## **Data & Methodology**

*Data*

The UC Berkeley Social Networks Study, or “UCNets” is a five-year panel study funded by the National Institute on Aging (<http://ucnets.berkeley.edu>) created with the intent of drawing an egocentric map of respondent networks and collecting information about their social connections. Responses used were collected in 2015 in the first wave of a longitudinal panel survey through address and Facebook-based sampling. The survey collected data on 1159 people in two cohorts – 21-30 year-olds and 50-70 year-olds living in the S.F. Bay Area. The surveys/interviews were conducted face-to-face and online (see documentation on website). The UCNets survey also collected detailed information about participants’ socioeconomic and health status.

Data on social networks was collected by asking respondents name-eliciting questions about how often they engaged in certain kinds of activity then asking them to provide a list of names they engaged in that activity with. One of these questions asked respondents to name people they “go out to concerts, plays, clubs, sports, or other events with…” This question is the focus of our study. If the parents were named in this list of names, they were removed: these are then a list of the respondents’ “Social Interaction Ties” beyond the parents.

The second stage in the procedure involved asking respondents to describe and interpret their named alters. This stage collected information on the name’s relationship role, perceived “closeness,” geographic proximity, gender, age, religion, and race and ethnicity. This stage in the procedure was used to identify “Close Fathers” as those alters who were a parent, a male, and considered by the respondent to be “especially close.”

*Variables*

*Father Variables*

Father variables were constructed around three categories of respondents. First, some named a father in their list and considered him to be “especially close.” Second, some people named their father but did not identify him as “especially close.” Lastly, some respondents did not name a father for whatever reason but reported that he was alive. This last category represents respondents with an “estranged” father—a father who is alive but not present in their lives. All deceased fathers were removed from the analysis. Parallel “close” mother variables were also created.

It’s important to note that a father simply *being named* in the network may be more significant than him being “close” when observing social network outcomes. In other words, a father being named may be associated with a more robust social network while him being considered “close” may not be. There is no assumption of a linear relationship between the three categories (close father, non-close father named, and no father named).

Lastly, the study asks respondents to identify their father as, “anyone they consider to be a father.” Thus, this variable does not only represent biological fathers and so both fathers and the small number of stepfathers (8 in total) reported by respondents are “fathers.” People who reported more than one father or mother in this study were excluded; their reason for stating they had two fathers/mothers was not clear.

*Social Interaction Variables*

The first six name-generating questions in the study generated a list of people with whom the respondent engaged in different types of social interaction. We used the total amount of people the respondent named as someone they engaged in social interaction with. Three people in this study who answered the survey but refused to provide any information about their social network and were removed from the sample. Social activities are defined generally as anything “social,” such as hanging out, going to a movie together, going out for drinks, etc.

Table 1A shows the distribution of all “Social Interaction” alters named in a network by role relationship, gender. Because we were interested in the association between a close parent and the number of people the respondent interacted with *beyond* them, we removed parents from these three lists *if* they were named. The result was a dependent variable in which all mothers and fathers are removed from the social interaction list. We then break this information out into 3 distinct lists (which are analyzed in separate models): the total number of “Social Interaction Ties,” male-only “Social Interaction Ties,” and the female-only “Social Interaction Ties.”

Table 1B features cross-tabulations of weighted case means of “Social Interaction Ties” by type of father relationship alongside N counts. Generally, those with an “especially close” father report a higher average amount of “Social Interaction Ties.”

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table 1A: Cross-Tabulation by Number of Alters named as Social Ties, Confidants, and Advice Givers** | |
| Category | Social Ties |
| **All** | 6,539 |
| **Males** | 2,622 |
| **Females** | 3,906 |
| **Fathers** | 70 |
| **Mothers** | 131 |
| **Total Beyond Parents** | |
| **All** | 6,338 |
| **Males** | 2,552 |
| **Females** | 3,775 |
| Note: Fathers and Mothers in this sample are anyone the respondent considers to be a "Father" or "Mother," stepparents are included. | |
|  |

*Covariates*

We controlled for respondent income, gender/sex, education, age, and race and whether the father was physically close (within an hour). Various events in life affect the size, and quality, of people’s social networks. For example, getting married has the effect of generating new kin ties, but also tends to *reduce* the amount of interaction people spend with kin. Losing a wife/husband tends to have the opposite consequence, where people will tend to lose kin but interact *more* with remaining kin (Gerstel and Sarkisian, 2006; Kalmijn, Graaf, 2012; Guiaux, et al., 2007). Lastly, we included variables that may inhibit or influence network size and quality as controls. These included events like a recent new job and/or a new baby (Wruz, et al, 2013).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 1B: Cross-Tabulations Number of Respondents in Father Named and/or Close Categories (Sons and Daughters) by Average Amount of Social Interaction Ties** | | |
|  | **N** | **Social Interaction Ties** |
| **Father Not Named** | **247** | **4.70** |
| Daughters | 165 | 4.72 |
| Sons | 82 | 4.67 |
| **Father Not Close** | **147** | **4.83** |
| Daughters | 104 | 5.40 |
| Sons | 43 | 4.83 |
| **Father Close** | **198** | **6.05** |
| Daughters | 128 | 6.00 |
| Sons | 70 | 6.10 |
| **All Respondents** | **592** | **5.19** |
| Daughters | 391 | 5.25 |
| Sons | 758 | 5.13 |
| Note: This sample contains all respondents who reported having a father who was alive and/or present in their lives in some capacity. The above presents unweighted N counts alongside weighted case means. | | |
|  |

**Methods**

Because of categorical independent variables, we used a General Linear Model (GLM) (also known as UNIANOVA in SPSS) instead of a normal linear regression due to its ability to incorporate categorical and continuous variables into one output easily. This model is, however, mathematically similar to linear regression. Essentially, this model takes the highest-numbered category and treats it as the reference category to compare to each category below it independently (2 compared to 1 and 2 compared to 0). Effectively, this converts the categorical variable into two dummy variables. In more concrete terms, this model will allow us to observe whether having a father in the network is significant in producing a more robust social network or whether he must also be “close.”

It’s important to mention that these models were designed around the father. We selected respondents who reported having a *father* who was alive and controlled for the *father’s* distance from the respondent; the same was not done for mothers. For this reason, results will be presented primarily around the “Close Father” variable.