# WORKING TITLE "'His' and 'Hers' Baggage: Whose Weighs More? Gender and Union Formation following a Non-Coresidential First Birth

J. Bart Stykes

Karen Benjamin Guzzo

Bowling Green State University

**Abstract**

Slightly less than half of nonmarital births occur to non-coresidential couples, yet we know little about non-coresidential fertility. We examine the formation and stability of coresidential unions after a nonmarital, non-coresidential birth. Our particular focus is on gender, as unmarried mothers and fathers likely face very different marriage markets. We use the 2006-2010 cycle of the National Survey of Family Growth, which collects detailed fertility information for both men and women for non-coresidential births in the five years preceding the survey (n=619). Our preliminary findings do not show statistically significant gender differences in whether a union was formed, the type of union formed, or the stability of that union, although men who marry do so sooner than women who marry. The lack of differences is interesting, though, given pronounced differences in child coresidence. Our planned analyses will explore the formation and stability of unions in multivariate event history models.

*Introduction*

As the age at marriage continues to rise, young adults are at increased risk of nonmarital fertility, and as a result, nonmarital fertility has risen dramatically over the past few decades (Ventura 2009; Wu 2008). Although it is widely noted that roughly half of nonmarital births in the U.S. occur to cohabiting couples (Raley 2001), the converse is also true – that about half of nonmarital births occur outside of coresidential unions. Nonmarital unions, particularly non-coresidential unions, are highly unstable (McLanahan and Beck 2010), and most parents go on to form new relationships, creating stepfamily situations and often experiencing multipartner fertility. However, it seems likely that never-married parents are disadvantaged as they enter the marriage market[1] in search of new partners (Bzostek, McLanahan, and Carlson 2012; Graefe and Lichter 2007; Stewart, Manning, and Smock 2003). Entrance, participation, and success in the marriage market are likely to be gendered, given differential patterns of child coresidence and evaluation by potential mates.

Union formation and stability following a non-coresidential nonmarital birth has important implications for child wellbeing. McLanahan's (2004) "diverging destinies" approach has drawn much attention to the issues facing children born to unmarried parents, and if parents form coresidential relationships with a new partner, the potentially higher instability of these stepfamilies could be detrimental to child well-being (e.g. Cherlin 2010; Osborne, Manning, and Smock 2007). There is a growing body of literature examining unmarried parents, generally following one of three lines. Initially, scholars considered the circumstances in which women, became unmarried parents, finding that these women are largely low-income and their births are largely unintended (Edin and Kefelas 2005; Hayford and Guzzo 2011). Next, researchers began

[1] We use the term "marriage market" because it is a widely accepted term, though we acknowledge that unions other than marriage occur. "Relationship market" is, perhaps, a more accurate term.

exploring the stability of nonmarital parental unions in fragile families (e.g. Carlson, McLanahan, and England 2004; Lichter 2012; Manlove et al 2012; Waller and McLanahan 2005), often focusing on cohabiting parents (i.e. Lichter 2012). Lastly, research has examined the benefits and consequences of new unions – usually cohabitation and/or marriage – for women following nonmarital birth(s) (e.g., Williams, Sassler, and Nicholson 2008). These studies have increased our knowledge about the circumstances and parental consequences of nonmarital fertility, but there are gaps in this literature. First, we know very little about the family formation paths of individuals with non-coresidential nonmarital births, an important oversight given the high proportion of non-coresidential births and the link between family instability and child well-being (Waldfogel, Craigie, and Brooks-Gunn 2010). Secondly, the existing body of research primarily focuses on women, but prior work suggests unmarried mothers and fathers likely face different constraints and opportunities in the marriage market (Goldscheider, Kaufman, and Sassler 2009). To the best of our knowledge, no current research considers the union consequences of having a nonmarital, non-coresidential first birth for both men and women, and we fill this gap by examining post-birth union formation among a sample of unmarried men and women.

*Gender and union formation*

Although there is a fairly wide literature on single parents and repartnering, many of these studies focus only on women (e.g., Gibson-Davis 2011; Graefe and Lichter 2007) or included never-married and divorced parents simultaneously (e.g., Stewart, Manning, and Smock 2003). Still, this literature shows that parents who are no longer with their child(ren)'s biological parent generally repartner at some point (McLanahan and Beck 2010). However, there is reason to believe that unmarried mothers and fathers fare differently when looking for new partners. A

number of studies using the Fragile Families data show gendered differences in parental well-being, finding that mothers report greater depressive symptoms (Fagan 2009), benefit less from institutions such as religion (Wolfinger and Wilcox 2008), and face greater material and psychological hardships (Heflin and Iceland 2009) than fathers. Such studies have rarely included unmarried fathers. However, if unmarried mothers are faring less well economically and emotionally than men but still to form partnerships, it is reasonable to expect that men would do even better on the marriage market, perhaps forming unions sooner or forming more serious unions (i.e., marriage over cohabitation).

The bigger issue, however, likely lies with child coresidence. By and large, single mothers are far more likely to have primary physical custody of their children. This may inhibit their functioning on the marriage market in two ways. First, their ability to fully participate is likely limited – being able to socialize and go out on dates will be restricted because of their childcare obligations. Even if a mother forms a relationship, one-on-one relationship-building time may be difficult to come by if her child(ren) are usually present. Fathers, because they are less likely to live with their children full-time, will have more time to spend searching for, and building a relationship with, a new partner. Second, potential partners may be reluctant to take on a stepfather role. Although a woman dating a father theoretically takes on a stepmother role, issues of child coresidence usually mean a new girlfriend's interactions with her partner's children are far more limited than a new boyfriend's interactions with his new partner's children. Along these lines – and perhaps for these reasons – it appears women are more willing to date a man with children than men are willing to date a woman with children (Goldschieder and Kaufman 2006).

Together, this leads us to our main hypotheses: fathers will fare better than mothers in the marriage market, indicated by earlier union formation and the entrance into more serious union types (marriage over cohabitation).

*Other influences on union formation*

Of course, a nonmarital union does not necessarily mean the birth occurs completely outside of a romantic relationship (McLanahan, Garfinkel, Reichman, Teitler, Carlson, and Audigier 2003). For many unmarried couples, a birth represents a "magic moment" where couples make decisions to move their relationship to a more serious union form. This seems most likely to happen when one or both partners intended to become pregnant or responded positively to the birth, although births outside of marriage, especially those outside of coresidential unions, tend to be unintended births (Chandra et al 2005; Finer and Zolna 2011). Intendedness, as such, may proxy commitment to the relationship with the biological parent. To date, intention and reaction to a pregnancy has not been examined in relation to non-coresidential nonmarital births and subsequent union formation. Further, most work on fertility intendedness has focused on women. On one hand, there is some limited qualitative work suggesting that low-income men often respond quite favorably to unintended nonmarital births (Augustine, Nelson, and Edin 2009). On the other hand, parental relationship quality and father involvement is lower for fathers with unintended births than those with intended births (Bronte-Tinkew, Scott, Horowitz, and Lilja 2009). Thus, intentions may be a key moderator of union formation with a new partner or with the biological coparent.

There are also a number of other factors that may play a role. Socioeconomic and demographic factors, such as race-ethnicity, education, and age, along with child factors such as

gender, may affect both union formation and stability by gender. We will discuss and explore possible covariates in more detail in the full paper.

Using the most recent cycle of the National Survey of Family Growth (2006-2010), we consider the effects of having a recent, non-coresidential first birth on subsequent union formation and stability. Our guiding question asks: Are the effects of having a non-coresidential, first birth on subsequent union formation and stability the same for men and women? Our preliminary expectation is that having a non-coresidential first birth reduces a woman's chances of forming a coresidential union considerably, while these effects will be either less pronounced or nonexistent for men. We also plan to model potential moderating effects based on intendedness of the birth. For instance, we expect individuals reporting an intended birth are more likely to enter a union quickly *and* to do so with the child's biological partner. In contrast, we expect individuals who label a birth as being unintended are less likely to form a union overall, and if they do form a union, to do so with a new partner considerably later. Lastly, we consider both the duration and type of unions formed following a non-coresidential first birth for men and women separately. We focus on a number of predictors surrounding relationships and the birth such as prior relationship histories, child's gender, and current coresidence with the child because these factors likely affect subsequent union formation.

*Data and method*

The analyses use the 2006-10 cycle of the National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG). The NSFG is a nationally representative cross-sectional sample of 22,682 men and women aged 15-44. We have to limit the sample considerably because information on intendedness is only collected for men for births in the past five years. As such, our final analytic sample consists of 619 individuals who reported having a non-coresidential first birth within the last five years.

Roughly 33% of these individuals are men while 67% are women. Although we would prefer a longer time period, data from the longitudinal Fragile Families survey suggests that the vast majority of non-cohabiting unmarried couples have dissolved within five years and a substantial minority have formed new unions and had additional children (McLanahan and Beck 2010).

The NSFG collects detailed retrospective fertility information for both men and women. Women's fertility histories were collected in the traditional manner, in a separate module by dates. The collection of men's fertility data in the NSFG used a different, and arguably better, approach, indexing men's childbearing to specific relationships (Martinez et al. 2006). A list of partners is compiled for each male respondent (current cohabiting partner/wife, up to three wives, first premarital cohabiting partner, and three most recent sexual partners); for each partner, men are asked whether they had any children with that partner. Men are also asked if there are any additional children by partners not discussed. If a man reports a child, standard information on the child is collected (date of birth, gender, and so on).

In addition, we consider if the first union formed after a non-coresidential, first birth is with the child's other biological parent or a new partner. Identifying partners for men is fairly straightforward, as fertility histories were collected in reference to relationships. However, for women, the data do not allow us to link the non-coresidential first birth with the first partner following the birth. Prior research demonstrates the movement to a more committed union with the biological coparent following a nonmarital birth happens very quickly or not at all (Carlson, McLanahan, and England 2004). In our preliminary analyses, we have operationalized a "new" partnership for women as one occurring more than 6 months after the first birth, with partnerships formed within 6 months after a birth considered as a union with the biological parent. We will explore other ways of identifying and defining new partnerships as we proceed

with the analyses. After examining the formation of a coresidential union, we also consider the stability of that union, focusing on overall stability (intact or not). We do not examine transitions from cohabitation to marriage in our preliminary analyses, and unfortunately, the NSFG does not collect data on non-coresidential partnerships.

The NSFG does not directly inquire whether a birth was intended or wanted. Instead, wantedness and intendedness are defined based on responses to a series of questions asked for every birth. Wantedness is derived from the question "Right before you became pregnant, did you yourself want to have a(nother) baby at any time in the future?" Negative answers are characterized as unwanted births. If a woman responds affirmatively, she is asked about the timing of the pregnancy: "So would you say you became pregnant too soon, at about the right time, or later than you wanted?" Births that are identified as too late or at about the right time are considered wanted and intended. Births that are identified as occurring too soon are identified as unintended

The NSFG uses a similar method for measuring intendedness for men as well. However, there are a few differences worth noting. The NSFG provides a category for fathers who did not know about the pregnancy before the birth, although none of the men in our analytic sample were in this response category. The measure for men is based on a single question, "Would you say the pregnancy came sooner than you wanted, at about the right time, or later than you wanted?" For women, there is a follow-up question measuring the extent to which a birth was mistimed.

In the full paper, we will conduct event-history models of coresidential union entrance and stability, but in this extended abstract, we spend a considerable amount of time exploring both univariate and bivariate relationships between gender and our focal variables. Initial

preliminary results do not provide evidence of a strong gender gap. However, our last table presents differences in individuals who enter a union versus those who do not (by gender), discussed below. Notable differences in this table suggest that event-history models will provide insight on the different processes/mechanisms that influence subsequent union formation for men and women.

*Preliminary Findings*

Table 1 presents the sample's distributions across proposed focal and control characteristics for the full sample and by gender. Due to our small sample size, we might have to limit some of our control characteristics in future analyses. However, we present descriptive statistics for all of the control variables we believe are salient predictors of union formation/dissolution following a recent, non-coresidential first birth. We find modest gender differences for the majority of our focal characteristics. However, stark gender differences arise in examining current coresidence with the child. As expected, far more women (88.3%) are currently living with their first child than men (20.8%). Given this difference in child's coresidence, we are surprised at the minimal differences in union formation.

Next, Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics for all dependent variables. Results are presented for both the full sample and by gender. Ultimately, 63.5% of our sample fails to enter a coresidential union following a recent, non-coresidential first birth. More surprisingly, we find no evidence of significant gender differences in subsequent union formation; this is particularly interesting given large differences in child coresidence. Contrary to our hypothesis, a slightly higher percentage of men fail to enter a union following the non-coresidential first birth compared to women, although this difference is not statistically significant. Similarly, we find no significant differences in the duration of unions formed by gender. While these differences are nonsignificant, we do find greater variation by gender. Again, these results tend to favor

women, with 34.2% of men forming a union (compared to 30.2% of women) dissolving that same union in less than six months. At the other end of the spectrum, 41.6 % of men forming a union (compared to 48.6% of women) remain in the coresidential union for at least one year. Lastly, we find no significant differences in the type of unions formed by gender.

After noting minimal differences in the overall entry into and exit from unions, we turn to the timing into and out of unions. Similarly, we find few significant gender differences for the entry into and exit from coresidential unions following a birth. Ultimately, men are more likely to enter directly into a marriage more quickly than women. However, this is based on a small number of marriages (15 cases). Overall, we find that on average, individuals enter cohabiting unions more quickly than marriage. However, the men in our sample who enter directly into a marital union do so more quickly than those men who enter into a cohabiting union. Again, this statistic might be biased due to small cell sizes.

Although there are no statistically significant gender differences in union formation and stability, these descriptive results suggest that accounting for differences in other factors, such as child coresidence or intendedness, in multivariate models may lead to statistically significant differences. To examine this possibility, Table 3 presents the distribution across our focal characteristics and selected controls for those who enter or did not enter a union, by gender. We do not present this table to discuss all of the gender differences across these characteristics. Rather, we include Table 3 as justification to continue and pursue multivariate analyses. Both Tables 1 and 2 present minimal gender differences which might suggest union formation following a non-coresidential first birth is not gendered. However, Table 3 suggests that on closer examination, a number of relevant gender differences emerge concerning union formation following a non-coresidential first birth. Of note, current coresidence with the child behaves

quite differently for men and women. According to Table 3, almost half (42.7%) of the men in our sample who entered a union currently live with the child (this represents 72% of all coresident fathers, not shown). In contrast, 9.02% of men who failed to enter a union currently live with the child. For women, these differences are both less pronounced and occur in the opposite direction. Among women who entered a union, 86.1% currently live with the child (representing only 36% of coresident mothers). Meanwhile, 89.6% of women who failed to enter a union currently live with the child. We suggest this difference is driven by the tendency of fathers to move in with the child and mother closely following the birth. In contrast, for women, who traditionally live with their children, the presence of a child might serve as a deterrent for subsequent union formation with a new partner.

Ultimately, men who enter a union following the non-coresidential first birth appear to be relatively advantaged compared to men who fail to enter a union following a non-coresidential first birth. In contrast, among women, we find less clear evidence of a socioeconomic status gradient. Although race/ethnicity behaves as we might expect (with White women being more likely to enter a union than not and Black women being less likely to enter a union), other characteristics such as education do not demonstrate the clear gradient we see among men. Preliminary results present minimal (or nonexistent) differences in the overall union formation/dissolution of men and women following a non-coresidential first birth. However, more detailed results present notable gender differences in the focal characteristics and selected controls of men and women who enter a union versus those who do not.

*Implications*

This study offers valuable information and addresses a gap in the literature concerning nonmarital fertility. First, by considering different effects of a non-coresidential first birth on

subsequent union formation by men and women separately, we will be able to consider gendered processes that might have implications for subsequent parental well-being. Women who experience a nonmarital first birth are becoming less likely to marry over time (Gibson-Davis 2011) and, when they do marry, benefit less from marriage than their peers (Williams et al. 2008). By considering the gender effects of non-coresidential fertility on subsequent union formations, we are able to consider if having a non-coresidential first birth is similarly detrimental for men's subsequent union formation. Second, this study builds off of literature examining the gendered effects of having a nonmarital first birth and subsequent fertility (Guzzo and Hayford 2009). We know a number of family processes are gendered. In addition, research on complex families has increased given changes in the contemporary family; by default, new relationships formed among those with children from prior unions are stepfamilies in some fashion, with all the corresponding complexities (Cherlin 2010), and also increase the risk of multipartnered fertility. However, to date, little empirical research has considered the gendered consequences of nonmarital fertility.

In the full paper, we will use multivariate event-history to model the entrance into unions overall and by union type by gender. We will explore whether first-birth intendedness moderates union formation as well. Additionally, for the subset of those who formed unions, we will also explore how gender is associated with union stability over the short term.

REFERENCES

Abma, J.C., W.D. Mosher, and J. Jones. 2008. "Wanted and Unwanted Births in the United States: Trends, Measurement, and Implications." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, New Orleans: April 17-19.

Augustine, Jennifer, Timothy Nelson, and Kathryn Edin. 2009. "Why do Poor Men Have Children? Fertility Intentions among Low-Income Unmarried Fathers." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. Vol. 624, No. 1. Pp. 99-117.

Bronte-Tinkew, Jacinta, Mindy Scott, Allison Horowtiz, and Emily Lilja. 2009. "Pregnancy Intentions during the Transition to Parenthood and links to Coparenting for First-Time Fathers of Infants." *Parenting: Science and Practice.* Vol. 9, Issue 1-2. Pp. 1-35.

Bzostek, Sharon, Sara McLanahan, and Marcia Carlson. 2012. "Mothers' Repartnering after a Nonmarital Birth." *Social Forces*. Vol. 90. Issue 3. Pp. 817-841.

Carlson, Marcia, Sara McLanahan, and Paula England. 2004. "Union Formation in Fragile Families." *Demography*. Vol. 41, No.2. Pp. 237-261.

Chandra, A., G. Martinez, W. Mosher, J. Abma, and J. Jones. 2005. "Fertility, Family Planning, and Reproductive Health of U.S. Women: data from the 2002 National Survey of Family Growth." Vital and Health Statistics. Series 23.

Cherlin, Andrew. 2010. *The Marriage-Go-Round: The State of Marriage and the Family in America Today.*

Edin, Kathryn and Maria Kefalas. (2005). *Promises I can keep: Why poor women put motherhood before marriage.* University of California Press: Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA.

Fagan, Jay. 2009. "Relationship Quality and Changes in Depressive Symptoms among Urban, Married African Americans, Hispanics, and Whites." *Family Relations.* Vol. 58, Issue 3. Pp. 259-274.

Finer, L.B., L. Lindberg, and C. Stokes-Prindle. 2008. "New Estimates of U.S. Unintended Pregnancy: Taking Timing into Account." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, New Orleans: April 17-19.

Finer, Lawrence and Mia Zolna. 2011. "Unintended Pregnancy in the United States: Incidence and Disparities, 2006." *Contraception*. Vol 84. Pp. 478-485.

Gibson-Davis, Christine. 2011. "Mothers but Not Wives: The Increasing Lag between Nonmarital Births and Marriage." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 73: 264-278.

Graefe, Deborah and Daniel Lichter. 2007. "When Unwed Mothers Marry: the Marital and Cohabiting Partners of Midlife Women." *Journal of Family Issues.* Vol. 28, No. 5. Pp. 595-622.

Goldscheider, Frances and Gayle Kaufman. 2006. "Willingness to Stepparent: Attitudes about Partners who Already Have Children." *Journal of Family Issues.* Vol. 27, No. 10. Pp. 1415-1436.

Goldscheider, Frances, Gayle Kaufman, and Sharon Sassler. 2009. "Navigating the "New" Marriage Market: How attitudes toward Partner Characteristics shape Union Formation." *Journal of Family Issues.* Vol. 30, No. 6. Pp. 719-737.

Guzzo, Karen and Sarah Hayford. 2009. "Single Mothers, Single Fathers: Gender Differences in Fertility After a Nonmarital Birth." *Journal of Family Issues*. Vol. 31, No. 7. Pp. 906-933.

Hayford, Sarah and Karen Benjamin Guzzo. 2011. "The Changing Demography of Nonmarital Births." Paper presented at the 2011 annual meeting of the Population Association of America meeting, Washington, D.C.

Heflin, Colleen and John Iceland. 2009. "Poverty, Material Hardship and Depression." *Social Science Quarterly*. Vol. 90, Issue 5. Pp. 1051-1071.

Lichter, Daniel. 2012. "Childbearing among Cohabiting Women: Race, Pregnancy, and Union Transitions. *Early Adulthood in a Family Context*. Vol. 2, Part 4. Pp. 209-219.

Manlove, Jennifer, Elizabeth Wildsmith, Erum Ikramullah, Suzanne Ryan, Emily Holcombe, Mindy Scott, and Kristen Peterson. 2012. "Union Transitions Following the birth of a Child to Cohabiting Parents." *Population Research and Policy Review.* Vol. 31, No. 3. Pp. 361-386.

Martinez, G., A. Chandra, J.C. Abma, J. Jones, and W.D. Mosher. 2006. "Fertility, Contraception, and Fatherhood: Data on Men and Women from Cycle 6 (2002) of the 2002 National Survey of Family Growth." Vital and Health Statistics. Series 23.

McLanahan, Sara. 2004. "Diverging destinies: How children are faring under the second demographic transition." *Demography*. Vol. 41, No. 4. Pp. 607-627.

McLanahan, Sara and Audrey N. Beck. 2010. "Parental Relationships in Fragile Families." *Future of Children* 20: 17-37.

McLanahan, Sara, Irwin Garfinkel, Nancy Reichman, Julien Teitler, Marcia Carlson, and Christina Audigier. 2003. "The Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study. *Baseline National Report* available at http://www.fragilefamilies.princeton.edu/documents/nationalreport.pdf.

Osborne, Cynthia, Wendy Manning, and Pamela Smock. 2007. "Married and Cohabiting Parents' Relationship Stability: a Focus on Race and Ethnicity." *Journal of Marriage and Family*. Vol. 69, Issue 5. Pp. 1345-1366.

Pulley, LeaVonne, Lorraine Klerman, Hao Tang, and Beth Baker. 2002. "The Extent of Pregnancy Mistiming and Its Association with Maternal Characteristics and Behaviors and Pregnancy Outcomes." *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*. Vol. 34, No. 4. Pp. 206-211.

Raley, Kelly. 2001. "Increasing fertility in cohabiting unions: evidence for the second demographic transition in the United States." *Demography*. Vol. 38, No. 1. Pp. 59-66.

Stewart, Susan, Wendy Manning, and Pamela Smock. 2003. "Union Formation among Men in the U.S.: Does Having Prior Children Matter?" *Journal of Marriage and Family*. Vol. 65, Issue 1. Pp. 90-104.

Ventura, S. J. 2009. "Nonmarital Childbearing." NCHS data brief, No. 18. Hyattsville, MD.

Waldfogel, Jane, Terry-Ann Craigie, and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn. 2010. "Fragile Families and Child Well-being." *Future of Children* 20: 87-112.

Waller, Maureen and Sara McLanahan. 2005. "'His' and 'her' marriage expectations: Determinants and Consequences." *Journal of Marriage and Family*. Vol. 67, Issue 1. Pp. 53-67.

Williams, Kristi, Sharon Sassler, and Lisa Nicholson. 2008. "For Better or For Worse? The Consequences of Marriage and Cohabitation for Single Mothers." *Social Forces*. Vol 86., No. 4. Pp. 1481-1511.

Wolfinger, Nicholas and W. Bradford Wilcox. 2008. "Happily Ever After? Religion, Marital Status, Gender, and Relationship Quality in Urban Families." *Social Forces.* Vol. 86, No. 3. Pp. 1-28.

Wu, Lawrence. 2008. "Cohort estimates of nonmarital fertility for U.S. Women." *Demography*. Vol 45, No. 1. Pp. 193-207.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Independent Variables by Gender, unweighted

| | Full Sample | | | Men | | | Women | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Obs | Mean/% | SD | Obs | Mean/% | SD | Obs | Mean/% | SD |
| FOCAL INDEPENDENT VARIABLES | | | | | | | | | |
| Union History | | | | | | | | | |
| No previous union | 420 | 67.8 | -- | 146 | 70.8 | -- | 274 | 66.3 | -- |
| Previous union more 12 months prior to first birth | 51 | 8.24 | -- | 10 | 4.85 | -- | 41 | 9.93 | -- |
| Previous union within 12 months of first birth | 148 | 23.9 | -- | 50 | 24.2 | -- | 98 | 23.7 | -- |
| Child's Current Living Arrangements | | | | | | | | | |
| Coresident | 408 | 65.9 | -- | 43 | 20.8 | -- | 365 | 88.3 | -- |
| Child's Gender[1] | | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 315 | 50.8 | -- | 113 | 54.8 | -- | 202 | 48.9 | -- |
| Intendedness of Birth | | | | | | | | | |
| Wanted (late or on time) | 139 | 22.4 | -- | 50 | 24.2 | -- | 89 | 21.5 | -- |
| Mistimed (too early) | 350 | 56.5 | -- | 109 | 52.9 | -- | 241 | 58.3 | -- |
| Unwanted | 130 | 21.0 | -- | 47 | 22.8 | -- | 83 | 20.1 | -- |
| CONTROL VARIABLES | | | | | | | | | |
| Time from First to Second Birth (if applicable) | 226 | 21.4 | 11.6 | 43 | 17.8 | 11.7 | 183 | 22.2 | 11.5 |
| Race/Ethnicity | | | | | | | | | |
| White | 155 | 25.0 | -- | 48 | 23.3 | -- | 107 | 25.9 | -- |
| Black | 276 | 44.5 | -- | 82 | 39.8 | -- | 194 | 46.9 | -- |
| Hispanic | 155 | 25.0 | -- | 64 | 31.0 | -- | 91 | 22.0 | -- |
| Other | 33 | 5.33 | -- | 12 | 5.83 | -- | 21 | 5.08 | -- |

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Independent Variables by Gender, unweighted (Cont.)

| | Full Sample | | | Men | | | Women | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Obs | Mean/% | SD | Obs | Mean/% | SD | Obs | Mean/% | SD |
| Educational Attainment | | | | | | | | | |
| At least a Bachelor's | 30 | 4.85 | -- | 10 | 4.85 | -- | 20 | 4.84 | -- |
| Some College | 125 | 20.1 | -- | 43 | 20.8 | -- | 82 | 19.8 | -- |
| High School Graduate (including GED) | 226 | 36.5 | -- | 69 | 33.5 | -- | 157 | 38.0 | -- |
| Less than a High School Diploma/GED | 238 | 38.4 | -- | 84 | 40.7 | -- | 154 | 37.2 | -- |
| Age | 619 | 23.2 | 5.29 | 206 | 25.2 | 6.26 | 413 | 22.3 | 4.47 |
| Religiosity | | | | | | | | | |
| Attends services Weekly | 127 | 20.5 | -- | 33 | 16.0 | -- | 94 | 22.7 | -- |
| Attends services at least once a month | 137 | 22.1 | -- | 36 | 17.5 | -- | 101 | 24.5 | -- |
| Attends services less than once a month | 171 | 27.6 | -- | 71 | 34.5 | -- | 100 | 24.2 | -- |
| Does not attend services | 184 | 29.7 | -- | 66 | 32.0 | -- | 118 | 28.6 | -- |
| Gender Attitudes | | | | | | | | | |
| Decoupling marriage and childbirth (1-5)[2] | 619 | 1.93 | 0.74 | 206 | 2.07 | 0.61 | 413 | 1.86 | 0.79 |
| Employment Status | | | | | | | | | |
| Full-time Employee[3] | 242 | 39.01 | -- | 116 | 56.3 | -- | 126 | 30.51 | -- |
| Part-time Employee | 101 | 16.3 | -- | 29 | 14.0 | -- | 72 | 17.4 | -- |
| Unemployed | 276 | 44.5 | -- | 61 | 29.6 | -- | 215 | 52.0 | -- |
| N | 619 | -- | -- | 206 | 0.33 | -- | 413 | 0.67 | -- |

Notes.

1. Two cases with missing data are coded as female.
2.. A 5-level ordinal where respondents are asked "It is okay for an unmarried female to have a child." Higher levels reflect higher scores for the decoupling of marriage and childbirth.
3. Includes 5 cases that on medical leave. All were women assumed to be on maternity leave.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Dependent Variables by Gender, unweighted

| | Full Sample | | | Men | | | Women | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Obs | Mean/% | SD | Obs | Mean/% | SD | Obs | Mean/% | SD |
| Continuous Measures (in century months) | | | | | | | | | |
| Time to Union | | | | | | | | | |
| Married or Cohabiting | 225 | 16.7 | 12.5 | 73 | 16.1 | 11.4 | 152 | 17.0 | 13.0 |
| Married | 43 | 19.5 | 13.0 | 15 | 13.7 | 9.00 | 28 | 22.6 | 13.9 |
| Cohabiting | 182 | 16.1 | 12.3 | 58 | 16.7 | 11.9 | 124 | 15.8 | 12.6 |
| Duration of Union | | | | | | | | | |
| Married or Cohabiting | 224 | 14.6 | 13.4 | 72 | 13.6 | 13.3 | 152 | 15.1 | 13.4 |
| Married | 43 | 17.1 | 11.7 | 15 | 17.1 | 14.7 | 28 | 17.1 | 10.0 |
| Cohabiting | 181 | 14.0 | 13.7 | 57 | 12.7 | 12.9 | 124 | 14.6 | 14.1 |
| Categorical Measures | | | | | | | | | |
| Time to Union | | | | | | | | | |
| Less than 6 Months to Union | 47 | 6.18 | -- | 15 | 7.28 | -- | 32 | 7.74 | -- |
| 6-12 Months to Union | 49 | 7.92 | -- | 14 | 6.8 | -- | 35 | 8.47 | -- |
| More than 12 Months to Union | 129 | 20.8 | -- | 44 | 21.3 | -- | 85 | 20.5 | -- |
| Duration of Union | | | | | | | | | |
| Less than 6 Months | 71 | 31.5 | -- | 25 | 34.2 | -- | 46 | 30.2 | -- |
| 6-12 Months | 49 | 21.8 | -- | 17 | 23.2 | -- | 32 | 21.0 | -- |
| More than 1 year | 104 | 46.4 | -- | 30 | 41.6 | -- | 74 | 48.6 | -- |
| Type of First Union Formed | | | | | | | | | |
| Married | 43 | 6.95 | -- | 15 | 7.28 | -- | 28 | 6.78 | -- |
| Cohabiting | 182 | 29.4 | -- | 58 | 28.1 | -- | 124 | 30.0 | -- |
| No Union | 394 | 63.5 | -- | 133 | 64.5 | -- | 261 | 63.2 | -- |
| N | 619 | -- | -- | 206 | 0.33 | -- | 413 | 0.67 | -- |

Table 3. Selected Characteristics for Those who Entered a Union and Those Who Did Not by Gender, unweighted

| | Entered a Union | | | | Did NOT Enter a Union | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Men | | Women | | Men | | Women | |
| | Obs | % | Obs | % | Obs | % | Obs | % |
| FOCAL INDEPENDENT VARIABLES | | | | | | | | |
| Union History | | | | | | | | |
| No previous union | 70 | 95.8 | 79 | 51.9 | 76 | 54.7 | 195 | 74.7 |
| Previous union more 12 months prior to first birth | 2 | 2.74 | 15 | 9.87 | 8 | 6.02 | 26 | 9.96 |
| Previous union within 12 months of first birth | 1 | 1.37 | 58 | 38.1 | 49 | 36.8 | 40 | 15.3 |
| Child's Current Living Arrangements | | | | | | | | |
| Coresident | 31 | 42.7 | 131 | 86.1 | 12 | 9.02 | 234 | 89.6 |
| Child's Gender[1] | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 37 | 50.6 | 82 | 53.9 | 76 | 57.1 | 120 | 45.9 |
| Intendedness of Birth | | | | | | | | |
| Wanted (late or on time) | 18 | 24.6 | 29 | 19.0 | 32 | 24.0 | 60 | 22.9 |
| Mistimed (too early) | 42 | 57.5 | 95 | 62.5 | 67 | 50.3 | 146 | 55.9 |
| Unwanted | 13 | 17.8 | 28 | 18.4 | 34 | 25.6 | 55 | 21.0 |
| SELECTED CONTROLS | | | | | | | | |
| Race/Ethnicity | | | | | | | | |
| White | 20 | 27.4 | 51 | 33.5 | 28 | 21.0 | 56 | 21.4 |
| Black | 27 | 36.9 | 61 | 40.3 | 55 | 41.3 | 133 | 50.9 |
| Hispanic | 23 | 31.5 | 31 | 20.3 | 41 | 30.8 | 60 | 22.9 |
| Other | 3 | 4.11 | 9 | 5.92 | 9 | 6.77 | 12 | 4.60 |
| Educational Attainment | | | | | | | | |
| At least a Bachelor's | 3 | 4.11 | 8 | 5.26 | 7 | 5.26 | 12 | 4.60 |
| Some College | 19 | 26.0 | 31 | 20.3 | 24 | 18.0 | 51 | 19.5 |
| High School Graduate (including GED) | 26 | 35.6 | 56 | 36.8 | 43 | 32.3 | 101 | 38.7 |
| Less than a High School Diploma/GED | 25 | 34.2 | 57 | 37.5 | 59 | 44.3 | 97 | 37.1 |
| N | 73 | 35.5 | 152 | 36.8 | 133 | 64.5 | 261 | 63.2 |