

How Do Attitudes Affect Relationship Stability? Content versus Concordance

Jeanette Chung

Mario Luis Small

Sara McLanahan

Center for Research on Child Wellbeing, Princeton University

1 March 2004

ABSTRACT

Extant research on attitudes and relationship dynamics documents that attitudes toward marriage, gender roles, and assortative mating affect the likelihood of marriage and of divorce. The prevailing argument is that attitudes reflect internalized cultural values that guide behavior. Yet, attitudes can also affect behavior through structural concordance, which promotes cohesion in ways that encourage union formation and prevent dissolution. This paper uses paired couple data on diverse attitudes from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study to test the hypothesis that cohesion from attitudinal concordance promotes marriage and prevents dissolution independently of attitudinal content. With the exception of marriage attitudes, we find no effect of attitudinal content on marriage or dissolution. However, we find that concordance is positively associated with marriage and negatively associated with relationship dissolution, suggesting that attitudinal homogeneity may be an important form of social capital that promotes union formation and relationship stability.

INTRODUCTION

Attitudes toward family issues are commonly linked to family formation behavior. A considerable body of research has uncovered a strong parallel between population trends in attitudes towards family issues and demographic trends in family formation. Attenuation of traditional family values and a growing acceptance of divorce, single-motherhood, , cohabitation, and non-marital sexual relations have shadowed declines in population marriage rates and increases in population rates of divorce, cohabitation, and out-of-wedlock births in the U.S. (Thornton, 1989; Thornton, 1985; Thornton et al., 1983; Cherlin and Walters, 1981) and in other Western societies (Lesthaeghe, 2000). At the individual level, research has found elicited attitudes towards family issues, gender role relations, and occupational aspirations associated with union formation (Sassler and Schoen, 1999) and household organization (Clarkberg, Stolzenberg and Waite, 1995).

All of this research is predicated on two strong assumptions. First, the literature assumes that elicited attitudes reflect individual internal motivations, and second, the literature assumes that behavior reflects internal motivations. Both of these assumptions are problematic. Attitudes commonly do not reflect internal motives, but this inconsistency is largely a measurement issue (for example, interviewer bias) and has been addressed extensively in social psychology (see for example, Schuman and Johnson, 1976; Liska, 1974). More importantly, individual actions commonly depart from individual intentions to act, and while this deviation is also partly a measurement issue, it reflects a theoretical issue as well. The theoretical problem of understanding the correspondence between attitudes and behavior is the focus of this paper.

The prevailing understanding regarding the link between attitude and behavior in the literature on family attitudes and family formation behavior is that attitudes influence behavior through the prescriptive or proscriptive content of these attitudes. Observed attitudes are expressions of cultural values, norms, and mores that have been internalized by individuals through socialization and as such, may be expected to act as precepts that guide and therefore predict behavior. Decisions to marry, cohabit, and/or divorce are shaped by cultural attitudes that may prescribe union formation and/or proscribe union dissolution. When prevailing norms place a premium on marriage, and when divorce, cohabitation, and non-marital sexual relations are negatively sanctioned, either formally and/or informally, individuals are more likely to marry and less likely to divorce, cohabit, and/or engage in non-marital childbearing. Changes in aggregate rates of marriage, divorce, cohabitation, and non-marital fertility can presumably be traced back to changes in norms regarding family formation.

While this first pathway describes a substantive effect of attitudes and norms on individual behavior, a second pathway exists that describes a structural effect of attitudes and norms on behavior and that has not been previously explored in this literature. Attitudes define membership within larger social groups: they connect an individual to others who share the same views, and they define boundaries between an individual and those who do not share the same views (Blau, 1960; Mead, 1934[1962]). Attitudes locate individuals within larger social structures, and features of these attitudinal structures may influence the behavior of individuals that constitute them.

In a classic exposition on structural effects in sociology, Blau wrote: "[t]he individual's orientation undoubtedly influences his behavior; the question is whether the prevalence of social values in a community also exerts social

constraints upon patterns of conduct that are independent of the influences exerted by the internalized orientations" (1960:179). This paper examines how the structure of attitudes - the "prevalence" of values and norms within couples - influence couple behavior independently of the internalized norms and values of individuals within the couple. Identifying the features of these attitudinal structures within and among couples and specifying how they influence couple behavior are the objectives of this paper. More specifically, we examine whether the content of family attitudes held by couples and the concordance of attitudes toward family issues exert independent effects on relationship dynamics.

The remainder of this paper will proceed as follows. We begin in Section One by developing the concept of attitudinal structures and how they, as a form of social structure, affect social behavior. We focus specifically on attitudinal structures within couples and elucidate how patterns of attitudes between partners in a couple can exert effects on couple behavior - that is, on outcomes of the couple - independently of the substantive orientations or motivations of each partner taken individually. We hypothesize that shared attitudes, regardless of the substantive content of those attitudes, promote cohesion between individuals, increase perceived attractiveness of partners, and facilitate the development of congruent role expectations – all of which strengthen social relationships. Conversely, discordant attitudes create relationship diatheses and increase the risk for dissolution. In short, the extent to which couples share similar attitudes – i.e. the structure of attitudes within couples - may encourage union formation and/or prevent union dissolution independent of the content or cultural capital embodied in attitudes.

We test these hypotheses in Section Two using paired couple data on attitudes toward marriage, homophily, and gender roles from the Fragile Families

and Child Wellbeing Survey. We present our results in Section Three, and conclude with a discussion of the theoretical and practical implications of our research in Section Four.

I. BACKGROUND

Attitudinal Structures

Attitudes are individual orientations towards social constructs, concrete or abstract (c.f. Liska, 1974).¹ As such, attitudes define relations between individuals and social objects, but more importantly, they define indirect relations between individuals on the basis of their orientation towards a particular object. Social bonds are implied between individuals who share similar attitudes and by the same token, social boundaries are implied between individuals who are of dissimilar attitudes (Heider, 1958). Patterns of attitudes - whether between as few as two people or between as many as all denizens within a society - define patterns of relationships among individuals on the basis of their attitudinal position or orientation with respect to a social construct. These patterns of attitudinal relationships constitute a type of social structure.

Cohesion in Attitudinal Structures

Cohesion is greater when social similarity is greater, and this applies to attitudinal similarity as well. This argument derives partly from theories of propinquity (Maissonneuve, Palmade and Fourment, 1952), homophily, and social distance, which have long ascribed social similarity as an important basis for interpersonal attraction (Hinde, 1979; Secord and Backman, 1964). In laboratory as well as naturalistic settings, individuals prefer interacting with similar others and they also interact more frequently with close counterparts (Sykes, Larntz and Fox, 1976). Individuals also rate similar others as more

¹ Liska (1974:261) "...attitude is defined as an organization of consistent responses toward some social object."

attractive and more likeable than dissimilar others (Hinde, 1979; Secord and Backman, 1964; Newcomb, 1961).

The central idea in these theories is common sense and succinctly summarized in the folk adage, "birds of a feather flock together." Yet, this simple idea belies a more subtle insight concerning similarity and social structures. Insofar as similarity increases attraction, groups comprised of highly similar members will be characterized by strong pressures towards conformity to group norms and social control. All of these, as Blau (1964) elucidates, increases group cohesion which in turn promotes the stability of group membership (i.e. group structure) and the ability of group members to act as a unitary actor (i.e. cooperate towards common ends). If similarity increases attraction between individuals, and attraction promotes social integration, then the greater the prevalence of an attitude in a social group, or the degree to which attitudinal concordance exists between two individuals, the greater the interpersonal attraction, the greater the social forces towards integration, and the greater the stability of interpersonal relations between individuals.

Put another way, the density of an attitude within a social group or the concordance of an attitude between two individuals measures cohesion within attitudinal structures. As cohesion is a social force towards integration and structural stability, attitudinal density or attitudinal concordance should promote movement towards greater structural stability. In the context of family attitudes and family formation behavior, attitudinal concordance between couples should promote union formation, movement towards marriage (or more stable relationship arrangements) and concordance should generally prevent union dissolution.

Attitudinal Structures and Structural Balance

While the density of attitudes (that is, the extent to which attitudes are shared among members of a social group) implies social forces towards structural stability operating through processes of interpersonal attraction and social control, the morphological patterns of attitudinal relations among group members also carry implications for the stability of interpersonal relations and group structure. Several theories of group behavior have formalized this argument, most notably Heider, (1958); Cartwright and Harary, (1956) and Davis (1963). These theories start with the premise that individuals prefer states of cognitive consistency (c.f. Festinger, 1957).

Social structures defined on relations of sentiment, or what we refer to as attitudinal structures, vary in the degree to which attitudinal relations among individuals and/or social objects are consistent with the attitudes of a focal individual within a structure. In the simplest structures involving two individuals and a social construct, cognitive consistency is greatest when two individuals who are already in a relationship, are also similarly oriented towards the social construct. However, an imbalanced social structure exists when individuals are in a relationship with each other but hold asymmetric attitudes towards a given social construct. Given individual preferences for cognitive consistency, social pressures will arise in imbalanced structures to restore or achieve balance. Mechanisms for attaining structural equilibrium in attitudinal relations may involve the use of social influence by one member to induce conformity in the other member; or, structural equilibrium may be restored by the severance of social relationships between two actors. The main insight from these theories is that the seeds of stability in interpersonal relationships are sown in sentiment structures. In the context of a couple, attitudinal concordance indicates a

relationship that confers cognitive consistency for both individuals involved. Attitudinal discordance indicates an unstable structural that will give rise to structural change.

Family Formation Attitudes and Couple Behavior

The preceding arguments suggest that independently of the substance of the particular values, norms, or beliefs regarding family issues that are held by individual partners in a relationship, the structure of those attitudes may itself influence the relationship dynamics of a couple. More specifically, we derive the following two hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1. Among unmarried couples, the greater the attitudinal concordance between partners, the greater the likelihood of marriage.

Hypothesis 2. Among all couples, the greater the attitudinal concordance between partners, the lower the likelihood of union dissolution.

II. DATA AND METHODS

Data

We test these two hypotheses using data from the first and second waves of the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Survey (FFS). The FFS is a longitudinal survey of parents of newborns from a nationally representative sample of births in large metropolitan areas within the U.S. Mothers and fathers were interviewed individually soon after the birth of their child, and were followed up at one, three, and five years after the birth. We use paired data on standard demographics, employment history, family background, couple relationship, and attitudes on marriage and parenting that were collected at baseline, as well as data on the couple relationship at the first follow-up. The sample and design of the FFS have been described extensively elsewhere (McLanahan et al. 2001).

Variables

Dependent variables. The couples under analysis are those involving the mothers and fathers of babies sampled in the FFS; accordingly, the couple dynamics being investigated concern union formation and dissolution of these mothers and fathers *as a couple*. The two dependent variables in this study are union formation at twelve months and union dissolution at twelve months. We define union formation as movement *of a couple* from an unmarried state in the baseline survey to a married state in the second wave of the survey twelve months later. Similarly, we define union dissolution as movement *of a couple* from a state of partnership in a romantic relationship to a state of non-partnership in a romantic relationship. By 'partnership in a romantic relationship,' we mean

involvement in either marriage or a self-reported romantic relationship. Mothers and fathers identifying themselves as friends or not in any relationship vis a vis the other parent are not identified as partners in a romantic relationship. To be clear, one set of analyses to follow examines how attitudes and concordance influence the movement of all unmarried couples into marriage, and another set of analyses examines how attitudes and concordance influence the movement of all married and romantically involved couples into a state of non-partnership in a romantic relationship.

Explanatory variables. There are two explanatory variables of interest in these analyses: attitudinal content and attitudinal concordance. Both attitudinal content and concordance are measured at the level of the couple; thus, our measure of content is an overall measure of a couple's attitudinal and normative orientation, and our measure of concordance is a structural measure of a couple's similarity or homogeneity.

Our measures of attitudinal content and attitudinal concordance were constructed from mothers' and fathers' responses to twenty items from the FFS concerning attitudes related to marriage, parenting, gender roles, and homophily. These items, listed in Table 1, were recoded on a scale of 1 to 4 to indicate the extent to which respondents expressed pro-marriage attitudes, homophilic preferences, or traditional gender role attitudes. Each couple's responses were averaged within each topical domain to create measures of attitudinal content with respect to marriage, homophily, and gender roles.

Couples with a higher score on marriage attitudinal content espoused beliefs and values favoring marriage. Couples with a higher score on homophily expressed a set of attitudes which favored differential association with like others.

Couples with a higher score in the gender role domain expressed attitudes favoring traditional division of labor within and outside the household.

We measured couple concordance by creating a dichotomous variable for each of the twenty survey items that took on a value of '1' if the couple responded identically to the survey question, and '0' if the couple did not respond identically. Our measure of attitudinal concordance is the sum of these individual concordance indicators, and theoretically ranges from a value of zero, in which partners in a couple did not express any shared attitudes, to a value of twenty, in which partners in a couple shared all attitudes. Attitudinal concordance, as we have measured it, is a purely structural measure of similarity or homogeneity within couples, and does not reflect any information about a couple's ideology or convictions.

Control variables. In all of our analyses, we control for several individual-level characteristics as well as couple-level characteristics. At the individual level, we include mother's and father's age; education (less than high school vs. high school degree or more); race (Non-Hispanic White, Non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic, and other); and family background (whether mother/father lived with her/his biological parents at age 16). We include additional controls for the father's employment status (unemployed vs. employed) at the time of the baseline survey, as well as whether the mother had other biological children. At the couple level, we control for the couple's relationship duration (the number of months partners had known each other before conceiving a child together) and relationship status (which, depending on the analyses, include: married, romantic cohabiting, romantic non-cohabiting, and non-romantic relationships). All explanatory variables and control variables were measured at baseline.²

² See Table 1 for descriptive statistics

Method of analysis.

We estimate the effect of attitudinal concordance and attitudinal content in each of the three topical domains in a series of six logistic regressions (three predicting movement to marriage, and three predicting movement to relationship dissolution) of the following general form:

where Y is an outcome of interest (marriage or relationship dissolution); i indexes attitudinal content domain (marriage, homophily, or gender roles); and X is a vector of control variables. In models predicting marriage, we excluded all couples who were married at baseline. In models predicting relationship dissolution, we excluded all couples who were not in a romantic relationship at baseline.

III. RESULTS

Descriptive statistics.

Table 2 presents descriptive statistics and frequencies for the variables included in our analyses. In our sample, couples expressed attitudes that tended to favor marriage (mean attitudinal content with respect to marriage = 3.13) and traditional household division of labor (mean attitudinal content with respect to gender roles = 3.22). Couples did not express a strong preference to associate with similar others (mean attitudinal content with respect to homophily = 1.49). The average couple in our sample agreed on slightly over half of the survey items (mean concordance = 12.23). The average age of mothers in our sample was 25 years, with fathers slightly older (mean age of fathers = 28 years). Thirty-five percent of mothers and about 49% of fathers had attained a high-school education or more. Mothers and fathers were predominantly non-Hispanic Black (48%), with the remainder of the sample either Hispanic (28%) or White (20%). Less than half of mothers and fathers grew up in intact households (43% and 46%, respectively). Over half of the mothers in our sample had other biological children, and the majority of fathers in our sample were employed at the time of the sampled baby's birth. On average, couples had known each other for nearly five months prior to conception. At baseline, roughly a quarter of the sample were married, 36% were romantically involved and cohabiting, and 32% were romantically involved but not cohabiting. At 12 months, slightly less than a third of the sample were married, 29% were romantically involved and cohabiting, 4% were romantically involved but not cohabiting and 35% of couples were not romantically involved. [DID I SCREW THIS UP?]

Effects on marriage.

Table 3 presents estimates from logistic regression models of the effect of attitudinal content and concordance on marriage. Model 1 examines the effects of marriage attitudinal content and total concordance on the log odds of marriage. Not surprisingly, we find that increasing levels of pro-marriage attitudes increased the likelihood of marriage at 12 months ($P < 0.00$). We also find that increasing concordance increased the odds of marriage at 12 months ($p < 0.00$). Model 2 examines the effects of attitudinal content regarding gender roles and total concordance on the log odds of marriage. Here, we find a positive but non-significant effect of traditional gender role attitudes on marriage, and a positive and significant effect of overall concordance on marriage ($p < 0.01$). Model 3 presents the estimated effects of attitudinal content with respect to homophily and total concordance on marriage. Here again, we find a positive but non-significant effect of increasing preferences for homophily on marriage, and a positive and significant effect of increasing total concordance on marriage ($p < 0.00$).

Effects on relationship dissolution.

The effects of attitudinal content and concordance on relationship dissolution are presented in Table 4. Model 1 shows that couples expressing attitudes that were more strongly in favor of marriage were less likely to have separated within 12 months ($p < 0.00$), and that overall concordance prevented dissolution ($p < 0.07$). However, consistent with the results presented for marriage, attitudes toward homophily and attitudes toward gender roles were not significant predictors of relationship dissolution, although couple concordance had a consistent and negative effect on dissolution ($p < 0.07$).

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Attitudes towards social norms and mores may affect behavior through their cultural content as prescriptions and/or proscriptions on behavior, but they may also affect behavior through structural effects arising from bonds they create between individuals. Our results show that attitudinal concordance among partners in a relationship increase union integration over time and prevent union disintegration. What is striking is that these structural effects are independent of substantive effects of family formation attitudes on couple behavior. Attitudinal homogeneity may be an important form of family social capital.

Policy makers are currently attempting to encourage marriage in the population by improving couple-communications and building more favorable attitudes towards marriage. However, our findings suggest that strategies aimed at identifying commonality (even on non-traditional values ostensibly inconsistent with marriage) may be just as effective as increasing pro-marriage attitudes and more effective than changing attitudes about other aspects of the couple-relationship, e.g. gender roles. Interventions designed to promote and emphasize commonality between partners in a relationship may be more effective in both forging unions and guarding against dissolution than strategies aimed to socialize or re-socialize individuals to relationship values of a given society.

REFERENCES

- Blau, Peter M. (1960). Structural Effects. American Sociological Review. 25(2): 178-193.
- Blau, Peter M. (1964). Exchange and Power in Social Life. New York: Wiley.
- Cartwright, Dorwin and Frank Harary. (1956). A Generalization of Heider's Theory. Psychological Review. LXIII:277-293.
- Clarkberg, M., R. Stolzenberg and L. Waite. (1995). Attitudes, Values, and Entrance into Cohabital Versus Marital Unions. Social Forces. 74(2):609-632.
- Davis, James A. (1963). Structural Balance, Mechanical Solidarity, and Interpersonal Relations.
- Festinger, Leon. (1957). A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Heider, Fritz. (1958). The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Hinde, R. (1979). Towards Understanding Relationships. New York: Academic Press.
- Lesthaeghe, R. (1983). A Century of Demographic and Cultural Change in Western Europe: An Exploration of Underlying Dimensions. Population and Development Review. 9(3):411-435.

- Liska, Allen E. (1974). Emergent Issues in the Attitude-Behavior Consistency Controversy. American Sociological Review. 39:261-272.
- Maisonneuve, J., G. Palmade, and C. Fourment. (1952). Selective Choices and Propinquity. Sociometry. 15:135-140.
- McLanahan, S., I. Garfinkel, N. Reichman, and J. Teitler. (2001). The Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study: Sample and Design. Children and Youth Services Review. 23:4/5.
- Mead, George Herbert. (1934[1962]). Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Newcomb, Theodore. (1961). The Acquaintance Process. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Sassler, S. (1999). The Effect of Attitudes and Economic Activity on Marriage. Journal of Marriage and the Family. 61:147-159.
- Secord, Paul and Carl Backman. (1964). Interpersonal Congruency, Perceived Similarity and Friendship. Sociometry. 27(2):115-127.
- Sykes, Richard E., Kinley Larntz, and James Fox. (1976). Proximity and Similarity Effects on Frequency of Interaction in a Class of Naval Recruits. Sociometry. 39(3):263-269.
- Thornton, A. (1985). Changing Attitudes Toward Separation and Divorce: Causes and Consequences. The American Journal of Sociology. 90(4):856-872.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics and Frequencies of Variables in Analyses

Variable	Percent	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.	N
Couple attitudes						
Marriage		3.13	1.20	0	5	
Homophily		1.49	0.89	0	3	3,719
Gender roles		3.22	1.09	0	5	3,628
Couple concordance						
		12.23	2.88	3	20	3,181
Mother variables						
Age		25.28	6.05	14	50	4,895
High School Degree	35.10%					4,898
Race						
White	21.29%					
Black	48.11%					
Hispanic	27.56%					
Other race	3.04%					
Intact family background	43.25%					
Other biological children	61.72%					
Father variables						
Age		27.95	7.27	15	80	3,830
High school degree or more	48.57%					4,898
Race						
White	20.59%					3,769
Black	48.00%					3,769
Hispanic	28.18%					3,769
Other race	3.24%					3,769
Intact family background	46.83%					
Employed at time of baby's birth	80.48%					
Couple variables						
Relationship duration (months)		4.69	4.78	0	36	4,821
Relationship status at Baseline						
Married	24.24%					4,897
Romantic cohabiting	36.43%					4,897
Romantic non-cohabiting	32.06%					4,897
No romantic relationship	7.27%					4,897
Relationship status at 12 months						
Married	31.92%					
Romantic cohabiting	29.07%					
Romantic non-cohabiting	4.22%					
No romantic relationship	34.80%					

Data: Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Survey, Baseline and 12-month follow-up.

Table 2. Logistic Regression Estimates of the Effects of Attitudinal Content and Structure on Marriage

	Model 1				Model 3				Model 2			
	Coef.	O.R.	S.E.	P	Coef.	O.R.	S.E.	P	Coef.	O.R.	S.E.	P
Marriage attitudes	0.17	1.19	(0.03)	0.00								
Gender role attitudes					0.28	1.32	(0.29)	0.34				
Sameness attitudes									0.26	1.30	(0.19)	0.18
Total concordance	0.07	1.07	(0.03)	0.01	0.07	1.08	(0.03)	0.01	0.07	1.07	(0.03)	0.01
Mother variables												
Age	0.02	1.02	(0.02)	0.32	0.02	1.02	(0.02)	0.42	0.02	1.02	(0.02)	0.44
High School Degree	0.02	1.02	(0.18)	0.91	0.08	1.08	(0.18)	0.67	0.05	1.05	(0.18)	0.78
Race (omit: White)												
Black	-0.32	0.73	(0.34)	0.34	-0.25	0.78	(0.33)	0.45	-0.26	0.77	(0.33)	0.44
Hispanic	0.73	2.08	(0.55)	0.18	0.84	2.32	(0.54)	0.12	0.84	2.32	(0.54)	0.12
Other race	0.49	1.63	(0.30)	0.10	0.46	1.58	(0.29)	0.12	0.45	1.57	(0.29)	0.12
Intact family background	0.23	1.25	(0.15)	0.14	0.22	1.25	(0.15)	0.15	0.22	1.25	(0.15)	0.14
Other biological children	-0.04	0.96	(0.17)	0.80	-0.10	0.91	(0.16)	0.56	-0.09	0.92	(0.16)	0.60
Father variables												
Age	-0.01	0.99	(0.02)	0.65	0.00	1.00	(0.02)	0.77	-0.01	0.99	(0.02)	0.73
High School Degree	0.65	1.91	(0.16)	0.00	0.65	1.92	(0.16)	0.00	0.64	1.89	(0.16)	0.00
Race (omit: White)												
Black	-0.71	0.49	(0.34)	0.04	-0.66	0.52	(0.34)	0.05	-0.65	0.52	(0.34)	0.06
Hispanic	-0.93	0.39	(0.60)	0.12	-1.00	0.37	(0.61)	0.10	-0.99	0.37	(0.61)	0.11
Other race	-0.57	0.56	(0.31)	0.06	-0.52	0.59	(0.30)	0.08	-0.52	0.60	(0.30)	0.09
Intact family background	-0.25	0.78	(0.16)	0.11	-0.22	0.80	(0.16)	0.16	-0.23	0.79	(0.16)	0.14
Employed	0.27	1.31	(0.21)	0.20	0.31	1.36	(0.21)	0.15	0.29	1.34	(0.21)	0.17
Couple variables												
Relationship duration (months)	0.01	1.01	(0.02)	0.69	0.01	1.01	(0.02)	0.74	0.00	1.00	(0.02)	0.81
Relationship status (omit: non-cohabiting and non-romantic)												
Cohabiting	0.98	2.67	(0.19)	0.00	1.00	2.71	(0.19)	0.00	1.01	2.73	(0.19)	0.00
Constant	-6.37		(0.74)	0.00	-4.69		(0.89)	0.00	-4.40		(0.62)	0.00

N=2,198

Data: Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Survey, Baseline and 12-month follow-up.

Table 3. Logistic Regression Estimates of the Effects of Attitudinal Content and Structure on Relationship Dissolution

	Model 1				Model 3				Model 2			
	Coef.	O.R.	S.E.	P	Coef.	O.R.	S.E.	P	Coef.	O.R.	S.E.	P
Marriage attitudes	-0.06	0.94	0.02	0.00								
Homophily attitudes					0.14	1.15	0.17	0.40				
Gender role attitudes									-0.04	0.96	0.12	0.73
Total concordance	-0.03	0.97	0.02	0.06	-0.03	0.97	0.02	0.06	-0.03	0.97	0.02	0.03
Mother variables												
Age	-0.01	0.99	0.01	0.58	-0.01	0.99	0.01	0.60	-0.01	0.99	0.01	0.63
High School Degree	-0.26	0.77	0.11	0.02	-0.27	0.77	0.11	0.02	-0.28	0.76	0.11	0.01
Race (omit: White)												
Black	0.17	1.19	0.20	0.40	0.14	1.15	0.20	0.49	0.15	1.16	0.20	0.46
Hispanic	0.35	1.41	0.34	0.31	0.33	1.39	0.34	0.33	0.34	1.40	0.34	0.32
Other race	-0.29	0.75	0.19	0.14	-0.29	0.75	0.20	0.13	-0.28	0.76	0.20	0.15
Intact family background	-0.18	0.84	0.09	0.06	-0.20	0.82	0.09	0.04	-0.19	0.83	0.09	0.04
Other biological children	-0.18	0.83	0.10	0.07	-0.17	0.84	0.10	0.08	-0.17	0.84	0.10	0.08
Father variables												
Age	0.02	1.02	0.01	0.07	0.01	1.01	0.01	0.10	0.01	1.01	0.01	0.09
High School Degree	-0.02	0.98	0.11	0.82	-0.03	0.97	0.11	0.77	-0.04	0.96	0.11	0.73
Race (omit: White)												
Black	0.51	1.67	0.22	0.02	0.52	1.68	0.22	0.02	0.52	1.68	0.22	0.02
Hispanic	0.25	1.29	0.33	0.45	0.23	1.26	0.33	0.49	0.23	1.26	0.33	0.48
Other race	0.51	1.66	0.21	0.02	0.51	1.66	0.21	0.02	0.51	1.66	0.21	0.02
Intact family background	-0.09	0.92	0.11	0.44	-0.10	0.91	0.11	0.39	-0.10	0.91	0.11	0.38
Employed	-0.08	0.92	0.09	0.39	-0.10	0.91	0.09	0.30	-0.09	0.91	0.09	0.34
Couple variables												
Relationship duration (months)	0.00	1.00	0.01	0.68	0.01	1.01	0.01	0.63	0.01	1.01	0.01	0.62
Relationship status (omit: non-cohabiting)												
Married	-2.20	0.11	0.16	0.00	-2.34	0.10	0.15	0.00	-2.32	0.10	0.15	0.00
Cohabiting	-1.31	0.27	0.10	0.00	-1.31	0.27	0.10	0.00	-1.31	0.27	0.10	0.00
Constant	1.34		0.41	0.00	0.21		0.51	0.68	0.60		0.37	0.10

N=2,979

Data: Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Survey, Baseline and 12-month follow-up.