

ONLINE SUPPLEMENT

1. DATA

The FFCWB is a longitudinal birth cohort study of nearly 5,000 children born in 20 large U.S. cities between 1998 and 2000, including 3,700 children born to unmarried parents and 1,200 born to married parents. Baseline in-person interviews were conducted shortly after the birth of the focal child, and follow-up interviews were completed when children were aged one, three, five, and nine. The weighted sample data are representative of nonmarital births to parents residing in cities with populations over 200,000 (Reichman, Teitler, Garfinkel, & MacLanahan, 2001). Study outcomes were assessed at year 9, and additional covariate information was drawn primarily from the baseline and year 1 interviews. The final analytic sample consisted of 3,196 respondents.

2. MEASURES

Outcomes variables. We examined four indicators of child well-being, including internalizing problem behaviors, externalizing problem behaviors, PPVT scores, and early juvenile delinquency. To assess internalizing and externalizing problem behaviors, we created mean scales based on caregiver's responses to 32 and 34 questions, respectively, from the Child Behavior Checklist assessed at the time of the in-home 9-year interview. Caregivers were asked how often their child engaged in a variety of behaviors, and responses ranged from 0 "not true" to 2 "very true or often true." In addition to youth's behaviors, children's verbal abilities were also assessed at the 9-year interview using the PPVT-III. Our measure of PPVT is taken directly from these assessments, in which children were provided a word and had to identify the corresponding image (range = 37-159). Juvenile delinquency is a 17-item summed scale, and

was taken from a series of questions asking whether children had engaged in the following behaviors: 1) purposely damaged or destroyed property that was not yours; 2) taken or stolen something that did not belong to you from another person or from a store; 3) taken some money at home that did not belong to you; 4) cheated on a school test; 5) had a fist fight with another person; 6) hurt an animal on purpose; 7) gone into somebody's garden, backyard, house, or garage when you were not supposed to be there; 8) run away from home; 9) skipped school without an excuse; 10) secretly taken a sip of wine, beer, or liquor; 11) smoked marijuana, grass, pot, or weed; 12) smoked a cigarette or used tobacco; 13) been suspended or expelled from school; 14) written things or sprayed paint on walls or sidewalks or cars; 15) purposely set fire to a building, a car, or other property or tried to do so; 16) avoided paying for things such as movies, bus or subway rides, or food; and 17) thrown rocks or bottles at people or cars.

Explanatory variables. Parental incarceration, including maternal and paternal incarceration, were based on direct and indirect reports of time spent in prison or jail taken from the mothers' and fathers' year 3, 5, and 9 interviews. Direct reports included questions assessing whether the biological mother or father of the focal child had been incarcerated since the prior survey wave, or were incarcerated at the time of the survey administration. Indirect evidence was gleaned from unrelated survey items, including questions assessing the parent's current housing situation, labor market involvement, and justification for not seeing his or her child more often.

Control variables. We include a broad range of mother, father, and child characteristics in models estimating propensity scores for maternal and paternal incarceration. Similar to prior investigations of the effects of parental incarceration on child well-being using the FFCWB data,

we draw on baseline and 1-year survey reports of our matching covariates in order to establish appropriate temporal ordering (an exception is mother's impulsivity, which was taken from the 5-year interview). We include a broad range of sociodemographic characteristics, including four dummy variables for parent's race, including non-Hispanic White, Black, Hispanic, and other, a dichotomous variable indicating whether the child's parents were a mixed-race couple, an indicator of the mother's immigrant status (1 = foreign born), a continuous measure of mother's age, and an indicator of whether the mother lived with both biological parents at age 15 (1 = yes). A series of dummy variables assessed maternal and paternal levels of education, including less than high school, high school (or GED), and at least some postsecondary education. Mother's poverty status was a dichotomous variable indicating whether the household income was below the poverty line at the time of the 1-year interview (1 = yes). We also included a continuous measure of material hardship, ranging from 0-12, which was based on whether or not the household struggled to meet basic needs. Two dummy variables assessed whether the child's biological mother and father were employed during the 1-year interview.

We also measured a number of family background factors, including a dummy indicator of whether the mother lived with the child's grandparent, the mother's relationship with the child's father (dummy variables for married, cohabiting, nonresidential romantic relationship, and separated), and whether the mother had a new partner (1 = yes). Mother relationship quality was assessed on a scale of 1-5, such that higher scores were indicative of higher quality relationships. We also controlled for the number of children in the household (range = 0-9). We included a continuous measure of parenting stress, as well an indicator of maternal depression. A number of child characteristics were also included: gender was a dummy variable (male = 1), an indicator of low birth weight, and a continuous measure of child's temperament (higher scores

indicate poorer emotional regulation). Although controls for parental (antisocial) behaviors are largely unavailable in the data, we control for the following potential cofounds: mother's smoking and substance use during pregnancy, whether either parent had a substance abuse problem (e.g., drinking/drugs interfered with how you manage daily; drinking/drugs interfered with your personal relationship; since the child's birth, have you sought help/been treated for drug/alcohol problem), mother's reports of domestic violence, mother's and father's previous incarceration (i.e., during/prior to the 1-year interview), and parent's impulsivity.