Children and the Union Formation Process: Using the NLSY79 to Examine Relationship Status for Men and Women over the Life Course

Carrie E. Spearin
Brown University[1]

[1] Department of Sociology/Population Studies and Training Center, Box 1916,Providence, RI 02912

Abstract

Marriage and parenthood in the U.S. have become increasingly decoupled during the 20th century, making children an active part of adult lives not only after marriage but also throughout the union formation process. However, the effect of children may differ significantly for men and women, largely due to the residential status of children. This paper investigates the role of children in union formation processes, focusing on the gender differences associated with the effect of children on the types of unions formed over the life course. Data from NLSY 1979 (1979-2004) are used to estimate a series of multinomial logit approximations of event history models to determine the odds of entering a specific relationship type for each year of a respondent's life. Results show the effect of children is similar in direction for both men and women, but is stronger for men even when child's residential status is taken into account.

Word Count: 150

Key Words: union formation, parenthood, marriage, cohabitation, gender, NLSY79

Children and the Union Formation Process:
Using the NLSY79 to Examine Relationship Status for
Men and Women over the Life Course

Given the rise in nonmarital childbearing, coupled with a retreat from marriage and increasing rates of cohabitation, it has become increasingly important to understand how children may affect the union formation choices their parents make in the United States. Such demographic changes occurring during the latter half of the 20^{th} century have shifted the traditional definition of "family" away from two married parents living with their biological child(ren) to a complex variety of family forms. Romantic unions, especially marriage, have become increasingly less central and stable throughout young and middle adulthood. Furthermore, this lack of stability and centrality within unions has complicated the role of parenthood for many men and women. Children are significantly more likely to remain living in coresidence with their mother than with their father once union dissolution occurs (Seltzer 1991). As a result, children are ever more likely to experience living alone with their mother and with any of her future partners. Men, removed from day to day living with their biological children, are increasingly likely to form unions which possibly may include living with their partner's coresidential children.

Given these important demographic changes, it has become increasingly important to include the potential effect of own biological children in any study of union formation. It is expected that one's own children will have a significant effect on the type of unions men and women form over the life course. In addition, it is expected that due to gender differences in the residential status of own biological children, the effect of own children will notably differ for men and women. This paper investigates the role of own children in the union formation process among adults living in the United States over time, focusing on the differing effects children have on men's and women's relationship choices.

Using data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, 1979 (NLSY79), I estimate the effect of one's own children, both coresident and nonresident, on the type of union formed (i.e. marital or cohabiting) and how this effect may differ for first and subsequent unions. These particular data are most suitable for this study since fertility and relationship information was asked of both men and women as they moved from mid/late adolescence (14 to 21 in 1979) to middle adulthood (39 to 44 in 2004). For both men and women, I estimate a series of multinomial logit approximations of event history models to determine the odds of entering a specific relationship type for each year they are at risk of transitioning into a union.

While prior research has examined the influence of children on women's union formation, few have examined this from a male perspective. Understanding men's choices regarding family living is perhaps even more important as men are more likely than women to experience several transitions into and out of coresidential parenthood roles and hence, into and out of the lives of children. This research then, adds to the growing literature that examines the effect of children on both men's and women's lives (Goldscheider and Sassler 2006; Goldscheider and Kaufman 2006) and expands this work by examining the effect of resident status of own children on these processes as men and women move from late adolescence to middle adulthood.

Background

It has been strongly established in the literature that at least until the 1980s, women with children from previous partners had significantly lower odds of marrying than women without children (Becker et al 1977; Bumpass et al 1990; Clarkberg et al 1995). Research suggested that this decrease in likelihood of marriage was due in part to the parenting demands associated with coresidential children. Hence, the greater these demands, the lower the odds of marrying. However, most of these studies only focused on the transition to marriage or remarriage, ignoring the possibility women had of forming cohabiting unions, which was increasing at this time.

While cohabitation continues to increase as a family form, especially one that includes children, it still remains distinctive from marriage. Research has found that cohabiting unions are more unstable than marriages and relatively short lived. It may also be that the level of commitment within such relationships is lower than that found within marriage (Bumpass, Sweet, and Cherlin 1991). While a cohabiting relationship can be complex for the couples involved, it is even more complicated for children within these unions. Children in such unions have fewer legal rights for financial support after relationship dissolution, making ties between children and parent's partners weaker and less stable (Graefe and Lichter 1999). Cohabitation, once viewed as a phase in the marriage process, is an increasingly common alternative to marriage or living alone (Manning and Smock 2002) as fewer cohabiters have plans to marry their partners (Bumpass 1995, 1998) in the future. Given this, it is impossible to ignore the effect children may have on the development of these relationships.

Results from older studies take on a new light when cohabitation is included in comparison to marriage. While prior research showed that coresidential children decreased women's chances of marrying, other work shows that they increase women's likelihood of forming a cohabiting union (Bennett, Bloom, and Miller 1995; Clarkberg, Stolzenberg, and Waite 1995). Therefore, while children do not hinder their mother's likelihood of forming a union, they do decrease her likelihood of forming a more stable and committed, i.e., married, union.

When men are included in studies of family formation, the effect of own children on subsequent family formation differs from that of women. While this is slowly changing, men are less likely to have residential custody of their children, shifting the research question for men to include the effect of nonresident children on their union formation. Early studies that included men used nonmarital births as a proxy for the impact of residential status of children on family formation. However, using nonmarital births as a proxy for residential status is problematic in that not all nonresident children are nonmarital and men who have nonmarital births may differ significantly from men who have married, had a child, and then divorced. More recent work acknowledges this difference and has included residential status of men's children into the study of union formation. However, while most find that children have no effect on union formation for men (Stewart et al 2003; Clarkberg et al 1995), others find that fatherhood is associated with higher rates of cohabitation and lower rates of marriage (Nock 1998).

Overall, it seems as though the presence of children has a less negative effect on the union formation patterns for men than it does for women. What is unclear is how much of this difference is due in part to the residential status of own biological children. Newer work shows some evidence of that. While own children hinder women's likelihood of entering married unions, the presence of children in men's lives may possibly enhance their likelihood for marriage. Single fathers living in coresidence with their biological children have been found to be significantly more likely to form unions (Bernhardt and Goldscheider 2002), and when a union is formed it is more likely to be a married rather than a cohabiting union (Nock 1998).

Overall, prior research provides a mixed answer to the question of how children affect the union formation process. Therefore, the goal of this paper is to shed new light on this question by examining how own biological children affect the types of relationships both men and women form over the life course. In this paper I first examine the effect of residential status of own children on forming a cohabiting union or marriage versus remaining single. Then, I examine the differential effect residential status of own children has if the union being formed is a first or subsequent union. In doing such, I seek to answer the following questions: Does residential status of children affect relationship type? Does the effect of children's residence explain the differences in union formation between men and women? Finally, does the presence of a child matter if the union being formed is a first union or a subsequent one? It is expected that children will affect parent's relationships similarly, but that the effect of children will be less negative for men than for women, which may be primarily due to the residence status of children.

Method

Data

To answer the research questions I use data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, 1979 (NLSY79). These data are specifically suited for examining the effect of children on family formation because they contain both fertility and union formation information, as well as complete household rosters, for men and women that were collected as they moved through adulthood. The first wave of data was collected in 1979 when respondents were between the ages of 14 and 21. Respondents were then interviewed annually until 1994, then biennially from 1994 to 2004. Currently there are twenty-one rounds of survey data available to the public and respondents are now in their early 40s.

In addition to the main NLSY79 file, I also use the Augmented Male Fertility File created under the direction of Frank Mott. This file reconciles the fertility histories of all NLSY79 male respondents to create the best possible estimate of men's actual biological fertility from NLSY79 data (Mott 2002). This cleaned fertility file is matched to the main NLSY79 file to create nearly identical fertility and marriage history files for both men and women in the NLSY79.

The unit of analysis used in the following models is a person-year. While person-months would have been preferable to person-years, as months would be more precise and could detect changes occurring between observation periods, the NLSY79 data do not allow for this. Thus, the following results may underestimate the likelihood of cohabitation among men and women in this sample since cohabiting unions are usually short and unstable and may have begun and ended between observation periods (Bumpass and Sweet 1989).

Because not everyone in the NLSY79 was single and the same age at the time of the first interview, there is a problem of left censoring. A total of 1,486 (11.5% of the original sample) respondents indicated they were either married or cohabiting at the time of the first interview. Of these 1,486, the majority were women (66.35%) and were married (91.52%). The mean age of these respondents was approximately 20 years old. Because of this, these respondents were eliminated from the current analyses unless they returned to the risk pool (i.e. due to union dissolution). Therefore, the results presented may be slightly biased as those who formed unions early in young adulthood have been removed from the analysis[2].

Since not all respondents were the same age at the time of the first interview, I am missing time-varying information for those who were older than fourteen. To correct for any possible length bias (i.e. those who are younger may contribute more person-years prior to union formation than those older at first interview), I include age at first interview (time-invariant) as well as age at current interview (time-varying and lagged) as controls in the models. This should reduce any additional left censoring bias.

In the present analysis, single respondents contribute cases yearly until they become married, cohabit, or until right censoring occurs. Once in a union, the respondent contributes no additional person years to the sample until they are at risk of forming a new union (i.e. once the previous union has dissolved). As would be expected, men contribute more person years to this analysis than women since they are more likely than women to be single at the first interview and tend to form relationships at ages older than those of women. Overall, there are 11,850 respondents (6,063 men and 5,787 women) represented in the following analyses contributing 61,214 person-years for men and 56,741 person-years for women.

Key Measures

[2] However, several statistical tests (results not shown) have been conducted to determine if left censoring does in fact bias the results. Thus far, there is no indication that left censoring is a major issue.

One dependent variable, union status, is used in all of the analytical models that follow, having three possible outcomes: remaining single, entering a cohabiting union, or marrying. Union status was obtained through household roster information collected at each survey round. Respondents indicated whether they were living with a spouse, a partner, or with no one with whom they are romantically involved. Overall, 58% of the respondents reported living with a spouse or partner at least once during the period of observation.

The main independent variable included in the models is residence status of own biological children. Each year, the NLSY79 asked respondents about the usual residence status of each biological child they identified. For those who indicated they were a parent, I examined the residence information of all biological children of the respondent to summarize the usual living arrangements of their children. If a respondent indicated that the usual residence of any biological child was with him or her, the respondent was considered to be living with at least one biological child. If all children were living separately from the respondent, the respondent was considered to have all nonresident children. Therefore this variable is included in the models as three dummy variables: (1) no biological children (reference category), (2) at least one biological child in coresidence, (3) has all nonresident biological children. Residential status of children is included in the models as a time-varying covariate as the residence status of biological children can be variable over time, especially among men.

In addition to residential status of own children, I include a series of covariates prior research has shown to affect union formation for both men and women. These variables represent both life course and sociodemographic characteristics of the respondents. Overall, these covariates are added into the models as a mix of both time-constant and time-varying measures. Time-constant variables were measured as of the date of the first interview (in 1979) and time-varying were measured at each individual interview. I briefly discuss each below.

As prior research has shown, experiences in childhood can influence one's orientations towards different family types in adulthood. Those who have experienced a non-traditional family structure in childhood are more likely to form a stepfamily union in adulthood (Goldscheider and Sassler 2006). Retrospective information regarding respondent's childhood living arrangements when they were fourteen was collected in the NLSY79 in 1979. From this information, a series of dummy variables were constructed summarizing childhood family structure. These variables included "lived with both biological parents," "lived with a stepparent," "lived with a single parent," and "lived in some other family situation."

A second life course variable included in the models is prior relationship history. Since respondents can generate several union or cohabiting intervals over the period of time observed, variables for union history during adulthood are controlled in the models. Men and women who have experienced a union dissolution may differ in the types of relationships they form in the future more than they did before they had such experiences. Therefore, a variable for past relationship status is included in the first set of models. This dummy variable indicates if the respondent has ever cohabited or been married (coded "1") or not (coded "0"). In the second set of models, this variable is used to create the subsamples of respondents who were either at risk of forming a first union or forming a subsequent union.

Lastly, age is added into the models in two different formats. First, age at current interview is added to the model as a time-varying continuous variable. By including this variable, I can determine if union formation decreases as the respondents age. Additionally, age at first interview is also included into the models as a time-constant continuous variable, mainly as a statistical control. This variable helps to determine if there are possible cohort differences in union formation, but largely allows for an additional control to determine length of risk (since not everyone was the same age at the start of the initial survey).

A second set of covariates included in the models are controls for a variety of sociodemographic characteristics. The first of these is education. Highest level of education is added to the models as a time-varying covariate, as educational attainment can change over time. Since respondents were between the ages of 14 and 21 at the time of the baseline survey, most were in the middle of their educational careers. Since that time, most have completed their educations, but the stage at which these educations were completed may affect union formation. For this reason, an additional education variable, a dummy indicating if the respondent is currently enrolled in school, is added to the models. This variable for school enrollment is also a time-varying covariate.

In addition to education, yearly earnings are included in the models as a time-varying covariate, as it is expected earnings will change as respondents graduate from school and move into the workforce. Finally, race/ethnicity is included in the models as a time-constant variable. In 1979, respondents self-reported their race/ethnicity. Subsequently, the NLSY79 recoded race/ethnicity into three categories: Hispanic, non-Hispanic Black, and non-black/non-Hispanic.

Analytic Strategy

To address the question of how children affect men's and women's risk of forming a union, I use multinomial logistic regression to estimate discrete-time event history models predicting union formation among all men and women in the sample who are at risk of a transition into a union. Discrete-time models are used in the analyses because they allow for both time-varying (such as education level) and time-invariant (such as race/ethnicity) covariates (Yamaguchi 1991) Multinomial logistic regression is used because it allows polytomous outcomes to be measured simultaneously (Maddala 1983). All analyses are conducted separately for men and women. In doing so, I can determine if the effect of own children is significantly greater ($p<.05$) for men than for women. All results are expressed as odds ratios, which are the exponentiated values of the regression coefficients (e^b). These values indicate the change in probability of union formation associated with a one-union change in that variable.

Results

All Unions

Table 1 examines how the residential status of own children influences relationship status for both men and women. These results show that much, but not all, of the positive effect of children on union formation is due to having at least one coresidential child. The effect of residential status of children is also significantly stronger ($p<.05$) for men than for women among those who have at least one coresident child. I discuss the results for men and women separately, beginning with the men. I do not discuss the covariates included in the models as their effects are generally as expected.

TABLE 1 HERE

Coresidential fathers are nearly three times (2.8) as likely to enter a cohabiting union as remain single and almost five times (4.7) as likely to marry compared to those men who do not have any children. The difference in odds between the union types is statistically significant ($p<.05$); men with at least one coresidential biological child are significantly more likely to marry than enter a cohabiting union than those who do not have any children. These results are consistent with previous research which indicates that coresidential children have a positive effect on men's union formation (Bernhardt and Goldscheider 2002) and this effect is stronger for marriage than for cohabitation (Goldscheider and Sassler 2006; Nock 1998).

Having a nonresident child increases men's odds of entering a cohabiting union by 70% and marrying by 57%. The effect of nonresident children on entering a cohabiting union appears larger than for marrying, however the difference is not statistically significant. Again, these positive results for entering either a marriage or a cohabiting union challenge previous findings that nonresident children decrease men's likelihood of marrying and increase their likelihood of entering a cohabiting union (Stewart et al 2003; DeGraaf and Kalmijn 2003).

While the effect of children is significant and positive for women, the strength of the coefficients appears weaker than that for men. Like men, women with coresidential children are significantly more likely to enter a cohabiting union than remain single, but the difference in the effect is almost half that for women than it is for men. Women with coresident children are 1.3 times as likely to marry as remain single when compared with those women who do not have children. These results are contrary to previous research, suggesting that the presence of children decreases women's likelihood of marrying and increases her likelihood of cohabition (Bennett et al 1995; Clarkberg et al 1995).

Overall, the effect of children on entering a cohabiting union for women is greatest among those who have only nonresident children. Women with nonresident children increase their likelihood of entering a cohabiting union by over 50%, however, nonresident children have no effect on whether a woman marries rather than remain single. In both cases, coresident and nonresident children increase women's odds of forming a union versus remaining single, but the direction of the coefficients predicting marrying versus entering a cohabiting union differs. Taken as a whole, these results suggest that the residence of children matters in predicting relationship status for both men and women, but the effect of coresident children is greater for men than for women while the effect of nonresident children acts similarly for both the genders.

First and Subsequent Unions

The results above provide a very interesting and perhaps new perspective on how children can affect the types of unions men and women form over time. However, it begs a new question: Does the effect of children differ if the relationship being formed is a first union or a subsequent union? Is the effect of children strongest for first unions (possibly a nonmarital birth effect) and weaker for subsequent unions? The following models address these new questions

Table 2 shows the effect of own biological children on forming first and subsequent unions for both men and women. These results, similar to what was found in Table 1, show that much, but not all, of the positive effect of children on men's and women's union formation is due to the residence status of own children. As was found before, the effect of coresidential children is stronger ($p<.05$) for men than for women in terms of forming both first and subsequent unions. Additionally, the effect of children, regardless of their residential status, is stronger ($p<.05$) for men in terms of forming first unions as compared to forming subsequent unions. I discuss the results for men and women separately, beginning with the men. Again, I do not discuss the additional covariates included in the models.

TABLE 2 HERE

Men who have at least one coresident child and have never previously been in a union are nine (9.1) times as likely to enter a cohabiting union and thirteen (13.4) times as likely to marry as remain single. The difference in odds between the union types is statistically significant ($p<.05$), indicating that when forming a first union, men with at least one coresidential biological child are significantly more likely to marry than enter a cohabiting union as compared to those who do not have any children. These results are consistent with previous results presented for all unions and with prior research indicating that children have a positive effect on men's union formation.

However, once those at risk of forming a first union are removed from the sample, the effect of coresidential children is greatly reduced. Men who have previously been in a relationship and have at least one coresidential child are 40% as likely to cohabit and 2.2 times as likely to marry relative to remaining single. As with first unions, when a union is formed, men with a coresident child are significantly more likely to marry than cohabit.

As expected, having a nonresident child also increases men's odds of entering a first union. Men with all nonresident children are two times as likely to enter a cohabiting union and 64% as likely to marry as remain single relative to childless men. There is also a significant difference between theses coefficients suggesting that when a man with only nonresident children forms a union, he is more likely to cohabit than marry. Not expected are the results for subsequent unions for men. However, while the previous models showed both positive and significant effects of children on forming any union, when the sample is reduced to only those at risk of forming a subsequent union, the effect of nonresident children is weakened and no longer significant. Therefore, in terms of forming subsequent unions, men with only nonresident children are no different than childless men.

Results for women with coresidential children are similar to those found in Table 1. For first unions, women with at least one coresidential child are 62% as likely to enter a cohabiting union and 48% as likely to marry as remain single. However, the effect of coresident children on subsequent union formation diminishes greatly for women. Women with coresidential children are no more or less likely to enter a cohabiting union than remain single, and they are only 16% as likely to marry as remain single.

The strongest result for women is among those who have only nonresident children and are at risk of forming a first union. Women not living with any of their own children are 2.3 times as likely to enter a cohabiting union as remain single and they are significantly more likely to enter a cohabiting union than marry if the union being formed is her first. There is no effect regarding nonresident children on whether a woman cohabits or marries if she is at risk of forming a subsequent union. Overall, while coresident children positively influence first union choice, as well as to some degree subsequent union choice, nonresident children have little effect on the type of union women form.

Summary and Discussion

In short, the results presented in this paper suggest that children do matter in the union formation choices of their parents, but not in the way prior research has indicated. Having at least one biological child, especially a coresidential child, increases both men's and women's likelihood of forming a union. Additionally, having at least one coresidential child significantly increases a man's likelihood of marrying versus entering a cohabiting union. This is especially true if the union being formed by a man is his first. These results seem to indicate that men are eager to find a partner to help raise his child (i.e. finding a new mother for his child). It may also be that these fathers are seriously committed to finding a partner, not only finding a partner more quickly, but also only forming more committed and stable relationships, such as marriages.

From the potential partner's perspective, men with coresidential children may be viewed by positively, as much can be learned about a man by the way he interacts with his children. Therefore, a man who is raising a child on his own might be viewed by a potential partner as a more committed individual. She may also anticipate that his commitment to his child would overflow into their relationship and any relationship he may have with children they may have together in the future.

Having only nonresidential children also increases men's likelihood of forming a union, but there is little to no difference in the type of union he forms. The only difference occurs among first unions. Men who have only nonresident children are significantly more likely to form a first union, and when a union is formed, they enter a cohabiting relationship. A possible reason for this increased likelihood in forming a cohabiting union may be that such relationships are often less stable and transitory, indicating that these men are not ready for commitment, which is reflected by their only having nonmarital children.

In general, the results for men are generally intriguing, as little was known about how children affected their relationships. The larger body of research on union formation has focused on women, more specifically the negative affects of children on their relationship trajectories. The results presented in this paper challenge this research, showing that women with children are significantly more likely to form unions over time. Women with coresidential children are significantly more likely to form a union, especially a first union, than to remain single. These results show no evidence that children negatively affect the types of unions women form. However, while children may not hinder union formation, they do not seem to enhance it for women either (as it does for men). Taken together, these results suggest that men with coresidential children are seriously in search of a partner (or mother for their child), but they likely are not willing to partner up with a woman who has coresidential children of her own.

One limitation, but a future direction, of this work is that we know little about the partners men and women with children choose. New questions arise, such as what are the characteristics of women who form unions with coresidential fathers? And, do these relationships contain partners' children? A further limitation of this study is censoring. Right censoring is always a problem in a longitudinal panel study. Given that cohabitation is short-lived, and those who form cohabiting unions may be less likely to remain in a study of this nature, the likelihood of cohabitation is most likely underestimated in this study. However, while this is a weakness of this study, a major strength is its use of a unique male fertility file, which eliminates many of the problems associated with studying nonresident fatherhood and the effect of children on men's lives.

Overall, this study updates our general knowledge of how men and women form relationships in a contemporary marriage market where children, as a characteristic of their parents, are included. Building on prior research, my results suggest that men and women do differ in their union formation strategies largely because of the presence of children. While prior research has examined the influence of children on women's later union formation, few have examined this relationship from a male perspective, and those that have done so have used less than fully appropriate male fertility data. Understanding men's choices regarding family living is perhaps especially important given that men are more likely than women to experience several transitions into and out of coresidential parenthood and children's lives. This research adds to the growing literature on men in families and provides a thorough investigation of the effects of children on the family lives of both men and women using data collected as individuals were experiencing family change.

Men rarely engage in family life apart from women, making the connection between partners an important component of the parenthood experience. However, the retreat from marriage and increasing instability of unions has weakened the connection between men and women and between men and children. At the same time, these weakened connections are creating multiple opportunities for parents, often extending across households. While research shows many men as absent and removed from family life, another group of men are experiencing parenthood on a different level, a social one. Given these changes in family living, it is vital to investigate the link between children and subsequent family formation as complex parenting situations are likely to continue well into the future.

Work Cited

Becker, Gary S., Michael Landis, and Robert Michael. 1977. An Economic Analysis of Marital Instability. *Journal of Political Economy*, 85: 1141-1187.

Bennett, Neil G., David E. Bloom, and Cynthia K. Miller. 1995. The Influence of Nonmarital Childbearing on Formation of First Marriages. *Demography*, 32: 47-62.

Bernhardt, E., and Goldscheider, F. 2002. Children and Union Formation in Sweden. *European Sociological Review*, 18(3): 289-299.

Bumpass, L. 1995. The Declining Significance of Marriage: Changing family life in the United States. *National Survey of Families and Households Working Paper No. 66.* Madison: University of Wisconsin-Madison Center for Demography and Ecology.

Bumpass, L. 1998. The Changing Significance of Marriage in the United States. In K. O. Mason, N. Nilsuya, and M. Choe (Eds.), *The Changing Family in Comparative Perspective: Asia and the United States* (pp., 63-79). Honolulu, HI: East-West Center.

Bumpass, L. 1990. What's Happening to the Family? Interaction between demographic and institutional change. *Demography*, 27: 483-498.

Bumpass, L., and Sweet, J. 1989. National Estimates of Cohabitation. *Demography*, 32, 425-436.

Bumpass, L., Sweet, J., and Cherlin, A. 1991. The Role of Cohabitation in Declining Rates of Marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53: 913-927.

Clarkberg, Marin, Ross M. Stolzenberg, and Linda J. Waite. 1995. Attitudes, Values, and Entrance into Cohabitational Versus Marital Unions. *Social Forces*, 74(2): 609-632.

De Graaf, P.M., & M. Kalmijn. 2003. "Alternative Routes in the Remarriage Market: Competing Risk Analyses of Union Formation After Divorce." Social Forces, 81:1459-1498.

Goldscheider, F. and Sassler, S. 2006. Creating Stepfamilies: Integrating Children into the Study of Union Formation. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68:275-291.

Goldscheider, F. and Kaufman, G. 2006. Willingness to Stepparent: Attitudes Toward Partners Who Already Have Children. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27:1415-1436

Graefe, D., and Lichter, D. 1999. Life Course Transition of American Children: Parental cohabitation, marriage, and single motherhood. *Demography*, 36: 205-217.

Maddala, G. S. (1983). *Limited-dependent and qualitative variables in econometrics*.: Cambridge University Press.

Manning, W., and Smock, P. 2002. First Comes Cohabitation and then Comes Marriage? *Journal of Family Issues*, 23: 1065-1087.

Mott, Frank L. 2002. Augmented Male Fertility Variables for All NLSY79 Respondents, 1979-1998, User's Guide. Center for Human Resource Research, The Ohio State University.

Nock, S. 1998. The Consequences of Premarital Fatherhood. *American Sociological Review*, 63: 250-264.

Seltzer, J. A., and Y. Brandreth. 1994. What Fathers Say about Involvement with Children after Separation. *Journal of Family Issues*, 15: 49-77.

Stewart, S., Manning, W., and Smock, P. 2003. Union Formation among Men in the United States: Does having prior children matter? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 65: 90-104.

Yamaguchi, K. 1991. Event history analysis. : Sage.

Table 1: Parameter Estimates (Odds Ratios) from Discrete-Time Multinomial Models Predicting Union Formation for Men and Women (1979 - 2004) by Residence Status of Children

	Men						Women					
Characteristic	Cohabiting versus Single		Married versus Single				Cohabiting versus Single		Married versus Single			
Residence Status of Children ^												
Has no children`	--		--				--		--			
Has at least one coresident child	2.795	***	4.664	***	#		1.251	***	1.344	***		
Has all nonresident children	1.696	***	1.567	***			1.524	***	1.200			
Childhood Family Structure												
Lived with both biological parents`	--		--				--		--			
Lived with a stepparent	1.410	***	0.993		#		1.393	***	1.057		#	
Lived with a single parent	1.185	***	0.853	***	#		1.232	***	0.878	**	#	
Lived in another family situation	1.312	**	0.997		#		1.367	***	1.015		#	
*Respondent's Relationship History^*												
Ever married or cohabited	1.901	***	1.198	***	#		2.379	***	1.494	***	#	
Life Course Stage												
Age at current interview^	0.945	***	0.925	***	#		0.925	***	0.907	***	#	
At at first interview (1979)	1.015		1.079	***	#		1.011		1.060	***	#	
*Respondent's Education^*												
Enrolled in school	0.303	***	0.347	***			0.362	***	0.420	***		
Highest year of school completed	1.014		1.123	***	#		1.028	*	1.098	***	#	
*Economic Characteristics^*												
Yearly earnings (logged)	1.070	***	1.047	***	#		1.025	***	1.031	***		
Race												
Non-Hispanic white`	--		--				--		--			
Non-Hispanic black	0.825	***	0.548	***	#		0.404	***	0.457	***		
Hispanic	0.882	*	0.957				0.711	***	0.905	*	#	
-2 Log likelihood	43918.53						43516.63					
N (person years)	61,214						56,741					

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***<.001

Notes: Results are expressed in odds ratios (e^{b}). ^Variable measured in year prior to outcome.
Married v. cohabiting is significantly different at p<.05.
`Reference category.

Table 2: Parameter Estimates (Odds Ratios) from Discrete-Time Multinomial Models Predicting First and Subsequent Union Formation by Parental Status

	Men				Women			
	First Union		Subsequent Unions		First Union		Subsequent Unions	
Characteristic	Cohabiting versus Single	Married versus Single	Cohabiting versus Single	Married versus Single	Cohabiting versus Single	Married versus Single	Cohabiting versus Single	Married versus Single
*Residence Status of Children^*								
Has no children`	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Has at least one coresident child	9.112 ***	13.372 *** #	1.390 ***	2.241 *** #	1.620 ***	1.473 ***	0.901	1.158 * #
Has all nonresident children	2.056 ***	1.636 *** #	1.146	1.121	2.094 ***	1.075 #	1.098	1.107
Childhood Family Structure								
Lived with both biological parents`	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Lived with a stepparent	1.541 ***	1.034 #	1.210	0.901 #	1.686 ***	1.119 #	1.157	0.966
Lived with a single parent	1.328 ***	0.803 *** #	0.945	0.932	1.286 ***	0.849 ** #	1.125	0.919 #
Lived in another family situation	1.282	1.000	1.316 *	1.030	1.540 **	1.096 #	1.146	0.867
Life Course Stage								
Age at current interview^	0.967 ***	0.928 *** #	0.915 ***	0.919 ***	0.935 ***	0.898 *** #	0.919 ***	0.915 ***
At at first interview (1979)	1.015	1.091 *** #	1.015	1.053 ***	0.991	1.057 *** #	1.014	1.057 *** #
*Respondent's Education^*								
Enrolled in school	0.345 ***	0.344 ***	0.564 **	0.763	0.349 ***	0.393 ***	0.810	0.722 **
Highest year of school completed	1.032 *	1.132 *** #	0.957 **	1.064 *** #	1.065 ***	1.121 *** #	0.945 ***	1.043 ** #
*Economic Characteristics^*								
Yearly earnings (logged)	1.083 ***	1.057 *** #	1.046 ***	1.024 *	1.045 ***	1.043 ***	1.012	1.014
Race								
Non-Hispanic white`	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Non-Hispanic black	0.784 ***	0.464 *** #	0.794 **	0.693 ***	0.404 ***	0.455 ***	0.375 ***	0.464 *** #
Hispanic	0.858	0.920	0.910	1.030	0.657 ***	0.948 #	0.742 ***	0.824 *
-2 Log likelihood	29,208.39		14,015.62		26,811.82		16,642.39	
N (person years)	46,930		14,284		38,037		18,704	

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***<.001

Notes: Results are expressed in odds ratios (e^b). ^Variable measured in year prior to outcome.
Married v. cohabiting is significantly different at p<.05.
`Reference category.