Stepfamily Fertility:

Children from Previous Relationships and Intentions for Another Child

Bryndl Hohmann-Marriott

University of Otago

Abstract

Parents who form new partnerships and have children together create complex stepfamilies. As they consider future childbearing together, these parents also consider their and their partner's children with former partners. This study includes 1,809 couples in the UK Millennium Cohort Study where one or both partners had children from former relationships, as well as one or two joint children in the current relationship. For both partners, the analysis examined number of children, residence, and involvement with nonresident children. When mothers and fathers had children of their or their partner's prior relationships living with them, they were less likely to intend another child. Fathers were especially influenced by their partner's coresident children and contact with their own nonresident children.

Relationship dissolution and reformation often occurs during the childbearing years, and parents with young children who repartner often bear new children in their new relationship. The relationship context is central to multiple-partner fertility, and includes commitment to a new partner, as well as the children each partner brings to the new relationship (Guzzo & Furstenberg 2007). The process of stepfamily fertility is important for understanding stepfamily dynamics as well as population fertility (Sweeny 2010). The new complex stepfamily can include children of the mother and/or children of the father, as well as children of both together. For parents, stepparents, and half-brothers and –sisters it represents a unique family constellation. Stepfamily fertility can also lead to fertility levels higher than would be seen in an undisrupted union. One or both parents may revise their ideal number of children upward to accommodate childbearing in the new union (Iacovou & Tavares 2011).

In stepfamilies, Thomson (2004) suggests that a first joint child represents commitment to the new partnership as well as the opportunity for biological parenthood if one partner has not yet had a child. The second joint child represents a full sibling for the first joint child. The motivation for a second joint child may not be as strong, however, as the first joint child already has siblings, albeit half-siblings. There may be no unique value for a third joint child.

Children from prior partnerships who are brought into the stepfamily may have a different meaning to the parents and stepparents. To understand fertility within the new stepfamily, it is critically important to have an accurate representation of the children with prior partners. It is necessary to know not only the number of children of each partner, but also the level of involvement with those children (Jefferies, Berrington, & Diamond 2000; Thomson, 1997). However, this is often quite difficult to establish precisely.

How might prior children influence future fertility plans in stepfamilies? Does the influence of prior children differ by whether they are one's own or one's partner's, the mother's or the father's, or by the parents' level of responsibility and involvement? This study of stepfamily fertility in the UK aims to answer these questions by examining intentions for a second or third joint child for both partners in a coresident relationship. Building on prior studies investigating the value and influence of stepchildren, the relative influence of each partner's prior children are carefully separated out. These prior studies are then extended by considering mother's vs. father's prior children and the level of involvement with these prior children, including residence, contact, and payments.

BACKGROUND

Childbearing in Stepfamilies

Couples in new partnerships both intend and have a child together regardless of the number of children they have already had, as indicated by evidence from both Europe and the United States (Buber-Ennser & Fürnkranz-Prskawetz 2000, Henz 2002, Stewart 2002, Thomson and Li 2002, Vikat, Thomson and Hoem 1999). Mothers in the UK may be somewhat less likely than mothers in the US to have a new child with a new partner (Kiernan et al. 2011). This indicates that the unique values of first shared children in a new relationship may be stronger than the costs of having a larger number of children in total.

Former children may have differential influence on fertility depending on parents' level of involvement. Parents are most involved when the child resides in the household. Vikat et al. (1999) found that the risk of a second shared birth was lower in both Austria and Finland when the respondent lived together with their children from prior relationships, compared to parents with nonresident prior children. They suggest that the responsibility for prior children may be the key factor underlying fertility in the new union. Because they were only able to examine one partner's perspective and were unable to assess involvement with nonresident prior children, a more thorough test of this initial idea is necessary.

It is often difficult to assess the precise effect of prior children, as many early studies did not take into account both partners' fertility histories. Even of studies which do, this is often reported by only one partner, raising the possibility of inaccuracies, as noted by authors such as Thomson (2004) and Buber-Ennser and Fürnkranz-Prskawetz (2000). The current study is able to extend this prior research by including both partners' own reports of prior children as well as involvement with nonresident prior children.

Nonresident Parents and Stepfamilies in the UK

The UK, as with the US, has very high rates of family instability. This occurs both through divorce as well as births to unmarried parents, whose relationships tend to be less stable (Clarke et al, 1998). The legal context of divorce in the UK is also more similar to that of the US than to the Nordic model. Courts determine custody, visitation, and support arrangements. Financial transfers are often incomplete, and in the UK, as in the US, single mothers make up a disproportionate share of the population in poverty (Del Boca, 2003). Just before the millennium, somewhat fewer fathers in the UK were nonresident, compared with US fathers, with 12% of UK fathers and 20% of US fathers living apart from at least some of their children. In the UK, fathers were more likely to be absent when the child was born outside marriage and when the fathers were younger (Clarke et al, 1998).

It is estimated that, in the decade prior to the new millennium, around 30% of mothers in the UK will have formed stepfamilies, and that 86% of children living in a stepfamily were living with their mother and a stepfather (Ermisch & Francesconi 2000). Stepfamilies are highly unstable, although there is a slight protective effect of marriage for stepfamilies in the UK. Nearly one-third of cohabiting stepfamilies and 16% of married stepfamilies dissolved within one year. Within 10 years, one-half of cohabiting stepfamilies and one-quarter of married stepfamilies were dissolved (Ermisch & Francesconi 2000). This contrasts with the US, where just over half of both married and cohabiting stepfamilies dissolved within 10 years (Bumpass, Raley, & Sweet 1995).

Of divorced mothers who had one child prior to forming a new relationship, 32% went on to have another child within 5 years, and 45% within 10 years. The proportions having a child in a new relationship were somewhat lower for those who already had two or three children (Jefferies, Berrington & Diamond 2000). The age of the youngest child was even more important than parity, however, with mothers being most likely to have another child if their children with prior partners were young, controlling for her own age.

It is clear that stepfamily fertility is playing an important role in the increasing complexity of family composition. Repartnered couples with children from prior partnerships who go on to have children together thus represent a very selective group of families with growing importance for understanding both family constellations as well as fertility patterns.

Involvement with Stepchildren and Nonresident Children

Stepfamily formation is often a different process for women and men. Most separated or divorced mothers are living together with their children. When these mothers form a new coresident relationship, their new partner becomes a resident stepfather to their children. When the new partners have new children together, it is possible that all the children of the family will live in one household. Separated or divorced fathers, by contrast, most often are not living with their children. When these fathers form a new relationship and have new children, they are simultaneously resident fathers to their new children and nonresident fathers to their prior children.

The involvement of nonresident fathers, usually measured as contact and financial support, can change in the years following parental separation (Cheadle, Amato & King 2010). Some of this change stems from new partnerships and childbearing. From a social-parenting perspective, fathers will be most involved with the children with whom they are coresident. This may be because fathering can be seen as a ‘package deal’ wrapped together with a romantic relationship with the children’s mother (Furstenberg 1995). This process may be intensified when the father has new children with the new partner, as in this situation his involvement with his nonresident

children often decreases (Manning & Smock 1999). Nonresident fathers' involvement may decrease even further when the children's mother has a new child with a new partner (Guzzo 2009; Meyer & Cancian 2012; Tach et al 2010). The birth of a child to the new relationship may diminish the involvement of the stepfather with his resident stepchildren as well (Stewart 2005). This evidence suggests the most parental investment in children from the current relationship, followed by resident stepchildren, with nonresident children trailing.

Fertility Intentions

Intentions may be a more compelling indicator of the effect of prior children than actual births, as they are not influenced by unintended pregnancies. In the UK, it is estimated that 30% - 40% of births are unplanned (Fleissig 1991; Lakha & Glasier 2006). It has been theorized that intentions provide insight into the motivations behind fertility decisions (Miller 1994). Thomson (2004) found that intentions for a second child are no different between couples with one shared child and those with one with one stepchild and no shared children. Couples appear to want two children together even when that means having more children altogether. These findings underscore the perceived unique value of a second child in the current relationship, separate from children from previous relationships.

Fertility intentions are influenced by individual as well as relational factors. Given that women's fertility declines over time, the age of the female partner will be an important consideration for both mothers and fathers. Education and employment are also factors for mothers, with UK research finding that women with greater education are more likely to have second and third births, when age at first birth is taken into consideration (Ní Bhrolcháin 1986; Smallwood 2003). This may be because higher-educated women are more likely to have the kinds of employment which offer a higher income and greater ability to maintain a career. Assortative mating would also suggest that these women are also more likely to have a partner who has a high income. There has been a rise in the proportion of births in the UK to foreign-born women, as those of a minority ethnicity maintain a slightly higher fertility rate than those born in the UK (Tromans, Jefferies, & Natamba 2009). Partnership status is one of the most important contexts of fertility intentions (Jefferies, Berrington & Diamond 2000). Both marital status and relationship quality can indicate relational commitment and may influence future plans. The intentions for the past pregnancy may also influence intentions for future fertility, as an unintended second birth is more likely for those whose first pregnancy was unintended (Guzzo & Hayford 2011).

It is also vitally important to study the intentions of both partners. In the US, husbands' and wives' intentions each equally influence their likelihood of a subsequent birth (Thomson 1997). Couples in Sweden and in the Netherlands also show this pattern of both partners having equal influence (Jansen & Liefbroer 2006, Thomson & Hoem, 1998). Partner influences may also differ by parity (Miller & Pasta 1995). In the US, second births are the more often jointly

planned than either first or third births (Williams 1994). No prior study has yet examined the intentions of both partners in a stepfamily.

Research Aims

This analysis will examine the influence of children from prior relationships on childbearing intentions of mothers and fathers. The first aim is to compare the relative importance of own and partner's prior children. The second aim is to investigate involvement by comparing own and partner's resident and nonresident prior children, and the third aim unpacks involvement further by examining own and partners' contact with and payments for these children. The final aim is to examine whether there is a difference in these effects for mothers and fathers, separate from the effects of residence and involvement.

METHOD

This analysis is enabled by the extensive couple-level data in the Millennium Cohort Study (MCS). The MCS is a national survey of all four countries of the United Kingdom, representing a random sampling of the families of children born in the year 2000 (Hansen 2010). The current analysis included only coresident couples who had either one or two joint children. The analysis is thus able to capture the fertility intentions of couples in longer-term, relatively more committed relationships. Couples in shorter-term repartnered relationships, who may have very different fertility intentions, thus are not influencing this analysis.

Face-to-face interviews with mothers were completed when the focal child was about nine months old, and interviews were also completed with coresident fathers. Both mothers and fathers were asked about their intentions for another child, as well as an array of demographic, behavioral, and attitudinal questions.

There were 11,733 coresident couples in the study who had just had their first or second child together. In 10,256 (87%) of these, both partners had been interviewed. Of these, 208 women and 299 men, together 4% of the couple sample, were missing the entire self-complete section which contained questions about nonresident children. These cases were dropped from analysis, but a selection analysis reveals that they were less likely than those with the self-complete section to have a resident prior child. In 1,809 (18%) of the cases with complete couple information, either one or both partners had a child from a prior relationship, and these cases made up the final sample.

Fertility Intentions

Intentions for another child were measured by a variable asking "Do you plan to have any more children?" Responses were coded dichotomously as *yes* and *no* (includes *don't know*).

Children with Prior Partners

The number of resident children with prior partners can be established from the household roster, which includes all resident children and indicates their relationship with each resident parent. Nonresident children are identified using questions asking each parent about their children who do not live in the household. Children who were nonresident because of death or hospitalization were not counted in this total. For each nonresident child, parents were asked about their frequency of contact with the child. This was coded dichotomously for each nonresident child as weekly (every day, several times a week, once a week) or less than weekly (once a month or less than once a month; neither fathers nor mothers reported no contact at all). The variable for contact indicates the number of nonresident children with whom the respondent had weekly contact. Payment for each nonresident child was asked and coded dichotomously as making regular support payments or not. The variable for payment indicates the number of nonresident children for whom the respondent made regular maintenance payments. When used in the models, these variables were truncated at 3 to reduce the outlier effect of the very small number of parents with very high numbers of children.

Individual and Couple Characteristics

Age was measured to capture the declining fecundity of the female partner. It was included in all models as a categorical variable indicating the mother's age as 24 or less, 25-29, 30-34 (used as the reference), 35-39, and 40 or more. Age difference between partners was a dichotomous variable indicating whether the partners' age differs by 6 or more years.

Education was a continuous variable representing the number of years in formal education before first leaving, and ranged from 7-20 for both women and men. Education difference between the partners was included by a variable indicating whether the partners' years of education differed by 3 or more years.

Ethnicity was coded as *White* (reference category), *Asian* (primarily Indian and Bangladeshi), *Black* (primarily Caribbean), and *Other* (including mixed ethnicity). If partners reported different panethnic identifications, they were coded as different.

Employment was coded for the partners as *both employed full-time* (35+ hours; this was the reference category), *man employed full-time and woman employed part-time* (1-34 hours), *man employed full-time and woman not employed* (including maternity leave), and *man employed less than full-time* (regardless of woman's employment).

Happiness with the current relationship was measured on a scale from 1 (*very unhappy*) to 7 (*very happy*). Partner similarity was included with a variable indicating whether the two partners differed by more than 2 points in their assessment of relationship happiness.

Relationship-level characteristics include marital status (*married* vs. *unmarried cohabiting*) and whether the most recent pregnancy was *unplanned* (vs. *planned*). Both of these are reported by the mother.

Analysis

Because the incidence and meaning of resident and nonresident prior children differs so widely between fathers and mothers, their analyses are conducted separately. Each partner's outcome is their own fertility intentions, which are tested using logistic regression models. The key predictor variables include the individual's own and partner's prior children. Individual characteristics are included as the individual's own as well as partner difference variables. Shared relationship characteristics are also included.

RESULTS

Overall, 26% of fathers and 29% of mothers intended another child (Table 1). A comparison of partners revealed that in 20% of couples both partners intended another child, in 65% neither intended another child, in 9% it was only the mother who intended another, and in 6% it was only the father. Couple-level analyses revealed that intentions for another child did not differ significantly by gender.

Description of Children from Prior Relationships

In 18% of the couples, both partners had prior children. In 31% only the mother had prior children, and in 51% only the father had prior children. In 58% of the households, there were no resident stepchildren. In 38% there were only the mother's, in 4% only the father's, and in 1% of the households there were "his, hers, and ours" resident.

For 69% of the fathers in the sample, there was at least one prior child. For those with prior children, the mean number was 1.74 (SD 1.02) with a range of 1-10. For mothers, 45% had at least one prior child, with a mean number of 1.57 (SD 0.85) and range of 1-9 for those with prior children.

Of the fathers with prior children, 83% had all prior children living outside their household, 13% had only resident children, and the remainder had a combination. The residence pattern for mothers with prior children was reversed, with 93% of mothers having only resident children, 4% only nonresident children, and the remainder with both resident and nonresident children

Fathers had varying levels of involvement with their nonresident children. Of the fathers with nonresident prior children, 44% had one or more children with whom they had weekly contact, and 55% had one or more children to whom they made regular payments. It was possible for a

father to have multiple prior children with different levels of involvement. The largest number of nonresident children were reported to be living with the child's other parent.

Mothers had a similar pattern of contact, but differed in payments. For the very small number of mothers with nonresident children, 45% had one or more children with whom they had weekly contact, and 17% had one or more children to whom they made regular payments. This lower percentage is explained by a further examination of the living situation of mothers' nonresident children, which revealed that a disproportionate number were living independently. Thus, for many mothers with nonresident children, the children were out of the house because they were already grown up.

Individual and Relational Characteristics

The association of individual and relational characteristics with intentions for another child are shown in Table 2. For fathers, children of the current relationship exerted the strongest influence. Fathers were the least likely to want another child when they and their current partner already had two children together. Another strong influence was age; the older the female partner, the less likely fathers were to intend another child. Fathers were more likely to intend another child when they reported Black ethnicity and had the same ethnicity as their partner. Compared to couples where both partners worked full-time, couples where the woman did not work and also those where the father did not work full-time had higher intentions for another child. Fathers also had higher intentions when they reported a happier relationship and when their most recent child was planned. These controls were included in all models for fathers.

As with fathers, mothers were much less likely to want another child when they and their current partner already had two children together. Age was the strongest predictor of intentions, with mothers over 40 much less likely to intend another child than mothers aged 30-34. Mothers' intentions were much higher when they had more education, but their partners' education was not important. Compared to couples where both were working full-time, mothers in relationships where she was not working at all or where her partner was not working full-time had higher intentions. As with fathers, mothers had higher intentions when they reported a happier relationship and when their most recent child was planned. These controls were also included in all models for mothers.

Prior Children.

The first question aimed to examine the effect of the total number of parents' own prior children and their partners' prior children. The analysis for fathers, presented in Model 1 in Table 3, showed that both own and partners' prior children significantly reduced the odds of fathers intending another child. Although the children of each partner had significant effects, mothers' prior children had an effect nearly twice as large as father's own prior children. For mothers, presented in Model 1 in Table 4, both their own and their partners' prior children significantly

lower their odds of intending another child. Mothers' own prior children had an effect on her intentions nearly four times larger than fathers' prior children. Thus, for both fathers and mothers, all prior children have an effect, but the effect of mothers' prior children is considerably stronger.

Residence of Prior Children

The second question asks if residence is the key factor in prior children's influence. The analysis for fathers, presented in Model 2 in Table 3, clearly indicates that residence of prior children is a major factor in reducing fathers' intentions for another child. Comparing resident with nonresident prior children reveals that fathers' odds of intending another child were lowered much more by the presence of both their own and their partners' children in their household than by children outside the household. For resident children, it was again mothers' children who had the greater effect on fathers' intentions. By contrast, nonresident children only had an effect on the father's intentions when they were his own.

For mothers, seen in Model 2 in Table 4, the odds of intending another child were also more sharply reduced by resident than by nonresident children. For mothers, her own resident children had twice the effect on her intentions as the father's resident children. Mothers were influenced by both their own and the fathers' nonresident children, although her own children had a stronger effect.

Nonresident Prior Children

The third question unpacks nonresident involvement by examining contact and payments. These are analyzed in separate models because contact and payments are counted separately, and placing them in the same model would double-count some prior children. Additional models (not shown) which combined contact and payments into a single variable in the same model found comparable results, but for ease of interpretation the separate models are presented here.

For fathers, only contact had a strongly significant effect on intentions (Model 3, Table 3). Fathers' weekly contact with their own nonresident children reduced the odds of intending another child. Making regular financial support payments, however, had no significant effect on fathers' intentions for another child (Model 4, Table 3).

For mothers, this pattern was reversed. Contact did not have any effect on intentions (Model 3, Table 4), but mothers' intentions were lowered when they had nonresident children to whom they made regular financial support payments (Model 4, Table 4). Payments made to her partners' prior children had no effect on mothers' intentions.

Fathers and Mothers

The final question asks about the different effects of mother's and father's prior children. The analyses reveal that mothers' children exert a stronger effect than fathers' children for both mothers and fathers (Model 1 in Tables 3 and 4). This could be simply the result of children being more likely to reside with mothers. When residence was considered, however, a small gendered effect remains whereby mothers' children exert a stronger effect than fathers' children (Models 2-4 in Tables 3 and 4). This would be expected for mothers, as it is their own children exerting the strongest effect. For fathers it is particularly noteworthy, as the children of their partner exert a larger effect than their own children.

Fathers and mothers also differed in the pattern of influence of nonresident prior children. For fathers, contact with his nonresident children had more influence, whereas for mothers, financial support of nonresident children had more influence.

Robustness Analyses

Because of the very different meaning of prior children to mothers and fathers, they were analyzed separately in this analysis. Although partner characteristics were included in the models, this did not fully account for the partner's influence. To assess partner influence and test for robustness, additional analyses were performed using an Actor Partner Interdependence Model (APIM, Kenny et al 2005). The APIM used logistic hierarchical linear regression models where the outcome was the individual's own intentions for another child and the predictors were the individual's own and partner's characteristics at the individual level, with the couple as the grouping level. The APIM analysis found similar patterns for the effects of both resident and nonresident children (models available upon request), indicating that these results are robust and adequately take into account the partner's characteristics.

DISCUSSION

As parents in stepfamilies consider whether to have another child, they take into account their children together, their own children from prior relationships, and their partner's children from prior relationships. For both fathers and mothers, the more prior children they and their partners had, the lower their odds of intending another child. It is clear that not only their own children, but also their partners' prior children do exert an important influence. This is quite different for mothers and fathers. For mothers, her own prior children have the strongest influence, although her partners' children are also important.

For fathers, partner's children matter more than his own children. The key to understanding this effect depends on whether or not the mother has prior children herself. If the father's partner

does have children from a prior partnership, it is most likely that those children are living with the family and are thus a very salient presence for the father in lowering his intentions. Alternatively, if the father's partner has no children from a prior partnership, their child together will be her first and she may have a normative desire for two children. In this case, the father may want another child for his partner's sake.

This analysis was able to make a detailed assessment of not only number of children with prior partners, abut also parents' involvement with these children. Both fathers and mothers appear most influenced by the children they are most responsible for. For both parents, the children who are resident in their household are at the forefront of their attention. This finding confirms prior research by Vikat et al. (1999) that responsibility, in the form of coresidence, may be the key to understanding how prior children influence fertility intentions.

The current study extends this by considering responsibility for nonresident children, finding that involvement with nonresident children also matters. For fathers, contact with his nonresident prior children is more important than financially supporting them. This may be because they are visible and thus salient as he considers his family size. It may also be his is an involved father and wants to maintain involvement in both his families, so he does not want more children. In either case, having another child appears to be less of a financial decision for fathers.

For mothers, financial support of nonresident children does have an influence. This may be because a mother who is paying support for a nonresident child is in a very unusual position which may indicate other difficult circumstances which would make having another child undesirable (King 2007). Mothers who are in contact with their nonresident children but who are not making regular support payments most often have older children who have left the household and which do not affect her childbearing plans one way or the other.

Few studies of the effects of children with new partners on nonresident parent involvement have examined the number of additional children. These studies indicate that nonresident father involvement decreases when fathers and especially mothers have children with new partners (Guzzo 2009, Manning & Smock 2000, Meyer & Cancian 2012, Tach et al 2010). The current analysis adds to this by suggesting that those fathers who maintain involvement with their nonresident children are less inclined to have further children. It may be that these involved fathers are not 'swapping' families to the same extent as less-involved nonresident fathers.

Complex combinations of biological and step relationships within households appear to be more of a reality for families where the mother has prior children. Previous research has indicated that social fathers' involvement with resident stepchildren decreases with the birth of a child in the new relationship (Stewart 2005). The current study provides further evidence that the child of the new relationship is more salient than the resident stepchild. It is interesting to note, however, that both own and partner's resident stepchildren have an effect on fertility intentions. For resident

stepchildren, it appears that the practical realities of parenting the child may be as important or more important than the biological parentage of the child. One of the effects of repartnering is to revise fertility intentions upward. This study suggests that one of the ways this happens is when men with prior children partner with women who have no prior children. The men may intend additional children to accommodate their partner's desires.

These parents are a select group. They have had a child with (at least) one partner, then have gone on to have a child with another partner. Multiple-partner fertility is not uncommon, and is increasingly experienced by parents with unstable early relationships. A limitation of the current study is the lack of information on the prior partnership(s) of the parents.

The next step for this research will be to examine whether or not the couple achieves their fertility intentions. Those who intend another child may be able to achieve this goal, or they may be hindered by the dissolution of the relationship, secondary infertility, or another barrier. Those who do not intend another child may be able to accomplish this, or they may change their intentions or may experience an unplanned pregnancy.

These findings clearly indicate that children have differential effects on fertility intentions. Children from the current partnership appear to be the most meaningful, substantiating Thomson's (2004) conceptualization of the value of children in a new relationship. When considering the effect of prior children on fertility intentions, it is not enough to simply count the children. The responsibility for children, both as biological and social parent, is indeed key to determining how prior children affect intentions for childbearing in a new relationship. The more involved parents are with their own and their partners' prior children, the more those children count in future fertility intentions.

REFERENCES

Buber-Ennser, I., & Fürnkranz-Prskawetz, A. (2000). Fertility in second unions in Austria: Findings from the Austrian FFS. *Demographic Research, 3 (2).* Available http://www.demographic-research.org/volumes/vol3/2

Bumpass, L. L., Raley, R. K. and Sweet, J. A. (1995). The changing character of stepfamilies: Implications of cohabitation and nonmarital childbearing, *Demography*, *32*, 425–436.

Cheadle, J. E., Amato, P. R., & King, V. (2010). Patterns of nonresident father contact. *Demography, 47*, 205-225.

Clarke, L., Cooksey, E. C., & Verropoulou, G. (1998). Fathers and absent fathers: Sociodemographic similarities in Britain and the United States. *Demography*, *35*, 217-228.

Del Boca, D. (2003). Mothers, fathers, and children after divorce: The role of institutions. *Journal of Population Economics, 16*, 399-422.

Ermisch, J. & Francesconi, M. (2000). The increasing complexity of family relationships: Lifetime experience of lone motherhood and stepfamilies in Great Britain. *European Journal of Population, 16,* 235-249.

Fleissig A. (1991). Unintended pregnancies and the use of contraception: changes from 1984 to 1989. *British Medical Journal, 302*, 147-149.

Furstenberg, F. F. (1995). Changing roles of fathers. In P. L. Chase-Lansdale & J. Brooks-Gunn (Eds.), *Escape from poverty: What makes a difference for children* (pp. 189–210). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Guzzo, K. B. (2009). Maternal relationships and nonresidential father visitation of children born outside of marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *71*, 632-649.

Guzzo, K. B. & Furstenburg, F. F. Jr. (2007). Multipartnered fertility among American men. *Demography, 44*, 583-601.

Guzzo, K. B. & Hayford, S. (2011). Fertility following an unintended first birth. *Demography, 48*, 1493-1516.

Hansen, K. (Ed). (March 2010). *Millennium Cohort Study First, Second, Third and Fourth Surveys: A Guide to the Datasets, Fifth Edition.* London: Centre for Longitudinal Studies.

Henz, U. (2002). Childbirth in East and West German step-families. *Demographic Research, 7*, 307-342.

Iacovou, M. and Tavares, L. (2011). Yearning, learning and conceding: Reasons men and women change their childbearing intentions. *Population and Development Review 37,*: 89-123.

Jansen, M., & Liefbroer, A. C. (2006). Couple's attitudes, childbirth, and the division of labor. *Journal of Family Issues, 27*, 1487–1511.

Jefferies, J., Berrington, A. & Diamond, I. (2000). Childbearing following marital dissolution in Britain. *European Journal of Population, 16,* 193-210.

Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D.A., & Cook, W. L. (2005). *Dyadic Data Analysis*. New York: Guilford Press.

Kiernan, K., McLanahan, S., Holmes, J. & Wright, M. (2011). *Fragile families in the US and UK.* Center for Research on Child Wellbeing Working Paper #11-04-FF.

King, V. (2007). When children have two mothers: relationships with nonresident mothers, stepmothers, and fathers. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 69,* 1178–1193.

Lakha, F. & Glasier, A. (2006). Unintended pregnancy and use of emergency contraception among a large cohort of women attending for antenatal care or abortion in Scotland. *Lancet, 368,* 1782-1787.

Manning, W. D. & Smock, P. J. (1999). New families and nonresident father-child visitation. *Social Forces, 78,* 87-116.

Meyer, D. R. & Cancian, M. (2012). "I'm not supporting his kids": Nonresident fathers' contributions given mothers' new fertility. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 74,* 132-151.

Miller, W. B. (1994). Childbearing motivations, desires, and intentions: A theoretical framework. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychological Monographs, 120,* 223–258.

Miller, W. B., & Pasta, D. J. (1995). Behavioural intentions: Which ones predict fertility behaviour in married couples? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 25,* 530–555.

Ní Bhrolcháin, M., 1986. 'Women's paid work and the timing of birth – longitudinal evidence'. *European Journal of Population, 2,* 43–70.

Smallwood, S. (2003): Higher qualifications, first-birth timing, and further childbearing in England and Wales. *Population Trends, 111,* 18-26.

Stewart, S. D. (2002). The effect of stepchildren on childbearing intentions and births. *Demography, 39,* 181–197.

Stewart, S. D. (2005). How the birth of a child affects involvement with stepchildren. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67,* 461-473.

Sweeny, M. M. (2010). Remarriage and stepfamilies: Strategic sites for family scholarship in the 21st century. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 72,* 667-684.

Tach, L., Mincy, R. & Edin, K. (2010). Parenting as a "package deal": Relationships, fertility, and nonresident father involvement among unmarried parents. *Demography, 47,* 181-204.

Thomson, E. (1997). Couple childbearing desires, intentions, and births. *Demography, 34,* 343–354.

Thomson, E. (2004). Stepfamilies and childbearing desires in Europe. *Demographic Research*: *Special Collection 3,* Article 5; DOI: 10.4054/DemRes.2004.S3.5

Thomson, E., & Hoem, J. (1998). Couple childbearing plans and births in Sweden. *Demography, 35,* 315–322.

Thomson, E, & Li, J.-C. A., (2002). *Her, his, and their children: Childbearing intentions and births in stepfamilies*. National Survey of Families and Households Working Paper # 89. Center for Demography and Ecology at the University of Wisconsin - Madison.

Tromans, N., Jefferies, J. & Natamba, E. (2009) Have women born outside the UK driven the rise in UK births since 2001? *Population Trends, 136,* 28-42.

Vikat, A., Thomson, E., and Hoem, J. M. (1999). Step-family fertility in contemporary Sweden: The impact of childbearing before the current union. *Population Studies, 53,* 211-25.

Williams, L. (1994). Determinants of couple agreement in US fertility decisions. *Family Planning Perspectives, 26(4),* 169-173.

Table 1: Fathers' and Mothers' Children and Characteristics

	Fathers	**Mothers**
Intend another child (%)	26	29
Prior children (number, SD)	1.21 (1.17)	0.71 (0.97)
Resident	0.07 (0.36)	0.57 (0.85)
Nonresident	1.13 (1.15)	0.14 (0.54)
With Contact	0.44 (0.80)	0.06 (0.34)
With Payments	0.55 (0.85)	0.02 (0.16)
Two children together (%)	67	67
Age (%)		
24 or less	9	20
25-29	18	29
30-34	27	30
35-39	25	17
40 or more	21	4
Different (%)*	49	49
Education (years, SD)	11.6 (1.9)	12.0 (2.0)
Different (%)*	36	36
Ethnicity (%)		
White	92	92
Asian	2	2
Black	4	3
Other	2	4
Different (%)*	7	7
Employment (%)		
Both full-time	12	12
Father full-time, mother part-time	30	30
Father full-time, mother not employed	33	33
Father not employed	24	24
Happiness (1-7, SD)	5.7 (1.5)	5.6 (1.5)
Different (%)*	29	29
Married (%)	50	50
Unplanned pregnancy (%)	43	43

*See variable descriptions for coding of indicators of partner difference.

Data: 1,809 couples in the first wave of the UK Millennium Cohort where one or both partners had children from a prior relationship.

Table 2: Effects of Individual and Relational Characteristics on Fathers' and Mothers' Odds of Intending Another Child

	Fathers			Mothers		
	B	*SE B*	*OR*	*B*	*SE B*	*OR*
Two children together	-1.75***	0.16	0.17	-1.89***	0.16	0.15
Age						
24 or less	0.88***	25.18	2.41	0.76***	0.17	2.14
25-29	0.51***	10.99	1.66	0.31*	0.15	1.37
30-34 (ref)						
35-39	-0.73***	11.40	0.48	-0.84***	0.21	0.43
40 or more	-1.39**	6.41	0.25	-2.02***	0.63	0.13
Different	-0.12	0.84	0.89	-0.07	0.13	0.94
Education	0.05	0.03	1.05	0.12***	0.03	1.13
Different	0.17	0.13	1.19	0.08	0.14	1.08
Ethnicity						
White (reference)						
Asian	0.64	0.48	1.90	-0.41	0.50	0.66
Black	0.94**	0.31	2.56	0.50	0.36	1.64
Other	0.29	0.47	1.34	-0.13	0.42	0.88
Different	-0.56*	0.29	0.57	-0.30	0.31	0.74
Employment						
Both full-time (ref)						
Father full-time, mother part-time	0.30	0.20	1.35	0.26	0.19	1.30
Father full-time, mother not employed	0.36	0.20	1.43	0.45*	0.20	1.57
Father not employed	0.47*	0.22	1.59	0.47*	0.22	1.60
Happiness	0.10*	0.05	1.10	0.16***	0.04	1.17
Different	0.00	0.14	1.00	0.11	0.14	1.12
Married	0.13	0.13	1.14	0.06	0.13	1.06
Unplanned pregnancy	-0.31**	0.13	0.73	-0.36***	0.13	0.70
Constant	-1.42**	0.57		-2.47***	0.61	
X^2		324.76			409.77	
df		21			21	
% intending child		26			29	

Data: 1,809 couples in the first wave of the UK Millennium Cohort where one or both partners had children from a prior relationship.

Note: Models include variables for own and partner's prior children (See Table 3, Model 1 for fathers and Table 4, Model 1 for mothers).
* = $p < 0.05$ ** = $p < 0.01$ *** = $p < 0.001$

Table 3: Effects of Children with Prior Partners on Fathers' Odds of Intending Another Child

	Model 1: Total			**Model 2: Residence**			**Model 3: Contact**			**Model 4: Payments**		
	B	*SE B*	*OR*	*B*	*SE B*	*OR*	*B*	*SE B*	*OR*	*B*	*SE B*	*OR*
Prior Children												
Own	-0.36***	0.08	0.70									
Partner	-0.68***	0.10	0.51									
Resident												
Own				-0.44*	0.20	0.64	-0.28	0.19	0.76	-0.29	0.19	0.75
Partner				-0.79***	0.11	0.45	-0.61***	0.10	0.54	-0.60***	0.10	0.55
Nonresident												
Own				-0.37***	0.08	0.69						
Partner				-0.17	0.14	0.84						
Contact												
Own							-0.23***	0.08	0.80			
Partner							-0.23	0.22	0.80			
Payments												
Own										-0.13	0.08	0.88
Partner										-0.48	0.38	0.62
Constant	-1.42**	0.53		-1.42**	0.53		-1.79***	0.51		-1.85***	0.51	
X^2		324.76			334.13			319.30			314.51	
df		21			23			23			23	

Data: 1,809 couples in the first wave of the UK Millennium Cohort where one or both partners had children from a prior relationship.

Note: All models include controls for children together, age, education, employment, ethnicity, relationship quality, marital status, and intention for last pregnancy (See Table 2).

* = $p < 0.05$ ** = $p < 0.01$ *** = $p < 0.001$

Table 4: Effects of Children with Prior Partners on Mothers' Odds of Intending Another Child

	Model 1: Total			Model 2: Residence			Model 3: Contact			Model 4: Payments		
	B	*SE B*	*OR*	*B*	*SE B*	*OR*	*B*	*SE B*	*OR*	*B*	*SE B*	*OR*
Prior Children												
Own	-0.79***	0.10	0.46									
Partner	-0.19**	0.08	0.83									
Resident												
Own				-0.89***	0.11	0.41	-0.76***	0.10	0.47	-0.77***	0.10	0.46
Partner				-0.49**	0.20	0.61	-0.38*	0.19	0.68	-0.40*	0.19	0.67
Nonresident												
Own				-0.30**	0.15	0.74						
Partner				-0.18*	0.08	0.83						
Contact												
Own							-0.24	0.21	0.78			
Partner							0.00	0.08	1.00			
Payments												
Own										-1.17*	0.49	0.31
Partner										-0.04	0.08	0.96
Constant	-2.47 ***	0.56		-2.47***	0.56		-2.79***	0.55		-2.79***	0.55	
X^2		409.77			420.33			412.82			418.93	
df		21			23			23			23	

Data: 1,809 couples in the first wave of the UK Millennium Cohort where one or both partners had children from a prior relationship.

Note: All models include controls for children together, age, education, employment, ethnicity, relationship quality, marital status, and intention for most recent pregnancy (See Table 2).

* = $p < 0.05$ ** = $p < 0.01$ *** = $p < 0.001$