

**FAMILY STRUCTURE AND ADULT WELL-BEING: THE EFFECTS OF DURATION,
TIMING, TRANSITIONS, AND RECENTNESS**

By

JOLENE D. SMYTH

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN SOCIOLOGY

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
Department of Sociology

MAY 2004

To the Faculty of Washington State University:

The members of the Committee appointed to examine the thesis of JOLENE D.
SMYTH find it satisfactory and recommend that it be accepted.

Chair

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

There are several people that I would like to acknowledge for their support and feedback during this project. First, I would like to thank Scott Myers, my chair, for being so accessible as well as flexible and for his helpful feedback, comments, and guidance on multiple drafts of this paper. I would also like to acknowledge the feedback and advice received from my other two committee members, Monica Johnson and Viktor Gecas. I would like to thank Monica for jumping on board relatively late in the game and being a good sport about it and Vik for sticking with this project despite a lot of upheaval during the resettlement process. Finally, I would like to thank Kristi for forcing me to walk away during those self- and thesis-destructive moments of frenzied work in which I was just spinning my wheels.

**FAMILY STRUCTURE AND ADULT WELL-BEING: THE EFFECTS OF DURATION,
TIMING, TRANSITIONS, AND RECENTNESS**

Abstract

By Jolene D. Smyth, M.A.
Washington State University
May 2004

Chair: Scott M. Myers

Using data from the National Survey of Families and Households, this study looks at the effects of multiple dimensions of family structure during adulthood on adults' well-being. Specifically, it looks at the effects of the duration of time spent in family structures, the number of family structure transitions experienced, the timing of transitions, and the recentness of the last transition experienced on three measures of well-being: cognitive well-being, global relative health, and psychological well-being. The paper also explores how family process variables mediate and/or moderate the effects of the family structure variables on well-being. I hypothesize that family structure affects well-being to the extent that a given structure introduces stress into individuals' lives as well as, through the support built into it, impedes or facilitates the ability of the individual to cope with stress. Findings indicate that the family structure variables have very small effects on well-being while the family process variables have larger and more significant effects. However, among the family structure variables the findings indicate that longer durations of time spent married increase men's well-being, a benefit that is not experienced by women.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	2
FAMILY STRUCTURE DURATIONS, TRANSITIONS, TIMING, AND RECENTNESS	5
Duration in Family Structures	5
Number of Transitions	11
Timing of Transitions	13
Recentness of the Last Transition	14
FAMILY PROCESSES	15
Support	15
Family Characteristics	18
DATA	21
Dependent Variables – Adult Well-being	22
Independent Variables	24
Moderating/Mediating Variables	25
Support Variables	25
Family Characteristics Variables	26
Control Variables	30
Missing Data	30

Dropped Cases	31
METHODS	32
RESULTS	33
Analysis 1: The Entire Sample	33
Cognitive Well-Being	33
Global Relative Health	37
Psychological Well-Being	39
Moderating Relationships in the Full Sample	41
Analysis 2: Transitions Sample	46
Cognitive Well-Being	46
Global Relative Health	48
Psychological Well-Being	50
Moderating Relationships in the Transitions Sample	52
Analysis 3: Parents Sample	56
Cognitive Well-Being	56
Global Relative Health	58
Psychological Well-Being	60
Moderating Relationships in the Parents Sample	62
SUPPLEMENTARY ANALYSES	66
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	67
INTERPRETATION	76
CONCLUSION	81

REFERENCES 100

APPENDICES

A. Eighteen Psychological Well-Being Items 107

B. Regression Results for Interaction Terms 108

C. Standard Errors for Regression Models 113

D. Regression Results for Supplementary Analyses Interaction Terms 122

LIST OF TABLES

1. Summary of Research Hypotheses	84
2. Descriptive Statistics (Continuous Variables)	85
3. Frequencies (Dummy Variables)	86
4. Regression Results for Cognitive Well-Being (Full Sample)	87
5. Regression Results for Global Relative Health (Full Sample)	88
6. Regression Results for Psychological Well-Being (Full Sample)	89
7. Significant Interaction Terms (Full Sample)	90
8. Regression Results for Cognitive Well-Being (Transitions Sample)	91
9. Regression Results for Global Relative Health (Transitions Sample)	92
10. Regression Results for Psychological Well-Being (Transitions Sample)	93
11. Significant Interaction Terms (Transitions Sample)	94
12. Regression Results for Cognitive Well-Being (Parents Sample)	95
13. Regression Results for Global Relative Health (Parents Sample)	96
14. Regression Results for Psychological Well-Being (Parents Sample)	97
15. Significant Interaction Terms (Parents Sample)	98
16. Summary of Findings	99

INTRODUCTION

There is a large and growing body of work that seeks to explain the effect of family structure on individual child and adult outcomes. This increased interest stems from uncertainty about the meaning and influences of changes occurring within the family as well as the future of the family. However, the research that has been produced out of this interest has been flawed as explained by Wu and Martinson (1993). They argue that the most common way to measure family structure is using the snapshot approach where dichotomous variables are used to identify the family structure of a participant at one point in time. This method is problematic because it conflates distinct groups and ignores any history of changes in family structures (Wu and Martinson 1993). Hao and Xie (2002) explain that, “while a snapshot [of the] intact family captures the entire [family] experience, a snapshot of non-intact families obscures the variations in duration, timing, and transitions” (p. 6). I disagree with the first half of this statement and argue instead that even a snapshot look at a currently intact family either ignores their history of family structures and transitions leading up to their current state or conflates that history with the effects of their current state.

In this paper I will advance existing research on the effects of family structure on individual outcomes in two important ways. First, my research will explore the effects of family structure during adulthood on *those same adults*, thus extending current research on the effects of family structure on child outcomes into the realm of adults. The focus on adult experiences and adult outcomes is important both because adults’ well-being is important in its own right and because adults’ adjustment to family structure transitions has been shown to affect children’s well-being (Amato 1993). Second, this research uses four different measures to capture the dynamics of family structure rather than treating family structure as one-dimensional and static.

Specifically, I estimate the effects of (1) the duration of time spent in different family structures (married, cohabiting, separated, single, divorced, stepfamilies, and single-parent families), (2) the number of transitions respondents experienced, (3) the timing of the transitions, and (4) the recentness of the last transition experienced. For the sake of simplicity, these four dimensions of family structure will be referred to as “the family structure variables” hereafter.

The life course framework highlights the importance of early life events on subsequent outcomes (Elder 1985). In conjunction with the life course framework, the stress perspective posits that family structure transitions introduce individuals to stress and therefore affect individuals’ well-being outcomes (Amato 1993). Of interest here are three outcomes: cognitive well-being, global relative health, and psychological well-being. To test the hypotheses derived from these theories the models posit that current adult outcomes are dependent on an adult’s history of family structure transitions. Two main research questions are addressed. First, what are the effects of family structure on adult global well-being, health, and psychological well-being? Second, to what extent do family process variables (e.g. family support) mediate and/or moderate those effects? I expect the effects of different family structures to vary based on both the stress they introduce to the individual and how they enhance or hinder the individual’s ability to deal with life stresses. In exploring these issues I use data from both waves of the National Survey of Families and Households.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The life course perspective serves as the framework for this project. According to Elder (1985; 1994), the life course perspective posits that an individual’s life course is built upon different trajectories which intersect and interact throughout a person’s life. Embedded in these trajectories are specific transitions, or changes in life situations, such as marriage, divorce, and

employment. Theoretically, the intersecting and interacting trajectories combine to form “a pathway over the life span” (Elder 1985: 17). Variations in outcomes for individuals as well as entire cohorts are brought about by patterns of interacting trajectories and the historical conditions that map those trajectories. Thus, the foundation of the life course perspective is that the social trajectories (made up of transitions) that individuals follow have consequences for their developmental processes and outcomes. This claim is built on four main premises. First, human lives are connected to their historical times. Second, the timing of lives (i.e. incidence, duration, sequence of roles, and age related norms) is important for well-being. Third, lives are linked; it is through social relationships with kin and friends that individuals procure social support and experience social regulation. Fourth, although individuals are constrained by their social world, they have agency in their decision making (Elder 1994).

The foundational claim of the life course perspective along with the second (timing) and third (linked lives) premises reveal the importance of looking at adult well-being in terms of its relationship to the family structure variables as well as family process variables that include relationships with others. Examining transitions in family structure, both individually and in concert, can help map one’s trajectory in order to better understand outcomes. Additionally as family process variables reflect the interdependency of individuals, examining their effects can help identify the pushes and pulls that might redirect one’s trajectory and as a result one’s outcomes.

The stress perspective is a sociological perspective that is useful within the life course perspective as it provides insight into how the different dimensions of family structure influence subsequent outcomes. The stress perspective contends that uncertainty and change is stressful and that this stress can negatively affect outcomes (Aquilino 1996; George 1993; Holmes and

Rahe 1967). In particular, it is the accumulation of stressors that leads to negative outcomes, not necessarily the incidence of a single stressor (Amato 1993). When applied to family structure, the stress perspective implies that changes in family structure can have deleterious effects because of the stress they introduce into an individual's life. This is true because both "positive" (i.e. marriage) and "negative" (i.e. divorce or separation) events introduce stress, albeit of different types and magnitudes (McCubbin and Patterson 1982). Furthermore, the inability to keep stresses from accumulating can have deleterious effects as well. If for example, being a single-parent somehow impedes the ability of an individual to cope with stress, the longer the individual spends in that family structure the worse their outcome can be because the stress accumulates over time. However, if a family structure somehow aids individuals in dealing with their stress, thus avoiding its accumulation, the individuals should be better off the longer they remain in that family structure.

The stress perspective and its application to the family has been supported in research by McCubbin and Patterson (1982) who find that as the duration of time that fathers are absent from their families (due to being missing in action, or a prisoner of war) increases, the number of hardships increases, leading to a family "crisis" from the "pile-up" of life events. They find that over time families experience a pile-up of stressors resulting from three main sources: (1) the initial stressor itself (having a father reported missing in action or a P.O.W), (2) normal life stresses and strains that develop over time, and (3) trying to find ways to deal with all the stress. Although war is a special instance and certainly having a father missing in action or a prisoner of war is an unusually stressful situation, other events that introduce significant amounts of stress into the family will also reduce well-being. In addition, impediments to effectively dealing with stress will result in stress pile-up and diminished well-being.

FAMILY STRUCTURE DURATIONS, TRANSITIONS, TIMING, AND RECENTNESS

Duration in Family Structures

In relation to adult outcomes many researchers include duration of time spent in a family structure as a control variable in their analysis (e.g., Kim and McKenry 2002 and Brown and Booth 1996). Others treat marital durations as phases of family life and explore how variables work differently in the different phases to promote marital disruption or quality (e.g., Morgan and Rindfuss 1985; Orbuch et al. 1996; Zietlow and VanLear 1991). However, few researchers have examined duration as a dimension of family structure that explains the effects of family structure on adults. Further, those who do consider duration as an explanatory variable often look only at the duration spent in the current relationship or duration since the last transition, while ignoring entire trajectory histories (e.g. Demo and Acock 1996; Mastekaasa 1994). Additionally, studies that use the concept of duration with respect to families often concentrate solely on marital duration and ignore durations spent in other family structures. As a result, there is very little understanding of the effects of the duration spent in different family structures. However, consideration of the stresses and resources found in different family structures can shed light on the effects that the duration of time spent in a particular family structure can have on well-being outcomes.

The intact family structure might be especially beneficial to individuals because it provides them with high levels of support and companionship. In addition, marital relationships can benefit from economies of scale. Married individuals can be more efficient in terms of managing their stresses and obligations because marital unions contain two adults who share those burdens, provide resources (emotional, material, and temporal) to the family unit, and help each other out (Burke and Weir 1977; Kurdek 1989). In addition, marital unions can tap larger

pools to formulate social networks comprised of individuals who support the relationship and family; the couple can draw from both spouses' networks to formulate joint support networks. All of these benefits can cumulatively improve the well-being of the individuals in the marriage.

Evidence from past studies suggests that compared to other family structures an intact family structure might be healthiest for adults. For example, researchers find that in intact families adults have better relationships with their children, better general health, lower mortality, more stable kin and friendship networks, fewer depressive symptoms, and greater economic resources (Acock and Demo 1994; Amato and Booth 1991; Davies, Avison, and McAlpine 1997; Kitson and Holmes 1992; Kitson and Morgan 1990; Lorenz et al. 1997; Waite 1995). Research also finds that married individuals are less likely to engage in behaviors that could have negative health effects such as substance abuse, non-orderly lifestyles, and risk taking (Umberson 1987; Waite 1995). These benefits of marriage can occur because marriage allows spouses to spread the burden of stressful situations more thinly and helps individuals to deal appropriately with the stresses and strains in their lives and to keep them from accumulating and causing crises. Additionally, married individuals experience fewer life stresses than unmarried individuals and previously married individuals (Turner, Wheaton, and Lloyd 1995), indicating that they might have less accumulated stress. As a result I formulate the following as my first hypothesis:

H1: Longer durations spent married will increase well-being.

In contrast to married individuals, divorced individuals lack the marital companionship and support that result from the economies of scale of marriage. Thus, they might lack the resources to diffuse the stresses and strains of life that are afforded married individuals. Research has shown that those who divorce are more prone to mortality (especially among men)

as well as psychological and physical ailments and negative health behavior (Kitson & Morgan, 1990; Umberson 1987). Another finding that has been documented in a variety of studies is that divorce leads to eroding parent-child relationships including diminished contact between children and their noncustodial parent, inconsistencies in the use of discipline, and less affection and communication with children (Amato and Booth 1991), all of which can increase stress for any one individual within a family. In addition, studies have documented increases in financial burden associated with divorce, especially for women. These studies cite a substantial income loss of between 13 and 38 percent (Kitson and Holmes 1992; Kitson and Morgan 1990; Lorenz et al. 1997). Thus, divorce introduces its own stresses and strains in individuals' lives, but it also can impede their ability to adequately cope with those stresses and strains as well as others that arise throughout the life course. Not only might a divorced individual lose the support of their spouse, but their other support networks might also be disrupted. Some research finds that divorced individuals experience higher levels of depressive symptoms than married individuals, even after extended periods of time (Lorenz et al. 1997). Others find that the difference between married and divorced individuals diminishes significantly over extended periods of time (Kitson and Holmes 1992).

Instead of focusing solely on the pathology and negative aspects of divorce, some researchers have started looking at the positive aspects. Riessman (1990) admits that research has clearly shown divorce to be related to a variety of physical and psychological ailments. She critiques this research, however, for taking a purely "doom and gloom" approach to divorce. After analyzing interviews of 104 subjects (half men and half women), she concludes that the information in the interviews challenges the current popular and academic conception of divorce as an "all bad" phenomenon. For example, she points out that "women in the sample, especially,

spoke at length of the freedom and personal growth of their newly constructed lives as single people, of regaining aspects of life that they never knew they had lost” (p. 211). Nonetheless, given the overwhelming evidence from cross sectional analyses of the negative effects of divorce on well-being and the fact that the divorced cannot experience the benefits of economies of scale, my second hypothesis is as follows:

H2: Increases in the duration of time spent divorced will decrease well-being.

Separated adults are also considered to be worse off than those in both marital and cohabitating unions. Ren (1997) finds the separated to have lower levels of well-being than the divorced. He speculates that a possible explanation for their lower well-being is that their situation is in limbo and their future uncertain. Another possible explanation is that separations are often more recent than divorces. Mastekaasa (1994) finds that the separated have the lowest level of subjective well-being of all groups based on their union status. Mastekaasa also finds that the levels of subjective well-being among the separated do not increase even three or more years after the separation. These findings are consistent with the theory that couples benefit from economies of scale in their relationships while individuals cannot experience the same benefits. Similarly to the divorced, such individuals might not be able to diffuse the stresses and strains of life, which leads to an accumulation of stress. Additionally, the process of separation can provide a solid base of stress and strain on which other life problems pile up. Thus, small occurrences cumulatively become overwhelming. The findings of cross sectional research on the divorced and separated might be capturing the pile-ups of stress and strain that could be diffused if the individual had the support and resources that individuals in unions have. This leads me to my third hypothesis:

H3: Increases in the duration of time spent separated will decrease well-being.

The single-parent family structure is likely the most stressful for two reasons. First, it lacks the support and resources associated with a partner. Second, it contains the stresses and strains of rearing children. Studies continue to show that single-parents face a number of difficulties not faced by their married counterparts. Single-mothers report higher rates of depression and psychological distress as well as greater financial burden than do married mothers (Acock and Demo 1994; Davies et al. 1997). Emery (1994) sums up the situation when he concludes that single-parents are likely to be “overburdened, overwrought, and overwhelmed with the tasks of single-parenting” (p. 48). Additionally, it is unlikely that the financial burden and stresses associated with being a single-parent will decrease over time, but is more likely that they will accumulate over time, reducing the well-being of the single-parent. As such, my fourth hypothesis is as follows:

H4: Increases in the duration of time spent as a single-parent will decrease well-being.

The stepfamily structure has both similarities and differences from the intact family structure. It provides the economies of scale and the companionship and support that marriage offers, but it also contains its own set of stresses that might not be easily diffused over time, especially by the spouses involved. These stresses include unclear norms about the roles of family members, especially the relationship between step-parents and step-children (Cherlin 1978). As such, researchers make both positive and negative claims regarding stepfamilies. The positive effects of stepfamilies include the more egalitarian nature of second marriages, the addition of more emotional and childrearing support for the biological parent, and more frequent marital interaction and sexual intimacy (Acock and Demo 1994; Hetherington and Jodl 1994; Reissman 1990). However, one of the most widely discussed effects of stepfamilies and a source of stress that can be built into the family structure is diminished adult/child relationships

including distanced relationships and less frequent sharing of activities (Acock and Demo 1994; Cooksey and Fondell 1996; Glenn 1994; Hetherington and Jodl 1994; Popenoe 1994; White 1994). Other negative effects of stepfamilies include increased conflict about childrearing, ambiguous role expectations, lower overall satisfaction with life, increased depressive symptoms, and economic disadvantage (Acock and Demo 1994; Cherlin 1978; Fine et al. 1992; Hetherington and Jodl 1994; Thomson 1994; Zill 1994). Thus, while the stepfamily structure allows for support in diffusing certain stresses, it can also be the source of other accumulating stresses. With regard to stepfamilies my fifth hypothesis states:

H5: Longer durations spent in the stepfamily structure will increase well-being.

Individuals in cohabiting relationships can benefit from similar economies of scale as married individuals. Cohabitors can share the stresses and burdens that arise in their lives, resulting in those problems being dealt with more efficiently and avoiding the accumulation of stress. Research indicates that cohabitators fall between the married and the non-married in terms of happiness and depression levels (Brown 2000; Kim and McKenry 2002; Kurdek 1991). There is disagreement in the research, however, in terms of whether cohabitators' well-being levels most closely resemble the single or the married. On the one hand, in a Norwegian sample Mastekaasa (1994) finds that cohabitators report levels of subjective well-being that more closely resemble those reported by the married than the single. Additionally, in some cases (i.e. widows who are cohabiting) cohabitators report higher levels of subjective well-being than the married. On the other hand, both Ren (1997) and Stack and Eshleman (1998) find that cohabitators more closely resembled the single, with low levels of well-being.

Despite where they land between the single and the married, the question of why cohabitators do not receive equivalent benefits of marrieds remains unanswered. There are several

possible explanations for this deficit in benefits. First, it could be the result of selection. There might be something different about people who choose to cohabit as opposed to those who choose to marry. For example, research consistently finds that cohabitators tend to have slightly lower socioeconomic status than non-cohabitators and to be less gender traditional (Smock 2000). Second, Bumpass and Raley (1995) point out cohabiting couples can be better characterized as stepfamilies if there are children present and one of the parents is not the biological parent. This is the situation of 70 percent of cohabiting partnerships in which there are children present (Bumpass, Sweet, and Cherlin 1991). These cohabiting individuals might experience the stresses of the stepfamily situation, resulting in their decreased well-being. Third, Nock (1995) points out that cohabitation is not institutionalized as a family form; the role of a cohabiting partner is more ambiguous than the role of a spouse. He also claims that the lack of institutionalization can prevent cohabitators from forming social support networks. Given these findings I expect that the difference has something to do with cohabitators' ability to cope with the stresses and strains in their lives, and I predict that these stresses and strains will accumulate more for cohabitators than for married individuals, but less so than for those who are not in unions. Thus, my sixth hypothesis is as follows:

H6: Longer durations of time spent in cohabiting unions will increase well-being.

Number of Transitions

Within the life course perspective individual-based studies, as opposed to population-based studies, examine changes in life course outcomes of individuals that result from transitions at one point in time (Elder 1994; George 1993). According to the stress perspective the stress introduced by change makes transitions negative for well-being. Further, multiple transitions set individuals up for repeat occurrences of stressful situations (Amato 1993). Therefore, the stress

perspective suggests that well-being decreases as the number of transitions one experiences increases. This perspective received some support in the findings of research by Avison and Turner (1988). These authors make a distinction between chronic strain and eventful stressors and find that although eventful stressors have serious impacts on depressive symptoms, chronic strains also significantly increase depressive symptoms. This research, although not specific to family structure, suggests that the stresses and strains associated with particular family structures and family structure transitions can constitute chronic strain and therefore have persisting effects on adult well-being.

Past research shows that various family stressors lead to diminished outcomes for adults. Holmes and Rahe (1967) explain that life stress, emotional stress, and object loss is associated with illness onset. In their *Social Readjustment Rating Scale*, several family transitions are listed as highly stressful. The death of a spouse, divorce, and marital separation, in that order, occupy the top three positions on the scale. In more recent research, Simon and Marcussen (1999) find that transitions out of marriage increase psychological distress, but transitions into marriage reduce psychological distress. In related research Wu and Hart (2002) find that transitions out of marriage or cohabitation have deleterious effects for both men and women's physical and mental health. Additionally, in contrast to Simon and Marcussen (1999), they find that transitions into cohabitation or marriage from being single do not improve physical or mental health for men or women. On the other hand, Wheaton (1990) finds moderate evidence that transitions out of unions can alleviate stress and improve well-being by removing individuals from highly stressful situations. These studies, although insightful, have limited value for predicting the effects of the number of transitions because they refer to single event stressors. However, since in most cases transitions out of unions are shown to reduce well-being and since transitions into unions can be

accompanied by their own stresses, albeit of a different type and magnitude, I propose the seventh hypothesis as:

H7: Additional family structure transitions will reduce well-being¹.

Timing of Transitions

One of the main premises of the life course perspective is that the timing of lives is important. The life stage principle claims that change has different effects for individuals depending on the age of the individuals experiencing the change (Elder 1994). These different effects are due to the pressures of age-graded norms. Age-graded norms govern the occurrence and timing of transitions; those events that are untimely in terms of age norms can have severe negative consequences (Elder 1994). For example, getting married at the age of 18 is considered an “off-time” transition in most western cultures, whereas marrying in one’s early to mid-twenties is an “on-time” transition. Among the consequences of early marriage is a higher likelihood of divorce as well as lower socioeconomic status (Glenn and Supancic 1984; Teti and Lamb 1989). The concepts of timing of lives and age-graded norms imply that adults can be affected differently by transitions based on the timing of those transitions. Age-graded norms can be stronger for younger individuals than for older individuals because the age of the individual at the time of the transition might also affect the amount of resources they have available to help them deal with the stresses of the transition (i.e. the funding needed to establish a new residence) and/or any stigma involved with breaking an age-graded norm. In addition, adolescence and young adulthood is a time of demographically dense change in that this is the

¹ Summing the number of transitions and assuming that summation captures amount of stress has been criticized as a measure because it keeps us from identifying the unique characteristics of life events. As a result of this criticism researchers have begun aggregating only theoretically relevant events to formulate measures of stress. This technique allows the researcher to study transitions in sets (such as family structure transitions), without the exactness of studying individual transitions, but avoids problem of hiding unique characteristics of life events. (George 1993).

time in most people's lives when they are completing their education, entering the workplace, and starting their families (Arnett 2000). Thus, younger individuals may experience additional stress from transitions occurring in the context of dense change. In past research Mastekaasa (1994) finds no indication that those individuals who had uncommon marital status or living arrangements for their age experienced decreases in subjective well-being. However, consistent with the idea that older individuals will have more resources (emotion and material) with which to confront age-graded norms and the stresses of transitions as well as fewer demographic changes occurring in their lives, I expect the following:

H8: The age at the time of the first transition will be positively related to well-being.²

Recentness of the Last Transition

Another aspect of family structure is the recentness of the transition into the current family structure. Ren (1997) speculated that the health reports of separated individuals were more negative than those of divorced individuals because the separation was more recent and therefore more salient. Both Kitson and Holmes (1992) and Lorenz et al. (1997) find that the negative effects of divorce diminish over time, bringing outcomes among the married and divorced closer together in the long run. Consistent with these findings Zick and Smith (1991) find that the risk of mortality is significantly higher among men who recently experienced a marital transition than among those whose transitions were not recent. These findings are explained in terms of the amount of stress that accompanies marital transitions; it takes time to diffuse the stress that accompanies a transition and to collect the resources for diffusion. For example, in the early stages of a marriage the couple has to work on building a supportive network out of friends and family. It might take time for friends and family to adjust to the

² I use the first transition because using the age at the first transition provides me with the largest sample, as 2,355 respondents had at least one transition but only 932 had at least two transitions. Using the age at the second transition would exclude a large number of respondents who experienced a transition from the sample.

married couple's new relationship, to their own position relative to that new relationship, and to be able to offer the support needed (Johnson and Milardo 1984). The same can be true for individuals breaking up a marriage or another family structure. As a result hypothesis 9 is as follows:

H9: Decreased time since the last transition will decrease well-being.

FAMILY PROCESSES

I expect the family process variables to be related to well-being in a number of ways. First, they will have direct effects on well-being if they single-handedly increase or reduce well-being. Theoretically, this would happen if they increase or reduce stress levels that are then related to well-being. Second they will have mediating effects to the extent that the family structure variables affect well-being through the family process variables. One example scenario would be that the number of transitions somehow reduces the amount of outside help received which in turn reduces well-being. Therefore, if there is reason to believe that the family structure variables influence the family process variables a mediating relationship would be expected. Finally, the family process variables will have moderating effects on well-being if they interact with other stressors to increase or decrease the magnitude of the effects of those stressors on well-being.

Support

The premise of linked lives (in the life course perspective) suggests that social relationships are important because they affect the social trajectories of individuals that in turn affect outcomes (Elder 1994). One way the linkage of lives is demonstrated is through the support offered to an individual by friends and family. Prior research finds that support positively influences well-being by increasing access to resources that reduce the effects of stress

(Murray and Terry 1999; Pearlin et al. 1981; Thoits 1995; Tschann, Johnston, and Wallerstein 1989; Turner 1981). Often support comes from members of an individual's network. One important source of support is one's psychological network, defined by Bryant and Conger (1999) as a social network that is composed of those people who have a lot of influence over a respondent such as parents, in-laws, other kin, and close friends. Pittman and Lloyd's (1988) work attests to the importance of one's psychological network with respect to psychological well-being. They find that friendship support is a reliable predictor of life satisfaction. These researchers, however, also find that stressors consistently have stronger effects on life satisfaction than do support or resource variables. With a sample of African Americans, Ellison (1990) finds that the frequency of contact with and the availability of close friends is positively related to happiness, but is not related to global life satisfaction. Ellison also finds that family closeness is positively related to happiness while the geographical proximity of family members predicts global life satisfaction.

Additionally, increased levels of support have been linked to health outcomes. In a review of the literature linking support to health outcomes, House, Umberson, and Landis (1988) find social support to be positively related to physical health and negatively related to mortality. More recently, Ren (1997) finds that perceived financial support affects reports of global health for the divorced and never-married and that perceived emotional support and social activity is important for both the married and unmarried. These findings are consistent with the major trend in the literature, which is that perceived support is more important than actual support for well-being (Thoits 1995).

Based on findings regarding the positive effects of support from psychological networks I expect this type of support to have stronger effects on well-being than other types of support,

although, as reflected in the hypotheses below, I expect all support variables to positively influence well-being. Additionally, I expect one's history of family structure transitions to affect one's level of social and organizational participation as well as the level of help received, thus leading these variables to mediate the relationship between the family structure variables and well-being. I do not expect mediating relationships for the frequency of communication with members of one's psychological network because these relationships are rather enduring and should not be affected strongly by the family structure variables. Finally, I expect all of the support variables to moderate the relationship between the family structure variables and well-being. I indicate the direction of moderation in parentheses using the terms *diffuse* (refers to reducing the negative effects or increasing the positive effects of the independent variables on well-being) and *enhance* (refers to enhancing the negative effects or reducing the positive effects of the independent variables on well-being).

H10: Increased frequency of communication with parents will increase well-being and moderate (diffuse) the relationship between the family structure variables and well-being.

H11: Increased frequency of communication with in-laws will increase well-being and moderate (diffuse) the relationship between the family structure variables and well-being.

H12: Increased frequency of communication with siblings will increase well-being and moderate (diffuse) the relationship between the family structure variables and well-being.

H13: Increased social participation will increase well-being and mediate and moderate (diffuse) the relationship between the family structure variables and well-being.

H14: Increased organizational participation will increase well-being and mediate and moderate (diffuse) the relationship between the family structure variables and well-being.

H15: Increased non-paid help received will increase well-being and mediate and moderate (diffuse) the relationship between the family structure variables and well-being.

Family Characteristics

Family characteristics also reflect the premise of linked lives and its effects on outcomes. We tend to assume that family relationships are positive; family is a “haven in a heartless world” (Lasch 1977). Yet, it is important to remember that they do introduce their own stresses. In fact, a number of researchers and scholars warn that there is much variation within families and suggest that being in an especially conflicted intact family might be more harmful to individuals than being in an alternative family structure (Acock and Demo 1994; Amato 1994; Kitson and Morgan 1990; Wheaton 1990). Therefore, it is important to explore the effects that various family characteristics can have on well-being and on the relationship between the different dimensions of family structure and well-being.

According to past research, one important family characteristic is the individual’s happiness with the relationship. Demo and Acock (1996) find that marital stability and marital happiness are positively related to global well-being and self-esteem and that marital happiness is negatively related to depression for married mothers. These findings are further supplemented and supported by Ren (1997) who finds that marital and cohabitation relationship quality is positively related to global health perception and Cotton, Burton, and Rushing (2003) whose results show marital quality to be negatively related to depression and positively related to self-esteem. In two separate analyses Barnett and colleagues (Barnett 1994; Barnett, Marshall, and Pleck 1992) find that the quality of the marital role for women and men respectively is negatively related to distress. Additionally, they find that marital role quality moderates the relationship between poor experiences at work and distress. These findings are similar to those of Gove, Hughes, and Style (1983) who conclude that marital quality is the link that explains the relationship between marriage and mental health. Gove, Hughes, and Style’s findings highlight

the link between marital quality and well-being, but do not address other types of relationships. They beg the question: does *relationship quality* moderate the effect between family structure and well-being? In my analyses I include a measure of the perceived happiness with current relationships (including marriages, steady dating relationships, and cohabiting relationships) and hypothesize the following with regard to it:

H16: Perceived happiness with current relationships will have a positive impact on well-being and both mediate and moderate (diffuse) some of the negative effect of the family structure variables.

Another important characteristic of families is the amount and quality of interaction between adults and children. Interaction with children might diffuse stressful situations before they ever get started by promoting the child's well-being and health (Amato 1993). Additionally, these interactions might assure the parent that they are meeting their parental obligation. Finally activities with children can introduce parents to more support networks (other parents) that deal specifically with the stresses of being a parent. Using the same data set as this paper Demo and Acock (1996) find that mothers who frequently interact well with their children report higher well-being than those who frequently experience difficulties interacting with their children. Eggebeen and Knoester (2001) use the same data set to explore the effects of father interaction with children on fathers' well-being. They report that involvement with children, measured as the amount of time spent with children, increases men's satisfaction with their lives. This relationship holds for both residential and nonresidential fathers. Given the apparent positive impact that parent-child interaction has on parents' well-being and past research that shows levels of interaction to be dependent on family structure, I expect the following:

H17: Increased frequency of interaction with children will increase well-being and will both mediate and moderate (diffuse) the effects of the family structure variables on well-being.

H18: Having a particularly difficult child to raise will decrease well-being and will moderate (enhance) the effect of the family structure variables on well-being.

H19: Having a particularly easy child to raise will increase well-being and will moderate(diffuse) the effect of the family structure variables on well-being.

I expect these moderating relationships because lacking parent/child interaction or having a hard child to raise will increase the effects of other stressors, thus increasing the rate of accumulation of stress. I expect the opposite effects for having a particularly easy child to raise as this might reduce the effects of other stressors and stress accumulation over time in family structures. In addition, whereas previous research informs that family structure affects frequency and quality of parent/child interactions, there is no strong evidence to suggest that the family structure variables will affect whether or not a parent reports having a particularly easy or difficult child to raise. Therefore, I don't expect a mediating relationship for those two variables.

Family cohesion is also an important family characteristic because a family that is working together is taking on its problems together. Family cohesion reduces the amount of stress falling on the shoulders of any one family member and it can give parents the sense that they are managing their family the "right" way. Olson et al. (1983) argues that family cohesion is curvilinearly related to family functioning with either too high or too low of levels of cohesion resulting in negative outcomes. However, Farrell and Barnes (1993) test this argument and find a positive linear relationship between family cohesion and the well-being of family members. Additionally, Windle and Dumenci (1997) find low levels of family cohesion to be associated with higher levels of depression among both husbands and wives in a matched pairs research design. Because family cohesion should reduce the amount of stress entering the family, be affected by the family structure variables, and help family members diffuse other stressors, I expect the following:

H20: Increased family cohesion will increase well-being and family cohesion will mediate and moderate (diffuse) the relationship between the family structure variables and well-being.

On the other hand, conflict in the family could increase stress and the rate of accumulation of stress for individuals as well as taking time and energy that could be used diffusing other sources of stress. Research shows that conflict with the absent parent reduces well-being among the divorced. For example, Masheter (1991) finds that frequent quarreling over various issues such as financial arrangements and mutual relationships is negatively correlated with the well-being of divorced individuals. This leads to my next hypotheses:

H21: Conflict with the absent parent will reduce well-being and mediate and moderate (enhance) the relationship between family structure and well-being

H22: Dissatisfaction with arrangements made with the absent parent will decrease well-being and mediate and moderate (enhance) the relationship between non-intact family structures and well-being.

DATA

For this research, the data are taken from both wave one and wave two of the National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), a nationally representative survey of households. Wave 1 of the NSFH survey includes a probability sample of 13,008 respondents with a double sampling of Blacks, Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, single-parent families, families with step-children, cohabiting couples, and recently married individuals. The survey design is cross sectional; however, there are several sets of retrospective questions which collect information on union history, fertility, employment history, and similar topics. Wave 1 surveys were conducted in 1987 and 1988 (see Sweet, Bumpass, and Call 1988). Five years later, from 1992 to 1994, the original sample was re-interviewed in a longitudinal follow up. Wave 2 replicates the original interview with some additions such as collecting union history and fertility history for the years between the two surveys. Wave 2 includes 10,005 of the original respondents for a response rate

of 82 percent (Bumpass and Sweet 1995). My full sample contains 8,225 respondents, which is 82 percent of the wave 2 sample.³

In interpreting the findings of this research a number of caveats should be kept in mind. The most important caveat is that the family structure variables utilized in this data are only from a five year period between 1987 and 1992. This time period is in no way exhaustive in terms of accounting for all of the family structure variables and characteristics that the respondents experienced. Retrospective data was collected in the first survey for the family variables, but the data is incomplete for the needs of this project. Further research needs to be conducted on data that can account for the entire history of family structure transitions, but until that is possible this research starts us on the road to understanding the effects of duration as well as the other dimensions of family structure on well-being. A second caveat has to do with incomplete data collected in the second interview. Missing data precludes the creation of the duration variables for a number of respondents and others are missing data on the dependent variables. These cases have to be excluded from the analysis but are found to differ in some pretty substantial ways from those remaining in the sample. Details are discussed below. Thus, although the original sample is nationally representative, the findings of this research may not be.

Dependent Variables - Adult Well-being

In measuring well-being it is necessary to make a distinction between cognitive and affective aspects and to include both in analysis (Diener 1994; Headey, Kelley & Wearing 1993). Cognitive aspects include those measurements that require the respondent to make a conscious judgment about their life. An example is “How satisfied are you with your life as a whole?” Affective measurements are argued to be capturing two distinct categories – positive and negative affect (Diener 1994). Positive affect includes measures of happiness or elation while

³ Information about dropped cases is presented below.

negative affect includes measures of anxiety or depression. Although it has been argued that self report measures of well-being are influenced by factors such as mood at the time of the survey, Diener (1994) argues that these measures display sufficient levels of reliability and validity to be useful to researchers. Further, although subjective well-being displays some degree of temporal stability, it is sensitive to change and can be affected by life events such as family structure changes. Overall, Diener (1994) suggests that researchers examine multiple measures of subjective well-being in order to capture its multiple aspects and that they resist the temptation to limit measures of subjective well-being to negative affect.

To get a comprehensive picture of adult well-being in this paper, three measures of well-being are used. The first is a measure of cognitive well-being based on a question which asks, “Taking all things together, how would you say things are these days?” The respondent answered on a polar point Likert scale ranging from very unhappy (1) to very happy (7). The second dependent variable consists of a question to assess global relative health. “Compared with other people your age, how would you describe your health?” The response categories were: (1) very poor, (2) poor, (3) fair, (4) good, (5) excellent.

The third variable is a scale measure of psychological well-being consisting of 18 items (See Appendix A) with six response categories ranging from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (6). The items in this scale came from the Ryff Well-Being Scales that include measures of both positive and negative affect (Ryff 1989). Because this variable is composed of multiple items, it should have higher reliability than single-item measures. To construct the scale, a mean value is calculated for each individual based all of the items they responded to. This mean is then multiplied by 18, the number of items in the scale, resulting in final scores that could range from 0 to 108. This method is the equivalent of replacing each individual’s missing

data with their mean response and then constructing the scale by summing the responses. The scale variable ranges from 19 to 108 and has an overall mean of 84. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for this scale is 0.81. Descriptive statistics for the dependent variables as well as the independent and control variables can be found in Table 2 and Table 3.

Independent Variables

The independent variables that are the focus of this research are four different aspects of family structure: duration spent in a given family structure, number of transitions between family structures, timing of transitions, and recentness of family structures. Each of these variables (or sets of variables) is constructed for the time between the first and second interview. Duration represents each spell the respondent spent married, cohabiting, separated, divorced, in a stepfamily, or as a single-parent and is calculated by subtracting the starting date of the spell from its ending date.⁴ The number of transitions consists of a count of the entrance and exiting of family structures. For example, a respondent who was married at the time of the first interview and then divorced, cohabited, and remarried by the second wave would have three transitions whereas an individual who was single at the time of the first interview and then married by the second wave would have one transition (See George (1993) for a discussion of why it is acceptable to aggregate transitions within one domain).⁵ The timing of transitions is represented by a variable that gives the age of the respondent at the time of their first transition (between the two interviews). The final independent variable measures the recentness of the last transition that the individual went through. This is analogous to the duration of the current family structure.

⁴ The duration of time spent single was eliminated from analyses to avoid multicollinearity.

⁵ Entrance and exit transitions are both included in the same variable so that it will be possible to observe the inherent effects of a transition, not necessarily the type of transition.

Respondents spent on average 33.36 months married, 5.29 months cohabiting, 1.52 months separated, 2.63 months divorced, 8.41 months in step families and 8.37 months as single parents. About 71 percent of respondents do not have any transitions while 2,355 respondents have between one and eight transitions. All respondents who have at least one transition are included in the recentness variable, which ranges from zero to 88 months with a mean of 58.45 months. Respondents experience their first transition anywhere between the ages of 18 and 91, but the average age of the first transition is 37.55 years. Because only 2,355 of the 8,225 respondents experience transitions, separate analyses are conducted on this sample to ascertain the effects of the timing of transitions.

Moderating/Mediating Variables

Support Variables. Support variables include: communication with parents, in-laws, and siblings; help received; social participation; and organizational participation. Communication with parents, in-laws, and siblings are represented by a measure of the frequency of communication between the respondent and his/her parents, parent-in-laws, and siblings constructed using the following questions: “During the last 12 months, about how often did you see your mother [father, mother-in-law, etc.],” and “During the last 12 months, about how often did you communicate with your mother [father, mother-in-law, etc.] by letter or phone?” The response options to these questions were as follows: (1) not at all, (2) about once a year, (3) several times a year, (4) 1 to 3 times a month, (5) about once a week, and (6) more than once a week. Responses to the questions that referred to the respondents’ mother and father are averaged to create the variable for communication with parents. The same process is undertaken to create the variable for communication with in-laws, except using the questions for mother-in-law and the questions for father-in-law. The questions for siblings were only asked once and

referred to all siblings so the responses from these questions are averaged to form a score for frequency of communication with siblings.

One variable, ranging from zero to one, represents the proportion of areas in which respondents receive non-paid help. The possible areas include: help with babysitting or childcare; help with transportation; help with housework, yardwork, car repairs, and other work around the house; and advice, encouragement, moral or emotional support. For respondents who did not have children at the second interview calculations are adjusted to omit the first area.

Respondents' social participation is represented by an index score (the average of their responses) of their responses to the question "About how often do you do the following things?" Respondents were then asked to respond to each of the following events: social gatherings with relatives, neighbors, coworkers, friends outside of the neighborhood, at church, at a bar or tavern, or in group recreational activities. The response categories for these questions included: (0) never (1) once a year or less (2) about once a month, (3) about once a week, (4) several times a week. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for this scale is .55. Organizational participation is represented a similar index variable. The organizations included in this variable include: service clubs, fraternal groups, or political groups; work related groups; sports, hobby or garden organizations, or discussion groups; and church affiliated groups. The question asked, "How often do you participate in the following types of organizations?" The response options for this question were the same as for social participation. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for this scale is also .55.

Family Characteristic Variables. The family characteristic variables in this study include a measure of time spent interacting with children, a measure of family cohesion, variables marking those individuals who claimed that at least one of their children was either particularly easy or

particularly difficult to raise, variables that indicate the level of conflict and dissatisfaction respondents have with an absent parent situation, and a measure of happiness with current relationships including marriage, cohabitation, and steady dating relationships. Both the family cohesion and the interaction with children variables are limited to only those 4,320 respondents who had children; therefore, separate analyses of the parents sample are conducted to ascertain the effects of these variables.

The variable measuring time spent interacting with children resulted from the following question which followed individual questions on each of the activities listed: “About how many hours did you spend with the children in all of these activities during the past week?” – leisure activities away from home, at home working on a project or playing together, having private talks, helping with reading or homework, watching television or videos. For the 4,320 respondents who had children at NSFH2, this variable ranges from zero to 85 hours with a mean of 14.5 hours.

The measure of family cohesion, also included for those respondents who had children at the second interview, consists of an index score (average) for questions pertaining to how strongly the respondents agreed with the following statements: our family has fun together, things are tense and stressful in our family, family members show concern and love for each other, family members feel distant and apart from each other, and our family works well together as a team. The response options for these questions were: (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) neither agree nor disagree, (4) disagree, and (5) strongly disagree. Appropriate items are reverse coded so that a high score reflects high family cohesion. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for this scale is .81. The mean score for family cohesion is 4.03.

Dummy variables marking those respondents who claimed that at least one of their children was particularly difficult or easy to raise are also included in the family characteristics variables. One thousand two hundred twenty eight (1,228) respondents reported that at least one of their children was particularly difficult to raise while 2,923 respondents reported that at least one of their children was particularly easy to raise.

Respondents reported their level of conflict with the absent parent over the following issues: where the child lives, how the child is raised, how the respondent spends money on the child, how the absent parent spends money on the child, the time the absent parent spends with the child, and the absent parent's financial contribution to the child's support. The exact wording was: "I am going to read you a list of issues that you and [absent parent] may have conflict over. For each one, please tell me if you have (0) no conflict, (1) a little, (2) some, (3) pretty much, or (4) a great deal of conflict." Respondents' answers for each of these issues are averaged to form an index score. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for this index is .84. If the respondent's index score is two or above they are assigned a one in a dichotomous dummy variable that indicates those respondents who reported conflict with the absent parent. Two is made the cutoff because respondents who perceive themselves as having over "a little" conflict with the absent parent probably experience more consequences of that conflict in their daily lives (making it salient enough to report) than do those who indicate only having a little conflict. In addition the decision to make the cutoff point at two is in part practical in that a cutoff point at three would have yielded too few respondents to be meaningful. One hundred nine (109) respondents reported having conflict with the absent parent. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the current absent parent situation in the following areas: where the child lives, the time the child spends with the absent parent, and

the absent parent's financial contribution to the child's support. Respondents answered on a four point scale ranging from very satisfied to very dissatisfied. Scores are averaged to form an index of satisfaction with their arrangements with the absent spouse. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for this scale is .57. The 240 respondents with index scores of three or above (somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied) are then assigned a one in a dummy variable representing dissatisfaction. Dummy variables for these two sets of questions are used because only respondents who were in a situation requiring them to deal with an absent parent were asked these questions. Those who were not in such a situation are assigned zeros for these variables.

Finally, measures of happiness with current relationships are included. Individuals in dating relationships, cohabiting relationships, and marital relationships were asked about how happy they were with various aspects of their relationships (understanding, love and affection, sexual relationship, etc.). Respondents were asked to indicate, on a seven point scale ranging from very unhappy to very happy, the degree to which they are happy with each aspect of their current relationship. The responses for the questions are averaged to form an index score for each respondent (Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients: steady dating = .84; cohabiting relationships = .91; and marital relationships = .91). This variable is then converted to a dummy variable so that all respondents in the sample could be assigned a value. Those scoring 3.5 or above (indicating happiness with the current relationship) are assigned a one while those scoring below 3.5 (indicating they were unhappy with their current relationship) are assigned a zero. Respondents who were not in relationships at the time of the second interview are assigned a zero as well.

Control Variables

Control variables include age, sex, race/ethnicity (white or non-white), completed education at wave two, number of people living in the household with the respondent, the number of children (biological, step, adopted, foster, or child of lover/partner) living in the household, and household income, all measured at the second interview. Dummy variables indicating the family structure respondents were in at the time of the second interview are also included as control variables.

At wave 2 respondents in the analyses in this research ranged in age from 22 to 97 with the mean age being 47 years. The sample is comprised of 3,112 men (38%) and 5,113 women (62%). Of these, 76 percent (6,255) are white and 24 percent (1,970) are nonwhite. Nineteen percent (1,556) of respondents have completed less than a high school education. Another 36 percent (2,969) have completed their high school education while 23 percent (1,914) have completed some college. Fourteen percent (1,151) have completed their bachelor's degree and the remaining eight percent (635) have completed a graduate or professional program. Household income ranges from zero to about 1 million dollars with the average being \$41,820 and the median household income being \$34,000. Finally, 4,320 respondents have children living in their household with them at the time of the second interview. Of these, the average respondent has two children with some having as few as one and others having as many as ten children living in their household.

Missing Data

For those respondents who are missing data on a specific variable the mean or median value of the variable is used. The mean age is inserted for four respondents. Twenty respondents (< 1%) have missing data replaced by the mean level of completed education and

463 (5.6%) have the median household income entered for them. Eight respondents have missing data on the race/ethnicity variable and therefore are entered into the analysis as being white. The mean value of social participation (participated periodically) is entered for 143 respondents and the mean for organizational participation (participated periodically) is entered for 157 respondents. One hundred forty three respondents are coded as having the mean proportion of help received. In additional analyses not reported here dummy variables (for each variable) marking those respondents who have missing data replaced by means are included in the full models for all three samples. Results do not change significantly with the inclusion of these variables.

Dropped Cases

One hundred thirty three (133) cases are dropped from the analyses because they contain inconsistent dates or have incomplete information which makes it impossible to determine the durations of time they spent in different family structures between the interviews. Cases which contain missing data for any of the three dependent variables (1,647) are also dropped from the analysis. Overall, 1,780 cases are eliminated leaving 8,225 or about 82 percent of the NSFH2 sample in the analysis.

A dummy variable is generated which is coded 0 for those cases that are “kept” in the analyses and 1 for those cases which are “dropped” from the analyses for reasons cited above. A t-test indicates that those cases dropped from the analyses are not significantly different in terms of age from the cases kept in the analyses ($t = 1.0588$, $p = .290$). However the dropped cases are significantly different than the kept cases on a number of other variables. A chi-square statistic of 15.60 ($p = .000$) indicates that there is a significant difference between the two groups in terms of sex of the respondent. Specifically, 19.7 percent of all males are dropped from the

analyses while only 16.6 percent of all females are dropped. A significantly greater percent of women are kept in the data set for the analyses. A one-sided t-test ($t = 3.7188$, $p = .000$) indicates a statistically significant difference in completed education levels with the kept group (12.69) having, on average, completed more education than the dropped group (12.41). Congruent with these results, the kept group also has higher household incomes than the dropped group. Their means are \$41,819 and \$38,829 respectively (one-sided t-test = 3.2190, $p = .000$).

METHODS

Three separate analyses are conducted. The first analysis contains the full sample ($n = 8,225$) as described above. The second analysis is conducted on the subgroup that has at least one transition in family structure between the two interviews. This subgroup contained 2,355 respondents. The transitions sample is important because it allows testing of the effects of the age at first transitions. The final analysis is conducted on only those respondents who have children ($n = 4,320$) so that the role of interaction with children and family cohesion can be tested. Analyses are conducted using OLS regression. Models are built for each dependent variable within each sample ($3 \times 3 = 9$). Mediation is tested in each analysis by entering the support and family characteristics variables as a group independently of each other and observing the change in coefficients. In a final model both the support and family characteristics variables are entered at the same time. Using this model as the backdrop each support or family characteristic is tested individually using the methods and criteria set forth by Baron and Kenny (1986).⁶ Moderation is tested by creating interaction terms between the significant independent

⁶ Mediation was tested for all control and family characteristics variables independently by running three separate regressions. First, the hypothesized mediator was regressed on the independent variables, the control variables, and the family process variables, excluding the mediator. Second, the dependent variable was regressed on all of the independent variables, the control variables and the family process variables, excluding the mediator. Third, the dependent variable was regressed on all of the variables, including the mediator. For mediation to occur four conditions must be met. The independent variable must significantly affect the mediator, the independent

variables and the support and family characteristics variables (Agresti 1990). All continuous variables are centered before creating the interaction terms. On all models the data are weighted using NSFH case weights to account for the over sampling in specific areas mentioned above. Variance inflation factors are calculated to check for multicollinearity in every analysis and indicate no multicollinearity.

RESULTS

Analysis 1: The Entire Sample

Cognitive Well-Being. Table 4 shows the results of the regression of cognitive well-being on the family structure variables.⁷ The independent variable measuring the age at the first transition is not included in any of these models because it would exclude too many respondents from the analysis. The first column shows the direct effects of each independent variable. Consistent with expectations, the duration of time married has a positive effect on cognitive well-being. Also consistent with expectations the duration of time spent in the non-union structures—separated, divorced, and single-parent—negatively affects cognitive well-being, with the duration of time being separated having the largest negative impact. This finding is consistent with the theory that being separated does not allow individuals to adequately deal with stress over time and that the separated family structure introduces more stress than do the other non-union structures. Findings regarding the effects of the duration of time spent cohabiting and in stepfamilies indicate that the duration of time spent in these family structures negatively affects cognitive well-being, but is less harmful than the non-union structures; however, this conclusion

variable must significantly affect the dependent variable when the mediator is not present, and the mediator must significantly affect the dependent variable. Additionally, the independent variable's regression coefficient must be greater in the model that excludes the mediating variable when compared to the model that includes it (Baron and Kenny 1986).

⁷ Robust standard errors for all regression models can be found in Appendix C.

is tentative because the coefficients on all of the duration variables are remarkably small as are the differences between them. Both the number of transitions and the recentness of those transitions have significant effects on cognitive well-being, indicating that each additional transition is harmful for cognitive well-being, but that those who experienced their transitions in the distant past are slightly better off than those who experienced them recently.

Model 1 shows the regression of cognitive well-being on all of the independent variables together. Again, consistent with expectations the duration of time spent married has a positive effect; however, in this model the duration of time spent in the stepfamily structure also has a positive effect, although not significant. The duration of time spent cohabiting, separated, divorced, and in the single-parent family structures all negatively affect cognitive well-being with cohabitation having the smallest, albeit it not significant, effect. Neither the number of transitions nor the recentness of those transitions has significant effects in this model.

In Model 2 cognitive well-being is regressed on the independent variables as well as the control variables.⁸ In this model the union family structures (married, cohabiting, and stepfamily) all have negative effects on cognitive well-being, a finding that is not consistent with expectations. In contrast, the duration of time spent separated and divorced have positive, but not significant effects. The duration of time spent in single-parent families has the expected negative effect on cognitive well-being, but is not significant. These findings suggest that the control variables account for the effects of the duration spent in a given family structure on cognitive well-being. Further analysis (not shown here), in which the control variables are entered in theoretically relevant groups indicate that the controls for family structure at the second interview may be exerting the bulk of the mediation power.

⁸ For all analyses (for all dependent variables) nine to ten models were run between model one and two. Each one contained one independent variable and the control variables. However, in the interest of saving space the results of these models are not reported here because they did not differ significantly from Model 2.

Among the control variables in this model both the age of the respondent and their income have significant and positive effects on cognitive well-being; however, the size of the coefficient for income is too small to be of substantive importance. All of the controls variables for the family structure at the second interview are significant and negatively affect cognitive well-being, except being in a stepfamily which is not significant. The omitted variable in this series is being married at wave 2; thus, respondents in the other family structures are worse off than those who are married.

In Model 3 the support variables are entered into the regression equation. Results are strikingly similar to Model 2 with respect to the independent variables. All three of the union family structures have negative effects on cognitive well-being. Some differences do arise among the control variables though. With the inclusion of the support variables the sex of the respondent becomes significant with males having lower cognitive well-being than females. In addition, the support variables slightly mediate the effects of being separated at the second interview on cognitive well-being. As for the support variables themselves, all of them positively affect cognitive well-being, with the frequency of communication with parents, social participation, organizational participation, and help received all having significant effects.

In Model 4 cognitive well-being is regressed on the independent, control, and family characteristics variables. Once again, the effects of the independent variables go unaltered, but there are changes in the control variables with the addition of family characteristics variables. The family characteristics variables seem to mediate the effects of the controls for NSFH 2 family structure, reducing the effect of being separated at NSFH 2 from -1.105 to -0.384. The coefficients for being single (ever married), single (never married), and a single-parent at the time of the second interview are also substantially reduced upon the inclusion of the family

characteristics variables. Among the family characteristics variables several have significant effects. Having a happy union has a strong positive effect on cognitive well-being while having a particularly difficult child to raise reduces cognitive well-being. As predicted, having a particularly easy child to raise increases cognitive well-being.

Model 5, the full model, includes all of the explanatory variables, control variables and family process variables. In this model the effects of the duration of time spent in various family structures does not differ from Model 2 (control variables). This indicates that the family process variables, contrary to expectations, do not mediate any of the effects of the duration of time spent in the various family structures on cognitive well-being. The most striking finding in this model is that, in conjunction, the support and family characteristics variables seem to mediate the effect of the current family structures on cognitive well-being. Additionally, in this full model, the effect of completed education becomes significant and negatively affects cognitive well-being. All other findings mirror those found in Models 3 and 4.

With respect to the family structure variables in the full model, none of the hypotheses (H1-H8) are supported. On the contrary, significant findings reveal that the duration of time spent in the union family structures have negative effects on cognitive well-being. However, substantively, these results are very small—small enough to be of little importance. On the other hand, a number of the family process hypotheses are partially supported. Among the support variables, increased communication with parents (H10), increased social participation (H13), increased organizational participation (H14), and increased non-paid help received (H15) all significantly increase cognitive well-being. Hypotheses regarding the positive effects of perceived happiness with current relationships (H16) and having a particularly easy child to raise (H19) are also supported as is the hypothesized negative effect of having a particularly difficult

child to raise (H18). None of these family process variables mediate the effects of the family structure variables on cognitive well-being though.

Global Relative Health. The first column of Table 5 shows the direct effects of the independent variables on global relative health. As expected the total time spent married positively and significantly affects reports of global health. The only other significant duration variable is the duration of time spent in the single-parent structure, which has a negative effect on global relative health. The duration of time spent cohabiting, separated, and in stepfamilies all have negative effects, but are not significant. In addition, and contrary to expectations, the duration of time spent divorced has a positive effect on global health, although also not significant. Interestingly, each additional transition increases global health slightly while those who experienced transitions recently are actually better off than those who experienced them less recently.

When all of the independent variables are entered into the model together in Model 1 the coefficients change very little, but their significance is altered in interesting ways. Variance inflation factors indicate that these changes are not due to multicollinearity. The duration of time spent married retains its small, but positive effect, but loses its significance. On the other hand, the duration of time spent cohabiting gains significance while maintaining its direction of effect and coefficient size. The durations of time spent separated, as a single-parent, or in a stepfamily are unchanged in this model from their direct effects, but more in line with expectations, the effect of the duration of time spent divorced becomes negative. Additional transitions increase global relative health significantly, while the recentness of the last transition has no significant effect.

In Model 2 the control variables are added to the regression model. In this model all of the duration variables have negative effects except for the duration of time spent divorced. However, only one of these variables is significant – the duration of time spent cohabiting. The loss of significance on the coefficient for time spent as a single-parent indicates that the control variables mediate that effect. The effect of the number of transitions is unchanged. Among the control variables the age of the respondent and the number of people living in the household both negatively affect global health while completed education levels and income positively affect it. Being currently single, (ever married) has a significantly negative effect on global health as well.

Models 3, 4, and 5 show the inclusion of the support variables, family characteristics variables, and both support and family characteristics variables, respectively. The results do not differ significantly across these models; as such I will only discuss the results of Model 5, the full model. In this model the duration of time spent cohabiting retains its negative effect on global health just as the number of transitions retains its effect. Among the control variables age and sex (male) have negative effects on global health while completed education and household income both have positive effects. As predicted all of the support variables have positive effects on global health with the frequency of communication with parents, social participation, organizational participation, and unpaid help received all reaching significance. Finally, among the family characteristics variables having a happy union or a particularly easy child to raise are both associated with positive increases in global health while having a particularly difficult child to raise or being dissatisfied with an absent parent both decrease global health.

The hypothesized effects of the duration variables on global relative health are not supported in these findings. Significant findings indicate that the duration of time spent cohabiting reduces global relative health and the number of transitions actually increases global

relative health. However, as with the results for cognitive well-being, these effects are substantively unimportant as they are so small. Results for the support variables indicate that hypotheses regarding the positive effects of communication with parents (H10), social participation (H13), organizational participation (H14), and help received (H15) are all supported while those for communication with in-laws (H11) and siblings (H12) are not supported. The hypothesized positive effects of having a happy union (H16) and an easy child to raise (H19) are supported among the family characteristics variables. Similarly, hypothesis 18 is also supported by the finding that having a particularly difficult child to raise reduces global health. Again, the effects of the family structure variables are not mediated by the family process variables.

Psychological Well-being. Column 1 of Table 6 shows the direct effects of each independent variable on psychological well-being. The results are consistent with expectations that both the duration of time spent married and the duration of time spent in the stepfamily structure are positively related to psychological well-being. However, the duration of time spent in the stepfamily structure is not significant. Also consistent with expectations are the negative relationships between the non-union structures and psychological well-being. While all three of these structures are negatively related to psychological well-being, only the duration of time spent divorced and the duration of time spent as a single-parent are significant. Contrary, to expectations, the duration of time spent cohabiting has a negative effect on psychological well-being. Neither the coefficient for the number of transitions nor the coefficient for the recentness of the last transition is significant, although the direction of the effects is consistent with expectations that increased transitions have negative effects while those who had their transitions in the distant past are better off.

Model 1 in Table 6 shows that when all of the independent variables are included in the model the results are virtually unchanged from the direct effects with the exception that the significance level of the duration of time spent cohabiting decreases. Upon entering the control variables in to the regression in Model 2 the effects of the duration variables change in important ways. All of the duration variables, including marriage and stepfamily, have negative effects on psychological well-being except the duration of time spent separated. Only one of these variables is significant, the duration of time spent cohabiting. These results are not at all in accordance with expectations. However, they indicate that the control variables account for the relationships seen in the previous models. Further exploration seeking to determine which control variables account for those effects does not yield any sound conclusions. Finally, the effect of the number of transitions switches back to the expected direction and stays that way throughout the rest of the models.

Models 3, 4, and 5 show the inclusion of the support variables, family characteristics variables, and both support and family characteristics variables, respectively. Models 3 and 4 indicate that the support and family characteristics variables slightly mediate the effect of the duration of time spent cohabiting on psychological well-being, but not significantly. However, when both the support and family characteristics variables are included in Model 5 the effect of the duration of time spent cohabiting loses its significance, indicating that together the support and characteristics variables do mediate that relationship. All of the support variables are positively related to psychological well-being, three of them significantly. The effects of communication with in-laws, social participation, and organizational participation are all significant with both social and organizational participation having notably large effect sizes relative to the other variables. However, the largest impact on psychological well-being comes

from two of the family characteristics variables. Individuals who reported being in a happy relationship at the time of the second interview are notably better off than those who did not. Conversely, those reporting having a particularly difficult child to raise are notably worse off.

Overall, with respect to psychological well-being, findings indicate little to no support for the predicted effects of the family structure variables. In fact, only the duration of time spent cohabiting approaches significance across the models; however, in a finding consistent with expectations, this effect is mediated by the family process variables. Hypotheses that are supported include those that predict the positive effects of communication with in-laws (H11), social participation (H13), and organizational participation (H14) as well as those that predict positive effects of being in a happy union currently (H16) and negative effects of having a particularly difficult child to raise (H18).

Moderating Relationships in the Full Sample. Table 7 shows the moderating relationships that are found for the full sample.⁹ The details (betas, t-values, and p-values) for these relationships can be found in Appendix B. Interaction terms are examined one at a time in the full model (represented as Model 5 in Tables 4-6). For each significant interaction term simple slopes are solved using the method of Aiken and West (1991) and are reported in the text.¹⁰ Very few moderating relationships are found for the support variables. Those that are significant for cognitive well-being indicate that increased frequency of communication with in-laws leads to increased benefits for each additional transition (low frequency $b = .015$, mean frequency $b = .113$, high frequency $b = .236$), but to decreased benefits for each additional month since the last

⁹ Only the significant interaction terms are shown here for the sake of brevity.

¹⁰ For interaction terms where the family process variable is continuous simple slopes are calculated at three different levels of the family process variable. Low refers to the value at one standard deviation below the mean, mean refers to the mean value of the variable, and high refers to the value at one standard deviation above the mean. In cases where one standard deviation below the mean falls outside of the observed range of the variable the minimum value for the variable is used for low.

transition (low frequency $b = .002$, mean frequency $b = -.081$, high frequency $b = -.183$).

Additionally, a significant interaction is found between the duration of time spent married and organizational participation, indicating that with increased organizational participation each additional month spent married becomes more and more detrimental for cognitive well-being (low participation $b = -.009$, mean participation $b = -.033$, high participation $b = -.057$).

Significant interaction terms for global relative health indicate that respondents who communicate more frequently with their parents see increased global relative health benefits for each additional month they spent either cohabiting (low frequency $b = .014$, mean frequency $b = .098$, high frequency $b = .183$) or as single-parents (low frequency $b = -.002$, mean frequency $b = .076$, high frequency $b = .143$). The same moderating relationship occurs between the frequency of communication with current in-laws and the duration of time spent cohabiting between interviews (low frequency $b = -.003$; mean frequency $b = .039$; high frequency $b = .091$). Global relative health is also more positively affected for each month spent as a single-parent by increases in organizational participation (low participation $b = -.002$, mean participation $b = .016$, high participation $b = .034$). None of the support interaction terms significantly affect psychological well-being.

Several family characteristics moderating relationships are found to significantly affect cognitive well-being. First, results indicate that those respondents who report currently having a happy union benefit from each additional month spent married ($b = .202$) while each additional month spent married for those who do not report having a current happy union decreases their cognitive well-being ($b = -.012$). The effects of currently having a happy union are similar for those in stepfamilies with respondents reporting a happy union experiencing benefits from each additional month spent in that family structure ($b = .832$) and those not reporting a happy union

experiencing decreases in cognitive well-being for each additional month (-.014). Having a happy union at the time of the second interview does not carry the same rewards with respect to the duration of time spent as a single parent. Findings indicate that for each additional month spent as a single parent cognitive well-being decreases by .155 units for those who report having a happy union while it increases very slightly ($b = .001$) for those who do not report having a happy union. The final moderation finding with respect to cognitive well-being is that each additional month spent separated results in no change in cognitive well-being for respondents who do not report conflict with the absent spouse, but in an increase in cognitive well-being for those who do report conflict ($b = .146$).

These findings are somewhat mirrored in terms of psychological well-being. Specifically, reporting having a current happy union results in increased psychological well-being for each additional month spent married ($b = 1.291$), while not reporting a happy union results in decreased psychological well-being for each additional month spent married ($b = -.037$). Findings also indicate that having a happy union at wave two leads to greater diminished psychological well-being for each additional month spent as a single parent ($b = -.763$) than not having a happy union at wave two ($b = -.003$). Also similar to the results for cognitive well-being, findings indicate that the effects of each additional month spent separated on psychological well-being are greater for those who report having conflict with an absent parent ($b = .868$) than for those who do not report such conflict ($b = .048$).

In addition to these parallels between cognitive and psychological well-being several moderating effects are found that are unique to psychological well-being. First, for those respondents who do not report having a particularly difficult child to raise each additional transition results in a .068 unit increase in psychological well-being, but for those who do report

having a difficult child to raise each additional transition results in a decrease of .988 units. Second, having a difficult child to raise results in increases in psychological well-being of 1.105 units for each additional month since the last transition, while not having a difficult child to raise results in decreases in psychological well-being of .007 units for each additional month. Third, for respondents with a particularly easy child to raise each additional month spent married results in increases in psychological well-being of .686 units while not having an easy child to raise results in decreased well-being ($b = -.019$) for each additional month spent married. The effects of each additional month spent cohabiting on psychological well-being is also affected by having a particularly easy child to raise. Those who report having a particularly easy child to raise experience larger negative effects for each additional month spent cohabiting ($b = -.845$) than do those who do not report having an easy child to raise ($b = -.007$). However, respondents who report having an easy child to raise see a .891 unit increase in psychological well-being for each additional month since their last transition while those who do not report having an easy child to raise have reduced psychological well-being for each additional month since the last transition ($b = -.013$). Finally, for each additional month spent divorced, respondents who reported being dissatisfied with arrangements with an absent parent experience increased psychological well-being ($b = .851$) while those who did not report such dissatisfaction experienced decreased psychological well-being ($b = -.055$).

The final family structure dimension, age at first transition is not included in the above models because it, by definition, limits the sample size to those who have experienced at least one transition. Therefore, additional analyses are needed to explore its effects on the three measures of well-being. I turn to those analyses now. Note that the sample size changes from 8,225 to 2,355 in the following analyses.

In sum, in the full sample it appears as if the different dimensions of family structure have little to no effect on all three measures of well-being. Those duration variables that are significant have coefficient sizes small enough to cause very small substantive changes in well-being, even when considering that they refer to months spent in these family structures. In addition, the number of transitions is only significantly related to global relative health while the recentness of the transitions is not significantly related to any of the measures of well-being. Findings regarding the support variables are remarkably consistent across outcomes with all of the support variables positively influencing well-being and communication with parents, social and organizational participation, and help received all reaching significance regularly. The most consistent findings among the family characteristics variables are the positive effects of reporting having a current happy union and the negative effects of having a particularly difficult child to raise. For the most part, the support and family characteristics variables do not play mediating roles. However, there is one exception. Together, the support and family characteristics variables do mediate the effects of the duration of time spent cohabiting on psychological well-being. Several moderation relationships are found to be significant. Among the support variables, communication with parents, communication with in-laws, and organizational participation all play moderating roles. Among the family characteristics variables having a happy union and/or conflict with an absent parent moderates some effects on cognitive well-being. No family characteristics variables moderate relationships between independent variables and global relative health. Conversely, each one plays a moderating role for various relationships between the independent variables and psychological well-being.

Analysis 2: Transitions Sample

Cognitive Well-being. The first column of Table 8 shows the direct effects of the independent variables on the cognitive well-being of those who experienced at least one transition between the two interviews. The results indicate that all of the duration variables have a negative effect on cognitive well-being for these individuals except for the duration of time spent in stepfamilies, which has a positive effect, albeit not significant. Only the duration of time spent separated and the duration of time spent as a single-parent have significant effects. The number of transitions is inversely related to cognitive well-being, but not significant. Recentness, on the other hand, is significantly related to cognitive well-being with the coefficient indicating that the longer it has been since one experienced their last transition the better off they will be. Results also indicate that the older one is at their first transition the worse off they will be in terms of cognitive well-being.

When all of the independent variables are included together in the regression model (Model 1 in Table 7), all of the duration variables have a negative effect on cognitive well-being. Additionally, the durations spent married, cohabiting, separated, divorced, and as a single-parent are all significant. This finding, considered in comparison to the directional effects found in the full sample, suggests that those individuals who experienced at least one transition in the given time frame differ in their ability to capitalize on the “goods” of unions from those who did not. In this model the number of transitions, the recentness of the last one, and the age at the first transition are virtually unchanged from their direct effects.

In Model 2 the control variables are added to the model. In this model the duration of time spent married, cohabiting, and as a single-parent are all significantly and negatively related to cognitive well-being. The duration of time spent divorced and in stepfamilies is also

negatively related to cognitive well-being while the duration of time spent separated is positively related to cognitive well-being; however, none of these three coefficients are significant. The number of transitions remains insignificant and the coefficients for recentness and the age at the first transition also become insignificant.

As with the full sample, Models 3, 4, and 5 show the inclusion of support, family characteristics, and both support and family characteristics variables in the regression equation. In these models the duration variables are unchanged from Model 2 with the duration spent married, cohabiting, and as a single-parent all having significant and negative effects on cognitive well-being. In Model 5 most of the current family structure control variables lose their significance. Upon looking back at Models 3 and 4 it becomes apparent that, like in the full sample, the effect of these variables is accounted for by the family characteristics variables. The only one of them to retain significance is being separated at the time of the second interview, but the coefficient for this variable is greatly diminished by the addition of the family characteristics variables. Among the support variables, only one is significant, although all of them are positively related to cognitive well-being. Increased social participation increases cognitive well-being. Two family characteristics variables are significant. Having a happy union increases cognitive well-being, while having a particularly difficult child to raise decreases cognitive well-being.

In the transitions sample, only one of the hypotheses for the independent variables is supported with respect to cognitive well-being; additional time spent as a single-parent decreases cognitive well-being (H4). Hypotheses 1 and 2 are directly countered in that longer durations spent married or cohabiting both lead to decreased cognitive well-being. Hypothesis 13 is also supported. Increased social participation leads to increased cognitive well-being, but none of the

other support variables have significant effects (although they are all in the hypothesized direction). Finally, with respect to family characteristics variables, hypotheses 16 and 18 are supported. Having a happy union increases cognitive well-being while having a particularly difficult child to raise decreases cognitive well-being.

Global Relative Health. Table 9 shows the results of the models for the global relative health of the individuals in the transitions sample. The first column consists of the direct effects of each independent variable on global health. The duration of time spent married positively affects global relative health. This finding is consistent with expectations as is the finding that the durations of time spent separated and in single-parent families are the most harmful in terms of global relative health. However, the only other significant duration variable is the duration of time spent in single-parent families. As with the full sample, the number of transitions experienced is positively related to global relative health, but the finding is not significant. The recentness of the last transition is positively related to health, but also not significant. However, the inverse relationship between the age at the first transition and health is significant, indicating that individuals who were older at the time of their first transition (between the interviews) are worse off than those who were younger.

When all of the independent variables are included in Model 1 together there are a couple of changes worth note. First, the coefficient for marriage decreases to virtually zero and loses its significance. On the contrary, the negative coefficients for the duration of time spent cohabiting and separated gain significance and the duration of time spent divorced, positive in its direct effects, is now negative with the inclusion of the other independent variables. The effect of the duration of time spent as a single-parent is unchanged in this model and remains significant. Although not significant, the number of transitions takes on the expected relationship with health

in this model and the recentness of the last transition remains unchanged from its direct effects. Finally, the age at the first transition remains negatively related to global relative health and significant.

Model 2 shows the results of regressing global health on the independent and control variables. In this model the duration of time spend married or in stepfamilies remain insignificant, but are positively related to global relative health. The rest of the duration variables are negatively related to health with only one, cohabitation, reaching significance. Both the transitions and the recentness variables retain their direction and strength of effect from the previous model without the control variables. The effect of the age at the first transition does the same, remaining negative and significant. Among the control variables, both completed education and income have positive effects on global relative health while the number of individuals living in the household is inversely related to health.

Models 3, 4, and 5 show the introduction of the support and family characteristics variables into the regressions. In Model 5, the full model, there are no significant duration variables, indicating that the family process variables mediate the effects of the duration of time spent cohabiting on global health. Specifically, as can be seen by comparing Models 3 and 4, the support variables are responsible for playing this mediation role. The only significant independent variable in this full model is the age at the first transition, which is still inversely related to global relative health. The control variables are unchanged by the introduction of the support and family characteristics variables. Only one support and two family characteristics variables are significant in this model. Social participation is positively related to global health as is, unexpectedly, conflict with an absent parent. Dissatisfaction with the absent parent, however, is inversely related to global health. The positive effect of conflict with the absent

parent and the negative effect of dissatisfaction with the absent parent are puzzling. One explanation would be that the measure of conflict is actually capturing something different, like contact. To have conflict with an absent parent one must have contact with them and that contact may have stronger positive effects than the actual conflict has negative effects. Conflict does not necessarily imply dissatisfaction and that could be the reason for the discrepancy here.

None of the hypotheses for the independent variables are supported for global relative health in the transitions sample. Only one independent variable is significant, the age at the first transition, but the direction of its effect is opposite of predictions. Among the support variables, all of them have positive effects, but only one hypothesis (H13) is supported as only one coefficient reaches significance. Increased social participation leads to increased global health. Results among the family characteristics variables are mixed in that hypothesis 22 (dissatisfaction with the absent parent leads to decreased well-being) is supported, but hypothesis 21 (conflict with the absent parent leads to decreased well-being) is not.

Psychological Well-being. The results of the transitions sample regressions for the final dependent variable, psychological well-being, can be seen in Table 10. As in the other tables, the first column shows the direct effect of each of the independent variables on psychological well-being. As expected the direct effects of the duration of time spent married are positive, however, not significant. All of the other duration variables are negatively related to psychological well-being with the duration of time spent cohabiting, divorced, and as a single-parent all reaching significance. The number of transitions and the age at the first transition are both inversely related to psychological well-being. The recentness of the last transition is positively related to psychological well-being, but not significantly so.

Model 1 shows the regression of psychological well-being on all of the independent variables. In this model all of the duration variables are negatively related to psychological well-being with marital and stepfamily structures being the only two duration variables that are not significant. The duration of time spent cohabiting, separated, divorced, and as a single-parent are all significant in this model. Similarly to their direct effects, both the number of transitions and the age at the first transition are negatively related to psychological well-being while the recentness of the last transition is positively related to psychological well-being, but not significantly so.

Upon the addition of the control variables to the regression in Model 2 all of the duration variables lose their significance. They also all remain negatively related to psychological well-being, except for the duration of time spent separated, which becomes positive. The number of transitions remains negatively and significantly related to psychological well-being. The effect of the age at the first transition is accounted for by the control variables to the point that it loses significance. Among the control variables both completed education and income are positively related to psychological well-being. Relative to being married at the time of the second interview, individuals who were in other family structures were worse off in terms of psychological well-being with all of these variables being significant except being in a stepfamily.

Models 3, 4, and 5 show the inclusion of support, family characteristics, and both support and family characteristics variables respectively, with Model 5 representing the full model. The effects of the duration variables in these models do not differ significantly from those in Model 2; there are no significant effects. The only independent variable that reaches significance in these models is the number of transitions, which remains negatively related to psychological

well-being and is unchanged by the inclusion of the support and family characteristics variables. The coefficient for sex reaches significance with the inclusion of the family process variables, indicating that males have lower psychological well-being than do females. The effects of the other control variables resemble those found in Model 2 with the exception that the family characteristics variables mediate some of the effects of the current family structure variables on psychological well-being. Once again social participation is the only significant support variable although they are all positively related to psychological well-being. Among the family characteristics variables both having a happy union and having a hard child to raise have strong effects on psychological well-being, the former being positive and the latter being negative.

For psychological well-being only one hypothesis (H7) for the independent variables is supported. Each additional transition leads to decreased psychological well-being. Among the support variables the hypothesis regarding the positive effects of social participation on psychological well-being (H13) is supported. All of the other support variables have the predicted direction of effect, but do not reach significance. Hypotheses 16 and 18 are supported for the family characteristics variables. Having a happy union increases psychological well-being while having a particularly difficult child to raise decreases psychological well-being. The family process variables do not mediate the effects of the family structure variables on psychological well-being.

Moderating Relationships in the Transitions Sample. As with the full sample, interaction terms are tested in the transitions sample by including each term individually in the full models (Model 5 in Tables 8-10) and then solving for the simple slope. Results can be found in Table 11 (with detail in Appendix B).

Among the support variables, significant interactions are found for four variables: frequency of communication with parents, frequency of communication with in-laws, frequency of communication with siblings, and help received. The frequency of communication with parents significantly moderates the relationship between the duration of time spent cohabiting and global relative health. As the frequency of communication with parents increases, each additional month spent cohabiting has increasingly positive effects on global health (low frequency $b = .034$, mean frequency $b = .106$, high frequency $b = .178$). The frequency of communication with in-laws moderates relationships for all three dependent variables. As the frequency of communication with in-laws increases so does the positive effects of the number of transitions on cognitive well-being (low frequency $b = -.054$, mean frequency $b = .065$, high frequency $b = .207$), the positive effects of the duration of time spent cohabiting on global relative health (low frequency $b = -.004$, mean frequency $b = .049$, high frequency $b = .113$), and the negative effects of the duration of time spent married on psychological well-being (low frequency $b = -.019$, mean frequency $b = -2.098$, high frequency $b = -4.588$). The frequency of communication with siblings moderates the relationship between the duration of time spent in the stepfamily structure and psychological well-being. As the frequency of communication with siblings increases each additional month spent in a stepfamily has increasingly positive effects on psychological well-being (low frequency $b = 1.722$, mean frequency $b = 2.970$, high frequency $b = 4.219$). Finally, the proportion of areas of help received moderates the effects between the duration of time spent married and cognitive well-being. As respondents receive help in more areas the effects additional months spent married become increasingly more negative (low $b = -.106$, mean $b = -.108$, high $b = -.111$). However, this change is very small substantively.

Each of the family characteristics variables moderates at least one relationship between an independent variable and dependent variable in the transitions sample. The effects of each additional month spent as a single parent on cognitive well-being are negative regardless of whether or not respondents report being happy with their current union, but for those who report such happiness the negative effects are larger. Having a happy union also affects the relationship between the recentness of the last transition and psychological well-being. Respondents who do not report being happy with their current relationship see reduced psychological well-being ($b = -.042$) for each additional month since their last transition while those who report being happy see increased psychological well-being ($b = 1.420$) for each additional month.

Respondents who report having a particularly difficult child to raise experience greater psychological benefits ($b = .839$) from each additional month spent separated than do those who do not report having a difficult child to raise ($b = .000$). In addition, whereas each additional month spent as a step parent has positive effects on psychological well-being for those who do not report having a difficult child to raise ($b = .017$), it has a negative effect for those who do report having a difficult child to raise ($b = -1.657$). Having an easy child to raise moderates the effects of the number of transitions on both cognitive well-being and global relative health. Each additional transition has negative effects on both cognitive well-being and global relative health for those who do not report having an easy child to raise, but positive effects for those who do report having an easy child to raise. Finally, whereas each additional month spent in a step family has positive effects for those who do not report having a particularly easy child to raise ($b = .001$), it has a negative effect for those who do report having a particularly easy child to raise ($b = -.101$).

The final group of family characteristics variables that have moderating effects includes conflict and dissatisfaction with absent parents. Results indicate that respondents who report having conflict with an absent parent benefit more in terms of cognitive well-being from each additional month spent separated and from each additional month since their last transition than those who do not. The same is true for the effects of additional months spent divorced on psychological well-being. Each additional month spent divorced has negative effects for those who did not report having conflict with the absent parent ($b = -.039$), but positive effects for those who did ($b = 1.268$). The results regarding the relationship between the duration of time spent divorced and psychological well-being in conjunction with dissatisfaction with the absent parent are similar. For those who did not report being dissatisfied each additional month spent divorced reduces psychological well-being ($b = -.048$) while it increases psychological well-being for those who did report being dissatisfied with arrangements with the absent spouse ($b = .999$).

In sum, the overall findings for the transitions sample are quite similar to those for the full sample in that the duration variables have few significant effects on the three dependent variables. In addition, those effects that are significant are miniscule in magnitude. The number of transitions is negatively related to all three well-being variables, but is only significant in its relation to psychological well-being. The results are mixed regarding the effects of transition age. Its effect is positive for both cognitive and psychological well-being, but negative for global relative health. Additionally, the effect of transition age is only significantly related to global relative health. Possible explanations for this finding will be discussed below. In the transitions sample the only support variable that has a significant effect is social participation, which is positively related to all three measures of well-being. Among the family characteristics variables

having a happy union and/or a difficult child to raise are significantly related to mental well-being while relations with absent parents are significantly related to judgments of global relative health. None of the family process variables, entered individually or as a group, mediate the effects of the family structure variables; however, it is notable that they do mediate the effects of the control variables for current family structure on both global and psychological well-being. As in the full sample, several moderating relationships are found to be significant. Communication with parents, in-laws, siblings, and help received all moderate various relationships between independent and dependent variables as do all of the family characteristics variables.

Analysis 3: Parents Sample

Because of data and conceptual limitations neither of the above samples have allowed for the testing of two very important family characteristics variables – frequency of interaction with children and family cohesion. In addition, it is not unlikely that respondents who have children differ significantly from those who do not. Therefore, one final set of analyses are conducted to examine the effects of the family structure variables on parents. This sample allows for testing of the effects of the omitted family characteristics variables as well. I turn to these analyses next, bearing in mind that the sample size for them is 4,320.

Cognitive Well-being. The direct effects of the independent variables on cognitive well-being are shown in Table 12. The effects are all in the expected direction with the duration of time spent married having positive effects and the duration of time spent in the other family structures having negative effects. All of the duration variables are significant except for the duration of time spent in a stepfamily. The coefficients for the number of transitions and the recentness of the last transition are also in the expected direction with additional transitions

reducing cognitive well-being and longer durations of time since the last one increasing well-being.

Model 1 shows the inclusion of all of the independent variables into the regression at one time. Controlling for the other independent variables the duration of time spent married becomes negative, and loses its significance. The other duration variables retain their direction of effect and their significance from the direct effects. However, the effect of the number of transitions becomes positive in this model and remains so throughout the rest of the models. The effect of the recentness of the last transition remains positive and significant.

The control variables are entered into the regression in Model 2 and their inclusion results in some changes in the direction of effects as well as significance levels. First, the duration of time spent married, cohabiting, divorced, in a stepfamily, and as a single-parent all have negative effects on cognitive well-being with married, cohabiting, and step all being significant. The duration of time spent separated has a positive, although not significant, effect in this model. The number of transitions and the recentness of the last lose their significance, but retain their positive direction.

In Models 3, 4, and 5 the support, family characteristics, and both support and family characteristics variables are entered into the models. Model 3, with the inclusion of the support variables is nearly identical to Model 2 (control variables), indicating that the support variables play no mediating role. Although all of the support variables have positive effects only two, social participation and help received, are significant. The results change substantially upon the inclusion of the family characteristics variables in Model 4. The effects of the duration of time spent cohabiting are mediated by the family characteristics variables as indicated by loss of significance in this model. In addition, all of the significant effects of current family structure

are mediated by the family characteristics variables. Four of the family characteristics variables have significant effects. Having a happy union, an easy child to raise, and/or increased family cohesion increases cognitive well-being. Having a particularly difficult child to raise has a negative effect on cognitive well-being. When both the support and family characteristics variables are included together in Model 5 the results do not differ substantially from those in Models 3 and 4.

Overall, these findings do not support any of the hypotheses for the family structure variables. Both of the significant family structure variables, duration married and duration step, are directly contradictory to their hypothesized effects (H1 and H5). Hypotheses 13 and 15 are supported by the finding that increased social participation and/or help received increase cognitive well-being, but the support variables do not play a mediating role as predicted. Among the family characteristics variables hypotheses 16, 18, 19, and 20 are supported in that having a happy union, an easy child to raise, and/or high degrees of family cohesion increases cognitive well-being while having a particularly difficult child to raise decreases cognitive well-being. In addition, as a group the family characteristics variables mediate the effect of the duration of time spent cohabiting on cognitive well-being.

Global Relative Health. Table 13 shows the results for the parent sample of modeling the regressions for global relative health. The first column contains the direct effects, which are largely in the expected directions with the exception of the positive effect of divorce. Three of the duration variables are significant: marriage, divorced, and single-parent. Neither the number of transitions nor the recentness of the last transition is significant although they are both in expected directions.

When all of the independent variables are entered into the regression together in Model 1 all of the duration variables come to have positive effects on global health with the exception of the duration of time spent separated, which although negative, has virtually no effect. Only the duration of time spent married and the duration of time spent divorced are significant in this model. While the recentness of the last transition retains its direction of effect, the number of transitions unexpectedly comes to have a positive effect.

The inclusion of the control variables to the model returns the coefficients back to a state resembling their direct effects with the exception that marriage has a negative effect in this model. Only the duration of time spent married and the duration of time spent separated have significant effects. Among the control variables positive and significant coefficients exist for completed education, the number of children in the household, and income while negative and significant coefficients exist for age and being single (ever and never married) at the time of the second interview.

Models 3, 4, and 5 show the results of adding support, family characteristics, and both support and family characteristics variable to the regression equations respectively. Since the results are fairly consistent across these models I will only address Model 5. In this full model only one duration variable is significant, the duration of time spent married. The inclusion of the support and family characteristics variables together mediate the effect of the duration of time spent divorced on global well-being. However, as can be seen by looking at Models 3 and 4, neither the support nor the family characteristics variable alone has this mediating effect. The effects of the control variables are consistent with those found in Model 2. As for support variables, two are significant and all are in the positive direction. Both increases in social participation and help received increased global relative health. The significant effect of

communication with parents in Model 3 seemed to be accounted for by the inclusion of the family characteristics variables in Model 5. Finally, among the family characteristics variables having a happy union a particularly easy child to raise, and/or high levels of family cohesion increases global relative health while having dissatisfaction with absent parents or increased interaction with children decreases global relative health.

Again, none of the hypotheses regarding the effects of the family structure variables on cognitive well-being are supported by these findings, and in direct contradiction to hypothesis one the findings indicate the additional time spent married decreases well-being. Both hypotheses 13 and 15 are supported in that increased social participation and increased help received have positive effects on cognitive well-being. Among the family characteristics variables hypotheses 16 (positive effects of having a happy union), 19 (positive effects of having an easy child to raise), 20 (positive effects of increased family cohesion), and 22 (negative effects of dissatisfaction with an absent parent) are supported. Surprisingly, hypothesis 17 is not supported in that increased interaction with one's children reduces cognitive well-being instead of having the predicted positive effects. A final important finding is that the inclusion of the family process variables as a group mediates the effects of the duration of time spent divorced on global relative health.

Psychological Well-being. Table 14 shows the results of the modeling of parents' psychological well-being. The first column shows the direct effects of the independent variables. Most of them are in expected directions. Specifically, the duration of time spent in two of the union type family structures, marriage and stepfamilies, have positive effects although only marriage is significant. The duration of time spent cohabiting has an unexpectedly negative effect. The duration of time spent in all of the non-union family structures also has negative

effects. Both the effects of the number of transitions and the recentness of the last transition are significant and in expected directions ($t=-3.53, p >.000$ and $t=4.87, p >.000$).

When the psychological well-being of the parents is regressed on all of the independent variables in Model 1 the results are very similar to the direct effects in terms of the direction of effects, but most of the variables lose their significance. In fact, only the duration of time spent married and the duration of time spent cohabiting retain their significance in this model. In addition, both the number of transitions and the recentness of the last transition lose their significance and the direction of effect for the number of transitions becomes positive.

Parents' psychological well-being is regressed on the independent variables and the control variables in Model 2. With the inclusion of the control variables the effects of the duration of time spent married are accounted for. The coefficient is greatly reduced, the direction of the relationship becomes negative, and all significance is lost. The duration of time spent cohabiting is virtually unchanged in this model. It remains negative and significant. No other independent variables are significant.

Support, family characteristics, and support and family characteristics variables respectively are included in Models 3, 4, and 5. In all three models only one independent variable remains significant, the duration of time spent cohabiting, and it is relatively unchanged across the models. Three of the support variables are positively and significantly related to psychological well-being: communication with in-laws, social participation, and organizational participation. Among the family characteristics variables, having a happy union currently, whether it be a steady dating relationship, a marital relationship, or a cohabiting relationship, increases psychological well-being by 3.393 units. Similarly, there is a strong positive relationship between family cohesion and psychological well-being among parents.

None of the hypotheses (H1-H9) regarding the effects of the family structure variables on psychological well-being are supported by these findings; the finding regarding the negative effect of additional time spent cohabiting is in direct opposition to expectations (H6).

Hypotheses regarding the positive effects of communication with in-laws (H11), social participation (H13), and organizational participation (H14) are all supported. However, none of the support variables play the expected mediating role. Among the family characteristics variables, hypotheses regarding the positive effects of having a happy union (H16) and the positive effects of family cohesion (H20) are both supported. Yet, as with the support variables, the hypothesized mediation effects of the family characteristics variables never materialized.

Moderating Relationships in the Parents Sample. Table 15 shows the general moderating relationships for the parents sample, once again with details being found in Appendix B. Results indicate that several support variables play moderating roles. The more frequently respondents communicate with their parents the more beneficial is each additional month spent cohabiting for global relative health (low frequency $b = .061$, mean frequency $b = .156$, high frequency $b = .251$). More frequent communication with in-laws results in each additional transition experienced being more beneficial for both cognitive well-being and psychological well-being. More frequent communication with in-laws also leads each additional month spent as a single parent to have increasingly positive effects on psychological well-being (low frequency $b = .213$, mean frequency $b = 1.877$, high frequency $b = 3.540$). However, increased frequency of communication with in-laws leads to larger and larger negative effects on cognitive well-being for each additional month since the last transitions (low frequency $b = -.014$, mean frequency $b = -.141$, high frequency $b = -.268$). The same finding occurs with regard to the moderating effect of communication with siblings on the relationship between the recentness of the last transition

and cognitive well-being (low frequency $b = -.116$, mean frequency $b = -.195$, high frequency $b = -.274$). Social participation moderates the effects of the duration of time spent cohabiting on psychological well-being with additional social participation leading to increasingly negative effects of each additional month spent cohabiting (low participation $b = -.340$, mean participation $b = -.517$, high participation $b = -.695$). Finally, increasing organizational participation increases the positive effects of each additional month spent as a single parent on global relative health (low participation $b = -.003$, mean participation $b = .020$, high participation $b = .042$).

A number of family characteristics variables play mediating roles. Having a happy union mediates the relationships between the duration spent cohabiting, in a stepfamily, and as a single parent on cognitive well-being. The durations of time spent cohabiting and in stepfamilies have negative effects for those who do not report being happy with their current relationships, but positive for those who do report being happy. The opposite is true for the duration of time spent as a single parent. Respondents who did not report being happy with current relationships experienced increases in cognitive well-being for each additional month spent as a single parent ($b = .003$) while those who did report being happy experienced decreases ($b = -.226$). The relationships between the number of transitions and both cognitive and psychological well-being are also moderated by having a happy union. In both cases those respondents who do not report being happy with current relationships experience decreased well-being with each additional transition while those who do report being happy with current relationships experience increases in well-being.

The effects of the number of transitions on psychological well-being are also moderated by having a particularly difficult child to raise. Respondents who did not have a difficult child to raise experience increases in psychological well-being associated with each additional transition

($b = .739$) while those who did have a particularly difficult child to raise experience decreases ($b = -.790$). Having a difficult child to raise also moderates the effects between the recentness of the last transition and psychological well-being such that respondents who report having a difficult child to raise see larger positive effects of each additional month since their last family structure transition. Having a particularly easy child to raise, on the other hand, moderates the relationship between the duration of time spent as a single parent and global relative health. Those respondents who report having a particularly easy child to raise experience larger negative effects for each additional month they spend as a single parent than those who do not report having a particularly easy child to raise.

Results of the tests for moderating effects of relationships with absent parents indicate that having conflict with the absent parent leads to positive effects for each additional month spent in the stepfamily structure (on cognitive well-being) and the cohabiting family structure (on global relative health). For both of these relationships respondents who did not report having conflict with the absent parent saw negative effects of each additional month spent in the family structure. Similar findings emerged for dissatisfaction with the absent parent in that the relationship between the duration of time spent divorced and psychological well-being is moderated by this variable. Those reporting dissatisfaction see increases in psychological well-being for each additional month spent divorced while those not reporting dissatisfaction experience decreasing psychological well-being. Interestingly, the relationship between additional time spent as a single parent and global relative health is not moderated in the same way by conflict. Instead, in both conflict and no conflict instances additional months spent single decrease global relative health, but this effect is larger for those who reported having conflict with the absent parent.

In the final moderating relationship family cohesion moderates the relationship between the duration of time spent as a single parent and cognitive well-being. Results indicate that higher levels of family cohesion lead to larger decreases in cognitive well-being for each additional month spent as a single parent (low cohesion $b = -.162$, mean cohesion $b = -.188$, high cohesion $b = -.213$).

In sum, results for the parent sample resembled the other two samples in that none of the independent variables have strong effects. The duration of time spent married is negatively and significantly related to cognitive well-being. The same relationship is found for the duration of time spent cohabiting and its effect on psychological well-being and for the effect of the duration of time spent in a stepfamily on cognitive well-being. However, none of these coefficients are of substantive importance as they are all quite small. In addition, neither the number of transitions nor the recentness of the transitions has significant effects on any of the three measures of well-being. The support variables and most of the family characteristics variables have similar effects on parents' well-being as they do in the other two samples. One exception is that this sample allows for testing the effects of interaction with children and family cohesion. While the results regarding interaction with children are mixed, family cohesion does have a significant and substantively large effect on parents' well-being. In terms of mediation, results indicate that the family characteristics variables mediate the effects of the duration of time spent cohabiting on cognitive well-being and the support and family characteristics variables together mediate the effects of the duration of time spent divorced on global relative health. Similarly, to the other two samples a number of moderating relationships are found. Especially worthy of note is the strong and consistent moderating role of having a happy union as well as the mixed effects of conflict with an absent parent as a moderator.

SUPPLEMENTARY ANALYSES

Because it has been posited that men and women experience their relationships differently (Gove 1972) additional analyses are undertaken to determine whether or not the independent variables have different effects for women than for men. To make this determination, interaction terms between gender and individual independent variables are included in the full regression models. Results are only discussed for the full sample and can be found in Appendix D. Results indicate that gender does in fact moderate the relationships between some of the independent variables and well-being.

One of the most striking findings is that while each additional month spent married is detrimental for women's cognitive well-being ($b = -.009$) it is actually beneficial for men's cognitive well-being ($b = .097$). This same finding is mirrored with respect to psychological well-being in that each additional month spent married reduces women's well-being by .023 units, but increases men's well-being by .597 units. The results for global relative health are slightly different. While each additional month spent married reduces women's global relative health very slightly ($b = -.001$), it reduces men's global relative health more substantially ($b = .048$).

Gender differences are also found for the effects of additional months spent cohabiting on both cognitive well-being and global relative health. For each additional month spent cohabiting women experience a decrease in cognitive well-being ($b = -.010$) while men experience an increase ($b = .065$). The same is found regarding global relative health (women $b = -.005$; men $b = .040$). Results also indicate that additional transitions improve both men's and women's global relative health, but men experience larger improvements than women (men $b = .074$; women $b = .006$). Finally, while women benefit very slightly in terms of global relative health from each

additional month since their last transition ($b = .001$) men see reduced global relative health for each additional month ($b = -.055$).

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A summation of significant findings can be seen in Table 16. Hypothesis 1 states that longer durations spent married will increase well-being. In terms of direct effects, this hypothesis is not supported in any findings reported here. Additional months spent married have positive effects on well-being in many of the equations before control variables are included, but control variables overwhelmingly account for these effects upon entering them in the models. With the inclusion of the control variables as well as the family characteristics variables the duration of time spent married has very small negative effects on all three measures of well-being across all three samples. However, the supplementary analysis of the moderating role of gender indicates that this hypothesis is supported in the specific case of males, but is not supported for females. This finding is consistent with the claims made by Gove (1972).

The second hypothesis claims increases in the duration of time spent divorced will decrease well-being. The findings with regard to the duration of time spent divorced are similar to those for marriage in that they substantiate the hypothesis until the control variables are entered into the models and account for their effects. In the full models, in terms of direction of effects, this hypothesis is substantiated in all but one case; however, the results do not reach statistical significance in any of the models. In all three models the effects of the duration of time spent divorced on psychological well-being is moderated by conflict or dissatisfaction with the absent parent so that for those who do not experience conflict or dissatisfaction each additional month spent divorced reduces psychological well-being while for those who do

experience conflict or dissatisfaction each additional month spent divorced increases psychological well-being.

Hypothesis 3 predicts: Increases in the duration of time spent separated will decrease well-being. Overall, this hypothesis does not receive support in the findings reported here. However, although rarely significant, the pattern of results across samples indicate that each additional month spent separated is positive for mental well-being, but negative for perceived physical well-being. Results of the moderating models on the full sample also indicate a phenomenon similar to that occurring with divorce in that respondents who reported having conflict with an absent spouse experienced increased well-being for each additional month spent separated while respondents who reported no such conflict experienced reduced well-being.

Hypothesis 4 says that increases in the duration of time spent as a single-parent will decrease well-being. The duration of time spent as a single parent does decrease well-being in all models across all samples, but is significant in only one model. Therefore, I must conclude that this hypothesis is not supported in the current study. Interestingly, the effects of additional time spent as a single parent on cognitive well-being are moderated in all three samples by being happy with a current union such that each additional month spent as a single parent has larger negative effects for those individuals who report currently being happy with their union. This finding suggests that the effects of one's history may differ depending on one's present situation.

Hypothesis 5 predicts that longer durations spent in the stepfamily structure will increase well-being. Longer durations in the stepfamily structure do not increase well-being. In fact, in all of the models the duration of time spent in the stepfamily structure has negative effects. These negative effects are significant in both the full and parents sample for cognitive well-being, but the size of the effects is very small, making them of little substantive importance.

Despite the bulk of the evidence pointing to no support for the hypothesis, the negative relationship between additional time spent in a stepfamily and cognitive well-being is moderated by reporting being happy with a current union in both the full and parents sample. Respondents who reported being happy with their current relationships experienced increased cognitive well-being for each additional month in the stepfamily structure, indicating that hypothesis 5 receives some support in this special instance.

Hypothesis 6 predicts: Longer durations of time spent in cohabiting unions will increase well-being. In all of the regression equations across all of the samples the duration of time spent cohabiting negatively affects well-being. The negative effects are significant in four of the models, most consistently for cognitive well-being. In a number of other models the significant negative effects of the duration of time spent cohabiting are mediated by the family process variables. The negative effects also seem to be moderated by communication with parents and in-laws such that additional frequency of communication results in increasingly positive effects of each additional month spent cohabiting. Thus, hypothesis 6 finds limited support when frequencies of communication with parents and in-laws is high, but is not supported in other instances.

Hypothesis 7 states that additional family structure transitions will reduce well-being. The results regarding the effects of the number of transitions on well-being are mixed. Results indicate that the number of transitions has a negative effect on psychological well-being for both the full and transitions sample, but a positive effect for the parents sample. These results are significant in the transitions sample only. The same pattern holds for cognitive well-being, but no significance is reached. In terms of global relative health, the number of transitions has a positive effect in both the full and parents sample, but negative effects in the transitions sample.

These results provide weak evidence both in favor of and opposed to hypothesis seven, but more importantly indicate a need for more specific measurement of transitions (such as entrance versus exit transitions). Although several family process variables moderate the effects of transitions on well-being one moderating relationship is particularly noteworthy as it appears in all three models. The frequency of communication with in-laws moderates the relationship between the number of transitions and cognitive well-being in all three samples and between the number of transitions and psychological well-being in the parents sample. In these cases the higher the frequency of communication with in-laws the more positive effects each additional transition has on well-being.

Hypothesis 8 says that the age at the time of the first transition will be positively related to well-being. This hypothesis received mixed support. The age at the time of the first transition is positively, but not significantly, related to both cognitive and psychological well-being. However, it is negatively and significantly related to global relative health. These findings suggest limited support with regard to mental health, but no support with regard to physical health.

Hypothesis 9 claims that decreased time since the last transition will decrease well-being. Again, in terms of direction of effects this hypothesis is supported in all but one full model; however, the coefficients are not significant. In addition, the effects are very small substantively suggesting that recentness since the last transition is of little importance for well-being. This result seems counter to findings that show that the well-being of divorced and separated individuals increases over time (Kitson and Holmes 1992; Lorenze et al. 1997). However, the findings here include all transitions, entrances and exits, and therefore the effects of any individual type of transition may be obfuscated by the other types of transitions.

Hypothesis 10 states: Increased frequency of communication with parents will increase well-being and moderate (diffuse) the relationship between the family structure variables and well-being. This predicted positive direct effect of the frequency of communication with parents is supported across the models and samples with respect to direction of effect. In addition, the findings are significant in the full models for both cognitive well-being and global relative health. Communication with parents moderates (diffuses) the effect of cohabitation on global relative health in all of the samples, but does not consistently moderate any other relationships. Thus, hypothesis 10 receives fairly strong support in terms of the direct effects, but relatively weak support in terms of the moderation effects.

Hypothesis 11 predicts: Increased frequency of communication with in-laws will increase well-being and moderate (diffuse) the relationship between the family structure variables and well-being. Hypothesis 11 receives support in terms of the direction of the direct effects of communication with in-laws, but once again the effects are largely insignificant. Significant results are only reached in two models. This variable moderates (diffuses) the relationship between the number of transitions and cognitive well-being. However, it moderates other relationships by enhancing the negative effects of the independent variables (i.e. the effects of recentness on cognitive well-being in the full sample). Thus, hypothesis 11 receives mixed, but weak support from these findings.

Hypothesis 12 claims that increased frequency of communication with siblings will increase well-being and moderate (diffuse) the relationship between the family structure variables and well-being. Overall, in seven of the nine full models frequency of communication with siblings has positive but not significant effects, indicating little to no support for the

hypothesized positive direct effects. In addition, this variable does not play a consistent moderating effect. Thus, this hypothesis is not supported.

Hypothesis 13 predicts that increased social participation will increase well-being and mediate and moderate (diffuse) the relationship between the family structure variables and well-being. The hypothesized direct positive effects of social participation on well-being are supported in all of the models and across all of the samples. Social participation consistently has positive and significant effects on all measures of well-being. However, social participation does not, on its own, play a strong mediating role nor does it consistently moderate any of the relationships between independent and dependent variables.

Hypothesis 14 states: Increased organizational participation will increase well-being and mediate and moderate (diffuse) the relationship between the family structure variables and well-being. The positive direct effect of organizational participation receives mixed support across samples. The variable has a positive effect in all models, but is only significant in four of the nine models. It does not reach significance at all in the transitions sample and is only significant for psychological well-being in the parents sample. These findings suggest that organizational participation may not be as beneficial for those under higher levels of stress than it is for the general population. Organizational participation does not have significant mediating or moderating power in any of the models in this paper.

Hypothesis 15 predicts that increased non-paid help received will increase well-being and mediate and moderate (diffuse) the relationship between the family structure variables and well-being. In both the full and the parents sample the predicted positive direct effects of help received are supported. In the transitions sample the effects are positive, but not significant. Thus, this hypothesis receives relatively strong support. However, this variable does not

independently play a mediating role. Neither does it consistently moderate any of the relationships between the independent and dependent variables.

Hypothesis 16 claims that perceived happiness with current relationships will have a positive impact on well-being and both mediate and moderate (diffuse) some of the negative effect of the family structure variables. The hypothesized direct effects of perceived happiness with current relationships receive among the strongest support of any variables in this research. In nearly every model this variable is significant and its effects are in the expected direction. In addition, whereas many other variables have very small substantive effects, the effects of perceived happiness are substantively meaningful in that they strongly affected well-being. Although it does not independently mediate any of the relationships between the independent and dependent variables it does play an important role as a moderator. Having a happy union consistently moderates the effects of the duration variables on cognitive well-being. For the most part reporting being happy with one's union leads the duration variables to have positive effects on well-being whereas not reporting being happy with one's current union leads to negative effects of the duration variables (diffuse). However, the findings are consistently reversed for the duration of time spent as a single parent (enhance).

Hypothesis 17 predicts that increased frequency of interaction with children will increase well-being and will both mediate and moderate (diffuse) the effects of the family structure variables on well-being. This hypothesis, only tested in the parents sample, is not supported. The direct effects are not always positive and are never significant and positive. In addition, this variable does not play an independent mediating role, nor does it moderate any of the relationships between the independent and dependent variables.

Hypothesis 18 says that having a particularly difficult child to raise will decrease well-being and will moderate (enhance) the effect of the family structure variables on well-being. This hypothesis garners moderate support. In six of the nine models this variable has significantly negative effects and it has a positive effect in only one model. Additionally, in both the full and parents sample having a particularly difficult child to raise moderates the effects of both the number of transitions (enhances) and recentness (diffuses) of the last transition on psychological well-being, suggesting mixed results for its hypothesized moderation effect.

Hypothesis 19 predicts that having a particularly easy child to raise will increase well-being and will moderate (diffuse) the effect of the family structure variables on well-being. Across samples and dependent variables having a particularly easy child to raise overwhelmingly has positive effects; however, these effects are only significant in four of the nine models indicating moderate support for this hypothesis. Additionally, this variable moderates a variety of relationships between independent and dependent variables, but no discernable patterns of moderation arise from it.

Hypothesis 20 states that increased family cohesion will increase well-being and family cohesion will mediate and moderate (diffuse) the relationship between the family structure variables and well-being. The results indicate that family cohesion has positive and significant effects in all three full models in which it is included, suggesting strong support for the hypothesized direct effects. However, individually this variable does not mediate any of the relationships between the independent and dependent variables and it only moderates (enhances) the relationship between duration of time spent as a single parent and cognitive well-being.

Hypothesis 21 claims that conflict with the absent parent will reduce well-being and mediate and moderate (enhance) the relationship between family structure and well-being.

Conflict with the absent parent has negative effects in six of the nine full models, but none of them are significant. In addition, it has significantly positive effects in one model. Thus, the hypothesized direct effects are not supported by the findings. Further, this variable does not play a significant mediating role. Nonetheless, it does moderate several relationships between family structure variables and well-being. However, in the bulk of these relationships it diffuses the effects, turning negative relationships positive. Only with regard to the relationship between duration spent as a single parent and well-being does it enhance the negative effects.¹¹

Finally, hypothesis 22 predicts that dissatisfaction with arrangements made with the absent parent will decrease well-being and mediate and moderate (enhance) the relationship between non-intact family structures and well-being. This hypothesis is strongly supported for global relative health in that in all three samples dissatisfaction with arrangements made with the absent parent decrease well-being significantly. It also receives somewhat weak support for cognitive well-being as it is negative, but insignificant in all three samples. However, it is not supported with respect to psychological well-being. On the contrary, across samples dissatisfaction with the absent parent has positive effects on psychological well-being, although not significant. Again, this variable does not play a mediating role, but it does consistently moderate the relationship between the duration of time spent divorced and psychological well-being such that those who reported being dissatisfied experienced increases in well-being (diffuse) for each additional month spent divorced (see footnote 11).

¹¹ It is worth note that in the full sample only 11 people who reported conflict spent any time separated and only 57 people who reported dissatisfaction spent any time divorced. Thus, these findings may not be robust. Larger samples of these types of individuals are needed for further exploration.

INTERPRETATION

Due to the extensive nature of the findings reported here I will limit my interpretation to the main themes that tie the results together. This paper set out to address two main questions using a more dynamic set of measures than have been used in the past. The questions driving it were: (1) What are the effects of various dimensions of family structure on adult global well-being, health, and psychological well-being? (2) To what extent do family process variables mediate and/or moderate those effects. A number of conclusions can be taken from the above findings.

First, the effects of the duration of time spent in different family structures varies depending on both the sample at hand and the outcome variables under examination, but most importantly, as a function of external factors. The importance of external factors is highlighted by observing the changes in results during the model building process. In all three samples and for all three dependent variables results follow the same general pattern. When the family structure variables are modeled without any control variables the results are strikingly consistent with all expectations. Additional time spent married is beneficial for well-being, and, in general, additional time spent cohabiting or in stepfamilies has small negative effects if they are not positive. These findings are consistent with expectations that union-type family structures provide individuals with the benefits of economies of scale, thus improving their ability to diffuse stress over time. The negative effects found for the non-union type family structures are also consistent with this explanation as these family structures do not contain the resources needed to diffuse said stress. However, upon entering the control variables into the models the findings are basically turned on their head with the union-type family structures resulting in decreases in well-being while the non-union family structures come to have positive or else very

small negative effects. This change in findings indicates that the picture is not as simple as we would like to think. The drastic change that is brought about by the introduction of the control variables suggests that the effects of time spent in different family structures might not be as much a function of something inherent to the family structure as it is to other confounding factors—demographic factors such as age, sex, income, etc. Further, there appears to be nothing inherent in the number of transitions that affects well-being outcomes; rather, the transitions need to be contextualized to illuminate their true effects. The lack of strength in the coefficients for the transitions suggests that the transitions should be split into entering and exiting transitions to parse out their effects.

Second, the results for the independent variables are rather weak overall in the sense that significant findings are rare and the substantive effects of those that are significant are miniscule. Therefore, the indication is that the duration, timing, transitions, and recentness of family structures/transitions do not significantly impact well-being. Instead, other variables such as support and family characteristics variables may be more important for well-being than the family structure variables. The support variables are positive in all of the models and overwhelmingly participation in social activities has significantly positive effects on well-being. Because the measure of social participation included activities enjoyed with members of one's psychological network these activities may provide the basis of the support provided by the members of that network. Organizational participation and communication with parents also turned out to be good sources of support. These findings are consistent with past research that has shown that support and resources can reduce the effects of stress (Murray and Terry 1999; Pearlin et al. 1981; Thoits 1995; Tschann, Johnston, and Wallerstein 1989; Turner 1981) and with work attesting to the importance of psychological networks for providing support and

resources (Bryant and Conger 1999; Ellison 1990; House, Umberson, and Landis 1988; Pittman and Lloyd 1988; Ren 1997). In a related vein, a couple of family characteristics variables are integral to respondents' well-being. Over all of the samples, having a happy union is consistently a source of increased well-being while having a hard child to raise is a source of lowered well-being. Additionally, for parents, increased family cohesion has a remarkably positive impact on all three measures of well-being, especially psychological well-being. However, it is worth note that support and family characteristics variables do not independently mediate the effects of the four dimensions of family structure on any of the measures of cognitive well-being. Additionally, when entered as a block of variables they play only very small mediating effects. This indicates that the effects of family structure are not determined by their effect on family process variables.

In one sense then this is a paper of no findings because of the lack of support for hypotheses and lack of significant direct effects. Thus it is important to the extent that it rules out certain explanations for the oft found links between family structure and enhanced or diminished well-being. However, if I were to stop there a large portion of the story would remain untold. In reality as the results of the moderation models indicate the effects of any one of the family structure variables tested are dependent on a number of external factors, indicating once again the complex nature of peoples' family trajectories.

One important complication arises in the supplemental analyses that look at the moderating effects of gender. The findings are consistent with ideas about "his" and "her" marriages, or the somewhat controversial idea, that was first expounded by Gove (1972) and has since been the subject of much debate—that men and women experience their marriages quite

differently with women being more negatively affected by marriage.¹² In attempting to rebut this claim Simon (2002) explains that 30 years worth of research has produced three main findings about this issue: (1) marriage is associated with enhanced mental health for men and women, (2) women, regardless of marital status, report more mental health problems than men, and (3) research is not clear as to whether marriage is more beneficial to men than to women. However, the studies both in favor of and opposed to Gove's theory rely on static conceptions of family structure and marriage in particular. A more dynamic dimension of family structure, duration, may help us better understand how men and women experience their marriages (and other family structures for that matter) differently. The results in this paper may indicate that men are able to capitalize on the benefits of economies of scale provided by the marital union more so over time than are women. Thus, over time marriage may reduce stress for men, but actually increase it for women. This explanation is consistent with findings that women increase the amount of domestic work they do upon entering marriage while men see reductions in the amount of domestic work they do (Gupta 1999; Hochschild 1989); thus, marriage carries certain benefits for men that it does not carry for women.¹³ These benefits may reduce men's overall stress and improve their ability to diffuse stress while actually contributing to the pileup of stress for women. The overall findings (not interaction terms) of negative effects of each additional month spent married may actually reflect the disproportionate number of women in this sample (see Table 2). Similar sex effects are found for the duration of time spent cohabiting in both the full and parents sample. Specifically, men benefit in terms of both cognitive well-being and global

¹² Gove's work has been critiqued for looking at mental health in terms of symptoms women are more likely to have and for ignoring the symptoms that men are more likely to have such as increased substance abuse (Simon 2002). Because this paper does not address this particular issue, conclusions are tentative.

¹³ Additional analyses (not shown here) were conducted in which the full model regressions were re-run, but separately for men and for women. Results indicated that for all three dependent variables the effects of the duration of time spent in union type family structures were more negative for women than for men. Additionally, men actually benefited psychologically from each additional month spent married.

relative health for each additional month they spent cohabiting while women experience negative effects for additional time spent cohabiting. This finding suggests that at least some of the benefits that men enjoy in marriage may also exist for them in other union-type family structures.

In all three samples men are also found to experience increases in all three measures of well-being (depending on the sample) for each additional transition they experienced whereas women experience decreased well-being for additional transitions. This finding is consistent with research that has shown women to be more negatively affected by transitions out of marriages (Marks and Lambert 1998; Simon and Marcussen 1999) and may also be reflecting the attendant changes in socioeconomic losses that accompany divorce, especially for women (Kitson and Holmes 1992; Kitson and Morgan 1990; Lorenz et al. 1997). In addition, evidence cited above about specific benefits (domestic work) of entering marriage for men as opposed to women suggests that men may benefit more from entrance into unions. However, the cited research deals almost exclusively with transitions into and out of marriage, a limitation that is not imposed on the current data. Therefore, these findings highlight the need for research into the effects of transitions into and out of unions that are not marriages.

Yet another complication to simplified models of the effects of family structure on well-being is highlighted by the moderating effects of the variable indicating those respondents who report being happy with a current union situation. For example, having a happy union currently is found to increase the benefits individuals received for each additional month spent in stepfamilies on cognitive well-being in both the full and parents sample.¹⁴ In addition, being

¹⁴ This finding is consistent with current discussions about the harm caused by particularly conflicted marriages (Acock and Demo 1994; Amato 1994; Kitson and Morgan 1990; Wheaton 1990) as well as findings regarding the importance of marital quality for well-being (Cotton et al. 2003; Demo and Acock 1996; Ren 1997; and others). Although these discussions have been largely limited to conflicted marriages, it is likely that high levels of conflict also cause harm in other union-type family structures and plausible that other dysfunctions (besides conflict) within these families may also lead to negative outcomes.

happy with a current union moderated the effects of the number of transitions on well-being such that those who reported being happy experienced benefits from each additional transition. While reporting a current happy union is beneficial for the effects of duration spent in stepfamilies and for the number of transitions on well-being, it leads to increased negative effects for cognitive and well-being associated with each additional month spent in a single-parent family. These findings are important because they suggest that current family situations affect the way that our trajectories and histories affect us (maybe through the ways we interpret and reinterpret them).¹⁵ Thus, family structure becomes an even more fluid, dynamic, and complicated phenomena.

CONCLUSION

In closing I would like to address two issues: what this paper tells us about individuals' real lives and about society and what it suggests are important directions for future research. Currently, a lot of energy and thought in American society is being directed toward trying to define the family. Inevitably the conversation regarding that definition comes back to family structure. Does the family consist of a married couple? Is it a marriage between a man and a woman? Do we consider cohabiting couples to be a family? What if they have children? In addition to these larger societal questions a lot of people, especially young adults, are striving to create their own ideal family. However, about half of all new marriages are ending in divorce, meaning that a large proportion of the American population is "failing" to meet their own and society's expectations. This paper suggests that the form of "the family" is not as important for well-being as other social factors and it informs us that as individuals and as a society we might

¹⁵ The only scenario in which respondents could report having a happy union and still be in the single-parent state is if they had a steady dating relationship. Otherwise they would have had to be in a union at the time of the second interview to do so. In the full sample about 24 percent (309) of those who spent any time as a single-parent fit this scenario (single-parent with a happy steady dating partnership at the second interview). They comprised 48% of those who had spent any time in a single-parent structure and reported having a happy union at the time of the second interview. This means there were 340 individuals who reported having a happy marital or cohabiting union, not a dating relationship, but who had been in the single-parent family structure previously.

be directing our energies toward goals that produce a lot of stress and upheaval while returning to us very few gains in terms of our well-being. On an individual and a societal level our energy might better be used trying to establish the appropriate levels of social support and building strong families, whatever form they may take.

Four areas of future research are suggested by the findings in this paper. First, the life course framework suggests that entire histories are important for understanding the present. Thus, this project needs to be extended using data that can account for the entire history of family structure durations and transitions rather than only a subset of them. Second, while we have increasingly dynamic ways to measure things like family structure we are still limited by our data sets to snapshot views of many other social phenomena that are related to family structure (e.g. snapshot views of family cohesion, marital quality, etc.). This limitation prevents exploration of how these factors change in concert. Future research needs to address the dynamic nature of family structure alongside the dynamic nature of family processes. Third, more exact research is needed on the effects of family structure transitions. Research that examines entrance as opposed to exit transitions, transitions into and out of different types of family structures, and the effects of multiple transitions is sorely needed. Finally, in the inequalities literature Barbara Reskin (2003) makes the point that we need to include mechanisms in our models. This advice applies to this research to the extent that the current research is largely descriptive and does not establish what the mechanism are behind the differences in the family structure dimensions included herein. Although it sheds light on the effects of the duration of time in a family structure or the number of transitions one experiences, it does not further our understanding of how these things come to have the effects that they do. The most important research question left unanswered by this research is what are the

mechanisms behind the effects that are found? While exploring this question we should also include the sequence of transitions as a dimension of family structure.

Table 1: Summary of Research Hypotheses

Variable	Direct Effects	Mediating	Moderating
Marital Duration	+	n/a	n/a
Divorce Duration	-	n/a	n/a
Separated Duration	-	n/a	n/a
Single-Parent Duration	-	n/a	n/a
Stepfamily Duration	+	n/a	n/a
Cohabiting Duration	+	n/a	n/a
Transitions	-	n/a	n/a
Transition Age	+	n/a	n/a
Recentness	-	n/a	n/a
Communication w/ Parents	+	No	Diffuse
Communication w/ In-Laws	+	No	Diffuse
Communication w/ Siblings	+	No	Diffuse
Social Participation	+	Yes	Diffuse
Organizational Participation	+	Yes	Diffuse
Help Received	+	Yes	Diffuse
Happy Union	+	Yes	Diffuse
Interaction w/ Children	+	Yes	Diffuse
Hard Child	-	No	Enhance
Easy Child	+	No	Diffuse
Family Cohesion	+	Yes	Diffuse
Conflict w/ Absent Parent	-	Yes	Enhance
Dissatisfaction w/ Absent Parent	-	Yes	Enhance

Note: “Diffuse” refers to reducing the negative effects (or increasing the positive effects) of the independent variables on well-being. “Enhance” refers to enhancing the negative effects (or reducing the positive effects) of the independent variables on well-being.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics (Continuous Variables)

VARIABLE	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	RANGE	
			MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
Married	33.36	33.36	1	88
Cohabiting	5.29	12.95	1	86
Separated	1.52	4.34	1	84
Divorced	2.63	7.92	1	80
Step	8.41	19.69	1	87
Single Parent	8.37	19.84	1	89
Transitions	0.50	1.00	0	8
Recentness	58.45	21.19	0	88
Transition Age	37.55	14.05	18	91
Age	47.17	15.84	22	97
Completed Education	12.69	2.99	0	20
Number in House	1.93	1.57	0	14
Number of Kids in House	1.03	1.24	0	10
Income	41,820.21	43,059.73	0.50	999,995.5
Communication w/ Parents	2.74	2.28	0	6
Communication w/ In-laws	1.62	2.00	0	6
Communication w/ Siblings	3.57	1.64	0	6
Help Received	0.50	0.33	0	1
Social Participation	1.44	0.58	0	4
Organizational Participation	0.70	0.67	0	4
Interaction w/ Child	14.46	10.51	0	85
Family Cohesion	4.03	0.55	1	5

Table 3: Frequencies (Dummy Variables)

VARIABLE	0		1	
	FREQ.	%	FREQ.	%
Sex (male = 1)	5,113	62.16	3,112	37.84
Race (white = 1)	1,970	23.95	6,255	76.05
Nsfh2cohab	7,803	94.87	422	5.13
Nsfh2sep	8,055	97.93	170	2.07
Nsfh2sing1 [†]	6,806	82.75	1,419	17.25
Nsfh2sing2 ^{††}	7,632	92.79	593	7.21
Nsfh2step	7,208	87.64	1,017	12.36
Nsfh2singpar	7,337	89.20	888	10.80
Happy Union	2,695	32.77	5,530	67.23
Hard Child	6,997	85.07	1,228	14.93
Easy Child	5,302	64.46	2,923	35.54
Conflict w/ Absent Parent	8,116	98.67	109	1.33
Dissatisfaction w/ Absent Parent	7,985	97.08	240	2.92

[†] ever married

^{††} never married

Table 4: Regression Results for Cognitive Well-Being (Full Sample)

	Direct Effects	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Married	0.004***	0.003***	-0.007***	-0.007***	-0.008***	-0.008***
Cohabiting	-0.005**	-0.002	-0.008***	-0.008***	-0.008***	-0.007***
Separated	-0.014***	-0.012**	0.005	0.005	0.000	0.001
Divorced	-0.006**	-0.005*	0.001	0.001	-0.001	-0.001
Step	-0.001	0.001	-0.008***	-0.007***	-0.008***	-0.008***
Single Parent	-0.006***	-0.004***	-0.003	-0.003	-0.003	-0.003
Transitions	-0.078***	0.033	0.032	0.032	0.020	0.021
Recentness	0.004***	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002
Transition Age						
Age			0.004*	0.008***	0.006***	0.010***
Sex (male)			-0.035	-0.077*	-0.072*	-0.110**
Race (white)			-0.049	-0.058	-0.015	-0.025
Completed Education			-0.003	-0.011	-0.007	-0.015*
Number in House			-0.004	0.019	-0.012	0.012
Number of Kids in House			-0.024	-0.039	0.007	-0.010
Income			0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***
Nsfh2cohab			-0.287*	-0.280*	-0.210	-0.205
Nsfh2sep			-1.105***	-1.034***	-0.384*	-0.332
Nsfh2sing1 [†]			-0.811***	-0.762***	-0.186	-0.148
Nsfh2sing2 ^{††}			-0.806***	-0.757***	-0.244	-0.203
Nsfh2step			-0.059	-0.059	0.009	0.006
Nsfh2singpar			-0.774***	-0.682***	-0.234	-0.156
Communication w/ Parents				0.024*		0.024*
Communication w/ Inlaws				0.017		0.017
Communication w/ Siblings				0.004		-0.003
Social Participation				0.244***		0.211***
Orgizational Participation				0.068*		0.075**
Help Recieved				0.234***		0.215***
Happy Union					0.845***	0.824***
Hard Child					-0.319***	-0.305***
Easy Child					0.111**	0.098*
Conflict w/ Absent Parent					-0.093	-0.107
Dissatisfaction w/ Absent Parent					-0.232	-0.213
Interaction w/ Child						
Family Cohesion						
Constant		5.148***	5.762***	5.006***	4.935***	4.299***
R-squared		0.01	0.04	0.06	0.09	0.10
Observations		8225	8225	8225	8225	8225

* p ≤ .05, ** p ≤ .01, *** p ≤ .001

[†] ever married

^{††} never married

Table 5: Regression Results for Global Relative Health (Full Sample)

	Direct Effects	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Married	0.001*	0.001	-0.001	-0.001	-0.002	-0.002
Cohabiting	-0.001	-0.002*	-0.003*	-0.003*	-0.003*	-0.003*
Separated	-0.004	-0.006	-0.003	-0.003	-0.004	-0.003
Divorced	0.002	-0.000	0.000	-0.000	-0.000	-0.000
Step	-0.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001
Single Parent	-0.003***	-0.003***	-0.003	-0.003	-0.003	-0.003
Transitions	0.033**	0.056**	0.043*	0.043*	0.041*	0.042*
Recentness	-0.001*	-0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Transition Age						
Age			-0.005***	-0.003**	-0.004***	-0.002*
Sex (male)			-0.008	-0.038	-0.018	-0.047*
Race (white)			0.013	0.009	0.022	0.018
Completed Edu.			0.044***	0.040***	0.043***	0.039***
Number in House			-0.044*	-0.027	-0.044*	-0.028
Number of Kids in House			0.042*	0.032	0.041*	0.031
Income			0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***
Nsfh2cohab			-0.122	-0.113	-0.117	-0.110
Nsfh2sep			-0.125	-0.082	0.001	0.027
Nsfh2sing1 [†]			-0.142*	-0.107	-0.031	-0.009
Nsfh2sing2 ^{††}			-0.072	-0.043	0.042	0.058
Nsfh2step			-0.154	-0.154	-0.157	-0.157
Nsfh2singpar			-0.100	-0.039	-0.008	0.041
Communication w/ Parents				0.017**		0.016*
Communication w/ Inlaws				0.007		0.006
Communication w/ Siblings				0.004		0.002
Social Participation				0.146***		0.139***
Orgizational Participation				0.048**		0.049**
Help Recieved				0.213***		0.210***
Happy Union					0.163***	0.148***
Hard Child					-0.080*	-0.071*
Easy Child					0.089***	0.082**
Conflict w/ Absent Parent					0.156	0.152
Dissatisfaction w/ Absent Parent					-0.156*	-0.143*
Interaction w/ Child						
Family Cohesion						
Constant		3.963***	3.727***	3.227***	3.542***	3.087***
R-squared		0.01	0.07	0.09	0.08	0.10
Observations		8225	8225	8225	8225	8225

* p ≤ .05, ** p ≤ .01, *** p ≤ .001

[†] ever married

^{††} never married

Table 6: Regression Results for Psychological Well-Being (Full Sample)

	Direct Effects	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Married	0.023***	0.020***	-0.013	-0.013	-0.016	-0.015
Cohabiting	-0.042***	-0.036*	-0.042*	-0.037*	-0.038*	-0.033
Separated	-0.073	-0.079	0.067	0.071	0.048	0.054
Divorced	-0.040*	-0.044*	-0.029	-0.028	-0.042	-0.040
Step	0.005	0.016	-0.025	-0.023	-0.026	-0.024
Single Parent	-0.048***	-0.036***	-0.023	-0.024	-0.023	-0.024
Transitions	-0.243	0.218	-0.057	-0.044	-0.143	-0.122
Recentness	0.008	-0.008	-0.005	-0.002	-0.006	-0.002
Transition Age						
Age			-0.053***	-0.011	-0.041**	-0.003
Sex (male)			-0.686*	-1.012***	-0.886**	-1.185***
Race (white)			-0.608	-0.603	-0.396	-0.409
Completed Edu.			0.729***	0.634***	0.713***	0.616***
Number of in House			-0.391	-0.236	-0.435*	-0.279
Number of Kids in House			-0.307	-0.431	-0.130	-0.258
Income			0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***
Nsfh2cohab			-2.351*	-2.349*	-1.947	-1.955
Nsfh2sep			-6.815***	-6.092***	-3.295*	-2.752
Nsfh2sing1 [†]			-2.736**	-2.365*	0.408	0.650
Nsfh2sing2 ^{††}			-3.077**	-2.646*	-0.212	0.097
Nsfh2step			0.822	0.799	1.156	1.127
Nsfh2singpar			-2.720*	-1.959	-0.011	0.623
Communication w/ Parents				0.163		0.166
Communication w/ Inlaws				0.214*		0.217*
Communication w/ Siblings				0.165		0.132
Social Participation				2.168***		1.995***
Orgizational Participation				1.035***		1.071***
Help Recieved				1.072*		0.979
Happy Union					4.274***	4.060***
Hard Child					-2.193***	-2.053***
Easy Child					0.727	0.571
Conflict w/ Absent Parent					-0.680	-0.866
Dissatisfaction w/ Absent Parent					0.215	0.431
Interaction w/ Child						
Family Cohesion						
Constant		84.416***	80.866***	73.951***	76.606***	70.435***
R-squared		0.01	0.08	0.10	0.09	0.11
Observations		8225	8225	8225	8225	8225

* p ≤ .05, ** p ≤ .01, *** p ≤ .001

[†] ever married

^{††} never married

Table 7: Significant Interaction Terms (Full Sample)

Variable	Cognitive Well-being	Global Relative Health	Psychological Well-being
Communication w/ Parents		Cohabiting + Single Parent +	
Communication w/ In- Laws	Transitions + Recentness -	Cohabiting +	
Communication w/ Siblings			
Social Participation			
Organizational Participation	Married -	Single Parent +	
Help Received			
Happy Union	Married + Stepfamily + Single Parent -		Married + Single Parent -
Hard Child			Transitions - Recentness +
Easy Child			Married + Cohabiting - Recentness +
Conflict	Separated +		Separated +
Dissatisfaction			Divorce +

Table 8: Regression Results for Cognitive Well-Being (Transitions Sample)

	Direct Effects	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Married	-0.001	-0.005*	-0.007**	-0.007**	-0.007**	-0.007**
Cohabiting	-0.002	-0.006*	-0.008**	-0.007*	-0.007*	-0.006*
Separated	-0.011*	-0.014***	0.006	0.006	0.001	0.002
Divorced	-0.004	-0.008**	-0.002	-0.002	-0.003	-0.003
Step	0.003	-0.000	-0.004	-0.004	-0.004	-0.004
Single Parent	-0.007**	-0.009***	-0.007*	-0.007*	-0.007*	-0.007*
Transitions	-0.062	-0.059	-0.055	-0.043	-0.068	-0.056
Recentness	0.005**	0.005**	0.002	0.003	0.002	0.003
Transition Age	-0.008**	-0.009**	-0.002	0.004	0.002	0.006
Age						
Sex (male)			-0.028	-0.075	-0.061	-0.100
Race (white)			-0.108	-0.106	-0.085	-0.079
Completed Edu.			-0.001	-0.009	-0.005	-0.013
Number in House			-0.036	-0.011	-0.058	-0.034
Number of Kids in House			0.006	-0.014	0.053	0.032
Income			0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***
Nsfh2cohab			-0.281*	-0.260	-0.249	-0.236
Nsfh2sep			-1.202***	-1.069***	-0.563**	-0.487*
Nsfh2sing1 [†]			-0.737***	-0.633***	-0.213	-0.154
Nsfh2sing2 ^{††}			-0.929***	-0.817***	-0.375	-0.314
Nsfh2step			-0.027	-0.021	-0.022	-0.018
Nsfh2singpar			-0.702***	-0.561**	-0.254	-0.163
Communication w/ Parents				0.037		0.032
Communication w/ Inlaws				0.031		0.021
Communication w/ Siblings				0.009		0.007
Social Participation				0.194**		0.139*
Orgizational Participation				0.095		0.107
Help Recieved				0.194		0.165
Happy Union					0.839***	0.810***
Hard Child					-0.201*	-0.181*
Easy Child					0.086	0.072
Conflict w/ Absent Parent					-0.032	-0.059
Dissatisfaction w/ Absent Parent					-0.244	-0.234
Interaction w/ Child						
Family Cohesion						
Constant		5.856***	6.117***	5.270***	5.313***	4.686***
R-squared		0.03	0.10	0.11	0.14	0.15
Observations		2355	2355	2355	2355	2355

* p ≤ .05, ** p ≤ .01, *** p ≤ .001

[†] ever married

^{††} never married

Table 9: Regression Results for Global Relative Health (Transitions Sample)

	Direct Effects	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Married	0.002*	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Cohabiting	-0.002	-0.005**	-0.003*	-0.003	-0.003*	-0.003
Separated	-0.006	-0.007*	-0.003	-0.002	-0.004	-0.003
Divorced	0.000	-0.002	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001
Step	-0.001	-0.002	0.000	0.000	-0.000	-0.000
Single Parent	-0.007***	-0.007***	-0.004	-0.004	-0.004	-0.004
Transitions	0.010	-0.007	-0.007	-0.002	-0.007	-0.002
Recentness	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.001
Transition Age	-0.010***	-0.011***	-0.010***	-0.007**	-0.009***	-0.006**
Age						
Sex (male)			0.070	0.044	0.060	0.037
Race (white)			0.001	-0.002	0.000	-0.004
Completed Edu.			0.034***	0.032***	0.033***	0.031***
Number in House			-0.076*	-0.064*	-0.077*	-0.066*
Number of Kids in House			0.062	0.055	0.065	0.057
Income			0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***
Nsfh2cohab			-0.074	-0.068	-0.082	-0.075
Nsfh2sep			-0.157	-0.109	-0.070	-0.041
Nsfh2sing1 [†]			-0.099	-0.073	-0.028	-0.017
Nsfh2sing2 ^{††}			0.053	0.069	0.131	0.129
Nsfh2step			-0.095	-0.089	-0.108	-0.101
Nsfh2singpar			-0.040	0.007	0.013	0.047
Communication w/ Parents				0.018		0.017
Communication w/ Inlaws				0.008		0.007
Communication w/ Siblings				0.014		0.014
Social Participation				0.148***		0.141***
Orgizational Participation				0.019		0.017
Help Recieved				0.114		0.113
Happy Union					0.126*	0.104
Hard Child					0.005	0.022
Easy Child					0.030	0.015
Conflict w/ Absent Parent					0.253*	0.248*
Dissatisfaction w/ Absent Parent					-0.208*	-0.198*
Interaction w/ Child						
Family Cohesion						
Constant		4.558***	4.037***	3.509***	3.926***	3.444***
R-squared		0.06	0.10	0.11	0.10	0.12
Observations		2355	2355	2355	2355	2355

* p ≤ .05, ** p ≤ .01, *** p ≤ .001

[†] ever married

^{††} never married

Table 10: Regression Results for Psychological Well-Being (Transitions Sample)

	Direct Effects	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Married	0.017	-0.020	-0.015	-0.017	-0.014	-0.015
Cohabiting	-0.037*	-0.069**	-0.034	-0.026	-0.026	-0.019
Separated	-0.077	-0.109*	0.066	0.070	0.056	0.061
Divorced	-0.046*	-0.075***	-0.033	-0.030	-0.036	-0.033
Step	-0.004	-0.022	-0.007	-0.007	-0.004	-0.003
Single Parent	-0.063***	-0.078***	-0.026	-0.027	-0.018	-0.018
Transitions	-0.889**	-0.917**	-0.979**	-0.885**	-1.065***	-0.972**
Recentness	0.020	0.015	-0.004	0.001	-0.004	0.000
Transition Age	-0.074***	-0.100***	-0.049	-0.000	-0.031	0.009
Age						
Sex (male)			-0.649	-1.089	-0.812	-1.181*
Race (white)			-0.785	-0.800	-0.612	-0.610
Completed Edu.			0.873***	0.806***	0.860***	0.793***
Number in House			-0.312	-0.160	-0.453	-0.304
Number of Kids in House			-0.788	-0.897*	-0.301	-0.424
Income			0.000*	0.000*	0.000*	0.000*
Nsfh2cohab			-3.405**	-3.358**	-3.060*	-3.071*
Nsfh2sep			-7.953***	-6.969***	-4.680**	-4.186*
Nsfh2sing1 [†]			-3.787**	-3.191*	-1.150	-0.957
Nsfh2sing2 ^{††}			-3.882*	-3.372	-1.120	-1.070
Nsfh2step			-0.039	0.034	0.093	0.171
Nsfh2singpar			-3.256*	-2.338	-0.960	-0.455
Communication w/ Parents				0.209		0.194
Communication w/ Inlaws				0.267		0.196
Communication w/ Siblings				0.076		0.068
Social Participation				2.534***		2.225***
Orgizational Participation				0.604		0.670
Help Recieved				0.672		0.434
Happy Union					4.176***	3.826***
Hard Child					-3.445***	-3.215***
Easy Child					0.093	-0.110
Conflict w/ Absent Parent					-0.568	-0.833
Dissatisfaction w/ Absent Parent					0.385	0.530
Interaction w/ Child						
Family Cohesion						
Constant		91.996***	81.462***	73.864***	77.309***	71.178***
R-squared		0.04	0.14	0.16	0.16	0.18
Observations		2355	2355	2355	2355	2355

* p ≤ .05, ** p ≤ .01, *** p ≤ .001

[†] ever married

^{††} never married

Table 11: Significant Interaction Terms (Transitions Sample)

Variable	Cognitive Well-being	Global Relative Health	Psychological Well-being
Communication w/ Parents		Cohabiting +	
Communication w/ In- Laws	Transitions +	Cohabiting +	Married -
Communication w/ Siblings			Stepfamily +
Social Participation			
Organizational Participation			
Help Received	Married -		
Happy Union	Single Parent -		Recentness +
Hard Child			Separated + Stepfamily -
Easy Child	Transitions +	Stepfamily - Transitions +	
Conflict	Separated + Recentness +		Divorced +
Dissatisfaction			Divorced +

Table 12: Regression Results for Cognitive Well-Being (Parents Sample)

	Direct Effects	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Married	0.003***	-0.001	-0.007*	-0.007**	-0.007**	-0.007**
Cohabiting	-0.006**	-0.006*	-0.007*	-0.007*	-0.005	-0.005
Separated	-0.017*	-0.015*	0.007	0.009	0.003	0.004
Divorced	-0.007*	-0.007*	-0.006	-0.006	-0.008	-0.008
Step	-0.001	-0.003	-0.007**	-0.007**	-0.006*	-0.006*
Single Parent	-0.005***	-0.006*	-0.002	-0.002	-0.001	-0.002
Transitions	-0.077*	0.103*	0.040	0.038	0.046	0.044
Recentness	0.006***	0.007**	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.003
Transition Age						
Age			-0.005	-0.000	0.002	0.004
Sex (male)			0.014	-0.032	-0.035	-0.070
Race (white)			-0.051	-0.050	0.024	0.023
Completed Edu.			-0.011	-0.014	-0.021*	-0.023*
Number in House			-0.053	-0.040	-0.070	-0.060
Number of Kids in House			0.117*	0.116*	0.161***	0.160***
Income			0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***
Nsfh2cohab			-0.524*	-0.511*	-0.348	-0.350
Nsfh2sep			-1.250***	-1.185***	-0.425	-0.414
Nsfh2sing1 [†]			-0.383	-0.339	0.182	0.192
Nsfh2sing2 ^{††}			-1.448**	-1.459*	-0.862	-0.893
Nsfh2step			-0.107	-0.100	-0.068	-0.066
Nsfh2singpar			-0.711***	-0.618**	-0.188	-0.149
Communication w/ Parents				0.009		0.002
Communication w/ Inlaws				0.024		0.011
Communication w/ Siblings				0.029		0.012
Social Participation				0.249***		0.160***
Orgizational Participation				0.040		0.031
Help Recieved				0.183*		0.162*
Happy Union					0.823***	0.804***
Hard Child					-0.169**	-0.160**
Easy Child					0.124**	0.121**
Conflict w/ Absent Parent					-0.287	-0.279
Dissatisfaction w/ Absent Parent					-0.163	-0.153
Interaction w/ Child					0.000	-0.000
Family Cohesion					0.571***	0.554***
Constant		5.026***	5.942***	5.089***	2.603***	2.224***
R-squared		0.02	0.04	0.06	0.16	0.17
Observations		4320	4320	4320	4320	4320

* p ≤ .05, ** p ≤ .01, *** p ≤ .001

[†] ever married

^{††} never married

Table 13: Regression Results for Global Relative Health (Parents Sample)

	Direct Effects	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Married	0.002***	0.004**	-0.004*	-0.004*	-0.004*	-0.004*
Cohabiting	-0.002	0.001	-0.003	-0.003	-0.002	-0.002
Separated	-0.003	-0.000	-0.002	-0.001	-0.002	-0.002
Divorced	0.004**	0.007**	0.006*	0.005*	0.005*	0.005
Step	-0.001	0.002	-0.003	-0.003	-0.002	-0.002
Single Parent	-0.003**	0.001	-0.004	-0.005	-0.004	-0.004
Transitions	-0.002	0.051	0.019	0.021	0.025	0.027
Recentness	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002
Transition Age						
Age			-0.012***	-0.008***	-0.009***	-0.007***
Sex (male)			-0.006	-0.032	-0.021	-0.044
Race (white)			-0.061	-0.066	-0.032	-0.037
Completed Edu.			0.043***	0.039***	0.039***	0.036***
Number in House			-0.059	-0.045	-0.062*	-0.049
Number of Kids in House			0.096**	0.087*	0.108**	0.098**
Income			0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***
Nsfh2cohab			-0.235	-0.225	-0.205	-0.201
Nsfh2sep			-0.195	-0.137	-0.041	-0.009
Nsfh2sing1 [†]			-0.314*	-0.271*	-0.220	-0.194
Nsfh2sing2 ^{††}			-0.890***	-0.868***	-0.745**	-0.738**
Nsfh2step			-0.215	-0.219	-0.218	-0.223
Nsfh2singpar			-0.101	-0.030	-0.029	0.021
Communication w/ Parents				0.019*		0.016
Communication w/ Inlaws				0.016		0.012
Communication w/ Siblings				0.007		0.002
Social Participation				0.097**		0.074*
Orgizational Participation				0.043		0.040
Help Recieved				0.143**		0.134*
Happy Union					0.121**	0.109*
Hard Child					-0.026	-0.023
Easy Child					0.100***	0.096***
Conflict w/ Absent Parent					0.084	0.086
Dissatisfaction w/ Absent Parent					-0.183*	-0.175*
Interaction w/ Child					-0.003*	-0.003*
Family Cohesion					0.222***	0.211***
Constant		3.592***	4.039***	3.563***	2.935***	2.636***
R-squared		0.01	0.09	0.10	0.12	0.13
Observations		4320	4320	4320	4320	4320

* p ≤ .05, ** p ≤ .01, *** p ≤ .001

[†] ever married

^{††} never married

Table 14: Regression Results for Psychological Well-Being (Parents Sample)

	Direct Effects	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Married	0.038***	0.032*	-0.008	-0.008	-0.006	-0.007
Cohabiting	-0.095***	-0.067**	-0.078**	-0.075**	-0.056*	-0.055*
Separated	-0.088	-0.061	0.071	0.092	0.065	0.081
Divorced	-0.057	-0.037	-0.038	-0.039	-0.047	-0.048
Step	0.006	0.028	-0.036	-0.034	-0.012	-0.011
Single Parent	-0.047***	-0.017	-0.021	-0.023	-0.010	-0.011
Transitions	-0.834***	0.559	0.222	0.266	0.254	0.290
Recentness	0.050***	0.027	0.021	0.022	0.018	0.018
Transition Age						
Age			-0.054*	0.002	-0.004	0.025
Sex (male)			-0.449	-0.983*	-0.642	-1.094*
Race (white)			-0.471	-0.489	0.181	0.142
Completed Edu.			0.720***	0.601***	0.615***	0.517***
Number in House			-0.123	0.077	-0.253	-0.076
Number of Kids in House			-0.383	-0.510	-0.073	-0.201
Income			0.000***	0.000***	0.000**	0.000**
Nsfh2cohab			-1.211	-0.988	-0.258	-0.180
Nsfh2sep			-5.693**	-4.551*	-1.737	-1.091
Nsfh2sing1 [†]			-1.584	-0.831	0.631	1.081
Nsfh2sing2 ^{††}			-2.660	-2.362	-0.184	-0.059
Nsfh2step			2.150	2.049	1.878	1.732
Nsfh2singpar			-1.614	-0.265	0.199	1.071
Communication w/ Parents				0.186		0.116
Communication w/ Inlaws				0.422**		0.305*
Communication w/ Siblings				0.031		-0.127
Social Participation				1.995***		1.254**
Orgizational Participation				1.315***		1.184***
Help Recieved				1.044		1.028
Happy Union					3.575***	3.393***
Hard Child					-0.109	-0.066
Easy Child					0.249	0.218
Conflict w/ Absent Parent					-1.109	-1.154
Dissatisfaction w/ Absent Parent					-0.021	0.122
Interaction w/ Child					0.007	0.002
Family Cohesion					7.107***	6.901***
Constant		81.211***	78.002***	70.779***	44.153***	41.352***
R-squared		0.02	0.08	0.10	0.20	0.21
Observations		4320	4320	4320	4320	4320

* p ≤ .05, ** p ≤ .01, *** p ≤ .001

[†] ever married

^{††} never married

Table 15: Significant Interaction Terms (Parents Sample)

Variable	Cognitive Well-being	Global Relative Health	Psychological Well-being
Communication w/ Parents		Cohabiting +	
Communication w/ In- Laws	Transitions + Recentness -		Single Parent + Transitions +
Communication w/ Siblings	Recentness -		
Social Participation			Cohabiting -
Organizational Participation		Single Parent +	
Help Received			
Happy Union	Cohabiting + Stepfamily + Single Parent - Transitions +		Transitions +
Hard Child			Transitions - Recentness* +
Easy Child		Single Parent -	
Conflict	Stepfamily +	Cohabiting + Single Parent -	
Dissatisfaction			Divorced +
Interaction w/ Children			
Family Cohesion	Single Parent -		

Table 16: Summary of Findings

	FULL SAMPLE			TRANSITIONS SAMPLE			PARENTS SAMPLE		
	Cognitive	Health	Psych.	Cognitive	Health	Psych.	Cognitive	Health	Psych.
Married	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-
Cohabiting	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Separated	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	-	+
Divorced	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-
Step	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Single Parent	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Transitions	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+
Recentness	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+
Transition Age	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	-	+	n/a	n/a	n/a
Communication w/ Parents	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Communication w/ Inlaws	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Communication w/ Siblings	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
Social Participation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Orgizational Participation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Help Recieved	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Happy Union	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Hard Child	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-
Easy Child	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Conflict w/ Absent Parent	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	-
Dissatisfaction w/ Absent Parent	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+
Interaction w/ Child	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	-	+
Family Cohesion	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	+	+

Note: Shaded areas = significant coefficients

REFERENCES

- Acock, Alan C. and David H. Demo. 1994. *Family Diversity and Well-Being*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Aiken, Leona S., and West, Steven G. 1991. *Multiple Regression: Testing and Interpreting Interactions*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Agresti, Alan. 1990. *Categorical Data Analysis*. New York: Wiley.
- Amato, Paul R. 1993. "Children's Adjustment to Divorce: Theories, Hypotheses, and Empirical Support." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 55:23-38.
- , 1994. "The Implications of Research Findings on Children in Stepfamilies." Pp. 81-88 in *Stepfamilies Who Benefits? Who Does Not?* edited by Alan Booth and Judy Dunn. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Amato, Paul R. & Alan Booth. 1991. "Consequences of Parental Divorce and Marital Unhappiness for Adult Well-Being." *Social Forces*. 69:895-914.
- Aquilino, William S. 1996. "The Life Course of Children Born to Unmarried Mothers: Childhood Living Arrangements and Young Adult Outcomes." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 58: 293-310.
- Arnett, Jeffrey Jensen. 2000. "Emerging Adulthood: A Theory of Development from the Late Teens through the Twenties." *American Psychologist*. 55:469-480.
- Avison, William R. and Jay R. Turner. 1988. "Stressful Life Events and Depressive Symptoms: Disaggregating the Effects of Acute Stressors and Chronic Strains." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*. 29: 253-264.
- Barnett, Rosalind C. 1994. "Home-to-Work Spillover Revisited: A Study of Full-Time Employed Women in Dual-Earner Couples." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 56: 647-656.
- Barnett, Rosalind C., Nancy L. Marshall, and Joseph H. Pleck. 1992. "Men's Multiple Roles and Their Relationship to Men's Psychological Distress." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 54: 358-367.
- Baron, Reuben M., and David A. Kenny. 1986. "The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 51: 1173-1182.
- Brown, Susan L. 2000. "The Effect of Union Type on Psychological Well-being: Depression Among Cohabitators Versus Marrieds." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*. 41: 241-255.

- Brown, Susan L. and Alan Booth. 1996. "Cohabitation Versus Marriage: A Comparison of Relationship Quality." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 58: 668-678.
- Bryant, Chalandra M. and Rand D. Conger. 1999. "Marital Success and Domains of Social Support in Long-Term Relationships: Does the Influence of Network Members Ever End?" *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 61: 437-450.
- Bumpass, Larry L. and James A. Sweet. 1995. "Cohabitation, Marriage and Union Stability: Preliminary Findings from NSFH2," (NSFH Working Paper No. 65) Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Bumpass, Larry L. and R. Kelly Raley. 1995. "Redefining Single-Parent Families: Cohabitation and Changing Family Reality." *Demography*. 32: 97-109.
- Bumpass, Larry L., James A. Sweet, and Andrew Cherlin. 1991. "The Role of Cohabitation in Declining Rates of Marriage." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 53:913-927.
- Burke, Ronald J. and Tamara Weir. 1977. "Marital Helping Relationships: The Moderators Between Stress and Well-Being." *The Journal of Psychology*. 95: 121-130.
- Cherlin, Andrew J. 1978. "Remarriage as an Incomplete Institution." *American Journal of Sociology*. 84:634-650.
- Cooksey, Elizabeth C. and Michelle M. Fondell. 1996. "Spending Time with His Kids: Effects of Family Structure on Fathers' and Children's Lives." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 58:693-707.
- Cotten, Shelia R., Russell P. D. Burton, and Beth Rushing. 2003. "The Mediating Effects of Attachment to Social Structure and Psychosocial Resources on the Relationship Between Marital Quality and Psychological Distress." *Journal of Family Issues*. 24: 547-577.
- Davies, Lorraine, William R. Avison, & Donna D. McAlpine. 1997. "Significant Life Experiences and Depression among Single and Married Mothers." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 59:294-308.
- Demo, David H. and Alan C. Acock. 1996. "Singlehood, Marriage, and Remarriage: The Effects of Family Structure and Family Relationships on Mother's Well-Being." *Journal of Family Issues*. 17: 388-408.
- Diener, Ed. 1994. "Assessing Subjective Well-Being: Progress and Opportunities" *Social Indicators Research*. 31:103-157.
- Eggebeen, David J. and Chris Knoester. 2001. "Does Fatherhood Matter for Men?" *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 63: 381-394.

- Elder, Glen H., Jr. 1994. "Time, Human Agency, and Social Change: Perspectives on the Life Course." *Social Psychology Quarterly*. 57:4-15.
- , ed. 1985. *Life Course Dynamics: Trajectories and Transitions, 1968-1980*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Ellison, Christopher G. 1990. "Family Ties, Friendships, and Subjective Well-Being among Black Americans." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 52: 298-310.
- Emery, Robert E. 1994. *Renegotiating Family Relationships Divorce, Child Custody, and Mediation*. NY: The Guilford Press.
- Farrell, Michael P. and Grace M. Barnes. 1993. "Family Systems and Social Support: A Test of the Effects of Cohesion and Adaptability on the Functioning of Parents and Adolescents." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 55: 119-132.
- Fine, Mark A., Patrick C. McKenry, Brenda W. Donnelly, and Patricia Voydanoff. 1992. "Perceived Adjustment of Parents and Children: Variations by Family Structure, Race, and Gender." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 54:118-127.
- George, Linda K. 1993. "Sociological Perspectives on Life Transitions." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 19: 353-373.
- Glenn, Norval. 1994. "Biology, Evolutionary Theory, and Family Social Science." Pp. 45-51 in *Stepfamilies: Who Benefits? Who Does Not?* edited by Alan Booth and Judy Dunn. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Glenn, Norval D. and Michael Supancic. 1984. "The Social and Demographic Correlates of Divorce and Separation in the United States: An Update and Reconsideration." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 46: 563-575.
- Gove, Walter R. 1972. "The Relationship Between Sex Roles, Marital Status, and Mental Health." *Social Forces*. 51:34-44.
- Gove, Walter R., Michael Hughes, and Carolyn Briggs Style. 1983. "Does Marriage have Positive Effects on the Psychological Well-Being of the Individual?" *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*. 24: 122-131.
- Gupta, Sanjiv. 1999. "The Effects of Transitions in Marital Status on Men's Performance of Housework." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 61:700-711.
- Hao, Lingxin and Guihua Xie. 2002. "The Complexity and Endogeneity of Family Structure in Explaining Children's Misbehavior." *Social Science Research*. 31:1-28.
- Heady, Bruce, Johnathan Kelley, and Alex Wearing. 1993. "Dimensions of Mental Health: Life Satisfaction, Positive Affect, Anxiety and Depression." *Social Indicators Research* 29:63-82.

- Hetherington, Mavis E. and Kathleen M. Jodl. 1994. "Stepfamilies as Settings for Child Development." Pp. 55-79 in *Stepfamilies: Who Benefits? Who Does Not?* edited by Alan Booth and Judy Dunn. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hochschild, Arlie Russell with Anne Machung. 1989. *The Second Shift*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Holmes, Thomas H. and Richard H. Rahe. 1967. "The Social Readjustment Rating Scale." *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*. 11:213-218.
- House, J.S., D. Umberson, and K.R. Landis. 1988. "Structures and Processes of Social Support." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 14: 293-318.
- Johnson, Michael P. and Robert M. Milardo. 1984. "Network Interference in Pair Relationships: A Social Psychological Recasting of Slater's Theory of Social Regression." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 46: 893 – 899.
- Kim, Hyoun K. and Patrick C. McKenry. 2002. "The Relationship Between Marriage and Psychological Well-Being: A Longitudinal Analysis." *Journal of Family Issues*. 23: 885-911.
- Kitson, Gay C. & Leslie A. Morgan. 1990. "The Multiple Consequences of Divorce: A Decade Review." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 52:913-924.
- Kitson, Gay C. & William M. Holmes. 1992. *Portrait of Divorce: Adjustment to marital Breakdown*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Kurdek, Lawrence A. 1989. "Social Support and Psychological Distress in First-Married and Remarried newlywed Husbands and Wives." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 51: 1047 – 1052.
- Kurdek, Lawrence A. 1991. "The Relations between Reported Well-Being and Divorce History, Availability of a Proximate Adult, and Gender." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 53: 71-78.
- Lasch, Christopher. 1977. *Haven in a Heartless World*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lorenz, Frederick O, Ronald L. Simons, Rand D. Conger, Glen H. Elder, Christine Johnson, and Wei Chao. 1997. "Married and Recently Divorced Mothers' Stressful Events and Distress: Tracing Change Across Time." *Journal of marriage and the Family*. 59:219-232.
- Marks, Nadine F., and James David Lambert. 1998. "Marital Status Continuity and Change among Young and Midlife Adults: Longitudinal Effects on Psychological Well-Being." *Journal of Family Issues* 19:652-86.

- Masheter, Carol. 1991. "Postdivorce Relationships between Ex-Spouses: The Roles of Attachment and Interpersonal Conflict." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 53: 103-110.
- Mastekaasa, Arne. 1994. "The Subjective Well-Being of the Previously Married: The Importance of Unmarried Cohabitation and Time Since Widowhood or Divorce." *Social Forces*. 73: 665-692.
- McCubbin, Hamilton I. and Joan M. Patterson. 1982. "Family Adaptation to Crisis." *In Family, Stress, Coping, and Social Support*. Edited by Hamilton I. McCubbin, A. Elizabeth Cauble, and Joan M. Patterson. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.
- Morgan, Philip S. and Ronald R. Rindfuss. 1985. "Marital Disruption: Structural and Temporal Dimensions." *American Journal of Sociology*. 90: 1055-1077.
- Murray, Judith A. and Deborah J. Terry. 1999. "Parental Reactions to Infant Death: The Effects of Resources and Coping Strategies." *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*. 18:341-369.
- Nock, Steven L. 1995. "A Comparison of Marriages and Cohabiting Relationships." *Journal of Family Issues*. 16:53-76.
- Olson, David. H., McCubbin, Hamilton. I., Barnes, H., Larsen, A., Muxen, M., and Wilson, M. 1983. *Families: What Makes Them Work*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Orbuch, Terri L., James S. House, Richard P. Mero, and Pamela S. Webster. 1996. "Marital Quality Over the Life Course." *Social Psychology Quarterly*. 59: 162-171.
- Pearlin, Leonard I., Elizabeth G. Menaghan, Morton A. Lieberman, and Joseph T. Mullan. 1981. "The Stress Process." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*. 22:337-356.
- Pittman, Joe F. and Sally A. Lloyd. 1988. "Quality of Family Life, Social Support, and Stress." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 50:53-67.
- Popenoe, David. 1994. "The Evolution of Marriage and the Problem of Stepfamilies: A Biosocial Perspective." Pp. 3-28 in *Stepfamilies: Who Benefits? Who Does Not?* Edited by Alan Booth and Judy Dunn. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ren, Xinhua Steve. 1997. "Marital Status and Quality of Relationships: The Impact on Health Perception." *Social Science and Medicine*. 44: 241-249.
- Reskin, Barbara F. 2003. "Including Mechanisms in Our Models of Ascriptive Inequality." *American Sociological Review*. 68: 1-21.
- Riessman, Catherine Kohler. 1990. *Divorce Talk: Women and Men Make Sense of Personal Relationships*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

- Ryff, Carol D. 1989. "Happiness is Everything, or Is It? Explorations on the Meaning of Psychological Well-Being." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 57:1069-1081.
- Simon, Robin W. 2002. "Revisiting the Relationships Among Gender, Marital Status, and Mental Health." *The American Journal of Sociology*. 107:1065-1099.
- Simon, Robin W. and Kristen Marcussen. 1999. "Marital Transitions, Marital Beliefs, and Mental Health." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 40: 111-125.
- Smock, Pamela J. 2000. "Cohabitation in the United States: An Appraisal of Research Themes, Findings, and Implications." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 26:1-20.
- Stack, Steven and J. Ross Eshleman. 1998. "Marital Status and Happiness: A 17-Nation Study." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 60: 527-536.
- Sweet, James, Larry L. Bumpass, and Vaughn Call. 1988. "The Design and Content of the National Survey of Families and Households," (NSFH Working Paper No. 1). Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Teti, Douglas M. and Michael E. Lamb. 1989. "Socioeconomic and Marital Outcomes of Adolescent Marriage, Adolescent Childbirth, and Their Co-Occurrence." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 51: 203-212.
- Thoits, Peggy A. 1995. "Stress, Coping, and Social Support Processes: Where are We? What Next?" *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*. 35: 53-79.
- Thomson, Elizabeth. 1994. "Settings' and 'Development' From a Demographic Point of View." Pp. 89-96 in *Stepfamilies: Who Benefits? Who Does Not?* edited by Alan Booth and Judy Dunn. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tschann, Jeanne M., Janet R. Johnston, and Judith S. Wallerstein. 1989. "Resources, Stressors, and Attachment as Predictors of Adult Adjustment after Divorce: A Longitudinal Study." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 51: 1033-1046.
- Turner, Jay R. 1981. "Social Support as a Contingency in Psychological Well-Being." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*. 22: 357-367.
- Turner, Jay R., Blair Wheaton, and Donald A Lloyd. 1995. "The Epidemiology of Social Stress." *American Sociological Review*. 60: 104-125.
- Umberson, Debra. 1987. "Family Status and Health Behaviors: Social Control as a Dimension of Social Integration." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*. 28: 306-319.
- Waite, Linda J. 1995. "Does Marriage Matter?" *Demography*. 32:483-507.

- Wheaton, Blair. 1990. "Life Transitions, Role Histories, and Mental Health." *American Sociological Review*. 55: 209-223.
- White, Lynn. 1994. "Stepfamilies Over the Life Course: Social Support." Pp. 109-138 in *Stepfamilies: Who Benefits? Who Does Not?* edited by Alan Booth and Judy Dunn. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Windle, Michael and Levent Dumenci. 1997. "Parental and Occupational Stress as Predictors of Depressive Symptoms among Dual-Income Couples: A Multilevel Modeling Approach." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 59: 625-634.
- Wu, Lawrence, L. and Brian C. Martinson. 1993. "Family Structure and the Risk of Premarital Birth." *American Sociological Review*. 58:210-232.
- Wu, Zheng and Randy Hart 2002. "The Effects of Marital and Nonmarital Union Transition on Health." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 64: 420-433.
- Zick, Cathleen D. and Ken R. Smith. 1991. "Marital Transitions, Poverty, and Gender Differences in Mortality." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 53:327-336.
- Zietlow, Paul H. and Arthur VanLear, Jr. 1991. "Marriage Duration and Relational Control: A Study of Developmental Patterns." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 53: 773-785.
- Zill, Nicholas. 1994. "Understanding Why Children in Stepfamilies Have More Learning and Behavior Problems Than Children in Nuclear Families." Pp. 97-106 in *Stepfamilies: Who Benefits? Who Does Not?* edited by Alan Booth and Judy Dunn. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

APPENDIX A: Eighteen Psychological Well-Being Items

1. I like most parts of my personality.
2. I think it is important to have new experiences that challenge how you think about yourself and the world.
3. The demands of everyday life often get me down.
4. Maintaining close relationships has been difficult and frustrating for me.
5. I tend to be influenced by people with strong opinions.
6. I have confidence in my own opinions, even if they are different from the way most other people think.
7. I live life one day at a time and don't really think about the future.
8. I have not experienced many warm and trusting relationships with others.
9. When I look at the story of my life, I am pleased about how things have turned out.
10. In many ways, I feel disappointed about my achievements in life.
11. People would describe me as a giving person, willing to share my time with others.
12. I gave up trying to make big improvements or changes in my life a long time ago.
13. In general, I feel I am in charge of the situation in which I live.
14. I sometimes feel as if I have done all there is to do in life.
15. I am quite good at managing the many responsibilities of my daily life.
16. Some people wander aimlessly through life, but I am not one of them.
17. For me, life has been a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth.
18. I judge myself by what I think is important, not by the values of what others think is important.

APPENDIX B: Regression Results for Interaction Terms

COGNITIVE WELL-BEING (FULL SAMPLE)			
	b	t	p
Married * Org. Part	-.036	-2.23	.026
Married	-.008	-5.04	.000
Org. Participation	.086	2.93	.003
Married * Happy Union	.214	3.68	.000
Married	-.012	-6.16	.000
Happy Union	.863	14.16	.000
Separated * Conflict	.146	3.27	.001
Separated	.000	0.08	.939
Conflict w/ absent parent	-.151	-0.85	.394
Stepfamily * Happy Union	.176	3.48	.001
Step	-.014	-5.46	.000
Happy Union	.846	14.42	.000
Single Parent * Happy Union	-.156	-3.72	.000
Single Parent	.001	0.37	.708
Happy Union	.822	13.91	.000
Transitions * Com w/ In-laws	.061	3.19	.001
Transitions	.015	0.45	.655
Communication w/ In-Laws	.020	1.73	.084
Recentness * Com w/ In-Laws	-.051	-2.10	.036
Recentness	.002	1.37	.170
Communication w/ In-Laws	.021	1.75	.080
GLOBAL RELATIVE HEALTH (FULL SAMPLE)			
	b	t	p
Cohabiting * Com w/ Parents	.037	2.89	.004
Cohabiting	-.003	-2.47	.014
Communication w/ Parents	.017	2.71	.007
Cohabiting * Com w/ In-Laws	.026	2.39	.017
Cohabiting	-.003	-2.37	.018
Communication w/ In-Laws	.006	0.73	.467
Single Parent * Com w/ Parents	.029	1.97	.049
Single Parent	-.003	-1.59	.112
Communication w/ Parents	.018	2.79	.005
Single Parent * Org. Participation	.027	2.22	.026
Single Parent	-.003	-1.38	.168
Organizational Participation	.056	3.03	.002
PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING (FULL SAMPLE)			
Married * Happy Union	1.328	2.78	.006

Married	-.037	-2.47	.014
Happy Union	4.301	8.52	.000
Married * Easy Child	.705	2.08	.037
Married	-.019	-1.45	.146
Easy Child	.336	0.88	.377
Cohabiting * Easy Child	-.838	-2.80	.005
Cohabiting	-.007	-0.35	.728
Easy Child	.596	1.59	.112
Separated * Conflict	.820	1.99	.047
Separated	.048	1.02	.309
Conflict w/ Absent Parent	-1.116	-0.80	.424
Divorce * Dissatisfaction	.906	2.44	.015
Divorce	-.055	-2.12	.034
Dissatisfaction	-.440	-0.40	.692
Single Parent * Happy Union	-.760	-2.25	.025
Single Parent	-.003	-.017	.866
Happy Union	4.050	8.23	.000
Transitions * Hard Child	-1.056	-2.661	.008
Transitions	.068	0.24	.808
Hard Child	-2.005	-4.25	.000
Recentness * Hard Child	1.112	2.70	.007
Recentness	-.007	-0.60	.546
Hard Child	-2.057	-4.38	.000
Recentness * Easy Child	.904	2.94	.003
Recentness	-.013	-0.98	.329
Easy Child	.603	1.61	.107

COGNITIVE WELL-BEING (TRANSITIONS SAMPLE)

	b	t	p
Married * Help Received	-.105	-2.16	.031
Married	-.007	-3.14	.002
Help Received	.023	0.18	.858
Separated * Conflict	.141	3.19	.001
Separated	.001	0.20	.843
Conflict w/ Absent Spouse	-.121	-0.61	.543
Single Parent * Happy Union	-.174	-1.97	.049
Single Parent	-.001	-0.18	.859
Happy Union	.815	7.81	.000
Transitions * Com w/ In-Laws	.071	2.02	.043
Transitions	-.054	-1.37	.170
Communication w/ In-Laws	-.028	-0.74	.461
Transitions * Easy Child	.133	1.99	.047

Transitions	-.115	-2.30	.022
Easy Child	-.106	-0.91	.361
Recentness * Conflict	.571	3.28	.001
Recentness	.002	1.04	.296
Conflict	.752	2.54	.011

GLOBAL RELATIVE HEALTH (TRANSITIONS SAMPLE)

	b	t	p
Cohabiting * Com w/ Parents	.034	2.06	.039
Cohabiting	-.004	-2.22	.027
Communication w/ Parents	.009	0.63	.531
Cohabiting * Com w/ In-Laws	.032	2.27	.023
Cohabiting	-.004	-2.20	.028
Communication w/ In-Laws	-.008	-0.46	.642
Stepfamily * Easy Child	-.102	-2.47	.014
Stepfamily	.001	0.54	.587
Easy Child	.016	0.35	.724
Transitions * Easy Child	.092	2.33	.020
Transitions	-.042	-1.44	.149
Easy Child	-.107	-1.49	.135

PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING (TRANSITIONS SAMPLE)

	b	t	p
Married * Com w/ In-Laws	-1.245	-2.38	.017
Married	-.019	-1.02	.310
Communication w/ In-Laws	-.131	-0.47	.639
Separated * Hard Child	.839	2.25	.025
Separated	-.000	-0.00	.999
Hard Child	-3.672	-4.44	.000
Divorce * Conflict	1.307	2.01	.044
Divorce	-.039	-1.31	.189
Conflict	-2.293	-1.16	.246
Divorce * Dissatisfaction	1.047	2.56	.011
Divorce	-.048	-1.55	.122
Dissatisfaction	-.927	-0.62	.535
Stepfamily * Com w/ Siblings	.790	2.50	.012
Stepfamily	-.008	-0.34	.736
Communicate w/ Siblings	.054	0.29	.771
Stepfamily * Hard Child	-1.674	-2.49	.013
Stepfamily	.017	0.73	.466
Hard Child	-2.492	-2.74	.006
Recentness * Happy Union	1.462	1.98	.048
Recentness	-.042	-1.55	.121
Happy Union	5.791	4.56	.000

COGNITIVE WELL-BEING (PARENTS SAMPLE)			
	b	t	p
Cohabiting * Happy Union	.163	2.58	.010
Cohabiting	-.013	-2.74	.006
Happy Union	.787	10.20	.000
Stepfamily * Happy Union	.200	2.88	.004
Stepfamily	-.011	-3.63	.000
Happy Union	.827	10.65	.000
Stepfamily * Conflict	.415	2.63	.009
Stepfamily	-.006	-2.36	.018
Conflict w/ Absent Parent	-.467	-2.12	.034
Single Parent * Happy Union	-.229	-3.86	.000
Single Parent	.003	1.03	.303
Happy Union	.820	10.35	.000
Single Parent * Family Cohesion	-.046	-1.97	.049
Single Parent	-.002	-0.66	.511
Family Cohesion	.537	12.76	.000
Transitions * Com w/ In-Laws	.090	3.69	.000
Transitions	.036	0.80	.423
Communication w/ In-Laws	.019	1.31	.190
Transitions * Happy Union	.182	2.88	.004
Transitions	-.103	-1.54	.123
Happy Union	.795	10.18	.000
Recentness * Com w/ In-Laws	-.062	-2.00	.046
Recentness	.002	0.66	.509
Com w/ In-Laws	.018	1.20	.232
Recentness * Com w/ Siblings	-.052	-2.16	.031
Recentness	.003	1.25	.210
Communication w/ Siblings	.013	0.77	.443
GLOBAL RELATIVE HEALTH (PARENTS SAMPLE)			
	b	t	p
Cohabiting * Com w/ Parents	.046	2.33	.020
Cohabiting	-.002	-0.89	.371
Communication w/ Parents	.018	2.04	.042
Cohabiting * Conflict	.154	2.21	.027
Cohabiting	-.002	-1.10	.271
Conflict	-.003	-0.02	.985
Single Parent * Org. Part	.034	2.19	.029
Single Parent	-.004	-1.54	.124
Organizational participation	.052	2.02	.043
Single Parent * Easy Child	-.087	-2.42	.016
Single Parent	-.002	-.076	.446

Easy Child	.075	2.53	.011
Single Parent * Conflict	-.338	-3.09	.002
Single Parent	-.004	-1.46	.144
Conflict	.167	1.63	.103

PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING (PARENTS SAMPLE)			
	b	t	p
Cohabiting * Social Participation	-.322	-2.66	.008
Cohabiting	-.055	-2.40	.017
Social Participation	1.328	3.16	.002
Divorced * Dissatisfaction	1.357	2.47	.014
Divorced	-.067	-0.29	.771
Dissatisfied w/ Absent Parent	-.676	-0.71	.479
Single Parent * Com w/ In-Laws	.811	2.48	.013
Single Parent	.004	0.17	.862
Communication w/ In-Laws	.453	3.43	.001
Transitions * Com w/ In-Laws	.619	3.07	.002
Transitions	.238	0.70	.481
Communication w/ In-Laws	.357	2.84	.005
Transitions * Happy Union	1.090	2.12	.044
Transitions	-.592	-1.01	.312
Happy Union	3.340	5.28	.000
Transitions * Hard Child	-1.529	-3.65	.000
Transitions	.739	2.04	.041
Hard Child	-.114	-0.24	.814
Recentness * Hard Child	.385	2.10	.036
Recentness	.022	1.31	.191
Hard Child	-.037	-0.08	.939

APPENDIX C: Standard Errors for Regression Models

Robust Standard Errors for Table 3 (Cognitive Well-Being, Full Sample)

	Direct Effects	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Married	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002
Cohabiting	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002
Separated	0.004	0.004	0.006	0.006	0.005	0.005
Divorced	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
Step	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002
Single Parent	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.003
Transitions	0.021	0.035	0.035	0.034	0.034	0.033
Recentness	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002
Transition Age						
Age			0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002
Sex (male)			0.037	0.037	0.036	0.036
Race (white)			0.048	0.048	0.047	0.047
Completed Edu.			0.007	0.007	0.007	0.007
Number in House			0.027	0.027	0.028	0.027
Number of Kids in House			0.032	0.032	0.032	0.032
Income			0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Nsfh2cohab			0.129	0.126	0.125	0.123
Nsfh2sep			0.183	0.184	0.181	0.182
Nsfh2sing1 [†]			0.115	0.117	0.121	0.123
Nsfh2sing2 ^{††}			0.122	0.128	0.129	0.134
Nsfh2step			0.141	0.142	0.141	0.142
Nsfh2singpar			0.164	0.168	0.173	0.175
Communication w/ Parents				0.010		0.010
Communication w/ Inlaws				0.012		0.012
Communication w/ Siblings				0.012		0.012
Social Participation				0.037		0.036
Orgizational Participation				0.030		0.029
Help Recieved				0.056		0.055
Happy Union					0.060	0.059
Hard Child					0.051	0.050
Easy Child					0.040	0.040
Conflict w/ Absent Parent					0.176	0.174
Dissatisfaction w/ Absent Parent					0.121	0.121
Interaction w/ Child						
Family Cohesion						
Constant		0.106	0.197	0.227	0.204	0.229
R-squared		0.01	0.04	0.06	0.09	0.10
Observations		8225	8225	8225	8225	8225

Robust Standard Errors for Table 4 (Global Relative, Health Full Sample)

	Direct Effects	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Married	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
Cohabiting	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
Separated	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
Divorced	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.002
Step	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
Single Parent	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002
Transitions	0.012	0.020	0.020	0.019	0.020	0.019
Recentness	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
Transition Age	0.002					
Age			0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
Sex (male)			0.023	0.023	0.023	0.023
Race (white)			0.030	0.030	0.030	0.030
Completed Edu.			0.004	0.005	0.004	0.005
Number in House			0.018	0.017	0.018	0.018
Number of Kids in House			0.020	0.020	0.021	0.020
Income			0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Nsfh2cohab			0.081	0.080	0.081	0.081
Nsfh2sep			0.104	0.105	0.108	0.109
Nsfh2sing1 [†]			0.064	0.066	0.067	0.070
Nsfh2sing2 ^{††}			0.070	0.076	0.074	0.079
Nsfh2step			0.095	0.094	0.095	0.095
Nsfh2singpar			0.107	0.107	0.110	0.110
Communication w/ Parents				0.006		0.006
Communication w/ Inlaws				0.008		0.008
Communication w/ Siblings				0.007		0.007
Social Participation				0.022		0.022
Orgizational Participation				0.019		0.019
Help Recieved				0.036		0.036
Happy Union					0.034	0.033
Hard Child					0.033	0.033
Easy Child					0.026	0.026
Conflict w/ Absent Parent					0.087	0.087
Dissatisfaction w/ Absent Parent					0.070	0.070
Interaction w/ Child						
Family Cohesion						
Constant		0.058	0.113	0.136	0.117	0.140
R-squared		0.01	0.07	0.09	0.08	0.10
Observations		8225	8225	8225	8225	8225

Robust Standard Errors for Table 5 (Psychological Well-Being, Full Sample)

	Direct Effects	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Married	0.005	0.006	0.013	0.013	0.013	0.013
Cohabiting	0.013	0.015	0.018	0.018	0.017	0.017
Separated	0.044	0.044	0.047	0.046	0.046	0.046
Divorced	0.020	0.022	0.023	0.024	0.023	0.024
Step	0.008	0.009	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016
Single Parent	0.008	0.009	0.017	0.016	0.017	0.016
Transitions	0.173	0.278	0.269	0.265	0.268	0.265
Recentness	0.008	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012
Transition Age						
Age			0.014	0.016	0.014	0.016
Sex (male)			0.318	0.317	0.317	0.317
Race (white)			0.388	0.392	0.387	0.390
Completed Edu.			0.062	0.063	0.061	0.063
Number in House			0.201	0.200	0.206	0.203
Number of Kids in House			0.254	0.255	0.263	0.263
Income			0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Nsfh2cohab			1.172	1.175	1.171	1.174
Nsfh2sep			1.531	1.512	1.544	1.536
Nsfh2sing1 [†]			0.963	0.981	1.039	1.057
Nsfh2sing2 ^{††}			1.032	1.086	1.103	1.151
Nsfh2step			1.165	1.150	1.166	1.153
Nsfh2singpar			1.286	1.302	1.348	1.363
Communication w/ Parents				0.088		0.088
Communication w/ Inlaws				0.107		0.106
Communication w/ Siblings				0.101		0.102
Social Participation				0.316		0.312
Orgizational Participation				0.264		0.263
Help Recieved				0.503		0.501
Happy Union					0.502	0.493
Hard Child					0.476	0.471
Easy Child					0.373	0.374
Conflict w/ Absent Parent					1.332	1.371
Dissatisfaction w/ Absent Parent					1.019	1.030
Interaction w/ Child						
Family Cohesion						
Constant		0.859	1.715	1.980	1.818	2.045
R-squared		0.01	0.08	0.10	0.09	0.11
Observations		8225	8225	8225	8225	8225

Robust Standard Errors for Table 7 (Cognitive Well-Being, Transitions Sample)

	Direct Effects	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Married	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002
Cohabiting	0.001	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
Separated	0.003	0.004	0.006	0.006	0.006	0.006
Divorced	0.001	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
Step	0.001	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
Single Parent	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
Transitions	0.022	0.044	0.043	0.042	0.041	0.041
Recentness	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002
Transition Age	0.002	0.003	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004
Age						
Sex (male)			0.073	0.073	0.071	0.071
Race (white)			0.088	0.088	0.085	0.086
Completed Edu.			0.014	0.015	0.013	0.014
Number in House			0.051	0.052	0.048	0.049
Number of Kids in House			0.059	0.060	0.057	0.058
Income			0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Nsfh2cohab			0.142	0.145	0.137	0.139
Nsfh2sep			0.208	0.228	0.211	0.221
Nsfh2sing1 [†]			0.174	0.188	0.172	0.178
Nsfh2sing2 ^{††}			0.198	0.224	0.218	0.229
Nsfh2step			0.156	0.156	0.156	0.156
Nsfh2singpar			0.180	0.201	0.189	0.200
Communication w/ Parents				0.022		0.021
Communication w/ Inlaws				0.028		0.026
Communication w/ Siblings				0.025		0.024
Social Participation				0.072		0.069
Orgizational Participation				0.061		0.060
Help Recieved				0.115		0.112
Happy Union					0.106	0.104
Hard Child					0.092	0.091
Easy Child					0.076	0.076
Conflict w/ Absent Parent					0.193	0.193
Dissatisfaction w/ Absent Parent					0.141	0.140
Interaction w/ Child						
Family Cohesion						
Constant		0.193	0.309	0.386	0.321	0.389
R-squared		0.03	0.10	0.11	0.14	0.15
Observations		2355	2355	2355	2355	2355

Robust Standard Errors for Table 8 (Global Relative Health, Transitions Sample)

	Direct Effects	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Married	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
Cohabiting	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002
Separated	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.004	0.003	0.003
Divorced	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002
Step	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002
Single Parent	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
Transitions	0.022	0.025	0.025	0.025	0.025	0.025
Recentness	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
Transition Age	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002
Age						
Sex male)			0.044	0.044	0.044	0.043
Race white)			0.053	0.053	0.053	0.053
Completed Edu.			0.009	0.009	0.009	0.009
Number in House			0.032	0.032	0.032	0.032
Number of Kids in House			0.035	0.035	0.036	0.035
Income			0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Nsfh2cohab			0.084	0.085	0.084	0.084
Nsfh2sep			0.117	0.124	0.125	0.132
Nsfh2sing1 [†]			0.082	0.096	0.088	0.099
Nsfh2sing2 ^{††}			0.120	0.132	0.128	0.140
Nsfh2step			0.096	0.096	0.098	0.097
Nsfh2singpar			0.110	0.114	0.115	0.119
Communication w/ Parents				0.013		0.013
Communication w/ Inlaws				0.016		0.016
Communication w/ Siblings				0.013		0.014
Social Participation				0.041		0.042
Orgizational Participation				0.035		0.034
Help Recieved				0.068		0.068
Happy Union					0.058	0.059
Hard Child					0.053	0.052
Easy Child					0.045	0.045
Conflict w/ Absent Parent					0.102	0.103
Dissatisfaction w/ Absent Parent					0.087	0.087
Interaction w/ Child						
Family Cohesion						
Constant		0.105	0.189	0.228	0.196	0.231
R-squared		0.06	0.10	0.11	0.10	0.12
Observations		2355	2355	2355	2355	2355

Robust Standard Errors for Table 9 (Psychological Well-Being, Transitions Sample)

	Direct Effects	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Married	0.013	0.017	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.018
Cohabiting	0.018	0.023	0.022	0.022	0.021	0.021
Separated	0.044	0.044	0.048	0.048	0.049	0.048
Divorced	0.021	0.023	0.029	0.029	0.029	0.029
Step	0.016	0.019	0.024	0.023	0.023	0.023
Single Parent	0.016	0.018	0.021	0.020	0.021	0.021
Transitions	0.298	0.328	0.321	0.316	0.323	0.319
Recentness	0.015	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016
Transition Age	0.021	0.023	0.028	0.032	0.029	0.033
Age						
Sex male			0.593	0.594	0.588	0.589
Race white			0.673	0.688	0.656	0.670
Completed Edu.			0.138	0.140	0.135	0.138
Number in House			0.293	0.299	0.289	0.296
Number of Kids in House			0.408	0.410	0.407	0.412
Income			0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Nsfh2cohab			1.254	1.260	1.231	1.233
Nsfh2sep			1.718	1.773	1.789	1.818
Nsfh2sing1 [†]			1.363	1.417	1.443	1.472
Nsfh2sing2 ^{††}			1.751	1.929	1.816	1.949
Nsfh2step			1.283	1.273	1.274	1.263
Nsfh2singpar			1.453	1.575	1.535	1.620
Communication w/ Parents				0.174		0.173
Communication w/ Inlaws				0.236		0.229
Communication w/ Siblings				0.190		0.188
Social Participation				0.613		0.599
Orgizational Participation				0.543		0.540
Help Recieved				1.023		1.009
Happy Union					0.873	0.860
Hard Child					0.829	0.821
Easy Child					0.649	0.642
Conflict w/ Absent Parent					1.623	1.675
Dissatisfaction w/ Absent Parent					1.281	1.294
Interaction w/ Child						
Family Cohesion						
Constant		1.591	2.817	3.206	2.940	3.290
R-squared		0.04	0.14	0.16	0.16	0.18
Observations		2355	2355	2355	2355	2355

Robust Standard Errors for Table 11 (Cognitive Well-Being, Parents Sample)

	Direct Effects	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Married	0.001	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
Cohabiting	0.002	0.003	0.004	0.003	0.003	0.003
Separated	0.007	0.007	0.008	0.008	0.008	0.008
Divorced	0.003	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004	0.004
Step	0.001	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
Single Parent	0.001	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
Transitions	0.031	0.048	0.051	0.049	0.047	0.047
Recentness	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002
Transition Age						
Age			0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
Sex male			0.051	0.051	0.048	0.049
Race white			0.063	0.063	0.060	0.060
Completed Edu.			0.011	0.011	0.010	0.011
Number in House			0.042	0.043	0.042	0.043
Number of Kids in House			0.048	0.049	0.048	0.049
Income			0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Nsfh2cohab			0.220	0.214	0.207	0.204
Nsfh2sep			0.273	0.275	0.262	0.264
Nsfh2sing1 [†]			0.207	0.208	0.203	0.205
Nsfh2sing2 ^{††}			0.551	0.606	0.660	0.691
Nsfh2step			0.209	0.205	0.200	0.197
Nsfh2singpar			0.217	0.222	0.218	0.221
Communication w/ Parents				0.014		0.013
Communication w/ Inlaws				0.016		0.014
Communication w/ Siblings				0.017		0.017
Social Participation				0.052		0.049
Orgizational Participation				0.041		0.038
Help Recieved				0.080		0.075
Happy Union					0.079	0.078
Hard Child					0.053	0.053
Easy Child					0.045	0.045
Conflict w/ Absent Parent					0.200	0.198
Dissatisfaction w/ Absent Parent					0.125	0.123
Interaction w/ Child					0.002	0.002
Family Cohesion					0.042	0.042
Constant		0.159	0.291	0.326	0.324	0.350
R-squared		0.02	0.04	0.06	0.16	0.17
Observations		4320	4320	4320	4320	4320

Robust Standard Errors for Table 12 (Global Relative Health, Parents Sample)

	Direct Effects	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Married	0.000	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002
Cohabiting	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002
Separated	0.004	0.004	0.006	0.006	0.005	0.006
Divorced	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.003
Step	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002
Single Parent	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002
Transitions	0.018	0.030	0.029	0.028	0.028	0.028
Recentness	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002
Transition Age						
Age			0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002
Sex male			0.032	0.032	0.032	0.032
Race white			0.038	0.038	0.037	0.038
Completed Edu.			0.007	0.007	0.007	0.007
Number in House			0.031	0.031	0.031	0.031
Number of Kids in House			0.034	0.034	0.035	0.035
Income			0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Nsfh2cohab			0.148	0.145	0.146	0.144
Nsfh2sep			0.161	0.161	0.159	0.159
Nsfh2sing1 [†]			0.126	0.128	0.127	0.129
Nsfh2sing2 ^{††}			0.223	0.250	0.254	0.276
Nsfh2step			0.144	0.142	0.141	0.139
Nsfh2singpar			0.139	0.138	0.140	0.138
Communication w/ Parents				0.009		0.009
Communication w/ Inlaws				0.011		0.010
Communication w/ Siblings				0.011		0.011
Social Participation				0.031		0.031
Orgizational Participation				0.026		0.026
Help Recieved				0.053		0.052
Happy Union					0.044	0.044
Hard Child					0.036	0.036
Easy Child					0.029	0.029
Conflict w/ Absent Parent					0.116	0.115
Dissatisfaction w/ Absent Parent					0.077	0.077
Interaction w/ Child					0.001	0.001
Family Cohesion					0.029	0.029
Constant		0.100	0.184	0.212	0.217	0.235
R-squared		0.01	0.09	0.10	0.12	0.13
Observations		4320	4320	4320	4320	4320

Robust Standard Errors for Table 13 (Psychological Well-Being, Parents Sample)

	Direct Effects	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Married	0.006	0.016	0.023	0.022	0.021	0.021
Cohabiting	0.016	0.023	0.026	0.026	0.023	0.023
Separated	0.066	0.067	0.067	0.069	0.069	0.070
Divorced	0.030	0.034	0.038	0.038	0.038	0.037
Step	0.009	0.017	0.025	0.025	0.023	0.023
Single Parent	0.009	0.017	0.022	0.021	0.021	0.020
Transitions	0.237	0.389	0.387	0.374	0.350	0.341
Recentness	0.010	0.017	0.018	0.018	0.017	0.017
Transition Age						
Age			0.024	0.026	0.023	0.025
Sex male			0.443	0.450	0.418	0.428
Race white			0.538	0.537	0.514	0.513
Completed Edu.			0.094	0.096	0.089	0.092
Number in House			0.296	0.296	0.285	0.285
Number of Kids in House			0.379	0.373	0.362	0.359
Income			0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Nsfh2cohab			1.634	1.615	1.498	1.486
Nsfh2sep			2.048	2.107	1.947	1.993
Nsfh2sing1 [†]			1.707	1.708	1.662	1.671
Nsfh2sing2 ^{††}			2.974	2.869	2.608	2.630
Nsfh2step			1.644	1.626	1.516	1.506
Nsfh2singpar			1.710	1.717	1.651	1.661
Communication w/ Parents				0.117		0.113
Communication w/ Inlaws				0.134		0.127
Communication w/ Siblings				0.150		0.145
Social Participation				0.439		0.421
Orgizational Participation				0.355		0.337
Help Recieved				0.707		0.669
Happy Union					0.645	0.633
Hard Child					0.492	0.489
Easy Child					0.399	0.399
Conflict w/ Absent Parent					1.711	1.743
Dissatisfaction w/ Absent Parent					0.931	0.929
Interaction w/ Child					0.017	0.017
Family Cohesion					0.384	0.381
Constant		1.290	2.490	2.900	2.733	2.969
R-squared		0.02	0.08	0.10	0.20	0.21
Observations		4320	4320	4320	4320	4320

APPENDEX D: Regression Results for Supplementary Analysis Interaction Terms

COGNITIVE WELL-BEING (FULL SAMPLE)			
	b	t	p
Married * Sex	.106	2.92	.003
Married	-.009	-5.57	.000
Sex (male)	-.140	-3.72	.000
Cohabiting * Sex	.075	2.06	.039
Cohabiting	-.010	-4.11	.000
Sex	-.107	-2.95	.003
GLOBAL RELATIVE HEALTH (FULL SAMPLE)			
	b	t	p
Married * Sex	-.047	-2.04	.041
Married	-.001	-1.21	.227
Sex	-.033	-1.43	.154
Cohabiting * Sex	.045	2.17	.030
Cohabiting	-.005	-2.86	.004
Sex	-.045	-1.95	.052
Transitions * Sex	.068	3.16	.002
Transitions	.006	0.24	.809
Sex	-.043	-1.87	.061
Recentness * Sex	-.056	-2.54	.011
Recentness	.001	1.46	.145
Sex	-.045	-1.94	.052
PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING (FULL SAMPLE)			
	b	t	p
Married * Sex	.620	2.02	.043
Married	-.023	-1.70	.089
Sex	-1.358	-4.18	.000
COGNITIVE WELL-BEING (TRANSITIONS SAMPLE)			
	b	t	p
Transitions * Sex	.140	2.07	.039
Transitions	-.129	-2.65	.008
Sex	-.276	-2.50	.013
GLOBAL RELATIVE HEALTH (TRANSITIONS SAMPLE)			
	b	t	p
Transitions * Sex	.092	2.33	.020
Transitions	-.050	-1.56	.119
Sex (Male)	-.080	-1.17	.224
Recentness * Sex	-.083	-2.12	.034
Recentness	.003	-.014	.886
Sex (male)	-.072	-1.11	.268

PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING (TRANSITIONS SAMPLE)			
	b	t	p
Cohabiting * Sex	1.132	2.63	.008
Cohabiting	-.063	-2.73	.006
Sex (male)	-1.816	-2.80	.005
COGNITIVE WELL-BEING (PARENTS SAMPLE)			
	b	t	p
Cohabiting * Sex	.118	2.32	.020
Cohabiting	-.008	-2.28	.023
Sex	-.062	-1.26	.209
Transitions * Sex	.132	2.50	.012
Transitions	-.006	-0.15	.881
Sex	-.051	-1.04	.299
GLOBAL RELATIVE HEALTH (PARENTS SAMPLE)			
	b	t	p
Married * Sex	-.078	-2.25	.024
Married	-.003	-1.69	.090
Sex	-.014	-0.40	.688
Cohabiting * Sex	.070	2.49	.013
Cohabiting	-.004	-2.30	.022
Sex	-.039	-1.21	.226
Transitions * Sex	.121	4.08	.000
Transitions	-.019	-0.64	.522
Sex	-.027	-0.84	.403
Recentness * Sex	-.100	-2.75	.006
Recentness	.003	2.29	.022
Sex	-.030	-0.90	.369
PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING (PARENTS SAMPLE)			
	b	t	p
Divorced * Sex	.845	2.01	.044
Divorced	-.076	-1.74	.083
Sex	-1.045	-2.45	.014
Transitions * Sex	.953	2.38	.017
Transitions	-.075	-0.20	.844
Sex	-.962	-2.26	.024