

Are Men or Women More Reluctant to Marry in Couples Sharing a Non-marital Birth?*

Emily Fitzgibbons Shafer

* I thank Paula England for her numerous and invaluable comments for this paper. I also thank Kathy Edin and the participants of the Family Practicum class at Northwestern University, Bobai Li, Corey Fields and Heather Schoenfeld.

Abstract

Despite growing concern over the “retreat from marriage”, little is known about gender differences in men and women’s attitudes towards marriage. Conventional wisdom suggests that men are less likely to desire marriage, but marriage has traditionally been a bad bargain for women. In order to examine whether one gender is driving the “retreat from marriage”, I capitalize on a new longitudinal study of unmarried parents – The Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study. I find that among romantically involved unmarried parents, unmarried fathers are more positive about marriage than unmarried mothers. Using ordered logistic analysis, I find that, net of other factors, men have more positive attitudes regarding marriage and their current relationship than their female partners. I also find that Hispanic and white men are more positive than Hispanic and white women regarding marriage irrespective of their current relationship.

Since the 1960s the proportion of births that are to unmarried women has increased substantially. In 1960 only 5% of all children were born to unmarried parents; today that number has risen to approximately one third (Horn and Sawhill, 2001). The increase of out-of-wedlock births has occurred unequally across classes. Since 1960, the bottom third of the educational distribution of women aged 25-32 has seen a 13% increase in the odds of becoming a single mother while the rate in the top educational third has seen an increase of only 5% (Ellwood and Jencks, 2001). Marriage, unlike the out-of-wedlock child rate, has decreased for women of all educational backgrounds. Women are getting married at later ages than their 1960s counterparts and some, especially those with less education, are delaying so long that they may not get married at all (Ellwood & Jencks, 2001). The decrease in marriage, along with increased sexual permissiveness, and decreased likelihood that once a child is conceived, a couple will have a “shot gun” marriage have contributed to the rising proportion of births that are out-of-wedlock births (Akerlof, Yellen & Katz, 1996).

Conventional wisdom surrounding commitment and marriage in the later part of the 20th century suggests that men are more reluctant to marry than women. Ehrenreich (1984) notes that men’s “flight from commitment” began in the 1950s:

The popular masculine wisdom of the fifties was that women had already won, not just the ballot, but the budget and most of the gross national product. Homemaking was a leisure activity reserved for the more powerful sex, while a proletariat of husbands labored thanklessly to pay the bills. (pg. 100)

Ehrenreich suggests that men are motivated to “flee” by the desire to not have to support a family and a wife who controls the household. Social scientists who study the “retreat from marriage”, however, have not focused on gender differences in the motivation or reluctance to marry, and therefore have not spoken to this conventional wisdom.

Past research has largely ignored viewing the “retreat from marriage” through a gender lens. Although research has examined individual characteristics associated with an increased likelihood of marriage for both genders (Goldscheider & Waite, 1986), rarely do researchers try to pinpoint whether or not one gender is more reluctant to marry than the other. In part this is due to examining the “retreat from marriage” through observations of the actual incidence of marriage, which by (heterosexist) law always involves one man for every woman married. In studying the incidence of marriage, it is unclear whether a person who does not marry actually wants to do so, at least under some conditions. Therefore, a gender difference in *interest* is difficult to assess (South, 1993).

The lack of research examining gender may also be due to the fact that many theories surrounding the “retreat from marriage,” like Becker’s theory of specialization or Wilson’s “marriageable male pool hypothesis,” cannot be used to make clear predictions of which gender is more reluctant. For example Wilson’s theory suggests that if a man, because of severely harsh economic conditions, cannot earn enough to support a family (or half of a family) he may be likely to disengage from the identity of father and husband and think he is inappropriate for marriage. However, such men may also become unattractive as possible marriage partners to women because of their lack of earnings. Likewise, Becker’s theory posits that the gains from specialization associated with men’s higher earnings make marriage attractive to both men and women. Of the studies that do explore gender differences in attitudes about marriage, most are discussed in terms of racial and ethnic differences (South, 1993) or have found no consistent gender difference in marriage attitudes (Thornton & Young-DeMarco, 2001).

The retreat from marriage has caused concern among researchers and policy makers regarding the out-of-wedlock childbearing rate. Specifically many are troubled with the

implications this increase has for child outcomes and parental well-being (McLanahan & Sandefur, 1994; Horn & Sawhill, 2001). Despite this concern, prior analysis has rarely focused on *unmarried parents'* attitudes about marriage, unless to analyze specific populations, such as very poor mothers (Edin, 2000). However, unmarried parenthood has not risen only in very poor economic groups – only the women in the highest 1/3 of the education distribution have not seen an increase over the past few decades (Ellwood & Jencks, 2001). The lack of focus on unmarried parents' attitudes in the literature is also surprising since, theoretically, unmarried men and women who have a child together may have distinctive attitudes regarding the reported likelihood of marriage and the perceived benefits of marriage compared to childless men and women of the same age (Bulcroft & Bulcroft, 1993).

The goal of this paper is to examine the attitudes toward marriage in unmarried parents through a gender lens. In doing so, I capitalize on a unique data set, taken from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing study, a longitudinal study that samples nearly 10,000 parents who have just had a birth, and by design over-samples unmarried new parents, to answer the questions at hand. Over 80% of the unmarried new parents report themselves to be romantically involved at the time of their child's birth when first surveyed, and I will limit my analysis to those who are romantically involved. Of these, 83% were cohabiting at the birth. Are men or women more likely to be reluctant to marry among new unmarried parents? Can any gender effect, if found, be explained by mediating variables? For example, if one gender is more reluctant about marriage in this sample of unmarried parents, is this because this group has a more critical appraisal of the current relationship? Or do differences in income, religiosity or gender role attitudes explain any difference in attractiveness of marriage to men and women? Further, does gender interact with racial and ethnic group membership?

Theoretical Background

Theoretical work surrounding the “retreat from marriage” has focused a great deal on increased economic opportunity for women. Becker (1981) argues that in order to gain maximum utility as a family, men and women specialize within marriage. Women generally specialize as homemakers and men as income earners. Because men typically specialize as the income earners, women need marriage as a contract against being left with no money. The increased economic opportunity for women, therefore, has decreased the need for such “contracts.” He states, “The gain from marriage is reduced by a rise in the earnings and labor force participation of women . . . because a sexual division of labor becomes less advantageous (pg. 248).” Overall this theory suggests that as women’s earning increases, either gender would perceive specialization as less advantageous, and thus find less reason to marry.

Empirical evidence that examines the increase in women’s economic opportunity on marriage rates has been somewhat inconclusive. In an extensive review of the changing family structure literature, Ellwood and Jencks (2001) state: “Cross-area and aggregate time-series data tend to find a negative impact of women’s wages and hours on marriage, while longitudinal data on individuals often shows the reverse (pgs. 4-5).” Such ambiguous findings suggest that further empirical analysis is needed in order to assess the true impact of increasing women’s economic opportunity on the “retreat from marriage” and rise in out-of-wedlock childbearing.

A second theory is Wilson’s “unmarriageable men hypothesis.” He credits the decrease in marriage among the black urban poor directly to the harsh economic conditions of the 1980s brought on by the deindustrialization of the cities. The disappearance of low-skilled jobs within the inner cities created communities where members could not economically support themselves. The number of “marriageable men,” men who could support a family at least minimally because

they had stable employment, therefore shrank. At the same time that the ratio of women to men in the black population became larger as men were lost to violence or incarceration. He states:

(B)oth the black delay in marriage and the lower rate of remarriage, each of which is associated with high percentages of out-of-wedlock births and female-headed households, can be directly tied to the labor-market status of black males. As we have documented, black women, especially young black women, are facing a shrinking pool of “marriageable” (i.e., economically stable) men. (1987, pg. 91)

One might extend Wilson’s argument to white men with no more than a high school degree as well. Although they are still more advantaged than black men in the labor market, their wages have fallen in the last two decades (Ellwood & Jencks 2001). Wilson’s argument, that there is a connection between male employment and opportunity and family formation, has been supported by strong empirical evidence, although it cannot account for all of the changes in family formation in the later half of the 20th century among either blacks or other groups (Ellwood & Jencks 2001). Despite the evidence that supports this theory, it makes no clear distinction between whether it is women who are unwilling to marry unemployed men, or men who decide they don’t have enough to offer to make marriage appropriate. The thesis would be consistent with either interpretation.

Although his theory seems to have no clear implications for which gender is more reluctant to marry, Wilson descriptively portrays relations between men and women in his book and cites men as being more reluctant. Wilson asserts: “The ethnographic data reveal especially weak support for the institution of marriage in the inner-city ghetto among black men. For many of the men, marriage ties a man down and results in a loss of freedom (pg. 100).”

Additional ethnographic work on the same population suggests that it is men who are more reluctant to marry than women (Anderson, 1990). In his book *Street Wise: Race, Class, and Change in an Urban Community*, Elijah Anderson (1990) discusses the “sex codes” of men

and women in Norton, a very poor neighborhood in Philadelphia. He describes sexual relationships between young women and men in this community as “games” initiated by men. In these “games”, men are only after sex, and in order to get sex they play on the common desire young women have for a “Prince Charming” to come take care of them. Often these “games” end up with a young woman becoming pregnant. However, when a young woman becomes pregnant it often does not lead to a commitment from her male partner. Anderson describes:

In a great number of cases, peer group or no, the boy will send the girl on her way even if she is carrying a baby he knows is his. He often lacks a deep feeling for a woman and children as a family unit and does not want to put up with married life, which he sees as giving a woman something to say about how he spend his time. (pg. 132)

Anderson’s account, like Wilson’s, implies that men are more reluctant to marry than women after the birth of a child. However, Anderson interviewed few women and appears to have never directly asked teenagers what they think about marriage. Moreover, more recent female-centered work finds that perhaps women are more reluctant to marry than men (Edin, 2000).

In her article “What do low-income single mothers say about marriage?”, Edin (2000) elaborates on interviews with nearly 300 low-income¹ single mothers and concludes that while most mothers hold marriage in high regard, they have no plans or hopes for marrying the men that father their children. Edin assesses:

[T]he mothers we spoke to were quite forthcoming about the fact that the men who had fathered their children often weren’t “worth a lifetime commitment” given their general lack of trustworthiness, the traditional nature of their sex-role views, the potential loss of control over parental and household decisions, and their risky and sometimes violent behavior. While mothers maintained hopes of eventual marriage, they viewed such hopes with some level of skepticism. (pg. 129)

Wilson also reports high levels of distrust between genders, which he attributes the antagonism to economic disparity. Edin argues that women are also likely to be negative towards marriage,

¹ Edin (2000) reports that about half of her sample relied on welfare while another half worked jobs that paid less than \$7.50 per hour.

not only because of trust and economic conditions, but also because of differences in gender role expectations. She also finds, counter to Anderson and Wilson's claims, that many of these mothers have no romantic dreams of marrying their babies' fathers.

Edin's (2000) findings should perhaps not be surprising. Marriage has long been criticized by feminists as a patriarchal institution, in which women are expected to become subservient to their husbands. In 1910, Emma Goldman published the essay "Marriage and Love" and stated:

Marriage is primarily an economic arrangement, an insurance pact Its returns are insignificantly small compared with the investments If . . . woman's premium is a husband, she pays for it with her name, her privacy, her self-respect, her very life, "until death doth part." Moreover, the marriage insurance condemns her to life-long dependency, to parasitism, to complete uselessness, individual as well as social. (pg. 233-242).

Although some social scientists believe that egalitarianism has replaced patriarchal dominance within marriage (Blood and Wolfe, 1960), patterns of unequal sharing of housework and male dominance within major decision making for the household still persist (Hochschild, 1983; Ostrander, 1984). This inequality within marriage could be driving women to be reluctant to marry, especially if the men that they could marry have little or no earnings to bring home.

Overall, theory surrounding the "retreat from marriage" and growing out-of-wedlock childbearing cannot be used to make a clear distinction as to which gender, if either, would be more reluctant to marry. Some, descriptive ethnographic studies of the inner-city men suggest that it is men who are running away from commitment (Anderson 1990; Wilson 1987).

However, interviews with women suggest that unmarried mothers are reluctant to marry for more than just economic reasons (Edin 2000). These qualitative studies apply to only the poorest of unmarried parents, however. By focusing on gender regarding attitudes about marriage among

new unmarried parents, I am able to address the need for research that directly examines gender differences in interest in marriage.

Data & Methods

The Fragile Families and Child Well-Being study is a nationally representative survey of nearly 10,000 new parents. Due to deliberate over-sampling on non-marital births, only one-third are married; I use only unmarried respondents for this paper. Researchers collected the first wave of the data in a sample of 20 U.S. cities where the population is greater than 200,000 in the hospitals very soon after each mother had given birth (the data are representative of non-marital births in large cities when weighted). Having both mother and father interviews is an important and innovative feature of the Fragile Families study and makes these data an excellent source for studying gender differences in marriage attitudes. However, interviewers were not able to question every father; therefore I limit this analysis by omitting cases where a mother was interviewed but a father was not. By limiting the analysis to cases where both were interviewed, a possible selection bias is eliminated. In the cases where men could not be interviewed, it is highly likely that they were the fathers to have the weakest relationship with the mother since she either refused to allow interviewers to contact him, interviewers were unable to contact him or he refused to be interviewed. If the analysis included the mothers in these couples but excluded the fathers, it would distort the gender comparison.

The survey asked respondents to assess their overall attitudes towards marriage as well as the hopes they had for marrying their baby's mother or father in the future. I use these items for my analysis. There are 3,038 unmarried, romantically-involved mothers are included in the data, but only 83% of the fathers of those mothers' babies were interviewed. Overall there are 2,013 couples where both mother and father were interviewed. However, not every individual of the

5,026 responded on every variable used in this analysis. After dropping cases because of missing values, my final sample of unmarried romantically-involved men and women is 3,364. Slightly more fathers than mothers were dropped for missing values – the percentage of men and women in the 3,364 is 49% and 51%, respectively (or 1,643 and 1,721 cases, respectively).

Dependent Variables

I use five questions to assess gender differences in marriage hopes and attitudes. Current relationship questions include: “What is the chance that you will marry your baby’s mother/father?” and “How would your overall happiness change if you were married to you baby’s mother/father?” Both are measured on a five point scale ranging from “No chance” to “Certain” and “Much worse” to “Much better,” respectively. Questions relating to marriage in general include: “All in all, there are more advantages to being single than to being married,” “It is better for a couple to get married than just live together” and “Living together is just the same as being married.” Respondents are asked to respond with “Strongly disagree,” “Disagree,” “Agree” or “Strongly agree” for each. I arranged responses so that the “pro-marriage” response was coded high.

Independent Variables

Besides gender, the explanatory variables I use in every model of this analysis include race, educational attainment, income, gender role attitudes, distrust of the other gender, age, religiosity and reported drug use.

Race, Educational Attainment, and Income

Many researchers have focused on the different rates of marriage across races. Although there are many possible explanations for these differences, evidence has shown that within races, gender differences may exist. Past attitudinal measures and ethnographies suggest that black

men are more negative about marriage than black women (Anderson, 1990; Wilson, 1987); however, both studies emphasize the male perspective in their analysis. Other studies have suggested that Hispanic men are more positive about marriage than Hispanic women (South, 1993). I control for race in my analysis of gender effects. I also consider race/gender interactions, allowing for the possibility that any gender difference in interest in marriage varies by race. In the extreme, it would be possible to find women much more interested than marriage than men in one race/ethnic group, while men are much more interested in another.

Theory surrounding women's increased economic opportunity has suggested that women with higher levels of education and income may be less likely to desire marriage. Research regarding specific bargaining within marriage shows that after marriage, housework increases for women but not men (South & Spitze, 1994). Therefore women devoted to careers may be less inclined to see marriage as a bargain. However the evidence regarding women's employment and marriage is somewhat inconsistent (Ellwood & Jencks, 2001) and Becker's theory implies that both men and women will see less of a gain from marriage and will therefore both be less desirous of it.

In contrast, both Becker's theory of specialization and Wilson's unmarriageable men hypothesis suggest that men's high levels of education and income predict marriage for men. Men with more income seem to benefit from the bargain of marriage and men with high educational attainment and income are "marriageable" and will therefore depend less upon peer group status to make up for feelings of inadequacy. Indeed, the empirical evidence supports such generalizations; high educational attainment and income for men has been shown to have a positive effect on their marriage rates (Cooney & Hogan, 1991). Of course, both theories do not specifically predict whether this increase in marriage is because the men desire marriage more as

their education increases, or because they are more desirable potential husbands. For this reason, I include measures of respondents own and current partner's highest education level achieved (as well as other indicators of SES) in my analysis.

I represent gender, race and educational attainment with dummy variables. Two questions regarding race were asked of each respondent. Interviewers first asked mothers and fathers "Which of these categories best describes your race" to which they could have responded "white," "black, African-American," "Asian or Pacific Islander," "American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut," or "other, specify" and then asked "Are you of Hispanic of Latino origin or descent." Thus, I was able to identify individuals who self-identified as Hispanic regardless of how they self-identified concerning race. In the sample I use, the majority of respondents were black (55% of men and 56% of women), followed by Hispanic (28% of females, 30% of males), and white (17% of females, 14% of males). I do not include respondents who identified as American Indian, Asian, Pacific Islander or "other" due to small numbers in the sample.

I classified each individual into one of three categories for education: those with no high school diploma, those with only a high school diploma or GED and those with some form post high school education. In the sample for this analysis, roughly 39% of women had no high school diploma, 34% only a high school diploma or GED and 27% had post high school education.² For men approximately 40% had no high school diploma, 36% only a high school diploma or GED and 24% had obtained post high school education. I use age at the time of the birth; the mean age for mothers is approximately 24 and for fathers it is approximately 26.

² Respondents' are coded as having post high school education if they answer any of the following options: "some college or two year degree," "technical or trade school," "Bachelor's degree," or "graduate or professional school" to the question "What is the highest grade or year of regular school that you have complete?" The majority of those coded with post high school education answered "some college or two year degree" (78% of mothers and 79% of fathers). The percentage of mothers and fathers who answered "technical or trade school" is 12% for both genders, "bachelor's degree" is 8% for both and "graduate or professional school" is 2% of both the men and women coded as having post high school education.

In the Fragile Families data, participants report their individual annual earnings by category. Ranges include “Under \$1,000,” “\$1,000 to \$2,999,” “\$3,000 to \$3,999,” “4,000 to \$4,999,” “\$5,000 to \$5,999,” “\$6,000 to \$6,999,” “\$7,000 to \$7,999,” “\$8,000 to \$8,999,” “\$9,000 to \$9,999,” “\$10,000 to \$12,499,” “\$12,500 to \$14,999,” “\$15,000 to \$17, 499,” “\$17,500 to \$19,999,” “\$20,000 to \$24,999,” and “\$25,000 or more.” For this analysis, I assigned each woman an income equal to the middle of each range that they chose except for those who chose the last category; they were assigned an income equal to \$40,000 (1.6 times \$25,000, which approximates assuming the Pareto Distribution for the right tail). Women who said that they did not have income from earnings were changed from missing to having a score of zero on earned income. The range of men’s income included “Under \$5,000,” “5,000 to \$9,999,” “\$10,000 to \$14,999,” “\$15,000 to \$19,999,” “\$20,000 to \$24,999,” “\$25,000 to \$34,999,” “\$35,000 to \$49,999,” “\$50,000 to \$74,999,” and “Greater than \$75,000.” Men’s income was assigned by middle of the category through the same process as women’s income. However, the final range for men, “greater than \$75,000,” was assigned \$140,000 (1.6 times \$75,000). The mean income for women and men after I assigned income levels is \$6,025 and \$17,754, respectively. In each model, I represent income in thousands of dollars. I use a dummy that is coded 1 for those who reported no income from earnings. Thus, if there is a nonlinearity in the effect of earnings, such that there are special effects of having had no employment at all, this will be captured in the coefficient on this dummy, and the linear effect of earnings will be captured by its coefficient.

Gender Role Ideology and Distrust of the Other Gender

Differences in gender role attitudes and high levels of distrust regarding the other gender may also play apart in any gender difference regarding marriage attitudes. In studies that

examine divorce, researchers have found that women's traditional views regarding gender roles promote remaining in marriage, while men's traditional views actually predict divorce (Sanchez & Gager, 2000; Sanchez, Manning & Smock, 1998). Although in this analysis I examine unmarried parents, gender role ideology may have similar effects for men and women as in the studies of divorce. Indeed, some have hypothesized that less-traditional gender-role ideology in men should promote marriage in the future due to a restructuring of marriage as an institution (Goldscheider & Waite, 1986). In other words, as marriage becomes less about specific specialization of each gender and more about lifetime partnership, men who have less traditional gender-role ideology should be more positive about the new form of marriage and at the same time more attractive to women with egalitarian gender role attitudes. High levels of distrust of either gender may also play a part in men and women's feelings about marriage.

I use respondent's level of agreement with the statement "The important decisions in the family should be made by the man of the house" to measure gender role attitudes in this analysis. Respondents could either strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3), or strongly agree (4). Approximately 86% of both men and women disagree or strongly disagree. I use the Z-score value for individual score in each model. Interpretation of the gender role attitude variable should then be thought of in terms of standard deviations from the mean score.

I measure distrust of the other gender using a scale of respondent's level of agreement to two separate questions in this analysis. Interviewers asked both mothers and fathers "In a dating relationship, a woman/man is largely out to take advantage of a man." and "Women/Men cannot be trusted to be faithful." Respondents could either "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree" or "strongly disagree." I code high levels of distrust of the other gender as high. Men and women

responded on average, “disagree;” both means are approximately equal to 2. I converted individual scores into Z-score value to be used for this analysis.

Religiosity, Age and Drug Use

Other variables that I examine regarding gender differences in marriage attitudes are religiosity, age and drug use. Religiosity has been shown to be a significant predictor of marriage and a significant predictor that a couple will not have a child out-of-wedlock (Thornton, Axinn, and Hill, 1992). Those who report higher religious attendance, therefore, should have more traditional views about marriage as well as a higher reported chance of marrying their baby’s mother or father. Women have been shown to be more religious than men (Batson and Ventis, 1992; Caplow, Bahr, and Chadwick, 1983), therefore I account for in this analysis. Respondents were asked “About how often do you attend religious services?” Possible scores are “Once a week or more,” “Several times a month,” “Several times a year,” “Hardly ever,” or “Not at all.” Frequent attendance is coded high. The mean scores for both men and women (2.6 and 2.8, respectively) are between “several times a month” and “several times a year.” I use a Z-score value.

Age effects are also generally found in attitudes about marriage, but the extent to which this is a cohort effect or simply that the pool of unmarried older adults is more negative about marriage because those who are positive have selected into marriage is unclear (Oppenheimer, 1988). Age is important when considering gender effects since traditionally women have gotten married at younger ages compared to men.

I also take into account reported drug use based on the conjecture that those who are heavily involved may be less positive about marriage or the possibility of marriage due to low relationship quality. And based on the same logic, I include partner’s reported drug use as well.

Reported drug use is a 5-point scale for both mothers and fathers. Interviewers asked mothers “During your pregnancy how often did you use drugs such as marijuana, crack cocaine, or heroin?” and asked fathers “In the past three months, about how often did you use drugs such a marijuana, crack cocaine, or heroin?” Both responded with either “Nearly every day,” “Several times a week,” “Several times a month,” “Less than once a month” or “Never”. “Nearly every day” is coded high. Ninety-four percent of mothers reported never using drugs compared to 82% of fathers. I use a Z-score value for reported individual drug use in this analysis.

Current Relationship Characteristics

For each dependent variable I include one model that includes measures of the individual’s current couple relationship. I include measures of quality, cohabitation, length of time that parents have known each other, and conflict. Quality of relationship is a scale based on an average of four items. Interviewers asked respondents “Thinking about your relationship with your Baby’s father/mother, how often would you say that: (1) He/She is fair and willing to compromise when you have a disagreement? (2) He/She expresses affection of love for you? (3) He/she insults or criticizes you or your ideas? (4) He/she encourages or helps you to do things that are important to you?” Respondents either answered “often,” “sometimes” or “never”. I code the scale so that high quality is high. The mean for both mothers and fathers is approximately 2.67. Chronbach’s alpha for this measure is .57 for mothers and .52 for fathers. I use a Z-score value for this scale in this analysis.

Time length of knowing each other is the mother’s response measured in years. I code those that knew each other less than a year at the time of pregnancy as zero. I measure cohabitation by a dummy variable. Conflict, like quality, is an average response on a scale of six items. Interviewers asked mothers and fathers how often they had a disagreement about the

following issues in the past month: money, spending time together, sex, the pregnancy, drinking or drug use, and being faithful. Responses were either “often,” “sometimes” or “never” (never is coded as high). The mean value for conflict, although practically meaningless, is 1.45 and suggests that this variable will have little statistical power since most individuals are reporting that they “never” fight about these issues (never was coded as 1). Chronbach’s alpha for mothers’ responses is .65 and .63 for fathers. For this analysis, I use a Z-score value for the conflict scale.

Method

In order to assess whether or not a gender difference exists in attitudes about marriage for new unmarried parents, I first test for gender differences in the distribution of the attitudinal variables using a chi square test for all five dependent variables. This test shows whether there are gender differences before controlling for any other factors on which men and women may differ. Then I proceed to multivariate models. As the dependent variables are categorical, I use an ordered logistical analysis for each of the models. For every dependent variable there are two models -- one with and one without current relationship quality measures. By having these two models for every dependent variable, I can examine the impact, if any, of current relationship quality on reported likelihood of marriage or attitudes about marriage. This way I can interpret whether or not a person’s current relationship is affecting his or her views on marriage. In order to assess if gender differences (if any) vary by race, I include race and gender interaction terms³ in each model.

³ In models not presented in this paper, I included an interaction term to see if gender significantly interacted with drug use, level of distrust of the other gender, religiosity gender role ideology and in models including current relationship quality variables; I also included an interaction term for gender and reported quality of relationship and gender and reported level of conflict. While some interactions were significant, most were small, and signs of gender effects never changed within most of the range of the interacting variable. Thus, I show models without these interactions here.

Results

In table 1 I report the aggregate responses to each marriage attitude question or statement by gender. The responses that I show are only those of unmarried parents who were both interviewed. Each non-independence test proved to be significant ($p < .01$). Since the tests reveal that mothers and fathers differ in terms of their attitudes towards marriage, we can assess who rated marriage more positively.

It appears that, in terms of the current relationship, fathers may be more positive about marriage than mothers. Indeed, fathers answered with more certainty to the question “What is the chance that you will marry your baby’s mother/father?” and more positively to the question “How would your overall happiness change if you were married to you baby’s mother/father?” than mothers did. However, the substantive difference in overall percentage who were pro-marriage (those that answered “good” or “certain” to the first item or “some better” or “much better” to the second) is not large. Regarding reported chance of marriage there is a difference of 8% regarding change in overall happiness there is a difference of 7% (both with men answering more positively).

The results concerning overall marriage attitudes are less straightforward. In panel 3, mothers were more likely to disagree with the statement “All in all, there are more advantages to being single than to being married.” However, in panel 4, fathers were more likely to answer in agreement to the statement “It is better for a couple to get married than to just live together.” One explanation for the difference could be that the questions are not measuring the same general attitudes about marriage.

The question regarding cohabitation (panel 4) could be picking up on an individual’s traditional or religious beliefs that may disagree with couples living together without being

married. Men tend to have more traditional views about gender roles within marriage, (Blee and Tickameyer, 1995) but women are more conservative about the appropriateness of sex outside marriage (Laumann, Gagnon, Michael & Michaels, 1994). The two facts lead to conflicting predictions regarding which gender would favor marriage over living together. The question regarding whether or not there are more advantages to being single than to being married is the only question with a definite gender difference where men are less pro-marriage than women. Perhaps it is not surprising that unmarried fathers think that there are more advantages to being single than unmarried mothers do – typically men still make more money than women and, given the double standard of sexuality, unmarried mothers are more likely to be looked down upon for being unmarried than unmarried fathers. Moreover, men are less constrained by the baby than women, and thus freer to pursue dating. The substantive difference between men and women on this item, it is important to remember, is less than five percent.

Panel 5 displays the question with the least amount of gender difference.⁴ Being asked to agree or disagree with the statement “living together is the same as being married” is perhaps the broadest question in terms of attitudes towards marriage. The minor difference in gender shows that women were slightly (only by 1%) more likely to feel that marriage is different than just living together.

Tables 3 and 4 present the ordered logistic analysis results for the five models. In the first two models (“What is the chance you will marry your baby’s mother/father” is the dependent variable) race and gender do not interact and gender is significant. Men are significantly more likely to report a greater chance of marrying their baby’s mother than women are to report marrying their baby’s father, and the lack of interaction with race implies that this is

⁴ The means for men and women are not significantly different on this item and in an ordered logit model where gender was the only predictor, gender was not significant, although the chi-square test shows a significant difference in the detailed distributions.

true to an equal extent across all three races. Table 3 reports the predicted probabilities for men and women for the highest two categories (most pro-marriage) and lowest two (least pro-marriage) in model 2, which included current relationship quality measures. Overall, when all other variables (including dummies) are set at their mean men have a probability of .84, and women a probability of .76 of giving either of the two highest category responses. The reader should take notice of the high reported probability of marriage in this sample, a surprising finding, which has been noted by other researchers using this data (Gibson & Edin, 2002; Carlson, McLanahan, & England, 2002). For my purposes, the important finding is that unmarried fathers are more confident than their female partners are that they will marry the other parent of their new baby.

Race and gender interact for some dependent variables. This means the gender effect differs by race, so additional calculations are necessary to see what the gender effect is in each race groups. In table 4 I present the predicted probabilities for model 4 which includes current relationship quality measures on the item “How would your overall happiness change if you were married to your baby’s mother/father?”. Since gender and race interact in model 4, I present predicted probabilities by race when necessary. The gender difference in Hispanic and whites is never significantly different and therefore I present those predicted probabilities together.

Within all races, men have higher predicted probabilities for giving a more pro-marriage response when asked about how their happiness would change if they were married to the other parent. Hispanic and white men have a .54 probability of giving the highest two categories (most pro-marriage) while Hispanic and white women have a probability of .40. Thus, Hispanic and white men give more “pro-marriage” responses than Hispanic and white women (however, the

difference between genders in these two races is not significantly different). Black men are also more likely than Black women to give one of the 2 most pro-marriage responses; the interaction is arising from the fact that the gender difference, while in the same direction, is less strong for black than other groups, and is so small in the other groups as not to be significant. Black men have a predicted probability of .61 and Black women have a predicted probability of .54. Thus, the other thing that is striking is that both Black men and women report that their overall happiness would improve if married to their baby's other parent at a higher rate than Hispanics and white of the same gender.

The final item where gender has an effect is in models 7 and 8, "It is better for a couple to get married than to just live together". Once again, gender significantly interacts with race. The gender difference for blacks is significantly different than the gender difference within whites and Hispanics (the gender difference in whites versus Hispanics is not significantly different). The predicted probabilities in table 6, which are derived from model 8, are reported for black men and women separately from Hispanic and white men and women.

Once again, Hispanic and white men are more "pro-marriage" than Hispanic and white women, and again, the differences between the genders for both Hispanics and whites are not significantly different. The probability for Hispanic and white men to give one of the two highest category (most pro-marriage) answers is .63. The probability for Hispanic and white women to give the same pro-marriage responses is .45. The predicted probability for black men and women is .63. In regards to this item, the outliers seem to be white and Hispanic women, who are least likely to think marriage is better than cohabitation than all the other groups.

This item is the most general regarding marriage and is interesting in regards to what we know about actual marriage instances across races. Blacks get married later in life and less often

than other racial groups (Rodgers & Thornton, 1985) and it has been hypothesized that this may be due to decreasing value of marriage among blacks (Thornton, 1989). However, my findings negate such claims and instead suggest that *high regard* for marriage may be one reason that blacks marry less often or later in life. This is consistent with qualitative work with new unmarried parents. Gibson, Edin, and McLanahan's (2002) qualitative interviews of unmarried parents suggest that romantically involved unmarried parents have a high bar for marriage. They do not claim to find racial differences, which is inconsistent with my findings, however, this may be due to their small sample size (N below 50).

Highest level of education obtained and income have no consistent pattern across the models in which they have significant effects. Neither are significant predictors in the models 7 and 8 ("It is better for a couple to get married than just live together"). Education and income are significant and positive predicting pro-marriage responses in the models with the dependent variables: "All in all, there are more advantages to being single than to being married", "Living together is the same as being married" and "What is the chance you will marry your baby's mother/father." Thus, higher SES is associated with more "pro-marriage" responses to these items.

However, the SES effect switches direction in models 3 and 4, "How would your overall happiness change if you were married to your baby's mother/father?". Respondents who have no high school diploma have greater odds in giving "pro-marriage" responses than respondents who have only a high school diploma and income has a weak negative effect. Why do variables measuring SES have a negative effect on an individual's predicted reported change in happiness if married? It could be due to how respondents read the question. If respondents read this question as "How would your overall happiness change if all barriers keeping you from marrying

your baby's mother/father were removed and you could get married?" then this finding regarding SES makes sense. If couples with the least amount of education and income are those who have, in their own opinion, the greatest obstacles to overcome before they can get married, then their reported happiness if married would be higher than couples with more education and income and less barriers. In their analysis of the qualitative data, one of the most frequently cited reasons that couples gave for postponing marriage was financial barriers (Gibson, Edin and McLanahan, 2002). If economics are an issue for low SES couples and they read the question as if all obstacles were removed, their predicted greater increase in happiness makes sense.

Two independent variables which perform as expected across models are frequency of religious service attendance and distrust of the other gender. A person's religiosity promotes pro-marriage attitudes significantly across all ten models. The biggest substantial effect is in models 7 and 8, "It is better for a couple to get married than to just live together." Distrust of the other gender, not surprisingly, negatively impacts the likelihood of giving "pro-marriage" responses. Distrust decreases the likelihood of a "pro-marriage" response on items "All in all, there are more advantages to being single than to being married" and to "Living together is the same as being married." General distrust of the other gender also decreases the likelihood of predicting that one will marry his or her current partner. Indeed, distrust negatively impacts responses to "What is the chance you will marry your baby's mother/father?" even after current relationship quality controls. A person's feelings of distrust regarding being taken advantage of or cheated on by the other gender therefore impact the relationship in which he or she is currently involved, even when relationship quality is controlled.

Traditional gender role attitudes do not have a clear or consistent impact on marriage attitudes. A person who reports being traditional is significantly ($p < .10$) more likely to give a

more “pro-marriage” response to predicted amount of happiness change if married to his or her partner, but the effect is quite small. Traditional gender role ideology also positively affects pro-marriage attitudes in models 7 and 8 (“It is better for a couple to get married than to just live together”); this finding is not surprising. A person who is traditional in one aspect regarding family life is likely to be traditional (i.e. more “pro-marriage”) in other aspects as well. What is surprising is the negative impact traditional gender role attitudes have on pro-marriage responses to the two other items regarding general marriage attitudes (“All in all, there are more advantages to being single than to being married” and “Living together is the same as being married,” both which are reverse coded in the analysis so that pro-marriage responses are high). It is unclear why a person with traditional views regarding gender roles would have less pro-marriage responses than a person with more egalitarian gender role beliefs. In regards to the negative impact traditional gender role attitudes have on the item “Living together is the same as being married” (reverse coded), it could be that those who are traditional in gender role ideology are more likely to believe that cohabitation suggests a serious commitment than individuals with more egalitarian gender role beliefs. In other words, they may be more likely to believe that sharing a household (and a bed) is equivalent to being married.

Current relationship quality variables are significant predictors across models. Not surprisingly, the quality scale is significant and positive in models addressing the current relationship: “What is the chance you will marry your baby’s mother/father?” and “How would your overall happiness change if you were married to your baby’s mother/father?” Although substantially smaller, the quality scale is also a positive predictor for more pro-marriage responses in models predicting general attitudes about marriage. “All in all there are more advantages to being single than to being married” and “It is better for a couple to get married

than to just live together” are positively affected by relationship quality. This suggests that an individual’s response to questions assessing marriage attitudes in general are often thought of in terms of his or her current relationship, despite the fact that the questions don’t directly address it. Similarly, reported conflict has a negative impact on pro-marriage responses to an item addressing current relationship and to one that addressing overall marriage attitudes; they are “What is the chance you will marry your baby’s mother/father?” and “All in all there are more advantages to being single than to being married.” Not surprisingly, higher reports of conflict within a romantic relationship will make an individual less likely to predict marriage. The negative impact of conflict regarding the benefit of being married, like quality, suggests that responses to general attitudes about marriage are shaped at least somewhat by an individuals’ current relationship.

Cohabitation has a positive impact on the reported likelihood that individuals will report that they are likely to get married, but a negative impact on their reported change in happiness if married (Model 4) and their belief that marriage and cohabitation are inherently different (Model 10). I take these findings to mean that couples who are cohabiting see cohabitation as a large commitment, one similar to marriage, and therefore would not expect a great increase in happiness if married. Also, as a practical matter, less would change for cohabiting couples if they married. Because of their high level of commitment they also report a greater likelihood of getting married compared to non-cohabiters. Another interpretation of the negative impact on general attitudes about marriage (model 10) could be that when compared to other romantically involved unmarried new parents, cohabiting couples may have more liberal attitudes about marriage in general.

The number of years a couple has known each other has a similar effect on attitudes about marriage as cohabitation. Couples who have know each other longer report a greater chance of marriage (Model 2), but are less likely to report greater happiness if married to their baby's other parent (Model 4) and disagree that cohabitation and marriage are innately different (Model 10). This finding could be that while length of time known each other predicts marriage, for unmarried parents it also predicts more liberal views about marriage since, despite greater length of knowing one another, they did not choose to have a "shot gun" marriage before the birth of their child.

In one aspect, the most surprising result of this analysis has been the poor predictive power of characteristics of respondents' partners in predicting how pro-marriage they are, even on questions about the current relationship. There is no consistent significant effect of current partner's characteristics in any of the models, even when not controlling for relationship quality⁵ (and thus letting coefficients on partner characteristic pick-up any effect of partners' characteristics mediated through relationship quality). When compared to the significant effect of current relationship quality, it appears that perhaps more important than characteristics of one's current partner is the respondent's view of the quality of the relationship.

In their paper using the same data as this paper, Carlson, McLanahan and England (2003) found both fathers' and mothers' positive attitudes towards marriage to be predictive of marriage one year after an unmarried birth, and use a scale of three indicators of general marriage attitudes ("It is better for a couple to get married than to just live together", "It is better for children if their parents are married", and "Living together is just the same as being married" (reverse coded)). In results not shown, I replicated their statistical model predicting marriage, but added all five attitudinal items used in this paper. I found that both parents' responses to four of the

⁵ Models where partner characteristics are included without measures of current relationship quality are not shown.

five items significant predicted having married by one year after the birth.⁶ Nonetheless, of unmarried parents romantically involved at the birth of their child, only 11% had married by one year later.

Discussion/Conclusion

Theories surrounding changing family structure provide no distinct prediction as to which gender in the retreat from marriage would be more likely to marry. Conventional wisdom and past ethnographic work that attempted to speak to the retreat and the rising out-of-wedlock childbearing have assumed and/or attempted to demonstrate that men are more reluctant to marry than women. By using data from the Fragile Families and Child Well-Being study, I have capitalized on the unique sampling design and have investigated romantically involved new unmarried mothers' and fathers' attitudes about marriage, specifically in terms of their own relationship as well as in terms of marriage in general. I have demonstrated that, despite conventional wisdom, unmarried fathers claim to be more interested in marriage than their female partners. Unmarried fathers are also more likely to say that their happiness would increase if married to their current partner than unmarried mothers. Unmarried Hispanic and white fathers are more likely to give "pro-marriage" answers than their female counterparts when asked about marriage irrespective of their current relationship (they are more likely to agree with the statement "It is better for a couple to get married than to just live together").

⁶ Specifically I found that responses to "What is the chance you will marry your baby's father/mother?" to positively affect the odds ratios of all higher versus lower cut points for relationship status one year later (significance of $p < .001$ for each) (Cut points are equal to broken up versus romantically involved but not cohabiting, cohabiting and married; broken up and romantically involved versus cohabiting and married; broken-up, romantically involved and cohabiting versus married). I found pro-marriage answers to "Being single is better than being married." significantly and positively affect the three higher versus lower cut points for relationship status one year later (significance of $p < .05$ for each). Responses to "It is better for a couple to get married than to just live together" also positively affected relationship status for broken up and romantically involved versus cohabiting and married ($p < .05$) and for all non-married versus married categories ($p < .001$). Pro-marriage responses to "Living together is the same as being married" had a positive impact on the odds ratio of non-married versus married at time two ($p < .10$).

My results suggest that Edin's (2000) findings that unmarried, poor women are cautiously reluctant to marry for multiple reasons may generalize to all unmarried women, although the population of all unmarried mothers is economically more heterogeneous. These findings also suggest that Wilson and Anderson's ethnographic work was perhaps too focused on the male perspective in regards to marriage. Their findings, that men talk among themselves in ways suggesting a reluctance to marry, are not supported in my analysis which reveals that overall unmarried fathers report a higher likelihood of marriage, and a higher predicted level of happiness if married than unmarried mothers. Again, not only are men more positive about marriage regarding their current relationship, they may be more positive about marriage in general, as unmarried fathers were more likely to have "pro-marriage" responses than their female partners. While marriage has clearly changed in an egalitarian direction, the greater reluctance of women than men to marry suggests that its remaining patriarchal associations – real or anticipated – need to change before as many women as men will be positive about marriage.

Works Cited

- Akerlof, George A., Janet L. Yellen, and Michael L. Katz. (1996). An analysis of out-of-wedlock childbearing in the United States. Quarterly Journal of Economics 111(2): 277-317.
- Anderson, Elijah. (1990). Streetwise: Race, Class, and Change in an Urban Community. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Becker, Gary S. (1981). A Treatise on the Family. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Batson, Daniel C. and W. Larry Ventis. (1982). The Religious Experience. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Blee, Kathleen M., and Ann R. Tickameyer. (1995). Racial differences in men's attitudes about women's gender roles. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57: 21-30.
- Brown, Susan L. (2000). Union transitions among cohabitators: The significance of relationship assessments and expectations. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62: 833-846.
- Bulcroft, Richard A. and Kris A. Bulcroft. (1993) Race differences in Attitudinal and motivational factors in the decision to marry. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 55: 338-355.
- Caplow, Theodore, Howard M. Bahr, and Bruce A. Chadwick. (1983). All Faithful People: Change and Continuity in Middetown's Religion. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Carlson, Marcia, Sara McLanahan, and Paula England. (2002). Union formation and

- dissolution in fragile families. *Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Population Association of America, 2001.*
- Cooney, T.M., & D.P. Hogan. (1991). Marriage in an institutionalized life course: First marriage among American men in the twentieth century. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53: 178-190.
- Edin, Kathryn. (2000). What do low-income single mothers say about marriage? *Social Problems*, 47: 112-133.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara. (1983). *The Hearts of Men: American Dreams and the Flight from Commitment*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Ellwood, David T. and Christopher Jencks. (2001). The growing differences in family structure: What do we know? Where do we look for answers? *Paper prepared as part of the New Inequality Program supported by the Russell Sage Foundation.*
- Gibson, Christina and Kathryn Edin (2002). High hopes but even higher expectations: The retreat from marriage among low-income couples. Paper presented at the 2002 Population Association Annual Meeting, Atlanta, GE. 6 May.
- Goldscheider, F. K., & Waite, L.J. (1986). Sex differences in the entry into marriage. *American Journal of Sociology*, 92: 91-109.
- Goldman, Emma. (1910). Marriage and love. *Anarchism and Other Essays*. Port Washington: NY: Kennikat Press, 233-242.
- Harknett, Kristen, and Sara McLanahan. (2002). Racial differences in marriage among new, unmarried parents: Evidence from the fragile families and child wellbeing study. *Center for Research on Child Wellbeing Working Paper #02-08-FF.*
- Horn, Wade F. and Isabel V. Sawhill. (2001). Fathers, marriage, and welfare reform.

- The New World of Welfare. Rebecca Blank and Ron Haskins, Eds. Washington, D.C.:
Brookings Institution Press.
- Laumann, Edward O., John H. Gagnon, Robert T. Michael, and Stuart Michaels. (1994). *The Social Organization of Sexuality: Sexual Practices in the United States*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- McLanahan, Sara and Irwin Garfinkel. (2000). The fragile families and child wellbeing study: Questions, design and few preliminary results. *Center for Research on Child Wellbeing Working Paper #00-07*.
- McLanahan, Sara, and Gary Sandefur. (1994). Growing Up with a Single Parent: What Hurts, What Helps. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Oppenheimer, Valerie Kincade. (1988). A theory of marriage timing. American Journal of Sociology, 94: 563-591.
- Ostrander, Susan A. 1984. *Women of the Upper Class*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Sanchez, Laura, Manning and Smock. (1998). Sex specialized or collaborative mate selection? Union transitions among cohabitators. Social Science Research, 27: 280-304.
- Sanchez, Laura & Constance Gager. (2000). Hard living, perceived entitlement to a great marriage and marital dissolution. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62: 708-722.
- South, Scott. 1993. Racial and ethnic differences in the desire to marry. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 55: 357-370.
- Teachman, Jay D., Karen A. Polonko, & Geoffrey K. Leigh. (1987). Marital timing: Race and sex comparisons. Social Forces, 66:239-268.
- Thornton, A. W.G. Axinn, and D.H. Hill. (1992). Reciprocal effects of religiosity,

cohabitation, and marriage. American Journal of Sociology, 98(3): 628-651

Thornton, A. and L. Young-DeMarco. (2001). Four decades of attitudes toward family issues in the United States: The 1960s through the 1990s. Journal of Marriage and Family, 64(4): 1009-1037.

Wilson, William J. (1996). When Work Disappears. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Wilson, William J. (1987). The Truly Disadvantaged. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of dependent variables of unmarried parents, by gender

Panel 1: What is the chance you will marry your baby's mother/father?	Mothers		Fathers		
1. No chance	258	9.5%	179	6.6%	
2. A little	229	8.5%	153	5.7%	
3. 50-50	494	18.3%	427	15.8%	
4. Good	683	25.2%	678	25.1%	
5. Certain	1042	38.5%	1269	46.9%	
N	2706		2706		
Chi-square/ sex nonindependence test	56.6***				
Panel 2: How would your overall happiness change if you were married to your baby's mother/father?	1. Much worse	69	2.6%	49	1.9%
	2. Some worse	116	4.4%	103	3.9%
	3. Same	1196	45.2%	1041	39.3%
	4. Some better	578	21.8%	605	22.9%
	5. Much better	687	26.0%	848	32.1%
	N	2646		2646	
	Chi-square/ sex nonindependence test	32.4***			
Panel 3: All in all, there are more advantages to being single than to being married.	1. Strongly agree	136	5.2%	212	8.1%
	2. Agree	784	29.8%	820	31.2%
	3. Disagree	1526	58.1%	1394	53.0%
	4. Strongly disagree	182	6.9%	202	7.7%
	N	2628		2628	
	Chi-square/ sex nonindependence test	25.8***			
Panel 4: It is better for a couple to get married than to just live together.	1. Strongly disagree	116	4.4%	100	3.8%
	2. Disagree	1087	40.9%	892	33.6%
	3. Agree	1001	36.7%	1176	44.3%
	4. Strongly agree	452	17.0%	488	18.4%
	N	2656		2656	
	Chi-square/ sex nonindependence test	36.02***			
Panel 5: Living together is just the same as being married.	1. Strongly agree	181	6.7%	229	8.5%
	2. Agree	1151	42.6%	1076	39.8%
	3. Disagree	1171	43.3%	1190	44.0%
	4. Strongly disagree	200	7.4%	208	7.7%
	N	2703		2703	
	Chi-square/ sex nonindependence test	7.71**			

*** p<.001

** p<.01

Table 2a: Ordered Logistical Regression

	What is the chance you will marry your baby's mother/father?		How would your overall happiness change if you were married to your baby's mother/father?	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Gender (Male)	.441 *	.574 **	.663 ***	.666 ***
Race (White = reference)				
Black	-1.076 ***	-.805 ***	.732 ***	.670 ***
Hispanic	-.508 **	-.555 ***	.276 +	.248 +
Education (HS diploma only=reference)				
No Diploma	-.290 ***	-.339 ***	.210 **	.237 **
Post HS Educ	.104	.065	-.027	-.030
Frequency of Drug Use (Z-score)	-.093 **	-.016	.008	.017
Income (in \$1,000s)	.013 ***	.006 +	-.005 +	-.005 +
No Income Dummy (not employed last year)	.094	.063	.020	.012
Distrust (Z-score)	-.323 ***	-.215 ***	-.071 *	-.044
Traditional Gender Role Attitude (Z-score)	-.002	.019	.064 +	.063 +
Religiosity (Z-score)	.153 ***	.115 **	.159 ***	.114 **
Age	-.011 +	-.014 *	-.002	.003
Quality Variables				
Quality Scale (Z-score)		.615 ***		.233 ***
Conflict Scale (Z-score)		-.141 ***		.053
Cohab		.954 ***		-.285 ***
Years Known Each Other Before Birth		.026 **		-.014 +
Partner Variables				
Partner No Diploma		-.096		-.090
Partner Post High School		-.041		-.022
Partner Income From Earnings (in \$1,000s)		.004		.002
Partner No Income From Earnings		.014		.094
Partner Traditional Gender Role Attitude (Z-score)		-.002		.020
Partner Distrust of Other Gender (Z-score)		-.082 *		-.016
Partner Religiosity (Z-score)		.108 **		.089 *
Partner Frequency of Drug Use (Z-score)		-.069 *		.062 +
Interactions				
Black*Male	.016	-.070	-.393 *	-.407 *
Hispanic*Male	-.049	.018	-.253	-.231
_Cut1	-4.502	-4.251	-3.944	-4.146
_Cut2	-3.356	-3.000	-2.635	-2.833
_Cut3	-1.953	-1.397	.508	.339
_Cut4	-.636	.126	1.490	1.338
N	3364	3364	3364	3364
X ²	388	1010	135	207
X ² for Difference Between 2 Models	626		80.3	

Pro-marriage responses are always coded high

*** p<=.001, ** p<=.01, * p<=.05, + p<=.10

Table 2b: Ordered Logistical Regression

	All in all, there are more advantages to being single than to being married.		It is better for a couple to get married than to just live together.		Living together is the same as being married.	
	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8	Model 9	Model 10
Gender (Male)	-.105	-.099	.725 ***	.778 ***	.102	.115
Race (White = reference)						
Black	-.482 ***	-.404 **	.857 ***	.863 ***	.290 *	.168
Hispanic	-.485 **	-.469 **	.307 *	.271 +	-.635 ***	-.689 ***
Education (HS diploma only = reference)						
No Diploma	-.205 *	-.187 *	-.043	-.068	-.029	-.022
Post HS Educ	.331 ***	.293 **	-.090	-.090	.237 **	.221 *
Frequency of Drug Use (Z-score)	-.023	-.003	-.026	-.008	-.023	-.018
Income (in \$1,000s)	.008 *	.005 +	.001	.000	.006 *	.007 *
No Income Dummy	.092	.098	-.038	-.046	-.065	-.062
Distrust (Z-score)	-.346 ***	-.311 ***	.014	.031	-.102 **	-.103 **
Traditional Gender Role Attitude (Z-score)	-.195 ***	-.183 ***	.233 ***	.222 ***	-.100 **	-.109 **
Religiosity (Z-score)	.188 ***	.180 ***	.371 ***	.335 ***	.171 ***	.133 ***
Age	.010	.010	-.002	-.001	-.006	-.001
Quality Variables						
Quality Scale (Z-score)		.120 **		.059 +		.019
Conflict Scale (Z-score)		-.103 **		-.055		-.002
Cohab		.155 *		-.107		-.467 ***
Years Known Each Other Before Birth		.004		-.011		-.023 **
Partner Variables						
Partner No Diploma		-.056		.032		.010
Partner Post High School		.248 *		-.104		.031
Partner Income From Earnings (in \$1,000s)		-.001		.004		.003
Partner No Income From Earnings		-.081		.097		.009
Partner Traditional Gender Role Attitude (Z-score)		-.040		.067 +		.033
Partner Distrust of Other Gender (Z-score)		.004		-.003		.027
Partner Religiosity (Z-score)		.011		.083		.065 +
Partner Frequency of Drug Use (Z-score)		.074 *		-.034		-.017
Interactions						
Black*Male	-.098	-.102	-.784 ***	-.081 ***	-.205	-.221
Hispanic*Male	.031	.076	-.070	-.090	.143	.139
_Cut1	-3.090	-3.010	-2.790	-2.769	-2.686	-3.003
_Cut2	-.853	-.746	.208	.230	-.129	-.419
_Cut3	2.480	2.630	2.247	2.281	2.563	2.303
_Cut4						
N	3364	3364	3364	3364	3364	3364
X ²	328	381	292	318	195	253
X ² for Difference Between 2 Models	53.3		33.7		69.7	

Pro-marriage responses are always coded high

*** p<=.001, ** p<=.01, * p<=.05, + p<=.10

**Table 3: Predicted Probabilities by gender for:
"What is the chance you will marry your baby's mother/father?"**

Predicted Probabilities for Model 2

	Lowest 2 Categories <u>Least Pro-Marriage</u>	Highest 2 Categories <u>Most Pro-Marriage</u>
Women	.06	.76
Men	.04	.84
Difference	.03	-.09

*Difference between genders significant
Race/gender interaction not significant*

**Table 4: Predicted Probabilities by race and gender for:
"How would your overall happiness change if you were married to your baby's mother/father?"**

Predicted Probabilities for Model 4

	Lowest 2 Categories <u>Least Pro-Marriage</u>	Highest 2 Categories <u>Most Pro-Marriage</u>
Black Women	0.03	0.54
Black Men	0.03	0.61
Difference	0.01	-0.06
Hispanic/White Women	0.06	0.40
Hispanic/White Men	0.03	0.55
Difference	0.03	-0.16

*Gender difference in whites not significantly different than gender difference in Hispanics
Gender difference in blacks significantly different than gender difference in whites and Hispanics
Race/gender interaction show the gender difference among blacks to be significantly smaller than among whites and Hispanics*

**Table 5: Predicted Probabilities by race and gender for:
"All in all, there are more advantages to being single than to being married."**

Predicted Probabilities for Model 5

	Lowest 2 Categories <u>Least Pro-Marriage</u>	Highest 2 Categories <u>Most Pro-Marriage</u>
Women & Men	0.33	0.67

*Difference between genders not significant
Race/gender interactions not significant*

**Table 6: Predicted Probabilities by race and gender for:
"It is better for a couple to get married than to just live together"**

Predicted Probabilities for Model 7

	Lowest 2 Categories <u>Least Pro-Marriage</u>	Highest 2 Categories <u>Most Pro-Marriage</u>
Black Women & Men	0.37	0.63
Hispanic/White Women	0.55	0.45
Hispanic/White Men	0.37	0.63
Difference	0.19	-0.19

*Gender difference in whites not significantly different than gender difference in Hispanics
Gender difference within blacks not significant*

**Table 7: Predicted Probabilities by race and gender for:
"Living together is the same as being married"**

Predicted Probabilities for Model 10

	Lowest 2 Categories <i>Least Pro-Marriage</i>	Highest 2 Categories <i>Most Pro-Marriage</i>
Women & Men	0.48	0.52

Difference between genders not significant

Race/gender interactions not significant