Rate of people living with own parents o	or partner's parents (%)	9.0	4.7	7.9	17.0	8.3	8.1	5.7	16.0	14.8	16.4	4.1	8.9	12.9	24.7

Table 6: Attitudes Towards Marriage

Totals	Tampa	Orlando	Miami	JAX									
				JAA	Other	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	High	Middle	Low	TANF
51.5	52.3	55.2	47.8	59.0	51.7	54.2	45.6	46.3	53.3	56.4	55.6	44.3	38.9
41.0	41.6	38.5	46.2	35.1	40.5	37.9	47.2	47.6	34.6	37.4	36.5	46.7	48.2
3.6	2.3	2.5	2.3	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.4	2.4	6.0	2.8	3.5	4.6	7.1
3.7	3.6	3.5	3.2	2.2	3.8	3.8	3.2	3.4	5.8	3.0	4.1	4.0	5.7
0.4	0.1	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.1
2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9
1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9
1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8
1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.9	1.8	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.8	1.8
1.6	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.6
1.5	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.6
1.4	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.2
1.2	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.0	1.2	1.1	1.4	1.4	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.5
0.6	0.6	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.4
		les data from e	erv respond	lent in th	e Florida res	ident and TA	NF sample	s.					
	3.6 3.7 0.4 2.0 2.0 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.8 1.7 1.6 1.5 1.4 1.2 0.6	41.0 41.6 3.6 2.3 3.7 3.6 0.4 0.1 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.9 1.6 1.7 1.6 1.7 1.5 1.5 1.4 1.4 1.2 1.0 0.6 0.6	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	41.0 41.6 38.5 46.2 35.1 40.5 37.9 47.2 47.6 34.6 3.6 2.3 2.5 2.3 3.5 3.8 3.8 3.4 2.4 6.0 3.7 3.6 3.5 3.2 2.2 3.8 3.8 3.2 3.4 5.6 0.4 0.1 0.4 0.5 0.2 0.3 0.3 0.6 0.3 0.5 2.0 1.6	41.0 41.6 38.5 46.2 35.1 40.5 37.9 47.2 47.6 34.6 37.4 3.6 2.3 2.5 2.3 3.5 3.8 3.8 3.4 2.4 6.6 2.8 3.7 3.6 3.5 3.2 2.2 3.8 3.8 3.2 3.4 5.6 3.0 0.4 0.1 0.4 0.5 0.2 0.3 0.3 0.6 0.3 0.5 0.4 2.0	41.0 41.6 38.5 46.2 35.1 40.5 37.9 47.2 47.6 34.6 37.4 38.5 3.6 2.3 2.5 2.3 3.5 3.8 3.8 3.4 2.4 6.6 2.8 3.5 3.7 3.6 3.5 3.2 2.2 3.8 3.8 3.2 3.4 5.6 3.0 4.4 0.4 0.1 0.4 0.5 0.2 0.3 0.3 0.6 0.3 0.5 0.4 0.5 2.0	41.0 41.6 38.5 46.2 35.1 40.5 37.9 47.2 47.6 34.6 37.4 36.5 46.7 3.6 2.3 2.5 2.3 3.5 3.8 3.8 3.4 2.4 6.0 2.8 3.6 4.6 3.7 3.6 3.5 3.2 2.2 3.8 3.8 3.2 3.4 5.6 3.0 4.1 4.0 0.4 0.1 0.4 0.5 0.2 0.3 0.3 0.6 0.3 0.5 0.4 0.2 0.4 2.0				

0 = not important

1 = somewhat important

2 = very important

Table 7: Intentions to Marry

			Geographic Region						Race	Ethnicity		Inco	ome Le	vel	
		Totals	Tampa	Orlando	Miami	JAX	Other	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	High	Middle	Low	TANF
Would you like to be married so	omeday? (% yes)	65.2	75.1	65.5	65.0	77.4	64.8	55.5	84.2	81.5	93.6	61.3	62.5	72.0	84.76
Never married	(% yes)	78.0	77.1	77.7	73.8	85.0	78.4	69.6	94.5	84.8	100.0	63.1	76.1	90.0	98.7
Previously married	(% yes)	47.8	77.2	53.5	56.0	65.8	45.5	39.7	64.7	74.6	84.2	59.4	42.2	45.2	56.2
What do you think the chances current partner?	are that you will ever marry your (%)														
No chance		28.3	24.2	18.1	21.0	18.3	29.7	35.1	17.5	16.1	25.3	30.4	28.2	25.8	12.7
A little chance		12.3	9.5	14.0	19.6	13.1	11.4	9.7	12.9	22.7	13.4	13.7	9.2	15.9	7.2
A 50-50 chance		18.9	29.0	21.3	19.6	12.1	18.7	19.1	20.0	16.1	19.6	19.1	19.9	16.8	31.3
A pretty good chance		17.1	11.6	17.2	18.8	24.9	16.8	14.9	25.0	16.4	15.8	13.4	16.6	19.7	19.3
An almost certain chance		23.4	25.8	29.4	21.0	31.7	23.4	21.1	24.6	28.7	26.0	23.4	26.1	21.9	29.4
Do you and your partner have p two years?	plans to marry within the next (% yes)	39.4	36.2	51.6	44.6	45.5	38.4	33.3	52.1	47.1	29.0	35.3	42.1	41.3	55.2
Living together	(% yes)	46.1	49.3	54.8	46.7	57.8	45.7	41.0	66.8	48.2	36.0	41.0	56.7	45.6	67.9
Not living together	(% yes)	33.2	23.5	47.0	43.0	34.0	31.9	24.1	44.4	46.2	23.7	27.6	31.0	37.6	46.9
What do you think the chances someone?	are that you will ever marry (%)														
No chance		15.4	15.8	8.9) 10.5	6.7	16.4	19.0	7.9	11.6	8.3	14.9	13.7	15.4	7.2
A little chance		11.3	5.6	11.6	12.8	14.7	11.2	13.8	7.8	11.3	0.0	12.7	9.5	12.6	7.2
A 50-50 chance		16.6	18.3	11.7	16.9	6.3	16.8	15.4	18.0	18.1	16.2	16.9	19.0	15.3	21.9
A pretty good chance		21.6	24.6	30.4	26.5	15.4	20.9	17.9	30.6	22.8	31.7	18.5	27.7	19.1	25.5
An almost certain chance		35.1	35.7	37.3	33.4	56.9	34.8	34.0	35.7	36.3	43.7	37.0	30.1	37.7	38.3

Table 8: Attitudes Towards Divorce

		6	Geograp	nic Re	gion			Race	Ethnicity	,	Inco	ome Lev	/el	
	Totals	Tampa	Orlando	Miami	JAX	Other	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	High	Middle	Low	TANF
When there are children in the family, parents should stay married even if they no longer love each other. (%)														
strongly agree	3.3	3.4	3.3	4.9	4.4	3.1	3.2	4.6	3.0) 3.1	2.9	3.5	2.8	1.7
agree	14.8	13.0	14.2	13.8	15.2	14.9	15.1	15.3	12.5	16.2	13.8	16.9	15.2	9.9
no opinion	8.6	8.3	12.7	7.3	9.4	8.7	8.9	5.6	9.8	9.7	7.0	8.5	8.2	5.5
disagree	51.9	54.4	51.4	53.0	51.0	51.7	49.8	56.0	58.5	46.9	50.0	51.2	55.1	55.5
strongly disagree	21.4	21.0	18.4	20.9	20.0	21.6	23.0	18.6	16.3	24.0	26.3	19.9	18.7	27.4
Divorce can be a reasonable solution to an unhappy marriage. (%)														
strongly agree	10.7	6.2	9.3	13.5	10.0	10.5	10.3	10.0	12.1	12.7	13.9	8.4	9.5	13.4
agree	62.3	65.5	61.1	61.5	60.3	62.9	63.8	56.6	64.2	60.8	62.6	62.7	62.5	56.8
no opinion	7.4	7.4	7.7	6.7	8.7	7.4	7.1	9.7	7.1	5.3	5.8	7.1	10.7	7.9
disagree	16.2	17.8	19.3	16.4	17.1	16.0	15.7	19.9	14.8	17.0	14.4	18.7	14.9	18.4
strongly disagree	3.1	3.2	2.6	1.9	3.9	3.2	3.2	3.8	1.8	4.2	3.4	3.1	2.4	3.5
When parents are arguing a lot, it is better for the children if they divorce. (%)														
strongly agree	7.3	4.4	4.4	9.0	5.1	7.2	7.1	5.7	9.4	۶.۶ ا	8.9	5.6	7.5	10.3
agree	33.3	32.9	33.3	40.3	27.1	32.6	32.7	24.6	43.5	36.5	31.5	33.1	36.5	40.4
no opinion	14.9	15.1	14.9	11.3	16.0	15.3	16.4	11.8	11.2	15.0	15.9	11.6	15.4	12.7
disagree	40.8	45.1	44.1	35.2	44.5	41.2	40.0	53.7	32.9	39.3	40.3	45.2	37.5	32.8
strongly disagree	3.8	2.4	3.4	4.2	7.2	3.6	3.8	4.2	3.1	3.4	3.4	4.5	3.2	3.8
When a husband and w ife divorce, it reflects badly on them as people. (%)														
strongly agree	2.2	0.6	1.2	2.6	3.7	2.2	1.6	2.9	3.8	3.1	1.0	2.0	3.3	2.9
agree	13.7	12.0	15.0	17.6	9.6	13.3	11.7	14.2	22.4	9.3	9.2	12.6	18.7	12.7
no opinion	6.7	6.6	6.5	8.3	5.4	6.6	5.2	9.1	10.6	9.7	4.8	5.0	10.2	7.5
disagree	57.5	64.8	60.5	53.8	60.0	57.7	59.3	57.3	52.9	46.3	57.5	63.5	51.9	60.0
strongly disagree	19.9	16.1	16.9	17.8	21.3	20.2	22.3	16.5	10.5	31.7	27.6	17.0	15.9	16.9

Table 9: Attitudes Towards Prior Relationships That Ended

				Geograp	nic Reg	gion			Race	Ethnicity		Inc	ome Le	vel	
		Totals	Tampa	Orlando	Miami	JAX	Other	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	High	Middle	Low	TANF
Do you wish you had worked h relationsip?	arder to save your last (% yes)	21.3	19.9	17.0	28.7	21.9	20.4	19.7	25.2	26.8	16.5	20.5	21.2	25.1	25.6
Divorced	(% yes)	18.1	24.6		31.2		16.5	18.0	12.7	23.8		18.8	18.8		35.5
Never divorced	(% yes) (% yes)	22.2	17.8		28.2		21.6	20.2	27.1	23.0		21.1	21.9		24.0
Do you wich that your partner	had w orked harder to save the														
relationship?	(% yes)	51.4	50.8	50.5	55.7	51.4	50.8	49.0	61.9	51.0	62.4	45.2	55.4	56.0	77.4
Divorced	(% yes)	55.8	56.6	66.5	51.3	61.4	55.8	55.4	55.8	52.4	72.0	53.3	60.3	53.8	76.0
Never divorced	(% yes)	50.1	48.2	44.7	56.6	48.0	49.4	46.9	62.8	50.7	59.2	42.5	54.1	56.4	77.6
How do you feel about the fact (%)	that this relationship ended?														
Divorced	(%)														
Regret - I wish it had not ended	I	10.5	15.5	6.7	21.3	12.7	9.4	10.4	5.6	11.3	25.6	11.3	6.0	16.3	25.8
Neutral - No feelings one way o	r the other	27.4	22.6	19.3	28.5	18.8	27.9	27.8	17.0	37.4	14.4	24.8	29.5	30.7	9.9
Glad - I am happy the relationsh	nip is over	62.1	61.9	73.9	50.2	68.5	62.7	61.7	77.4	51.3	60.0	63.9	64.5	53.1	64.3
Never divorced	(%)														
Regret - I wish it had not ended	1	16.5	13.5	14.5	18.8	13.6	16.3	15.3	18.4	18.0	26.9	13.4	17.5	19.7	20.8
Neutral - No feelings one way o	r the other	35.8	34.1	33.6	37.0	33.5	35.8	35.2	38.9	36.9	29.6	40.5	33.6	34.8	30.6
Glad - I am happy the relationsh	nip is over	47.7	52.4	51.9	44.2	52.9	47.9	49.5	42.7	45.0	43.5	46.1	48.9	45.5	48.6
Do you wish that it had been n standpoint-to get a divorce?	nore difficult-from a legal (% yes)	13.5	19.2	8.5	82	15.2	13.8	15.3	2.8	7.2	17.5	15.0	12 2	16.6	22.5

This table includes data from every respondent in the Florida resident and TANF samples that reported experiencing a romantic relationship that ended.

Table 10: Attitudes Towards Premarital Cohabitation and Premarital Sex

			Geograp	hic Reg	ion			Race	Ethnicity		Inc	ome Lev	/el	
	Totals	Tampa	Orlando	Miami	JAX	Other	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	High	Middle	Low	TANF
It is okay for couples who are not married to live together. (%)														
strongly agree	6.1	5.5	4.2	7.4	4.4	6.0	6.5	3.9	5.4	10.4	8.9	5.0	4.8	3.6
agree	46.4	46.4	41.6	50.9	42.8	46.0	47.3	36.4	51.6	44.1	52.6	44.5	45.1	49.4
no opinion	11.1	10.4	11.6	10.7	12.9	11.1	10.5	12.1	13.1	9.2	9.7	10.5	12.0	15.6
disagree	26.4	28.2	29.3	25.9	25.9	26.4	24.5	36.3	25.9	23.3	21.1	27.2	29.6	25.3
strongly disagree	10.1	9.6	13.3	5.1	14.0	10.6	11.3	11.3	4.1	13.0	7.7	12.8	8.6	6.2
Couples should wait to have sex until they are married. (%)														
strongly agree	13.8	11.5	16.5	8.7	19.7	14.3	14.2	17.2	8.9	14.1	11.6	16.7	13.5	11.5
agree	33.1	34.4	35.3	26.2	32.1	34.0	30.6	42.6	36.0	30.0	23.0	34.4	40.9	42.9
no opinion	15.6	15.4	16.5	16.0	16.9	15.5	15.8	14.6	14.1	23.6	16.2	13.3	14.8	17.4
disagree	31.3	33.8	28.4	40.1	28.7	30.2	32.2	21.9	36.6	25.1	39.9	30.5	26.6	26.2
strongly disagree	6.2	4.9	3.3	9.1	2.6	6.0	7.2	3.8	4.5	7.2	9.3	5.1	4.4	1.9
When a couple is committed to each other, it makes no difference whether they are married or just living together. (%)														
strongly agree	8.0	5.8	4.0	12.8	5.9	7.5	7.9	7.7	7.1	13.6	10.5	5.7	7.2	8.5
agree	39.4	40.8	36.2	41.9	33.0	39.3	38.3	35.5	47.6	34.9	40.3	38.7	42.6	46.1
no opinion	9.0	9.2	10.7	8.2	9.8	9.0	8.4	7.9	10.0	18.4	6.7	8.3	11.3	10.7
disagree	33.4	36.8	37.4	32.9	37.1	33.2	33.0	40.1	31.3	25.4	31.3	35.0	31.8	28.3
strongly disagree	10.3	7.5	11.8	4.2	14.2	11.0	12.3	8.8	4.0	7.7	11.1	12.4	7.1	6.4

Table 11: Attitudes Towards Unmarried Parenthood

			Geograpl	hic Reg	lion			Race	Ethnicity		Inc	ome Lev	vel	
	Totals	Tampa	Orlando	Miami	JAX	Other	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	High	Middle	Low	TANF
Children do better when their parents are married. (%)														
strongly agree	43.7	42.4	48.7	38.5	54.9	44.0	47.3	31.4	41.8	37.3	46.4	47.3	36.5	29.8
agree	36.4	39.5	34.0	40.5	32.3	36.0	34.3	38.1	42.3	44.2	33.9	33.8	42.6	37.5
no opinion	7.7	6.8	7.5	7.3	6.4	7.8	7.3	11.7	5.7	4.8	7.3	5.2	2 8.9	7.9
disagree	10.8	10.3	8.6	11.7	5.9	10.8	9.8	16.4	9.5	5 11.4	11.4	11.7	10.7	22.3
strongly disagree	1.4	1.0	1.2	1.9	0.6	1.4	1.4	2.4	0.6	2.4	1.0	1.9	9 1.3	2.5
People who have children together ought to be married. (%)														
strongly agree	18.6	19.4	22.9	14.1	25.1	18.9	21.4	13.2	12.6	18.7	19.6	18.9	9 16.4	9.8
agree	47.8	51.8	48.7	49.5	47.2	47.5	47.7	43.6	53.5	41.1	47.0	45.6	6 49.0	37.1
no opinion	9.2	7.1	10.2	8.8	9.1	9.3	9.4	9.9	7.4	9.9	9.6	8.9	9.0	10.4
disagree	21.2	20.3	17.2	23.7	16.9	21.1	18.5	28.6	24.6	24.2	20.6	23.4	22.6	39.0
strongly disagree	3.1	1.5	1.1	3.9) 1.7	3.1	3.0	4.7	1.9	6.1	3.2	3.2	2 2.9	3.7
Most mothers living alone can bring up their children as well as married couples. %)														
strongly agree	8.4	6.1	5.9	11.1	6.4	8.2	6.5	15.5	8.9	9.2	5.5	8.2	2 11.9	23.9
agree	40.6	39.8	37.9	41.6	33.6	40.7	37.5	50.6	44.8	33.2	37.8	38.2	45.4	51.2
no opinion	5.6	7.5	4.6	5.5	5 5.4	5.6	5.2	5.0	7.1	10.1	5.6	5.6	5.4	3.2
disagree	37.3	39.4	40.8	37.0	45.6	37.0	41.3	24.2	33.7	39.2	41.5	39.0	31.6	18.6
strongly disagree	8.2	7.2	10.9	4.8	9.1	8.5	9.5	4.8	5.6	8.2	9.6	9.0) 5.6	3.2

Table 12: Attitudes Towards Traditional Gender Roles

			Geograph	nic Regi	ion			Race	Ethnicity		Inc	ome Lev	'el	
	Totals	Tampa	Orlando	Miami	JAX	Other	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	High	Middle	Low	TANF
The important decisions in the family should be made by the man of the house. (%)														
strongly agree	4.9	2.5	5.0	5.2	6.7	4.8	3.9	9.3	5.3	3.5	2.6	6.5	5.5	3.6
agree	16.4	15.5	18.6	16.7	12.7	16.5	13.9	24.6	20.9	6.8	13.8	15.8	20.1	12.6
no opinion	6.8	5.4	8.0	7.6	12.2	6.6	7.1	7.8	5.7	3.4	7.1	7.2	6.6	8.5
disagree	52.5	55.6	49.9	55.5	51.2	52.1	52.6	48.3	55.8	52.1	50.0	51.6	54.4	54.7
strongly disagree	19.4	21.1	18.5	15.0	17.2	20.0	22.6	10.0	12.3	34.1	26.6	18.9	13.4	20.5
It is better for a family if the man earns a living and the woman takes care of the home. (%)														
strongly agree	8.9	8.1	10.6	7.6	13.0	9.0	10.4	6.9	5.9	4.7	7.4	10.3	8.9	8.1
agree	28.0	30.6	30.2	26.2	28.3	28.1	27.7	26.0	31.6	23.1	22.2	26.5	33.9	25.9
no opinion	10.0	10.7	12.8	7.9	10.4	10.2	10.8	8.9	8.1	8.2	11.1	8.7	8.0	9.0
disagree	43.3	41.2	38.2	49.1	41.1	42.8	41.3	48.4	46.8	46.0	45.1	45.3	41.9	46.4
strongly disagree	9.8	9.5	8.2	9.2	7.2	10.0	9.8	9.9	7.7	18.1	14.3	9.1	7.3	10.7

Table 13: Relationship Satisfaction by Relationship and Parental Status

			(Geograpl	hic Reg	gion			Race	Ethnicity		Inc	ome Le	vel	
		Totals	Tampa	Orlando	Miami	JAX	Other	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	High	Middle	Low	TANF
Married	(mean)	87.0	86.5	87.8	85.5	85.7	87.2	87.9	82.7	86.0	87.5	87.4	87.8	84.6	81.7
First		87.0	87.3	88.7	86.5	85.7	87.1	87.8	83.2	86.5	87.5	86.8	88.6	84.1	81.8
Re-marriage		86.9	85.2	86.3	82.6	85.9	87.5	88.0	81.3	83.6	87.6	88.6	85.7	85.7	81.5
Unmarried	(mean)	75.7	79.9	79.8	73.7	79.6	75.7	77.6	72.3	74.9	71.6	77.8	76.2	71.7	72.8
cohabiting		78.1	83.6	79.2	74.2	82.3	78.4	79.7	75.7	74.1	75.3	81.1	77.9	73.2	77.3
non-cohabiting		73.5	76.5	80.7	73.3	77.1	73.3	75.0	70.6	75.5	68.8	73.6	74.9	70.3	69.8

			(Geograp	nic Re	gion			Race	Ethnicity		Inc	ome Le	vel	
		Totals	Tampa	Orlando	Miami	JAX	Other	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	High	Middle	Low	TANF
Financial Strain	(mean)														
High satisfaction		2.0	2.0	2.0	2.3	1.9	2.0	1.9	2.2	2.5	5 1.8	1.7	2.1	2.6	3.1
Moderate satisfaction		2.1	2.1	2.2	2.4	1.9	2.1	2.0	2.2	2.5	2.3	1.8	3 2.2	2.7	3.1
Low satisfaction		2.4	2.3	2.3	2.6	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.5	2.7	2.5	1.8	3 2.4	3.0	3.3
Time Spent Together	(hours/week)														
High satisfaction		67.7	73.1	69.3	67.2	64.0	67.8	67.4	73.5	65.4	71.7	62.4	67.8	71.8	70.7
Moderate satisfaction		58.0	60.1	61.5	50.5	55.6	58.8	59.0	53.0	58.6	55.5	54.3	57.6	62.7	70.5
Low satisfaction		45.2	46.7	48.7	47.4	44.4	44.8	42.2	50.9	49.2	38.7	41.7	45.6	49.0	41.4
Difficult Events Scale	(mean)														
High satisfaction		1.2	1.3	1.2	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.8	1.0	1.3	1.2	2 1.3	1.4	2.5
Moderate satisfaction		1.5	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.5	2.1	1.2	1.6	1.4	l 1.7	1.8	2.6
Low satisfaction		2.1	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.3	2.0	3.5	1.8	8 2.1	2.7	3.6
Ever Receiving Government Assistance	(% yes)														
High satisfaction		22.0	25.1	19.2	23.4	13.5	22.2	17.4	37.1	33.4	37.1	12.1	24.1	48.7	98.2
Moderate satisfaction		28.5	31.7	30.5	23.4	18.2	29.3	22.8	42.9	41.9	16.4	13.1	30.2	56.2	96.6
Low satisfaction		34.1	37.0	37.9	35.2	25.0	37.6	29.6	47.6	35.6	37.5	16.8	32.4	59.3	99.4
Currently Receiving Government Assistance	e (% yes)														
High satisfaction		9.9	11.9	8.2	16.9	6.2	9.1	5.5	23.1	23.3	5.2	3.4	7.9	26.6	100.0
Moderate satisfaction		15.3	12.4	11.3	12.7	6.5	16.0	9.1	25.9	31.7	12.6	2.4	12.9	43.7	100.0
Low satisfaction		19.1	16.5	19.6	19.0	6.2	19.6	12.2	33.3	25.9	25.3	4.7	7 11.5	42.4	100.0
Availability of Social Support	(mean)														
High satisfaction		3.1	3.1	3.2	2.7	3.5	3.2	3.3	3.1	2.6	3.2	3.4	3.3	2.8	2.8
Moderate satisfaction		3.1	3.2	3.1	2.9	3.5	3.1	3.2	3.1	2.8	2.9	3.2	2 3.2	2.9	2.9
Low satisfaction		2.8	3.0	2.9	2.6	3.2	2.8	3.0	2.8	2.5	2.5	3.2	2.8	2.5	2.8

Table 14: Relationship Satisfaction and Environmental Demands/Support

Table 15: Relationship Satisfaction and Individual Differences

			(Geograph	nic Reg	jion			Race	Ethnicity		Inco	ome Le	vel	
		Totals	Tampa	Orlando	Miami	JAX	Other	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	High	Middle	Low	TANF
Substance abuse	(mean)														
High satisfaction		0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.3	8 0.2	0.1
Moderate satisfaction		0.3	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	2 0.4	0.4
Low satisfaction		0.6	0.6	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.6	6 0.6	0.5
Mental health	(mean)														
High satisfaction		27.6	27.6	27.8	27.2	27.7	27.7	27.9	27.2	26.7	27.2	28.1	28.0	26.4	25.9
Moderate satisfaction		26.4	27.0	26.3	25.3	26.8	26.5	26.7	26.0	25.1	27.2	26.9	26.9	25.1	24.6
Low satisfaction		24.2	23.6	24.7	22.9	24.9	24.3	24.7	24.5	22.3	22.5	25.4	24.6	22.1	22.4
Religiosity	(mean)														
High satisfaction		5.6	5.4	5.9	5.2	6.0	5.6	5.5	7.0	5.5	5.6	5.3	5.9	5.7	5.9
Moderate satisfaction		5.4	5.3	5.6	5.2	5.6	5.4	5.2	6.2	5.2	5.0	5.3	5.5	5 5.3	5.7
Low satisfaction		5.0	5.0	5.0	5.1	5.2	5.0	4.8	5.7	5.0	4.6	5.0	4.8	5.2	5.3

Table 16: Physical Aggression by Gender and Relationship Status

			Geograph	nic Red	ion			Race	Ethnicity		Inc	ome Lev	vel	
	Totals	Tampa	Orlando	Miami	JAX	Other	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	High	Middle	Low	TANF
Does your partner hit or slap you when he/she is angry? (% yes)														
Male	3.6	4.2	0.7	6.5	6.1	3.1	2.5	7.7	3.1	15.4	3.3	4.9	4.8	10.4
Married	3.4	4.5	0.9	6.3	6.4	3.0	2.5	6.4	3.2	18.9	3.3	4.7	4.8	8.3
First	3.8	3.2	0.0	6.8	6.9	3.3	2.9	6.6	2.3	24.1	4.8	3.9	9 4.2	9.3
Re-marriage	2.8	7.6	2.7	5.2	2 5.5	2.2	1.7	5.9	6.4	6.3	0.5	7.1	I 6.1	6.7
Unmarried	4.0	3.3	0.0	6.9	9 4.9	3.6	2.5	10.3	2.9	9.5	3.3	5.5	5 4.9	15.4
cohabiting	6.5	0.0	0.0	7.9	9 0.0	6.6	4.5	15.4	7.7	12.6	3.2	13.0) 7.3	4.0
non-cohabiting	2.1	7.0	0.0	6.2	2 8.0	1.2	0.5	7.8	0.0	6.9	3.5	0.7	3.0	25.9
Female	1.6	1.9	0.8	0.6	0.8	1.7	1.3	2.5	1.5	3.0	0.6	1.0	3.9	7.0
Married	1.1	2.1	1.0	0.6	6 1.0	1.2	1.0	0.1	1.6	2.1	0.4	0.8	3 3.2	2.0
First	1.3	0.9	1.5	0.7	0.7	1.3	1.3	0.2	1.9	1.4	0.5	0.6	6 4.5	3.0
Re-marriage	0.5	3.8	0.0	0.0) 1.6	1.0	0.5	0.0	0.3	3.3	0.1	1.4	4 0.0	0.0
Unmarried	3.0	1.5	0.0	1.6	6 0.0	3.3	2.5	5.0	1.1	4.9	1.7	1.6	6 5.0	10.0
cohabiting	2.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	7 0.0	2.0	1.9	2.9	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0) 4.1	12.9
non-cohabiting	4.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.6	3.4	6.1	0.0	8.3	3.6	3.0) 5.9	8.2
Reports of physical agression by relationship														
satisfaction (% yes)														
High satisfaction	0.9	0.9	0.0	3.7	7 0.9	0.6	0.6	0.0	2.5	1.6	1.2	0.9	9 1.1	2.3
Moderate satisfaction	1.7	2.0	1.3	0.8	5 1.8	1.8	1.5	1.0	0.1	14.8	1.3	1.6	6 3.6	5.0
Low satisfaction	5.5	7.2	1.6	5.4	4 9.2	5.4	4.4	10.2	3.8	7.0	3.9	7.0) 7.3	11.2
Interpersonal behavior by relationship satisfaction (mean)														
High satisfaction	13.8	13.8	13.8	13.6	6 14.0	13.9	14.0	13.4	13.6	13.7	14.0	13.9) 13.7	13.8
Moderate satisfaction	13.1	13.0	13.1	13.3	3 13.3	13.1	13.1	13.3	13.2	13.1	13.2	13.1	12.9	13.0
Low satisfaction	11.4	11.5	11.8	11.4	11.1	11.4	11.3	11.2	11.7	11.8	11.4	11.7	' 11.0	11.7

Table 17: Sources of Difficulty in Relationships

			Geograp	hic Reg	jion			Race	Ethnicity		Inco	ome Le	/el	
	Totals	Tampa	Orlando	Miami	JAX	Other	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	High	Middle	Low	TANF
How much are each of the following topics a source of difficulty between your partner and yourself? (% > 0)														
Money	62.1	60.5	64.2	64.4	63.1	61.7	62.7	58.6	63.1	62.3	62.1	64.9	66.0	70.4
Spending time together	41.7	37.0	36.3	48.6	44.2	40.9	39.3	48.3	44.8	44.3	43.9	41.3	42.3	42.7
Communication	39.2	33.8	36.6	38.3	38.6	39.4	41.2	34.9	33.9	39.7	43.7	36.8	38.1	39.8
Sex	33.2	30.2	30.1	37.2	37.3	32.7	33.1	28.7	37.9	27.6	37.6	31.5	30.9	35.3
Doing household chores	29.8	28.5	25.9	28.8	33.9	29.8	31.7	26.6	24.2	32.1	34.4	29.4	26.6	28.7
Being a parent or having children	24.6	21.9	19.4	28.5	26.6	24.2	27.0	17.5	21.8	20.5	26.9	25.9	23.1	17.9
Each other's parents	24.0	23.1	24.1	24.0	29.1	23.8	24.4	22.2	22.1	35.7	26.2	24.9	23.7	27.5
Friends	20.3	19.7	16.9	22.7	17.7	20.2	18.0	26.2	25.8	12.9	19.3	19.9	26.4	30.1
Drinking or drug use	13.4	8.4	12.9	17.3	12.5	13.1	11.2	13.9	22.0	12.7	12.3	12.6	18.7	14.8
Being faithful	10.0	5.8	6.3	19.7	5.9	9.1	6.6	16.8	19.1	6.4	7.2	10.0	16.0	16.6

Table 18: Reasons For Not Pursuing Marriage

		G	eograph	nic Re	gion			Race	Ethnicity		Inco	me Lev	vel	
	Totals	Tampa	Orlando	Miami	JAX	Other	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	High	Middle L	Low	TANF
Is this a major reason why you and your partner might not be planning to get married? (% yes)														
You both are happy the way things are	56.3	51.0	72.8	44.8	58.7	57.6	60.5	41.7	46.6	65.1	61.4	57.4	46.4	52.1
You worry that the marriage would end in divorce	31.4	23.9	18.4	29.1	31.5	31.9	26.8	42.7	38.4	39.3	26.2	25.3	42.5	6 40.1
The two of you are living apart	25.9	18.2	16.1	29.5	23.2	25.8	21.9	29.3	38.6	43.2	14.5	33.5	31.4	27.5
Hasn't come up or haven't talked about it	25.4	14.3	34.6	10.2	39.8	27.0	21.8	34.2	27.3	35.7	19.5	28.4	27.9	35.0
Not enough money in savings	17.6	10.9	9.5	13.0	9.3	18.5	12.4	27.9	25.3	36.1	9.2	9.6	35.5	5 22.3
You don't believe in marriage	16.3	15.5	19.6	24.8	10.7	15.4	13.3	10.4	37.6	11.4	13.8	15.0	17.0	9.7
Too much arguing or conflict	15.8	13.1	9.3	20.4	16.8	15.3	10.5	30.6	17.9	26.8	10.8	12.0	24.5	5 28.1
Questions about whether your partner is trustworthy	14.7	10.3	9.3	22.3	5.6	14.1	8.5	29.2	27.5	9.2	5.4	10.7	23.5	36.2
You cannot afford a place to live together	10.5	0.0	4.7	18.7	3.1	9.9	2.3	16.2	37.9	28.4	6.8	6.3	16.6	6 4.8
You do not make enogh money	10.2	6.9	4.7	21.7	6.9	9.0	5.9	19.9	19.5	11.1	3.4	6.2	20.6	6 21.3
Concerned about losing benefits	9.4	9.8	4.6	8.4	0.0	9.7	6.7	11.4	18.9	0.0	3.9	3.2	17.5	5 12.0
Drugs or alcohol	8.1	5.6	4.7	11.5	0.0	7.9	5.2	13.5	16.8	4.6	3.0	3.4	16.2	2 13.4
Your partner doesn't make enough money	8.1	0.0	9.3	11.2	4.9	7.9	4.7	19.2	12.4	2.5	4.5	5.6	14.4	6.2
Your partner would not be a good parent	7.6	0.0	7.1	11.5	7.5	7.3	5.5	3.5	24.9	4.8	0.0	7.8	13.9) 17.4
Medical problems	5.9	5.6	2.4	4.5	6.9	6.0	6.3	0.1	12.1	5.7	1.6	3.7	13.3	8 18.6
Domestic violence or abuse	3.8	1.5	0.0	1.8	4.4	4.1	3.0	6.7	4.9	2.7	1.1	2.7	5.1	13.4
Your partner is incarcerated/in jail	0.8	0.0	4.6	1.4	1.2	0.7	0.0	0.2	5.6	0.4	0.0	0.6	2.0) 8.1

Table 19: Beliefs About What Marriage To The Current Partner Would Be Like

		(Geograp	hic Re	gion			Race	Ethnicity		Inc	ome Le	evel	
	Totals	Tampa	Orlando	Miami	Ť	Other	White		Hispanic	Other	High	Middle	Low	TANF
How do you think your life might be different if you	l and													
your current partner were to marry?														
Your financial security would be (%)														
better	38.4	30.4	37.2	46.5	5 23.9	37.8	35.6	48.6	38.0	36.7	35.6	46.5	39.2	40.1
the same	48.4	60.2	60.4	43.9	9 64.3	48.3	52.4	29.2	49.8	61.1	59.5	42.2	3721	47.4
worse	13.3	9.5	2.4	9.6	6 11.8	13.9	12.0	22.2	12.2	2.2	4.9	11.3	23.6	12.5
Your freedom to do what you want (%)														
better	3.7	3.8	4.3	6.9	9 3.7	3.3	2.7	1.8	10.7	6.7	5.4	0.5	5 5.8	10.6
the same	71.1	80.2	88.5	6 76.1	1 69.7	70.3	73.3	64.8	73.3	75.6	74.7	70.9	63.5	72.3
worse	25.2	16.0	7.2	2 17.0) 26.6	26.5	24.0	33.5	16.0) 17.7	19.8	28.6	30.7	17.0
Your control over money (%)														
better	16.4	9.1	4.7	22.6	6 11.0	16.0	15.5	14.3	20.4	32.9	12.5	20.6	22.2	20.0
the same	70.2	79.2	90.5	68.8	8 80.0	69.8	73.4	66.6	60.7	57.6	77.7	64.1	58.8	74.7
worse	13.5	11.7	4.8	8 8.5	5 9.3	14.3	11.1	19.1	18.9	9.5	9.8	15.4	19.0	5.6
Your sex life (%)														
better	22.5	25.2	11.9	34.4	4 26.9	21.0	17.0	28.8	34.0	40.7	22.6	18.8	26.6	25.8
the same	65.1	70.7	81.4	60.8	68.7	65.3	66.2	64.3	62.2	59.3	68.2	67.7	58.6	661
worse	12.4	4.1	6.7	4.8	8 4.4	13.7	16.9	6.9	3.8	3 0.0	9.1	13.5	14.8	8.1
Your children(future or current) (%)														
better	34.2	23.2	9.9	9 41.4	4 24.0	33.9	29.8	35.7	40.0	61.1	30.9	30.7	42.4	22.1
the same	56.1	72.0	87.7	55.2	2 65.7	55.4	60.7	49.8	56.8	34.5	63.1	55.1	45.9	66.7
worse	9.7	4.8	2.5	5 3.3	3 10.2	10.7	9.5	14.5	3.2	2 4.3	6.1	14.2	11.7	11.2
How about your overall happiness (%)														
better	36.2	33.4	35.3	43.5	5 44.7	35.2	27.1	54.1	47.6	63.8	33.6	36.5	36.9	41.7
the same	50.5	60.1	55.6	42.9	9 48.5	51.3	60.4	27.4	45.6	33.0	57.2	52.4	42.7	50.3
worse	13.3	6.5	9.1	13.6	6.8	13.6	12.5	18.5	6.8	3 3.2	9.2	11.2	20.4	8.0

Table 20: The Experience of Premarital Education

		(Geograpi	nic Reg	gion			Race	Ethnicity		Inco	ome Le	vel	
	Totals	Tampa	Orlando	Miami	JAX	Other	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	High	Middle	Low	TANF
Did you and your current spouse have any preparation, such as educational classes, a workshop, or counseling, before you got married? (% yes)														
	34.8	26.8	38.4	32.3	45.5	34.8	34.3	35.0	35.8	43.6	39.1	36.2	29.0	37.4
First marriage	38.7	32.7	41.5	35.2	51.4	38.7	38.0	37.4	39.9	57.6	43.2	38.2	34.4	42.8
Inside religious setting	95.1	97.6	91.3	93.6	93.2	95.4	95.7	91.5	94.4	98.3	94.7	98.6	91.9	90.7
Outside religious setting	4.9	2.4	8.7	6.4	6.8	4.6	4.3	8.5	5.6	1.7	5.3	1.4	8.1	9.3
Remarriage Inside religious setting Outside religious setting	26.3 86.8 13.2	16.0 96.1 3.9	84.2	23.8 85.3 14.7	32.5 80.4 19.6	26.5 87.2 12.8	27.6 85.4 14.6	28.5 95.9 4.1	17.4 87.5 12.5	97.7	30.6 85.0 15.0	30.£ 92.4 7.€	16.6 85.7 14.3	26.9 60.1 39.9
Hours spent in pre-marital preperation (mean)	10.9	9.8	9.8	14.5	9.6	10.6	10.3	11.1	12.9	12.2	11.2	10.6	11.0	16.7
How has your experience with pre-marital preparation affected your relationship? (%)														
Very Positively	40.5	26.8	34.8	44.4	29.1	41.0	34.2	54.5	55.9	43.2	35.8	43.6	50.2	63.2
Somewhat positively	36.6	53.9	44.6	31.4	41.4	36.5	40.0	30.9	29.4	23.6	38.1	38.7	32.2	22.8
No effect	21.9	19.3	20.6	24.2	29.6	21.4	24.7	14.7	13.6	33.2	26.1	17.8	14.4	9.9
Somewhat negatively	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	4.1
Very negatively	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0

Table 21: Rates and Perceived Impact of Relationship Counseling

			Geograp	hic Reg	ion			Race	Ethnicity		Inc	ome Lev	/el	
	Totals	Tampa	Orlando	Miami	JAX	Other	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	High	Middle	Low	TANF
Would you ever consider using relationship education, such as workshops or classes, to strengthen your own relationship? (% yes)	78.9	74.6	77.0	78.8	83.6	78.9	78.7	77.7	81.9	76.5	80.6	80.8	79.7	86.8
Have you ever received relationship education or counseling? (% yes)	33.4	32.7	35.0	27.3	41.7	34.0	37.4	23.8	25.3	33.3	43.7	34.7	25.0	25.9
How did that experience affect your relationship? (%)														
Very Positively	37.1	30.4	36.4	43.9	34.2	36.6	33.6	49.3	49.7	30.3	33.5	38.7	40.4	44.7
Somewhat positively	39.1	36.7	35.9	36.5	40.7	39.4	41.4	32.7	31.0	47.5	45.9	38.4	29.3	32.2
No effect	17.3	25.8	18.1	14.1	22.5	17.3	19.2	9.7	13.1	13.6	16.6	19.1	16.6	14.2
Somewhat negatively	4.0	2.8	7.1	4.4	1.1	4.0	3.4	7.1	3.4	4.5	2.5	2.5	10.1	3.8
Very negatively	2.6	4.3	2.5	1.2	1.5	2.7	2.4	1.3	2.7	4.2	1.5	1.4	3.6	5.1

Table 22: Attitudes Towards and Awarness of Marriage and Family Initiatives

		G	eograph	ic Re	gion		R	ace E	Ethnicity	,	Inco	me Level]
	Totals	Tampa	Orlando	Miami	JAX	Other	White	Black I	Hispanic	Other	High	Middle Low	TANF
How would you feel about the idea of the government developing programs to strengthen marriages and reduce divorces? (%)													
very g ood idea	29.1	26.6	24.8	41.9	22.8	27.7	22.5	36.2	48.3	31.6	24.5	28.5 37.	1 44.0
good idea	38.3	35.6	40.6	38.8	37.6	38.2	37.3	40.6	41.6	33.0	36.5	40.5 39.6	6 46.4
bad idea	20.5	23.7	19.0	11.7	24.3	21.5	25.4	16.7	6.1	13.9	22.4	20.7 15.0	0 7.4
very bad idea	12.1	13.1	15.6	7.7	15.3	12.6	14.9	6.5	4.0	21.5	16.6	10.3 8.4	4 2.2
Are you aware of any efforts by government agencies to strengthen marriages and reduce divorces in your state? (% yes)	15.0	12.1	12.2	21.1	13.2	14.4	11.4	14.9	29.4	15.8	13.4	13.3 18.9	9 21.9
Are you aware of any efforts by churches, synagogues, or community-based organizations to strengthen marriages and reduce divorces in your state? (% yes)	69.5	65.7	71.0	68.5	81.7	69.3	70.0	69.2	69.4	62.4	74.3	69.8 65.3	3 60.9
Have you heard of the Marriage Preparation and Preservation Act of 1998? (% yes)	11.7	12.4	12.0	11.2	12.1	11.7	12.3	11.0	10.1	11.0	15.1	11.8 10.0)
This table includes data from every respondent in the Florida resident and TANF samples.													<u> </u>

Table 23: Demographics

		Sta	tes						Stat	es		
Gender (%)	FL	CA	NY	ΤХ	TANF	Age	(%)	FL	CA	NY	ΤХ	TANF
Male (70)			33.3			18 years to 24 years	(70)		10.0	8.5	9.1	17.5
Female			66.7			25 years to 34 years			21.7		-	27.2
remale	07.7	59.0	00.7	00.1	50.0							
		01-				35 years to 44 years			22.5			30.4
		Sta			TAN	45 years to 54 years			18.2			18.1
Race (%)	FL	CA	NY	ТΧ	TANF	55 years to 64 years		14.9	11.9	13.4	13.3	5.8
White	63.5	56.9	70.8	60.5	31.0	65 years and older		16.8	15.8	17.0	14.5	1.0
Black or African American	13.2	7.8	14.4	11.2	33.4				Stat	tes		
Hispanic	17.3	25.5	9.3	22.6	29.0	Household Income	(%)	FL	CA	NY	ΤХ	TANF
American Indian or Alaska						Under \$5,000		5.6	3.4	4.5	9.1	33.5
Native	3.4	3.5	2.0	3.8	4.8	\$5,000 to \$9,999		4.2	4.4	4.2	3.7	23.0
Asian	1.0	2.7	1.4	1.4	0.2	\$10,000 to \$14,999		6.9	4.4	4.7	3.9	12.1
						\$15,000 to \$19,999		5.7	5.2	5.2	5.2	9.6
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.3	0.6	0.2	0.0	0.2	\$20,000 to \$24,999		7.6	5.6	5.8	6.6	7.3
Other	1.4	3.1	1.8	0.6		\$25,000 to \$34,999		12.3	13.7	12.0	8.9	7.5
						\$35,000 to \$49,999		16.5	13.5	14 9	16.2	4.3
		Sta	tes			\$50,000 to \$74,999			19.4			2.5
Education (%)	FL	CA	NY	ΤХ	TANF	\$75,000 to \$99,999			14.7			0.2
Less than High School		12.0		12.6		\$100,000 or greater			15.7			0.2
High School graduate			21.2					10.7	10.7	14.1	10.0	0.0
									Stat	00		
High School equivalency	2.6	2.8		3.8		State Assistance		E 1	Т	Т	τv	
Some college			4.8 22.4			State Assistance	2000	FL	CA	NY	ТΧ	TANF
			22.4		21.8	State Assistance Receiving cash assista	ance (% yes)	FL 13.9	Т	Т	TX 9.8	
Some college Trade/Technical/Vocational	23.3 6.7	24.6 5.4	22.4	20.2 5.8	21.8 7.4	Receiving cash assista			CA	NY	•	89.7
Some college Trade/Technical/Vocational Training	23.3 6.7 20.8	24.6 5.4 20.4	22.4 5.0	20.2 5.8 24.2	21.8 7.4 5.6	Receiving cash assista Ever received	(% yes)	13.9	CA 12.7	NY 11.5	9.8	89.7
Some college Trade/Technical/Vocational Training College graduate	23.3 6.7 20.8	24.6 5.4 20.4	22.4 5.0 23.3	20.2 5.8 24.2	21.8 7.4 5.6	Receiving cash assista Ever received	(% yes) (% yes)	13.9	CA 12.7	NY 11.5	9.8	89.7
Some college Trade/Technical/Vocational Training College graduate	23.3 6.7 20.8	24.6 5.4 20.4	22.4 5.0 23.3 17.0	20.2 5.8 24.2	21.8 7.4 5.6	Receiving cash assista Ever received Currently receiving	(% yes) (% yes)	13.9	CA 12.7	NY 11.5	9.8	89.7
Some college Trade/Technical/Vocational Training College graduate	23.3 6.7 20.8	24.6 5.4 20.4 15.2	22.4 5.0 23.3 17.0	20.2 5.8 24.2	21.8 7.4 5.6	Receiving cash assista Ever received Currently receiving Receiving food stamps	(% yes) (% yes)	13.9 13.3	CA 12.7 20.6	NY 11.5 24.6	9.8 26.5	89.7 100.0 89.2
Some college Trade/Technical/Vocational Training College graduate Postgraduate work	23.3 6.7 20.8 9.4	24.6 5.4 20.4 15.2 Sta	22.4 5.0 23.3 17.0 tes	20.2 5.8 24.2 12.4 TX	21.8 7.4 5.6 4.2 TANF	Receiving cash assista Ever received Currently receiving Receiving food stamps Ever received	(% yes) (% yes) (% yes)	13.9 13.3 22.8	CA 12.7 20.6 16.4	NY 11.5 24.6 15.6	9.8 26.5 19.2	89.7 100.0 89.2
Some college Trade/Technical/Vocational Training College graduate Postgraduate work Religion (%)	23.3 6.7 20.8 9.4 FL	24.6 5.4 20.4 15.2 Sta	22.4 5.0 23.3 17.0 tes NY 13.4	20.2 5.8 24.2 12.4 TX	21.8 7.4 5.6 4.2 TANF 23.0	Receiving cash assista Ever received Currently receiving Receiving food stamps Ever received	(% yes) (% yes) (% yes)	13.9 13.3 22.8	CA 12.7 20.6 16.4	NY 11.5 24.6 15.6	9.8 26.5 19.2	89.7 100.0 89.2
Some college Trade/Technical/Vocational Training College graduate Postgraduate work Religion (%) Christian	23.3 6.7 20.8 9.4 FL 18.1	24.6 5.4 20.4 15.2 Sta CA 26.3	22.4 5.0 23.3 17.0 tes NY 13.4	20.2 5.8 24.2 12.4 TX 18.6	21.8 7.4 5.6 4.2 TANF 23.0 0.6	Receiving cash assista Ever received Currently receiving Receiving food stamps Ever received Currently receiving	(% yes) (% yes) (% yes)	13.9 13.3 22.8	CA 12.7 20.6 16.4	NY 11.5 24.6 15.6	9.8 26.5 19.2	89.7 100.0 89.2 80.8
Some college Trade/Technical/Vocational Training College graduate Postgraduate work Religion (%) Christian Jewish	23.3 6.7 20.8 9.4 FL 18.1 2.2	24.6 5.4 20.4 15.2 Sta CA 26.3 2.7	22.4 5.0 23.3 17.0 tes NY 13.4 5.1	20.2 5.8 24.2 12.4 TX 18.6 0.8	21.8 7.4 5.6 4.2 TANF 23.0 0.6 0.4	Receiving cash assista Ever received Currently receiving Receiving food stamps Ever received Currently receiving Receiving Medicaid	(% yes) (% yes) (% yes) (% yes)	13.9 13.3 22.8 23.1	CA 12.7 20.6 16.4 14.6	NY 11.5 24.6 15.6 25.6	9.8 26.5 19.2 29.2	89.7 100.0 89.2 80.8
Some college Trade/Technical/Vocational Training College graduate Postgraduate work <u>Religion (%)</u> Christian Jewish Muslim	23.3 6.7 20.8 9.4 FL 18.1 2.2 0.3	24.6 5.4 20.4 15.2 Sta CA 26.3 2.7 0.8	22.4 5.0 23.3 17.0 tes NY 13.4 5.1 1.0	20.2 5.8 24.2 12.4 TX 18.6 0.8 0.2 0.2	21.8 7.4 5.6 4.2 TANF 23.0 0.6 0.4 0.0	Receiving cash assista Ever received Currently receiving Receiving food stamps Ever received Currently receiving Receiving Medicaid Currently receiving	(% yes) (% yes) (% yes) (% yes) (% yes)	13.9 13.3 22.8 23.1 23.3	CA 12.7 20.6 16.4 14.6 15.4	NY 11.5 24.6 15.6 25.6 19.8	9.8 26.5 19.2 29.2 22.0	89.7 100.0 89.2 80.8 93.0
Some college Trade/Technical/Vocational Training College graduate Postgraduate work Religion (%) Christian Jewish Muslim Hindu	23.3 6.7 20.8 9.4 FL 18.1 2.2 0.3 0.2 7.7	24.6 5.4 20.4 15.2 Sta CA 26.3 2.7 0.8 0.2 6.5	22.4 5.0 23.3 17.0 tes NY 13.4 5.1 1.0 0.4	20.2 5.8 24.2 12.4 TX 18.6 0.8 0.2 0.2 6.4	21.8 7.4 5.6 4.2 TANF 23.0 0.6 0.4 0.0 1.6	Receiving cash assista Ever received Currently receiving Receiving food stamps Ever received Currently receiving Receiving Medicaid Currently receiving	(% yes) (% yes) (% yes) (% yes) (% yes)	13.9 13.3 22.8 23.1 23.3	CA 12.7 20.6 16.4 14.6 15.4	NY 11.5 24.6 15.6 25.6 19.8	9.8 26.5 19.2 29.2 22.0	89.7 100.0 89.2 80.8 93.0
Some college Trade/Technical/Vocational Training College graduate Postgraduate work Religion (%) Christian Jewish Muslim Hindu Protestant	23.3 6.7 20.8 9.4 FL 18.1 2.2 0.3 0.2 7.7	24.6 5.4 20.4 15.2 Sta CA 26.3 2.7 0.8 0.2 6.5	22.4 5.0 23.3 17.0 tes NY 13.4 5.1 1.0 0.4 9.0 34.7	20.2 5.8 24.2 12.4 TX 18.6 0.8 0.2 0.2 6.4	21.8 7.4 5.6 4.2 TANF 23.0 0.6 0.4 0.0 1.6 18.0	Receiving cash assista Ever received Currently receiving Receiving food stamps Ever received Currently receiving Receiving Medicaid Currently receiving	(% yes) (% yes) (% yes) (% yes) (% yes)	13.9 13.3 22.8 23.1 23.3	CA 12.7 20.6 16.4 14.6 15.4	NY 11.5 24.6 15.6 25.6 19.8	9.8 26.5 19.2 29.2 22.0	89.7 100.0 89.2 80.8 93.0
Some college Trade/Technical/Vocational Training College graduate Postgraduate work Religion (%) Christian Jewish Muslim Hindu Protestant Catholic Mormon Baptist	23.3 6.7 20.8 9.4 FL 18.1 2.2 0.3 0.2 7.7 23.2 0.6 15.7	24.6 5.4 20.4 15.2 Sta 26.3 2.7 0.8 0.2 6.5 27.4 1.2 3.1	22.4 5.0 23.3 17.0 tes NY 13.4 5.1 1.0 0.4 9.0 34.7 1.0 5.8	20.2 5.8 24.2 12.4 TX 18.6 0.8 0.2 0.2 6.4 25.9 1.0 17.0	21.8 7.4 5.6 4.2 TANF 23.0 0.6 0.4 0.0 1.6 18.0 0.8 25.3	Receiving cash assista Ever received Currently receiving Receiving food stamps Ever received Currently receiving Receiving Medicaid Currently receiving	(% yes) (% yes) (% yes) (% yes) (% yes)	13.9 13.3 22.8 23.1 23.3	CA 12.7 20.6 16.4 14.6 15.4	NY 11.5 24.6 15.6 25.6 19.8	9.8 26.5 19.2 29.2 22.0	89.7 100.0 89.2 80.8 93.0
Some college Trade/Technical/Vocational Training College graduate Postgraduate work <u>Religion</u> (%) Christian Jewish Muslim Hindu Protestant Catholic Mormon Baptist Church of Christ	23.3 6.7 20.8 9.4 FL 18.1 2.2 0.3 0.2 7.7 23.2 0.6 15.7 0.5	24.6 5.4 20.4 15.2 CA 26.3 2.7 0.8 0.2 6.5 27.4 1.2 3.1 0.2	22.4 5.0 23.3 17.0 tes NY 13.4 5.1 1.0 0.4 9.0 34.7 1.0 5.8 0.0	20.2 5.8 24.2 12.4 18.6 0.2 0.2 6.4 25.9 1.0 17.0 1.6	21.8 7.4 5.6 4.2 TANF 23.0 0.6 0.4 0.0 1.6 18.0 0.8 25.3 0.2	Receiving cash assista Ever received Currently receiving Receiving food stamps Ever received Currently receiving Receiving Medicaid Currently receiving	(% yes) (% yes) (% yes) (% yes) (% yes)	13.9 13.3 22.8 23.1 23.3	CA 12.7 20.6 16.4 14.6 15.4	NY 11.5 24.6 15.6 25.6 19.8	9.8 26.5 19.2 29.2 22.0	89.7 100.0 89.2 80.8 93.0
Some college Trade/Technical/Vocational Training College graduate Postgraduate work Religion (%) Christian Jewish Muslim Hindu Protestant Catholic Mormon Baptist Church of Christ Episcopalian	23.3 6.7 20.8 9.4 FL 18.1 2.2 0.3 0.2 7.7 23.2 0.6 15.7 0.5 2.0	24.6 5.4 20.4 15.2 Sta 26.3 2.7 0.8 0.2 6.5 27.4 1.2 3.1 0.2 1.4	22.4 5.0 23.3 17.0 tes 13.4 5.1 1.0 0.4 9.0 34.7 1.0 5.8 0.0 2.7	20.2 5.8 24.2 12.4 18.6 0.8 0.2 0.2 6.4 25.9 1.0 17.0 1.6 1.8	21.8 7.4 5.6 4.2 TANF 23.0 0.6 0.4 0.0 1.6 18.0 0.8 25.3 0.2 1.4	Receiving cash assista Ever received Currently receiving Receiving food stamps Ever received Currently receiving Receiving Medicaid Currently receiving	(% yes) (% yes) (% yes) (% yes) (% yes)	13.9 13.3 22.8 23.1 23.3	CA 12.7 20.6 16.4 14.6 15.4	NY 11.5 24.6 15.6 25.6 19.8	9.8 26.5 19.2 29.2 22.0	89.7 100.0 89.2 80.8 93.0
Some college Trade/Technical/Vocational Training College graduate Postgraduate work Religion (%) Christian Jewish Muslim Hindu Protestant Catholic Mormon Baptist Church of Christ Episcopalian Jehovah's Witness	23.3 6.7 20.8 9.4 FL 18.1 2.2 0.3 0.2 7.7 23.2 0.6 15.7 0.5 2.0 1.5	24.6 5.4 20.4 15.2 Sta 26.3 2.7 0.8 0.2 6.5 27.4 1.2 3.1 0.2 1.4 2.2	22.4 5.0 23.3 17.0 tes NY 13.4 5.1 1.0 0.4 9.0 34.7 1.0 5.8 0.0 2.7 1.4	20.2 5.8 24.2 12.4 18.6 0.8 0.2 0.2 6.4 25.9 1.0 17.0 1.6 1.8 0.6	21.8 7.4 5.6 4.2 TANF 23.0 0.6 0.4 0.0 1.6 18.0 0.8 25.3 0.2 1.4 0.4	Receiving cash assista Ever received Currently receiving Receiving food stamps Ever received Currently receiving Receiving Medicaid Currently receiving	(% yes) (% yes) (% yes) (% yes) (% yes)	13.9 13.3 22.8 23.1 23.3	CA 12.7 20.6 16.4 14.6 15.4	NY 11.5 24.6 15.6 25.6 19.8	9.8 26.5 19.2 29.2 22.0	89.7 100.0 89.2 80.8 93.0
Some college Trade/Technical/Vocational Training College graduate Postgraduate work Religion (%) Christian Jewish Muslim Hindu Protestant Catholic Mormon Baptist Church of Christ Episcopalian Jehovah's Witness Lutheran	23.3 6.7 20.8 9.4 FL 18.1 2.2 0.3 0.2 7.7 23.2 0.6 15.7 0.5 2.0 1.5 2.0	24.6 5.4 20.4 15.2 Sta CA 26.3 2.7 0.8 0.2 6.5 27.4 1.2 3.1 0.2 1.4 2.2 1.4	22.4 5.0 23.3 17.0 tes NY 13.4 5.1 1.0 0.4 9.0 34.7 1.0 5.8 0.0 2.7 1.4 0.6	20.2 5.8 24.2 12.4 18.6 0.8 0.2 0.2 6.4 25.9 1.0 17.0 1.6 1.8 0.6 2.4	21.8 7.4 5.6 4.2 TANF 23.0 0.6 0.4 0.0 1.6 18.0 0.8 25.3 0.2 1.4 0.4 1.0	Receiving cash assista Ever received Currently receiving Receiving food stamps Ever received Currently receiving Receiving Medicaid Currently receiving	(% yes) (% yes) (% yes) (% yes) (% yes)	13.9 13.3 22.8 23.1 23.3	CA 12.7 20.6 16.4 14.6 15.4	NY 11.5 24.6 15.6 25.6 19.8	9.8 26.5 19.2 29.2 22.0	89.7 100.0 89.2 80.8 93.0
Some college Trade/Technical/Vocational Training College graduate Postgraduate work Religion (%) Christian Jewish Muslim Hindu Protestant Catholic Mormon Baptist Church of Christ Episcopalian Jehovah's Witness Lutheran Methodist	23.3 6.7 20.8 9.4 FL 18.1 2.2 0.3 0.2 7.7 23.2 0.6 15.7 0.5 2.0 1.5 2.0 3.9	24.6 5.4 20.4 15.2 Sta 26.3 2.7 0.8 0.2 6.5 27.4 1.2 3.1 0.2 1.4 2.2 1.4 1.2	22.4 5.0 23.3 17.0 tes NY 13.4 5.1 1.0 0.4 9.0 34.7 1.0 5.8 0.0 2.7 1.4 0.6 2.9	20.2 5.8 24.2 12.4 18.6 0.8 0.2 0.2 6.4 25.9 1.0 17.0 1.6 1.8 0.6 2.4 5.4	21.8 7.4 5.6 4.2 TANF 23.0 0.6 0.4 0.4 0.0 1.6 18.0 0.8 25.3 0.2 1.4 0.4 1.0 2.2	Receiving cash assista Ever received Currently receiving Receiving food stamps Ever received Currently receiving Receiving Medicaid Currently receiving	(% yes) (% yes) (% yes) (% yes) (% yes)	13.9 13.3 22.8 23.1 23.3	CA 12.7 20.6 16.4 14.6 15.4	NY 11.5 24.6 15.6 25.6 19.8	9.8 26.5 19.2 29.2 22.0	89.7 100.0 89.2 80.8 93.0
Some college Trade/Technical/Vocational Training College graduate Postgraduate work Religion (%) Christian Jewish Muslim Hindu Protestant Catholic Mormon Baptist Church of Christ Episcopalian Jehovah's Witness Lutheran	23.3 6.7 20.8 9.4 FL 18.1 2.2 0.3 0.2 7.7 23.2 0.6 15.7 0.5 2.0 1.5 2.0	24.6 5.4 20.4 15.2 Sta CA 26.3 2.7 0.8 0.2 6.5 27.4 1.2 3.1 0.2 1.4 2.2 1.4	22.4 5.0 23.3 17.0 tes NY 13.4 5.1 1.0 0.4 9.0 34.7 1.0 5.8 0.0 2.7 1.4 0.6	20.2 5.8 24.2 12.4 18.6 0.8 0.2 0.2 6.4 25.9 1.0 17.0 1.6 1.8 0.6 2.4 5.4 2.0	21.8 7.4 5.6 4.2 TANF 23.0 0.6 0.4 0.0 1.6 18.0 0.8 25.3 0.2 1.4 0.4 1.0 2.2 0.2	Receiving cash assista Ever received Currently receiving Receiving food stamps Ever received Currently receiving Receiving Medicaid Currently receiving	(% yes) (% yes) (% yes) (% yes) (% yes)	13.9 13.3 22.8 23.1 23.3	CA 12.7 20.6 16.4 14.6 15.4	NY 11.5 24.6 15.6 25.6 19.8	9.8 26.5 19.2 29.2 22.0	89.7 100.0 89.2 80.8 93.0

No religious affiliation

12.7 16.5 14.8 10.0

13.5

XI. Acknowledgements

A great many people contributed to this project, and the authors wish to extend our sincere thanks to each of them.

First and foremost, we thank the Florida state government for initiating and sponsoring this project. We thank Governor Jeb Bush for making the support of healthy families a priority for his administration, and for giving his blessing to this survey. We thank Jerry Regier, Secretary of Florida's Department of Children and Families, for appreciating the need for accurate data and for initiating this survey. We thank the staff at the Division of Welfare Reform, and in particular Karen Murphy and the ever-capable and dependable Jeff Johnson, for shepherding this project through the gauntlet of the state bureaucracy.

We also thank the Department of Psychology at the University of Florida, and in particular Department Chair Martin Heesacker, for contributing significant additional resources to this project, including supporting all three authors and covering the cost of printing, binding, and delivering this report.

We are especially grateful to our partners Chris McCarty and Scott Richards at the University of Florida Survey Research Center. Their professionalism and expertise are unparalleled in our experience, and we look forward to many more opportunities for collaborating with them again.

Throughout the process of conducting this survey, we have had the great fortune of being able to draw on the wisdom of an Advisory Board composed of some of the nation's leading experts in this field: Eloise Anderson (Claremont Institute), Thomas Bradbury (UCLA), Steven Beach (University of Georgia), Robin Dion (Mathematica Policy Research), Kathryn Edin (Northwestern University), Ron Haskins (Brookings Institution), and Sara McLanahan (Princeton University). We thank each of the board members for volunteering their precious time to support and advance this project.

Several others contributed key advice at important points in the survey. Although they were not formal members of the team, we wish to recognize their impact on the project: Andrew Cherlin (Carnegie Melon University), Paul Duncan, (University of Florida), Lisa Neff (University of Florida), Colleen Porter (University of Florida), and Shauna Springer (University of Florida). Special thanks to Wei Hou of the Division of Biostatistics at the University of Florida, for a crucial assist in the home stretch.

Finally, we gratefully and humbly thank our spouses, Jessica Schulman, Frank Garvan, and Erin Thomas, for their steadfast support during the conduct of this study and the preparation of this report. Their continued love provides an illustrative case study for the conclusions drawn here.

XII. About the Authors

Benjamin R. Karney, Ph. D., Associate Professor of Psychology, University of Florida

(karney@ufl.edu). Dr. Karney received his doctorate in 1997 from the University of California, Los Angeles and is an Associate Professor of Social Psychology at the University of Florida. For most of the past decade, he has examined change and stability in early marriage as director of the Florida Project on Newlywed Marriage and Adult Development (FPNMAD), a longitudinal study focusing on the processes through which initially satisfying marriages either remain satisfying or deteriorate over time. His research has been published in the Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, the Journal of Marriage and the Family, and Psychological Bulletin, and has been supported by grants from the National Instit ute of Mental Health and the Fetzer Institute. Dr. Karney has twice been the recipient of the National Council on Family Relation's Reuben Hill Research and Theory Award for outstanding contributions to family science.

Cynthia Wilson Garvan, Ph. D., Research Assistant Professor of Biostatistics, University of Florida (cyndi@biostat.ufl.edu). After receiving her M.A. degree in Pure Mathematics from the Pennsylvania State University, Dr. Garvan completed her Ph.D. in 1996 at the University of Florida. Since then, Dr. Garvan has been a faculty member at the University of Florida's Department of Biostatistics. She has been involved with numerous collaborative projects with researchers from colleges across the University of Florida campus including the Colleges of Dentistry, Education, Health Professions, Liberal Arts & Sciences, and Medicine. Key projects include: the 1999 Florida Health Insurance Survey; Project CARE, a longitudinal development study looking at the many factors which affect child health and development from birth through age ten; the CABG study, a study examining the effects of coronary artery bypass graft surgery with or without cardiopulmonary bypass on cognition; and research concerning students with disabilities. Recently, Dr. Garvan was appointed the director of research at the Center for Family, Community, and Disability Studies (a developing University Center of Excellence for Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Services). Dr. Garvan is the associate editor of Pain Physician and has been selected to serve on the Eastern North American Region/International Biometric Society advisory board. Her research interests include the development of educational methods to teach introductory statistics to college students with learning disabilities, survey methodology, and longitudinal data analysis. Her work has appeared in numerous journals including, Biometrika, the Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference, Pediatrics, the Journal of Educational Psychology, and the Journal of Learning Disabilities.

Michael Thomas, B. A., University of Florida (mistert242@cs.com). Michael Thomas is currently graduate student in the Department of Statistics at the University of Florida. In 2002, Michael received a dual Bachelors degree from the University of Florida in Mathematics and Statistics and is now pursuing his Masters degree in Statistics with an emphasis in Biostatistics.

XIII. The Research Advisory Board

Eloise Anderson, Director, Program for the American Family, Claremont Institute

(eloisea@msn.com). Ms. Anderson has been director of social services first in the state of Wisconsin and most recently in California. She was named by the leadership of the U.S. House of Representatives to the National Advisory Board on Welfare Indicators and was honored with the 1996 National Governors' Association award for outstanding state official. Ms. Anderson was appointed to her previous post by former Governor Pete Wilson in 1992. Ms. Anderson also led the way in crafting California's new welfare reform program, CalWORKs. Under former Governor Wilson, Eloise Anderson directed the operations of a department with 4,200 employees and a budget of nearly \$18 billion. She was responsible for implementing a wide range of federal and state laws and setting administrative policy regarding welfare grant levels and benefits, community care licensing standards, disability evaluation determination, and child welfare services. She oversaw such diverse programs as child support enforcement, foster care, adoptions, child abuse prevention, child care, refugee support, emergency assistance, and special services to the aged, blind and deaf individuals.

<u>Thomas Bradbury, Ph. D., Professor of Clinical Psychology, University of California, Los</u> <u>Angeles</u> (bradbury@psych.ucla.edu). Dr. Bradbury conducts applied research on the prevention of marital dysfunction and basic research on the longitudinal course of marriage. Bradbury is the editor of <u>The Psychology of Marriage</u> (with Frank Fincham, 1990) and <u>The Developmental Course of Marital</u> <u>Dysfunction</u> (1998), and he was formerly a member of the Risk Prevention and Health Behavior Review Committee at the National Institute of Mental Health. He is the recipient of the 1997 Distinguished Scientific Award for Early Career Contributions from the American Psychological Association and, with Benjamin Karney, he has twice received the Reuben Hill Award for Research and Theory on Marriage and the Family from the National Council on Family Relations. Bradbury is presently Associate Editor at Journal of Family Psychology.

<u>Steven R. H. Beach, Ph. D., Professor of Clinical Psychology and Director of the Institute</u> for Behavioral Research, University of Georgia (sbeach@egon.psy.uga.edu). Dr. Beach is the nation's leading authority on the connection between marital processes and depression. He received his Ph.D. degree from S.U.N.Y. at Stony Brook in 1985 and joined the faculty of the Psychology Department at University of Georgia in 1987 after working as a practicing clinician in outpatient, hospital, and private practice settings. He was elected Fellow of the American Psychological Association (12, 43) in 1994. He currently serves as Professor of Psychology and is the Director of the Institute for Behavioral Research at the University of Georgia. Dr. Beach is the author of two books, serves on the editorial board of eight scholarly journals, and has published more than 100 scholarly papers on marital processes, close relationships, and depression.

M. Robin Dion, M. A., Senior Researcher, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.

(rdion@mathematica-mpr.com). For the past ten years, M. Robin Dion, M.A. (Social Psychology, Arizona State University, 1994) has studied the well-being of low-income families and children, particularly those that are served by public or private programs. These include, for example, the *New Chance Demonstration*, a large-scale comprehensive intervention for teenage mothers on welfare; the Child Outcomes Study of the *National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies*, and a study of the impacts on families of Iowa's *Family Investment Program*. More recently, Ms. Dion has been emerging as a national leader in the development of programs to strengthen and support relationships and marriage among unmarried parents, most of whom are low-income. As part of the *Strengthening Families* project sponsored by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families (ACF), she led the development of a conceptual framework to guide the design, implementation, and evaluation of programs to strengthen relationships and support healthy marriage in this population. She is Project Director on a related ACF contract that is providing guidance on program design and studying the implementation of programs across the country that are emerging to serve unwed parents. She serves as a member of the Research Advisory Group for initiatives to strengthen families and marriage in a number of states. In addition, Ms. Dion plays a lead role in Mathe matica's *Building Strong Families* project, a large-scale demonstration and rigorous 9-year evaluation of multiple programs to support healthy marriage among unwed parents.

<u>Kathryn Edin, Ph. D., Associate Professor of Sociology and Faculty Fellow at the Institute</u> <u>for Policy Studies, Northwestern University</u> (k-edin@northwestern.edu). Dr. Edin is well-known for her in-depth, qualitative research on low-income, mother-headed households. She currently directs the Qualitative Addition to Fragile Families Study, a longitudinal ethnographic study which focuses on couple dynamics and father involvement among couples participating in the N=4800 Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study, a nationally representative birth-cohort study of couples sharing a non-marital birth. In addition to chapters and articles in such journals as Social Problems and the American Sociology Review, Dr. Edin has published two books.

Ron Haskins, Ph. D., Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution (RHASKINS@brookings.edu). Ron Haskins is a guest scholar in the Economic Studies Program at the Brookings Institution, a senior consultant at the Annie E. Casey Foundation in Baltimore, and the Special Advisor to the President for Welfare Policy at the White House. Prior to joining Brookings and Casey, he spent 14 years on the staff of the House Ways and Means Human Resources Subcommittee, first as welfare counsel to the Republican staff, then as the subcommittee's staff director. In 1997, Haskins was selected by the National Journal as one of the 100 most influential people in the federal government. From 1981-1985, he was a senior researcher at the Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, where he was also a research professor. He also taught and lectured on history and education at UNC, Charlotte and developmental psychology at Duke University. Haskins was the editor of the 1996, 1998, and 2000 editions of the Green Book, a 1600-page compendium of the nation's social programs published by the House Ways and Means Committee that analyzes domestic policy issues including health care, poverty, and unemployment. Haskins has also co-edited several books, including The New World of Welfare (Brookings, 2001) and Policies for America's Public Schools: Teachers, Equity, and Indicators (Ablex, 1988), and is a contributor to numerous books and scholarly journals on children's development and social policy issues. He holds a Bachelor's degree in History, a Master's in Education, and a Ph.D. in Developmental Psychology, from UNC, Chapel Hill.

Sara McLanahan, Ph. D., Professor of Sociology and Public Affairs, Princeton University (mclanaha@princeton.edu). Sara McLanahan directs the Bendheim-Thoman Center for Research on Child Wellbeing and is an associate of the Office of Population Research at Princeton University. Her research interests include family demography, poverty and inequality, and social policy. She teaches courses on poverty and family policy. She is co-author of <u>Fathers Under Fire</u> (1998), <u>Social Policies for</u> <u>Children</u> (1996); <u>Growing Up with a Single Parent</u> (1994); <u>Child Support and Child Wellbeing</u> (1994); and <u>Single Mothers and Their Children: A New American Dilemma</u> (1986). She has served on the Boards of the American Sociological Association and the Population Association of America and is currently a member of the Board on Families, Youth, and Children of the National Academy of Sciences.

XIV. About the University of Florida Survey Research Center

With 70 stations, the computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI) survey lab at the University of Florida Survey Research Center (UFSRC) is among the largest university-based survey units in the country. Since its inception in 1983, the UFSRC has conducted a monthly Random Digit Dial survey of 500 Florida households. Since 1992, the UFSRC has conducted funded surveys for the state of Florida and other states, such as Indiana, Kansas, Texas and New Hampshire. Recent clients have included the UF Institute for Child Health Policy, the Florida Agency for Health Care Administration, the Florida Department of Education, the Florida Department of Elder Affairs, the Florida Department of Health, the Florida Public Service Commission, the Kansas Health Institute, and the National Science Foundation.

Dr. Chris McCarty (ufchris@ufl.edu), the director of the UFSRC, received an undergraduate degree in anthropology from West Virginia University in 1980 and a doctorate in anthropology from the University of Florida in 1992. He has worked extensively on the adaptation of traditional network methods to large-scale telephone and field surveys. His most recent work involves the estimation of hard-to-count populations, such as the homeless and those who are HIV positive. Dr. McCarty has published in several social science journals and presented papers at a variety of professional meetings.

<u>Scott Richards</u> (scottr@bebr.ufl.edu) is the full-time project manager at UFSRC. Now concluding his second full year at the center, he holds an M.A. in Political Science and is completing his dissertation for a Ph.D. in Political Science. He was a Senior Research Analyst for the State of Maryland for five years, and spent another nine years as a consultant specializing in research design and data analysis. His duties include survey sample management, Ci3 programming as well as the oversight of survey programming by graduate students, the output and formatting of data, and data analysis.

The UFSRC is one program within the Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR), long recognized as a source for applied economic and demographic research for the state of Florida. In addition to the UFSRC, the BEBR provides the official population estimates and projections for the Florida Legislature between census years, and produces a long run forecast of the state and its counties that are used in budget projections.

XV. Appendix A: Methods

A. Sampling Frame and Sampling Procedure

Households in Florida were selected using a stratified random sampling approach that ensured enough respondents from underrepresented groups to make meaningful inferences about those groups. In simple random sampling, each household carries an equal probability of selection and hence contributes an equal amount of information to the overall sample. This is an adequate approach when the goal of the survey is simply to describe a population as a whole. The current survey, however, had the more complex goal of describing not only the state as a whole but also specific underrepresented subgroups within the state. To achieve our specific sampling goals using simple random sampling would have required a sample size so large as to make the survey prohibitively costly. Instead, we used stratified random sampling, a sampling procedure in which various strata of the population are defined around key demographic characteristics. By dividing a heterogeneous population into somewhat homogeneous subpopulations, a precise estimate of any stratum proportion can be obtained from relatively small samples in that stratum. Adopting this approach preserved our ability to (1) obtain probabilistic results for the state as a whole, and (2) oversample key groups of interest (blacks, Hispanics, and low -income residents) to obtain more precise estimates for these groups.

To create the strata for the current study, all phone numbers in Florida were divided into groups characterized by geography (Jacksonville, Miami, Orlando, Tampa, and other regions), income level, and race/ethnicity. The metropolitan areas formed four strata. To form the strata for the other regions, we used commercially available data (from GENESYS) that provides information about the percent of blacks, Hispanics, and low-income residents for every telephone exchange in Florida (a telephone exchange consists of an area code and the first three numbers of the 7-digit telephone number). Telephone exchanges were then classified as to whether they were above or below the state medians for (1) percent black residents, (2) percent Hispanic residents, and (3) percent low income residents (defined to be a household income of less than \$25,000 per year). It was then possible to form eight strata based on race/ethnicity and income level, thus a total of 12 strata were formed. Table 1 illustrates the definitions that were used to classify a telephone exchange into a particular stratum.

Definition of Spo	ecific Sampling Strata f	or the Florida Family F	ormation Survey
Stratum	Median Percent Black In State	Median Percent Hispanic In State	Median Percent Low Income In State
Stratum 1	Above	Above	Above
Stratum 2	Above	Above	Below
Stratum 3	Above	Below	Above
Stratum 4	Above	Below	Below
Stratum 5	Below	Above	Above
Stratum 6	Below	Above	Below
Stratum 7	Below	Below	Above
Stratum 8	Below	Below	Below

For each of the comparison states of California, Texas, and New York, households were selected via random-digit dialing, a method that allows inclusion of households that have unlisted phone numbers.

To obtain the subsample of Florida residents currently receiving federal assistance, the Florida Department of Children and Families provided their complete roster of current recipients of Temporary

Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), organized by gender of the recipient. A random sample of males and females from this list were contacted by telephone in a two-stage procedure. In the first stage, the household of the TANF recipient was contacted, but no specific attempt was made to sample specific individuals within the household. When that procedure failed to result in sufficient numbers of interviews with actualTANF recipients, the procedure was revised. In the second stage, screening questions were added to the first moments of the interview to ensure that the interview was being conducted with a person currently receiving cash assistance in the form of TANF. The TANF sample analyzed in this report includes all 500 TANF recipients interviewed across the first and second stages of sampling.

No respondents in any of the samples were offered any compensation for their participation in the survey.

The sampling implementation followed a modified replicate approach¹ where representative subsamples were released and worked to final disposition by interviewers at UFSRC. This approach avoided a major pitfall of simple quota sampling where interviewing stops when the stratum quota is reached. Under quota sampling, there is a danger of interviewing only those individuals who are easiest to reach by telephone. Since the characteristics of such individuals may differ from the overall population, this approach would have introduced bias. The replicate approach adopted in this project reduced such opportunities for bias.

Early in the data collection period, larger subsamples were released. Subsequently, as strata began to approach their target sample sizes, smaller subsamples were released to minimize the cost of target sample overruns. Once a household was contacted, a roster of the adults residing in the household was developed and a randomization algorithm was used to select one adult to be the respondent. No substitutes were allowed.

There are a variety of strategies for picking respondents within households. The method currently in use by the UFSRC, the youngest male/oldest female method, asks the informant to identify the youngest male in the household, and if there is no male, the oldest female. This redresses the bias associated with disproportionately high likelihood of young females answering the telephone. This method has been shown to work better than comparable alternative methods of selecting respondents.

As with most telephone surveys, interviews were conducted through a CATI system. Typically, phone numbers identified through stratified random-digit dialing were called a maximum of 10 times. Refused cases were typically called back at least one time. The second call following a refusal was reserved for refusal converters who, with access to the information on the call history, are trained to convert soft refusals to completed interviews. The survey was administered in English and in Spanish when appropriate. Interviews were conducted seven days a week, with the exception of holidays, during the hours of 9 AM to 10 PM, local time. For the comparison samples in other states, interview hours were extended to accommodate different time zones.

B. <u>Response Rates and Cooperation Rates</u>

Among the survey researchers, there is no consensus about how response rates should be calculated and reported. Naturally, it is in the interests of researchers to report high response rates, and so researchers often choose the methods of calculating these rates that provide the most favorable results. The result, unfortunately, can be inflated reports of response rate that are not necessarily reflective of survey quality. To provide the most accurate and best justified estimates, the UFSRC calculates response

¹ Replicates are systematically nth-selected subsets of the sample itself. Individual replicates are released and worked to final disposition before moving on to the next replicate in order to ensure a representative sample.

rates using standard guidelines developed by the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR). The AAPOR web site (<u>http://www.aapor.org/ethics/stddef.html#response/</u>) lists six different methods for calculating response rate (AAPOR, 2000). The difference between the rates has to do with how to determine the number of eligible cases, and whether partial completes are counted as interviews or not. The fewer eligible cases, and the more completes, the higher the estimated of response rate will be. The AAPOR methods run from more conservative (RR1) to less conservative (RR6). Two of the six rates In this report, we report the relatively conservative RR3 method, which defines an estimation factor that allows the researcher to assume a percentage of "unknown households" to be counted as ineligible. Thus, the response rate is reported here as the number of completed interviews (not counting partial completes) divided by the number of eligible telephone numbers selected for the sample, including an estimate of what proportion of unknown cases were likely to have been eligible. As a result of using this procedure, these estimates may be more conservative than those reported by other comparable studies of these issues.

Using this method, the response rate for the main Florida survey was 22%. Response rates were slightly lower in the three comparison states: 19% in California, 16% in New York, and 21% in Texas. Response rates were highest in the TANF sample (28%).

In contrast to the response rate, the cooperation rate is the number of completed interviews divided by the number of households successfully contacted. The cooperation rate does not control for the efficiency of the telephone sampling, and so will be higher than the response rate. In this survey, the cooperation rates for the main Florida survey and the TANF sample were both 34%. As with response rates, cooperation rates were slightly lower in the three comparison states: 26% in California, 23% in New York, and 29% in Texas.

C. <u>Who Participated?</u>

How effective was the sampling design in obtaining adequate distribution of participants along parameters of interest? The unweighted demographics of the sample are described in Table 23. The five columns of the table describe the demographic make-up of the 4008 Florida respondents, the 500 California respondents, the 502 New York respondents, the 502 Texas respondents, and the 500 respondents sampled from the list of TANF recipients in Florida.

<u>Gender</u>: In the TANF sample only, gender was a selection criterion. By design, the distribution of genders in that sample was exactly equal. In the other four samples, the gender of the respondent was not a criterion for participation. In those samples, consistent with other survey research, females were about 50% more likely to participate in the survey than males. Roughly two-thirds of those samples were female, with the gender bias being strongest in the Texas sample (68% female) and weakest in the California sample (60% female).

<u>Race</u>: So that blacks and Hispanics would not be underrepresented in final estimates for the state, these groups were targeted for oversampling in the Florida resident sample. This proved to be an effective strategy, as 13.2% of this sample was black (523 individuals) and 17.3% were Hispanic (687 individuals). Blacks and Hispanics were not oversampled in the other four samples, and as a result the raw frequency of non-white individuals in those samples was relatively low. Nevertheless, percentage of Hispanics in the California and Texas was actually higher than it was in Florida. The percentage of blacks making up the California sample was low, but adequate in the other samples. The percentage of individuals indicating a race other than white, black or Hispanic was very low across the samples, and so these groups were not analyzed separately in these analyses. Compared to the general state samples, the racial and ethnic diversity of the TANF sample was noticeably different. Specifically, the proportion of whites in the TANF sample (31%) was about half that of the other samples, and the proportion of blacks (33%) more than double. The proportion of Hispanics and members of other ethnic groups in the TANF was similar to that of the other state samples.

Education: The distribution of educational attainment was quite similar across the four states that were sampled. Roughly a third of the samples had acquired a high school diploma, high school equivalency, or less. About half of the samples had received at least some college, an undergraduate degree, or some trade or vocational school. Across the state samples, between from 10-17% of respondents had received some education beyond college. The TANF sample included about twice the proportion of individuals who had not completed high school, and about a quarter the number of individuals who had completed college or received any post-graduate education.

Religion: The range of religious affiliations did not vary substantially across the five samples. Over 80% of all of the samples identified with some variety of Christianity. Between 18% to 35% of respondents specifically identified as Catholic. The highest percentage of respondents indicating no religious affiliation was in California (16.5%) and the lowest was in Texas (10%).

<u>Age</u>: The distribution of ages was very similar across the four general state samples. Within these samples, over half of the participants were between 25 and 54 years old. The TANF sample skewed notably younger, with a greater number of respondents in the 18 to 24 year old range. In all five samples, an adequate range of ages was represented among the participants.

Household Income: Across the four general state samples, the modal household income was between \$25,000 and \$49,999. As expected, household incomes among the TANF sample were much lower, with the modal household income being less than \$5,000 per year.

<u>State Assistance</u>: In the TANF sample, receiving cash assistance (in the form of TANF) was a selection criterion. It is worth noting that respondents in the TANF samples were also highly likely to be receiving Medicaid and food stamps as well. In the four state samples, rates of receiving government assistance were relatively low.

D. <u>The Survey Instrument</u>

The complete survey instrument used in this project is available for download at the project web site: <u>www.relationshipscience.net</u>.

The complete interview contained roughly 200 questions, most drawn from other national surveys that have addressed these issues (i.e., the Fragile Families study), others developed specifically for this project. It is important to note, however, that no single participant received anywhere near the entire set of questions, because many questions were administered only to specific groups (i.e., only to divorced individuals, or only to parents).

Across the data sets, the length of an average interview was 27 minutes.

E. <u>Weighting the Data</u>

As a result of the disproportionate sampling of blacks, Hispanics, and low-income residents in the Florida sample, this sample over-represented those groups while under-representing Floridians who did not fall into these groups. Thus, to provide an accurate description of the state as a whole, we needed to decrease the relative weight on over-represented groups in order to compensate for their over-representation in the sample. In addition, we needed to increase the relative weight of observations in our sample that fell outside these groups in order to compensate for their under-representation in our sample. In this way, we were able to achieve the twin goals of making reliable inferences and ensuring that our sample fairly represents the population from which it was drawn.

The analytical weights that shaped the analyses of these data were the product of *expansion weights* and a *poststratification adjustment*. An adjustment was made to compensate for nonresponse

within each stratum. Relative weights were computed by dividing the nonresponse adjusted expansion weight by the mean expansion weight. Details of computation for each component of the analytic weight are provided below.

The first stage in the weighting process was the construction of *expansion weights.* The expansion weight for a sample unit is constructed as the inverse of the sampling fraction. The sampling fraction is the probability of selection and depends on the occurrence of the following events:

- a phone number must be selected from a working bank (a "bank" is the set of all possible numbers beginning with (XXX) YYY-AB). If there is at least one published residential number in the bank, then the bank is called a "working bank." Phone numbers for the 2003 Baseline Study were selected randomly from working banks)
- household status is determined,
- household eligibility status is determined, and
- the eligible resident chooses to participate in the survey.

Thus the probability of household and respondent inclusion in the survey is the probability that all four events above occur. To elucidate weight formula construction, let **SEL** denote the probability that a phone number is selected, **HH** denote the event that the selected phone number's residential status is determined, **ELG** denote the event that a household's eligibility status is determined, and **RSP** denote the event that the survey. The probability of survey inclusion is then given by

P[SEL and HH and ELG and RSP],

which is equivalent to

P[SEL]*P[HH| SEL]*P[ELG|HH and SEL]*P[RSP|ELG and HH and SEL].

An expansion weight (the sampling fraction inverse) was computed for each stratum, and then divided by the stratum response rate (to adjust for the differential nonresponse). Relative weights were then constructed by computing the mean of the response rate adjusted expansion weights and dividing each weight by this mean.

A trimming procedure was used to limit extreme values. The final stage of analytic weight development was the poststratification adjustment. Population marginals in each stratum were computed based on sex and race distributions obtained from 2000 Census estimates. Ratios were constructed by comparing the population marginal percentages with the sample marginal percentages. The analytic weight for each case were then computed by multiplying the poststratification ratio and the trimmed weight.

XVI. Appendix B: Comparisons with other states

At the request of the Florida Department of Children and Families, the same survey that was administered to randomly selected residents and TANF recipients within Florida was also administered to randomly selected residents of California, New York, and Texas. The tables presented in this appendix describe the results of the survey for each of the three comparison states. The total results for Florida are presented again in the first column of each table to aid in comparisons across the states.

Table 24: Current Relationship Status

			States			
		FL	CA	NY	ΤХ	
Married	(%)	52.9	46.7	49.2	55.9	
First		36.4	35.4	40.5	40.3	
Remarriage		16.5	11.2	8.7	15.6	
Divorced/Separated	(%)	18.3	17.8	14.1	17.1	
No Relationship		12.1	10.9	8.2	11.1	
Relationship						
Engaged		1.7	1.6	1.2	1.3	
Not Engaged		4.5	5.3	4.8	4.7	
Never Married	(%)	20.0	29.9	27.4	21.0	
No Relationship		8.8	17.3	13.5	10.3	
Relationship						
Engaged		2.9	3.0	2.1	2.0	
Not Engaged		8.3	9.6	11.8	8.7	
Widowed	(%)	8.8	5.6	9.3	6.0	
No Relationship		7.7	5.1	7.5	5.7	
Relationship						
Engaged		0.1	0.2	0.9	0.3	
Not Engaged		1.0	0.4	0.9	0.0	

Table 25: Marital Statistics

			Sta	tes	
		FL	CA	NY	ΤХ
First Marriage	(%)	68.8	76.0	82.3	72.1
Age at marriage	(mean in years)	23.9	24.8	25.2	23.2
Length of marriage	(mean in years)	21.8	19.3	20.3	18.9
Length of relationship before marriage	(mean in years)	2.0	2.1	2.7	1.9
Remarriage	(%)	31.2	24.0	17.7	28.0
Age at marriage	(mean in years)	36.8	36.2	38.0	37.8
Length of marriage	(mean in years)	13.9	17.1	10.5	11.6
Length of relationship before marriage	(mean in years)	1.7	1.9	3.9	1.9

Table 26: Cohabitation

		States
		FL CA NY TX
Do you currently live with your spouse/partner?	(% yes)	85.3 80.7 78.8 82.8
Percent of those living together who are:		
Cohabiting		14.4 16.1 13.9 8.2
Engaged		5.1 6.2 5.1 2.4
Not engaged		9.3 9.9 8.7 5.7
Married, cohabited first		34.1 32.4 35.4 35.4
Before engagement		19.7 18.1 20.9 21.4
After engagement		14.4 14.3 14.5 14.1
Married, did not cohabit first		51.5 51.6 50.7 56.4

Table 27: Parenthood

			Sta	tes	
		FL	CA	NY	ΤХ
Rate of Parenthood	(%)	76.3	69.6	69.3	75.2
Percent of parents who are:	(%)				
Married		61.9	58.3	60.1	65.7
Divorced/Separated		19.8	21.2	17.8	19.7
Never Married		7.6	12.5	9.4	6.8
Widowed		10.7	8.1	12.7	7.8
Number of own children	(mean)	2.0	1.9	1.8	2.0
Number of different partners with whom had children	(mean)	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.2
Age when first child was born	(mean)	24.1	24.7	25.7	23.7

Table 28: Household Arrangements

			Stat	tes	
		FL	CA	NY	ΤХ
Number of other people in house	(mean)	1.6	2.1	1.6	1.9
Rate of married couple households	(%)	53.0	46.5	49.2	55.7
Without children		6.8	7.1	8.3	7.4
Children from current relationship only		27.5	26.6	29.4	30.4
Children from own prior relationship(s) only		1.6	0.8	0.9	2.4
Children from partner's prior relationship(s) only		1.3	0.2	1.3	0.
Children from both partners' prior relationship(s) only		5.8	3.4	1.8	4.
Children from both prior and current relationships		9.9	8.5	7.5	10.1
Rate of cohabiting couple households	(%)	8.9	8.7	8.0	4.8
Without children		4.1	3.3	2.8	1.
Children from current relationship only		0.7	2.1	1.6	1.
Children from own prior relationship(s) only		0.7	0.2	1.0	0.
Children from partner's prior relationship(s) only		0.5	0.6	0.6	0.
Children from both partners' prior relationship(s) only		1.6	1.0	0.8	0.
Children from both prior and current relationships		1.2	1.6	1.2	1.
Rate of single adult households	(%)	38.2	44.8	42.8	39.5
Without children		28.6	33.0	33.8	29.
With children		9.5	11.8	9.1	9.
Number of children under the age of 18 in hou	isehold (mean)	0.9	1.1	0.9	1.
Age of youngest child	(mean)	10.0	9.9	10.7	9.0
Rate of people living with own parents or part parents	ner's (%)	9.0	15.5	11.0	8.

Table 29: Attitudes Towards Marriage

		Stat	es	
	FL	CA	NY	ΤХ
A happy, healthy marriage is one of the most important things in life (%)				
strongly agree	51.5	44.1	40.1	48.6
agree	41.0	47.3	51.0	45.7
no opinion	3.6	4.8	3.4	2.8
disagree	3.7	3.6	4.7	2.9
strongly disagree	0.4	0.3	0.9	0.0
How important are these different parts of marriage: (mean)				
Having the same values and beliefs	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6
Spending time together	1.9	1.8	1.9	1.9
Being of the same race or ethnic group	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.7
Having good sex	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4
Supporting each other through difficult times	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
The husband having a steady job	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.7
The wife having a steady job	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.1
Having family that supports you	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8
Understanding each other's hopes and dreams	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.8
Being able to communicate effectively	2.0	1.9	2.0	2.0
Having savings that you can draw from	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.5
Кеу				
0 = not important				
1 = somewhat important				
2 = very important				

Table 30: Intentions to Marry

			Sta	tes	
		FL	CA	NY	ΤХ
Would you like to be married someday?	(% yes)	65.2	75.5	79.4	74.3
Never married	(% yes)	78.0	89.8	84.2	79.2
Previously married	(% yes)	47.8	53.1	70.9	66.0
What do you think the chances are that you your current partner?	u will ever marry (%)				
No chance		28.3	24.3	19.3	21.6
A little chance		12.3	16.1	20.2	11.9
A 50-50 chance		18.9	30.3	29.9	16.4
A pretty good chance		17.1	5.6	12.8	11.:
An almost certain chance		23.4	23.7	17.8	38.8
Do you and your partner have plans to mar two years?	ry within the next (% yes)	39.4	35.0	32.1	45.6
Living together	(% yes)	46.1	45.8	43.0	47.7
Not living together	(% yes)	33.2	27.0	26.3	44.7
What do you think the chances are that you <u>someone</u> ?	u will ever marry (%)				
No chance		15.4	10.1	13.1	9.4
A little chance		11.3	11.7	9.7	6.0
A 50-50 chance		16.6	24.1	20.1	13.0
A pretty good chance		21.6	16.1	24.6	24.9
An almost certain chance		35.1	38.1	32.5	46.

Table 31: Attitudes Towards Divorce

	States
	FL CA NY TX
When there are children in the family, parents should stay marriedeven if they no longer love each other.(%)	
strongly agree	3.3 3.3 2.3 3.
agree	14.8 17.6 14.0 16.
no opinion	8.6 7.4 9.1 8.
disagree	51.9 53.9 54.9 52.0
strongly disagree	21.4 17.8 19.7 20.
Divorce can be a reasonable solution to an unhappy marriage. (%)	
strongly agree	10.7 9.1 8.6 8.
agree	62.3 63.9 67.1 61.
no opinion	7.4 6.6 6.7 6.
disagree	16.2 17.4 15.2 20.
strongly disagree	3.1 3.0 2.4 3.
When parents are arguing a lot, it is better for the children if they divorce. (%)	
strongly agree	7.3 6.3 5.4 4.
agree	33.3 32.3 31.2 30.
no opinion	14.9 17.6 19.4 11.
disagree	40.8 40.1 40.9 47.
strongly disagree	3.8 3.7 3.1 6.
	9.
When a husband and wife divorce, it reflects badly on them as people (%)	
	2.2 1.8 1.5 3.
(%)	2.2 1.8 1.5 3. 13.7 13.9 11.3 17.
strongly agree	
(%) strongly agree agree	13.7 13.9 11.3 17

Table 32: Attitudes Towards Prior Relationships That Ended

			Stat	es	
		FL	CA	NY	ΤХ
			_	1	
Do you wish you had worked harder to save your last relationship?	(% yes)	21.3	20.6	22.0	19.
Divorced	(% yes)	18.1	11.2	14.6	16
Never divorced	(% yes)	22.2	22.4	23.1	20
Do you wish that your partner had worked harder to save the relation		54.4	50.4	45.4	40
	(% yes)	51.4	50.1	45.4	49.
Divorced Never divorced	(% yes) (% yes)	55.8 50.1	53.6 49.4	57.6 43.7	55 48
How do you feel about the fact that this relationship ended?					
Divorced	(%)				
Regret - I wish it had not ended		10.5	22.6	13.5	21
Neutral - No feelings one way or the other		27.4	17.9	25.1	11
Glad - I am happy the relationship is over		62.1	59.5	61.4	67
Never divorced	(%)				
Regret - I wish it had not ended		16.5	15.2	15.4	15
Neutral - No feelings one way or the other		35.8	37.2	41.3	36
Glad - I am happy the relationship is over		47.7	47.6	43.3	47
Do you wish that it had been more difficult-from a legal standpoint-t divorce?	o get a (% yes)	13.5	11.6	1.7	16.

		Sta	tes	
	FL	CA	NY	ΤХ
It is okay for couples who are not married to live together. (%)				
strongly agree	6.1	9.9		3.2
agree	46.4	48.3	49.6	41.7
no opinion	11.1	7.5		13.9
disagree	26.4	25.9	22.2	30.9
strongly disagree	10.1	8.4	8.5	10.4
Couples should wait to have sex until they are married. (%)	,			
strongly agree	13.8	11.8	9.0	14.1
agree	33.1	26.9	24.6	35.4
no opinion	15.6	14.7	15.3	16.6
disagree	31.3	37.4	41.1	30.2
strongly disagree	6.2	9.2	10.1	3.8
When a couple is committed to each other, it makes no difference whether they are married or just living together. (%)				
strongly agree	8.0	8.8	9.4	5.1
agree	39.4	39.0	43.7	34.5
no opinion	9.0	9.8	6.5	10.2
disagree	33.4	33.4	32.2	38.5
strongly disagree	10.3	9.0	8.2	11.7

Table 33: Attitudes Towards Premarital Cohabitation and Premarital Sex

Table 34: Attitudes Towards Unmarried Parenthood

	Γ		Sta	tes	
		FL	CA	NY	ΤХ
Children do better when their parents are married. (9	%)				
strongly agree		43.7	36.9	35.8	43.4
agree		36.4	42.0	39.4	40.9
no opinion		7.7	10.2	8.5	6.
disagree		10.8	9.0	14.9	9.3
strongly disagree		1.4	2.0	1.4	0.
People who have children together ought to be married. (9	%)				
strongly agree		18.6	19.9	16.5	19.7
agree		47.8	45.2	45.4	48.
no opinion		9.2	9.7	8.8	9.
disagree		21.2	22.3	26.8	20.
strongly disagree		3.1	3.0	2.5	1.
Most mothers living alone can bring up their children as well as marr couples.					
strongly agree		8.4	8.2	9.7	7.
agree		40.6	36.2	43.6	36.4
no opinion		5.6	9.0	7.9	8.
disagree		37.3	38.4	32.5	39.3
strongly disagree		8.2	8.3	6.3	8.

Table 35: Attitudes Towards Traditional Gender Roles

	States				
	FL	CA	NY	ΤХ	
The important decisions in the family should be made by the man					
of the house. (%)					
strongly agree	4.9	4.3	1.9	3.9	
agree	16.4	14.3	11.4	23.1	
no opinion	6.8	11.3	6.3	8.0	
disagree	52.5	46.5	54.4	49.7	
strongly disagree	19.4	23.6	26.0	15.4	
It is better for a family if the man earns a living and the woman takes care of the home. (%)					
strongly agree	8.9	7.6	6.9	9.2	
agree	28.0	27.8	23.2	29.7	
no opinion	10.0	14.2	12.3	10.8	
disagree	43.3	37.6	43.6	41.1	
strongly disagree	9.8	12.9	14.1	9.2	

		States
		FL CA NY TX
Married	(mean)	87.0 85.3 85.8 86.6
First		87.0 85.0 85.5 86.4
Re-marriage		86.9 86.2 87.4 87.1
Unmarried	(mean)	75.7 76.6 73.5 74.9
cohabiting		78.1 78.8 76.8 74.5
non-cohabiting		73.5 74.9 71.5 75.0

Table 36: Relationship Quality by Relationship and Parental Status

Table 37: Relationship Satisfaction and Environmental Demands/Support

			States				
		FL	CA	NY	ΤХ		
Financial Strain	(mean)						
High satisfaction		2.	0 1.9	2.0	2.0		
Moderate satisfaction		2.	1 2.1	2.2	2.2		
Low satisfaction		2.	4 2.5	2.4	2.4		
Time Spent Together	(hours/week)						
High satisfaction		67.	7 64.3	60.4	60.3		
Moderate satisfaction		58.	0 57.2	51.8	53.0		
Low satisfaction		45.	2 43.2	42.5	42.4		
Difficult Events Scale	(mean)						
High satisfaction		1.	2 1.3	1.1	1.3		
Moderate satisfaction		1.	5 1.7	1.6	1.4		
Low satisfaction		2.	1 2.1	2.0	2.1		
Ever Receiving Government Assistance	(% yes)						
High satisfaction		22.	0 17.9	15.2	19.7		
Moderate satisfaction		28.	5 29.6	24.1	24.9		
Low satisfaction		34.	1 33.7	26.4	29.7		
Currently Receiving Government Assistance	(% yes)						
High satisfaction		9.	9 8.9	8.1	12.4		
Moderate satisfaction		15.	3 8.2	13.4	12.1		
Low satisfaction		19.	1 14.0	17.3	19.2		
Availability of Social Support	(mean)						
High satisfaction		3.	1 3.4	3.2	3.3		
Moderate satisfaction		3.	1 3.1	3.1	3.2		
Low satisfaction		2.	8 2.8	2.9	2.9		

Table 38: Relationship Satisfaction and Individual Differences

		States			
		FL	CA	NY	ΤХ
Substance abuse	(mean)				
High satisfaction		0.2	0.4	0.2	0.2
Moderate satisfaction		0.3	0.5	0.5	0.5
Low satisfaction		0.6	0.7	0.4	0.6
Mental health	(mean)				
High satisfaction		27.6	27.2	27.3	27.9
Moderate satisfaction		26.4	26.1	25.8	26.6
Low satisfaction		24.2	24.5	24.5	24.4
Religiosity	(mean)				
High satisfaction		5.6	5.5	5.6	6.1
Moderate satisfaction		5.4	5.1	5.0	5.9
Low satisfaction		5.0	4.5	4.9	5.1

			Stat	es	
		FL	CA	NY	ΤХ
Does your partner hit or slap you when he/she is angry?	(% yes)				
Male		3.6	3.9	8.5	3.5
Married		3.4	4.9	7.7	2.2
First		3.8	5.1	9.4	1.6
Re-marriage		2.8	4.3	0.0	3.4
Unmarried		4.0	2.0	8.0	7.5
cohabiting		6.5	0.0	30.0	15.1
non-cohabiting		2.1	3.8	0.0	5.6
Female		1.6	1.4	1.5	0.5
Married		1.1	1.9	1.4	0.7
First		1.3	2.5	1.7	0.9
Re-marriage		0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Unmarried		3.0	0.0	1.8	0.0
cohabiting		2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
non-cohabiting		4.0	0.0	3.2	0.0
Reports of physical agression by relationship satisfaction	(% yes)				
High satisfaction	(70 yes)	0.9	0.0	2.0	0.9
Moderate satisfaction		1.7	1.9	3.4	1.8
Low satisfaction		5.5	5.4	8.5	3.7
Interpersonal behavior by relationship satisfaction	(mean)				
High satisfaction	· · ·	13.8	13.6	13.9	13.8
Moderate satisfaction		13.1	13.2	12.9	13.1
Low satisfaction		11.4	11.1	11.3	11.3

Table 39: Reports of Physical Aggression by Gender and Relationship Status

Table 40: Sources of Difficulty in Relationships

		States				
	FL	CA	NY	ТΧ		
How much are each of the following topics a source of difficulty between your partner and yourself? (% > 0)						
Money	62.1	63.2	64.6	62		
Spending time together	41.7	50.6	46.8	45		
Sex	33.2	38.4	36.6	32		
Drinking or drug use	13.4	17.3	16.6	16		
Each other's parents	24.0	26.7	32.0	24		
Being a parent or having children	24.6	27.9	28.8	27		
Being faithful	10.C	13.9	12.2	11		
Communication	39.2	51.6	45.2	39		
Friends	20.3	22.0	23.6	19		
Doing household chores	29.8	31.2	32.6	31		
Кеу	_					
3 = Very serious problem						
2 = Moderate problem						
1 = Barely a problem) = Not a problem at all						

Table 41: Reasons For Not Pursuing Marriage

	States
	FL CA NY TX
Is this a major reason why you and your partner might not be planning to get married? (% yes)	
You both are happy the way things are	56.3 49.4 54.4 47.6
You don't believe in marriage	16.3 16.6 12.2 9.2
Your partner doesn't make enough money	8.1 2.3 8.7 17.6
You do not make enogh money	10.2 10.0 11.6 21.5
The two of you are living apart	25.9 30.7 22.0 33.6
Your partner is incarcerated/in jail	0.8 2.6 3.2 1.7
Your partner would not be a good parent	7.6 4.2 2.9 4.4
You cannot afford a place to live together	10.5 4.0 9.2 8.8
Too much arguing or conflict	15.8 16.6 16.6 20.6
Drugs or alcohol	8.1 1.4 4.3 1.5
Concerned about losing benefits	9.4 16.5 13.5 4.5
Medical problems	5.9 5.3 9.9 5.9
Domestic violence or abuse	3.8 4.0 2.9 11.9
Not enough money in savings	17.6 17.0 18.5 22.3
Questions about whether your partner is trustworthy	14.7 14.5 9.8 19.5
You worry that the marriage would end in divorce	31.4 27.0 17.8 23.6
Hasn't come up or haven't talked about it	25.4 40.3 30.7 22.4

Table 42: Beliefs About What Marriage To The Current Partner Would Be Like

		States				
	FL	CA	NY	ΤХ		
How do you think your life might be different if you and your current partner were to marry?						
Your financial security would be (%)						
better	38.4	38.0	42.1	45.6		
the same	48.4	54.2	45.3	38.7		
worse	13.3	7.8	12.6	15.7		
Your freedom to do what you want (%)						
better	3.7	6.0	7.4	7.4		
the same	71.1	67.0	67.3	70.8		
worse	25.2	27.0	25.3	21.8		
Your control over money (%)						
better	16.4	21.8	16.7	16.2		
the same	70.2	62.3	70.3	74.5		
worse	13.5	15.9	13.0	9.3		
Your sex life (%)						
better	22.5	25.4	26.9	42.1		
the same	65.1	71.4	69.4	53.3		
worse	12.4	3.3	3.7	4.5		
Your children(future or current) (%)						
better	34.2	28.5	38.9	39.9		
the same	56.1	65.3	57.6	58.5		
worse	9.7	6.2	3.5	1.7		
How about your overall happiness (%)						
better	36.2	42.4	40.1	55.4		
the same	50.5	49.0	53.0	41.3		
worse	13.3	8.6	6.9	3.3		

Table 43: The Experience of Premarital Education

	States			
	FL	CA	NY	ΤХ
Did you and your current spouse have any preparation, such as educational classes, a workshop, or counseling, before you got married? (% yes)				
	34.8	36.0	42.6	38.5
First marriage	38.7	38.9	46.3	45.3
Inside religious setting	95.1	86.0	91.7	97.0
Outside religious setting	4.9	14.0	8.3	3.0
Remarriage	26.3	26.9	25.7	21.2
Inside religious setting	86.8	72.6	88.3	95.8
Outside religious setting	13.2	27.4	11.7	4.2
Hours spent in pre-marital preparation (mean)	10.9	13.1	11.2	15.3
How has your experience with pre-marital preparation affected your relationship? (%)				
Very Positively	40.5	37.5	39.9	32.1
Somewhat positively	36.6	37.6	39.9	50.7
No effect	21.9	24.9	20.3	15.8
Somewhat negatively	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Very negatively	0.2	0.0	0.0	1.8

Table 44: Rates and Perceived Impact of Relationship Counseling

		States			
		FL	CA	NY	ΤХ
Would you ever consider using relationship education, such as workshop strengthen your own relationship?	os or classes, to (% yes)	78.9	80.9	74.5	79.6
Have you ever received relationship education or counseling?	(% yes)	33.4	37.9	33.0	33.8
How did that experience affect your relationship?	(%)				
Very Positively		37.1	35.8	32.8	35.9
Somewhat positively		39.1	39.3	42.0	47.4
No effect		17.3	18.7	18.2	10.7
Somewhat negatively		4.0	3.4	3.6	3.6
Very negatively		2.6	2.8	3.5	2.4

Table 45: Attitudes Towards and Awareness of Marriage and Family Initiatives

		States			
		FL	CA	NY	ΤХ
How would you feel about the idea of the government developing programs to stre marriages and reduce divorces? ((engthen (%)				
very good idea		29.1	27.1	22.0	25.8
good idea		38.3	37.9	40.3	41.1
bad idea		20.5	19.9	22.4	17.9
very bad idea		12.1	15.1	15.3	15.2
Are you aware of any efforts by government agencies to strengthen marriages and reduce divorces in your state? (%	id % yes)	15.0	13.4	11.5	11.1
	ő yes)	69.5	71.2	61.8	73.5
Have you heard of the Marriage Preparation and Preservation Act of 1998? (%	% yes)				
		11.7	7.6	8.7	8.9