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ABSTRACT

Using data from the 1995 and 2002 cycles of the National Survey of Family Growth this study examines potential racial and ethnic variation in the role of cohabitation in the U.S. family system compared to marriage and singlehood. Cohabitation represents an increasingly prevalent family form and prior research endeavors examine the position of cohabitation. Past research suggests examining the fertility behavior of cohabitators, such as fertility rates and reports of birth intentions, as one avenue for understanding the role of cohabitation. Researchers argue that greater acceptance of childbearing within cohabiting unions suggests more similarity to marriage than singlehood. In addition, existing studies in this area argue that cohabitation may not play the same role for individuals from different racial/ethnic backgrounds.

This study looks at sexual frequency, contraceptive use, and current fertility intentions to investigate variation in the role of cohabitation for White, Black, and Mexican American men and women. Examining sexual frequency and contraceptive use sheds light on the potential factors behind documented race/ethnic differences in fertility rates among cohabitators. Looking at current fertility intentions uncovers variation in views on the acceptability of childbearing within cohabitation. Variation in attitudes associated with the second demographic transition is also examined in relation to differences in the role of cohabitation.

The results reveal that variation in sexual frequency is not a factor in fertility differences across race/ethnic groups among cohabitators. However, contraceptive use patterns differ across race/ethnic groups among cohabitators. Cohabitating Black men and women are more likely than Whites to report not using any method of contraception. In addition, cohabiting Black women also report greater use of less effective methods compared to more effective methods of contraception relative to Whites. Cohabitating Black and Mexican American women are substantially more likely to report that they are not using contraception and seeking a pregnancy compared to cohabiting White women. This suggests greater acceptance of childbearing within cohabiting unions among non-White women and variation in the role of cohabitation across race/ethnic groups.
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Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Cohabitation represents an increasingly prevalent family form. Over recent decades rates of cohabitation have increased, approaching a level where the majority of women will cohabit at some point in their lives. National estimates of the prevalence of cohabiting unions from the American Community Survey suggest that in 2006 there were approximately five million cohabiting couple households (with opposite sex partners) representing around four and a half percent of all households (U.S. Census Bureau 2006). As for incidence, by age 24 nearly sixty percent of women have had at least one pre-marital cohabitation (Schoen, Landale, and Daniels 2007).

With the rise of this type of family form has come an increase in research attempting to describe and explain factors related to cohabitation. One area where a substantial body of research has developed is on how cohabitation fits into the family system. Early research on cohabitation summarizes three alternative perspectives on the role of this family state. They include the view that cohabitation is an alternative to being single, an alternative to legal marriage, or a precursor to marriage (Rindfuss and VandenHeuvel 1990). More recent research outlines six potential roles of cohabitation, including a marginal status, a prelude to marriage, a stage in the marriage process, an alternative to being single, an alternative to marriage, and indistinguishable from marriage (Heuveline and Timberlake 2004). These potential roles or ideal types are related to decisions about living together, having children, and remaining together unmarried for a considerable amount of time.
Researchers have taken multiple avenues to determine the role of cohabitation in the family system. They include comparing the characteristics of individuals in different types of relationships (for example, married individuals to cohabiting individuals), mate selection studies, and analyses of fertility behavior (Smock 2000). Regarding the last avenue for determining the role of cohabitation, several researchers suggest that the relationship of cohabitation to legal marriage is related to the prevalence and acceptance of procreation in this family form (Manning and Landale 1996; Smock 2000; Musick 2002). Overall, recent estimates suggest that birth rates for cohabiting women are similar to those of married women. Using Current Population Survey data, Downs (2003) reports that the birth rate for cohabiting women is 87 births per 1000 women in 2002 similar to the rate of 86 births for married women and greater than the rate of 36 per 1,000 women not living with an opposite-sex partner. This suggests that examining fertility within cohabiting unions is a promising avenue for uncovering how cohabitation fits into the family system.

Between 1990 and 1994 nearly two-fifths of non-marital births were to cohabiting couples (Bumpass and Lu 2000). This intimates that cohabitation is, at least for some individuals, a family building state. In addition, there is substantial variation across race and ethnicity in this trend. For non-Hispanic White women 50 percent of non-marital births were in cohabiting unions for this time period. This figure was 53 percent for Hispanic women and 22 percent for Black women. These racial/ethnic differences in the percentage of non-marital births that occur within cohabiting unions engender questions about whether the role of cohabitation, gauged in relation to the acceptability of childbearing within this family state, varies across racial and ethnic groups.
The aim of the current study is to provide a better understanding of the role of cohabitation in the family system and whether the role varies across racial and ethnic groups by examining fertility-related behaviors and attitudes about family life. The focus of this study centers on racial and ethnic differences among cohabiters in two of the proximate determinants of fertility, current fertility intentions, and the values argued by Lesthaeghe (1995) to underlie the second demographic transition.

**Background and Significance**

*Theoretical Framework*

Lesthaeghe (1995) describes five major demographic shifts that began in the 1960s in more industrialized countries including a rise in the divorce rate, a decline in fertility, and a rise in the age at first marriage followed later by a rise in pre-marital and post-marital cohabitation, and non-marital fertility. These trends are argued by many, including Lesthaeghe, to warrant the identification of a “second demographic transition” that is distinct from the first demographic transition. The first demographic transition refers to the transition from high to low mortality and from high to low fertility.

Lesthaeghe (1995) argues that the motivations for the second demographic transition differ from those of the first demographic transition. He emphasizes the rise in individualism and market orientations, increased expectations from interpersonal relations, including romantic relationships, and secularization as influential on family changes in the second demographic transition. The increased economic independence of women is also a major factor. He cites decreases in institutional control following World War II as a factor in increased levels of individualism. Individualism is defined as a sense of greater individual freedom to choose one’s life course and a movement away
from one viewing their life course as a result of established norms. Changes in these values are posited to influence individual decisions about marriage, fertility, and family life.

One of the changes in the demographic transition is the rise in both pre and post-marital cohabitation. A behavior that was in the past uncommon has become normative. Historically, cohabitation was viewed as a step in the marriage process, but declines in the percentage of cohabiters that eventually marry their partner suggest that is less the case today (for a comparison of rates see Schoen and Owens 1992; Schoen, Landale, and Daniels 2007). Additionally, more children are born in cohabiting unions or experience a parental cohabitation at some point in their lives than in prior years (Bumpass and Lu 2000). These changes in cohabitation have led many researchers to consider the question of where cohabitation fits in the family system especially since these changes influence the future of the family. Some researchers focus on documenting the role of cohabitation at a given point in time while others describe the progression of cohabitation over the second demographic transition.

**Cohabitation**

As mentioned previously, early research on cohabitation characterized it as an alternative to being single compared to a precursor to marriage or an alternative to marriage (Rindfuss and VandenHeuvel 1990). Later characterizations suggest that there are four types of cohabitation based on measures of relationship quality, marriage plans, and general opinions about marriage (Casper and Bianchi 2002). By order of frequency, these types are a precursor to marriage, co-residential dating, a trial marriage, and a substitute for marriage. More current research posits that there are six ideal types of
cohabitation related to individual decisions about living together, having children, and remaining together unmarried for a considerable amount of time (Heuveline and Timberlake 2004). These types include a marginal status, a prelude to marriage, a stage in the marriage process, an alternative to being single, an alternative to marriage, and indistinguishable from marriage.

According to Heuveline and Timberlake (2004) cohabitation operates as marginal when it is uncommon and is not accepted culturally or institutionally. The prelude to marriage group involves individuals who decide to live together as a testing ground before entering legal marriage. The length of these cohabitations is short with a high percentage transitioning to marriage. The third ideal type, a stage in the marriage process, resembles the prelude to marriage group, however, these individuals are less concerned about the ordering of marriage and childbearing, but do intend to marry eventually. The fourth type, an alternative to being single, describes individuals who are not presently concerned with forming a family, but decide to live together during the courtship process. The fifth type is where cohabitation serves as an alternative to marriage and individuals choose cohabitation instead of marriage, but form a family as a married couple traditionally would. In this type, couples are self selected into this form of cohabitation based on their attitudes about marriage and their personal characteristics. The sixth type is where cohabitation becomes indistinguishable from marriage. This is similar to cohabitation as an alternative to marriage, however, individuals are not self selected into cohabitation, but rather they are indifferent about choosing marriage over cohabitation because cohabitation is viewed as acceptable and institutional support for
parents does not distinguish marital status. They suggest that cohabitation in the United States operates as an alternative to being single.

Aside from categorizing the types of cohabiting unions, researchers have offered ideas on the progression of cohabitation based on the experience in Western Europe (Kiernan 2000). There are four stages in the development of cohabitation. In the first stage, cohabitation is considered a peripheral behavior and is uncommon. In the second stage, cohabitation is used as a trial marriage to evaluate potential marriage partners. In the third stage, cohabitation is an alternative to legal marriage. In the fourth stage it becomes impossible to differentiate between cohabitation and marriage.

At least one other researcher also offers insights on the progression of cohabitation arguing that over the course of the second demographic transition cohabiting unions become more prevalent and undergo a shift from being a precursor to marriage that is often viewed as deviant to a more normative state as an alternative to marriage where childbearing is acceptable (Raley 2001). The end result of this transition is that cohabitation and marriage become equivalent with the stability of and fertility within cohabiting unions matching that of marriages.

Many researchers have responded to the changes in cohabitation in the United States and ideas about the progression of cohabitation based on the European experience by examining the current role of cohabitation. Although not always specifically framing the research in the second demographic transition, there is a fair amount of work dedicated to determining and describing the role of cohabitation in the United States family system.
There are three main avenues that research has taken to determine the place of cohabitation in the family system (Smock 2000). They include evaluations of the characteristics of cohabiters or cohabiting couples and comparisons to single or married individuals or married couples, mate selection studies, and studies on childbearing.

A foundational study in the literature on cohabitation and an example of the first type of study described by Smock is Rindfuss and VandHeuvel’s (1990) work comparing single, cohabiting, and married individuals on a variety of personal and couple characteristics. In an effort to garner evidence in support of cohabitation as either a precursor or an alternative to marriage, Rindfuss and VandHeuvel (1990) compare cohabiting individuals to single and married individuals on measures including childbearing expectations, marital intentions, employment, education, financial activities, economic independence, self-identification, and living arrangements. They suggest that overall, cohabiters’ values on these measures are somewhere between the values of single and married individuals, with more similarity to the single respondents. They conclude that cohabitation is best characterized as an alternative to being single or a form of co-residential dating rather than an alternative to marriage or stage in the marriage process.

This study provides insight into how cohabitation fits into the family system, however, the sample is limited to White respondents who were seniors in high school in 1972.

The second avenue for determining the role of cohabitation in the family system focuses on examining mate selection patterns. Given the documented assortative mating patterns among marital partners, researchers look to see how these patterns compare to those of cohabiters. If cohabitation operates as an alternative to marriage then the mate selection patterns of cohabiters should echo those of individuals choosing their marital
partner (Schoen and Weinick 1993). Generally, research suggests that mate selection processes for both marriage and cohabitation exhibit homogamy in regard to race and education, however there is less similarity among partners in cohabiting couples compared to married couples (Blackwell and Lichter 2000). In addition, among Mexican Americans there are lower levels of racial endogamy among cohabiting couples compared to married couples (Landale, Oropesa, and Bradatan 2006).

Research on non-marital fertility, more specifically fertility within cohabiting unions, also attempts to offer a possible answer to the question of whether cohabitation represents an alternative or precursor to legal marriage by comparing the fertility patterns of cohabiting women to those of married and single women. Numerous researchers argue that the relationship of cohabitation to legal marriage is related to the prevalence and acceptance of procreation in this family form (Manning and Landale 1996; Smock 2000; Musick 2002). Seltzer (2000), suggests that trends in cohabitation rates and childbearing within cohabiting unions indicate that cohabitation is becoming more like legal marriage; however they will not approach equivalence in the near future. At the same time, the increase in births to cohabiting women is a result of increases in cohabitation, not a higher fertility rate within cohabiting unions (Raley 2001).

Although the general statistics cited in the introduction suggest that birth rates among cohabiting and married individuals are quite similar, more focused research in this area indicates that these rates and the potential role of cohabitation as a family form vary greatly across racial and ethnic groups. As mentioned before, Heuveline and Timberlake (2004) suggest that the role of cohabitation in the U.S. resembles an alternative to being single. They also add that being single in the United States often involves childbearing
and, given the substantial racial and ethnic differences in family behavior, attention should be paid to within-country heterogeneity in the role of cohabitation. This underscores the merit of examining racial and ethnic variation in fertility in cohabiting unions.

Past research offers suggestions on variation in the role of cohabitation across race/ethnic groups. Overall, fertility rates within cohabiting unions are higher for Hispanics than for White and Black women (Bumpass and Lu 2000). Compared to Whites, Puerto Ricans and Blacks have a higher prevalence of childbearing within cohabiting unions (Manning and Landale 1996). In addition, childbearing within cohabiting unions is more similar to that within marriage for Blacks and economically disadvantaged Whites than White women overall (Loomis and Landale 1994). The effect of cohabitation on the risk of a non-marital birth is twice as high for Mexican Americans than for White women (Wildsmith and Raley 2006). In regards to the response to a pregnancy within a cohabiting union, Black women are less likely than non-Hispanic White women to marry before the birth of the child (Raley 2001; Manning 2001). Cohabiting Mexican American women are also less likely to marry in response to a pregnancy than Whites (Manning 2001). Taken together, these studies suggest that there is racial/ethnic variation in childbearing within cohabiting unions and indicate the potential role that cohabitation serves across these groups. This research also suggests that cohabitation operates more closely as an alternative to marriage for non-Whites compared to Whites, especially for Hispanics.

*Race/Ethnic Differences in Family Life*
It is useful to review the literature on perspectives for understanding race/ethnic variation in family patterns to inform this study on how these groups may differ on trends in cohabitation and non-marital fertility. Research describing racial/ethnic variation in family formation patterns generally focuses on the structural and cultural characteristics of these groups that are argued to influence family life. This review takes the same approach.

Research on Mexican Americans often cites familism as an underlying cultural force that shapes marriage and fertility patterns. Familism is defined as individuals placing a greater emphasis on family over their own individual needs along with a great value placed on family roles (Landale and Oropesa 2007). There is also an emphasis on fertility, gender role traditionalism, and connections with extended family as part of Mexican familistic culture (Raley, Durden, and Wildsmith 2004). Evidence of a high value on family roles and familism can be seen in attitudes such as the greater level of support for marriage among Mexican Americans than other race/ethnic groups (Oropesa 1996; Oropesa and Gorman 2000) and the desire among Hispanic girls for earlier ages at first marriage and birth compared to White and Black girls that is independent of socioeconomic characteristics (East 1998).

Researchers frequently call on familism and other aspects of Mexican culture such as the dominance of Catholicism to explain family patterns among this group. This is seen in explanations of what has been termed the “Hispanic marriage paradox” (Oropesa, Lichter, and Anderson 1994). Economic conditions are argued as one barrier to marriage and the paradox that exists is that Mexican American marriage rates more closely resemble those of non-Hispanic Whites even though the economic conditions of
Mexican Americans are more similar to those of African Americans who have lower rates of marriage (Oropesa, Lichter, and Anderson 1994). Cultural influences have been tested as explanation for this pattern (Oropesa, Lichter, and Anderson 1994; Lloyd 2006). Other researchers call attention to migration processes in Mexican American marriage patterns to explain at least part of this paradox (Raley, Durden, and Wildsmith 2004; Lloyd 2006).

Among Mexican Americans another potential cultural influence on cohabitation and fertility within cohabiting unions is the history of consensual unions in Latin America. In Latin American countries consensual unions operate, at least for some, as surrogate marriages and are socially recognized and viewed as acceptable unions for childbearing, but not regarded with the same social status as legal unions (Castro Martin 2002). Castro Martin (2002) calls attention to current trends in consensual unions in Latin American countries and notes heterogamy among these unions including the emergence of some unions that are like those in more industrialized countries, but suggests that most consensual unions still operate as surrogate marriages among individuals from lower socioeconomic statuses.

This characterization of cohabitation in Latin American countries stands in contrast to the delineation of cohabitation among individuals in more developed countries suggested by the second demographic transition framework. The second demographic transition framework describes current family trends including cohabitation as being driven by decreases in traditional values and increases in women’s economic independence. If Mexican Americans are influenced by the Latin American tradition of consensual unions then their motivations to enter cohabitation may differ from non-
Hispanics and their resulting unions may take a different form. One would expect cohabiting unions among Mexican Americans to have a greater resemblance to surrogate marriages that include childbearing if they are influenced by the Latin American tradition. Evidence reviewed earlier in this chapter suggests that cohabitation may act more like an alternative to marriage for Mexican Americans. In particular, the higher fertility rate among cohabiting Mexican Americans and the finding that the influence of cohabitation on a non-marital birth is twice as high for Mexican Americans than for White women suggest that this type of union is more often a state for childbearing for this ethnic group (Wildsmith and Raley 2006). Additionally, in a study of race/ethnic variation in attitudes about marriage and cohabitation, Oropesa (1996) finds that Mexican Americans are more supportive of cohabitation than non-Hispanic Whites, however they are even more supportive of cohabitation when it involves plans to marry. The potential influence of Latin American traditions on Mexican American behavior calls attention to the need to consider generational status to account for differences in exposure to Mexican culture and assimilation to U.S. culture. However, due to the already small sample size of Mexican Americans it is not possible to specify generational status in this study.

While the majority of arguments for African American family patterns focus on economic factors, research does call attention to cultural issues that impact family life. One of the major cultural themes in African American family life is the increased tendency to rely on extended family members for support (Cherlin 1992). This is viewed by many as an adaptation to the social and economic barriers many African Americans face in forming a family. One aspect of an increased reliance on extended families ties is a decreased focus on the tie between a husband and wife. With increased focus on
relationships across generations and households the tie between a husband and wife, and legal marriage, receive less emphasis than for Whites. This is argued as one influence on trends in fertility outside of marriage and single headed households among African Americans.

Other researchers argue that cultural differences among African Americans and Whites originated as early as the 19th century in response to structural conditions at that time. Some of these differences include greater acceptance of childbearing outside of marriage and less adherence to the idea of staying in a bad marriage for the sake of the marriage (Pagnini and Morgan 1996). Both of these arguments portray African American families as actively adapting to social and economic conditions as they form families and show how cultural patterns can be born out of responses to structural constraints. These cultural patterns highlight the interrelatedness of structure and culture in family formation. The next sections discuss structural issues across race/ethnic groups and the interrelatedness of structure and culture.

As mentioned above, explanations for variation in family patterns across race/ethnic groups often center on economic arguments and this is especially true for research on African Americans. Although women’s labor force participation increased over the second half of the twentieth century, the requirement for married men to make considerable contributions to household income remains and this is seen as a requirement for marriage (Cherlin 2000). In 2006, the median earnings for working Black men were $34,480 compared to $27,490 for Hispanics and $47,814 for Whites. In addition, the poverty rate for Blacks was 25.3%, 21.5% for Hispanics, and 9.3% for Whites (Webster and Bishaw 2007). These, on average, less favorable economic conditions among Blacks
and Hispanics are called on as explanations for variation in family life. Forste and Tienda (1996) describe this perspective when studying race/ethnic fertility differences as the “social characteristics hypothesis”. This perspective can be extended to other aspects of family life. They argue that race/ethnic differences in family patterns are explained by group differences in factors such as income and education. These differences do account for some, but not all, of the race/ethnic variation in family patterns (Forste and Tienda 1996; Landale and Oropesa 2007).

Structural explanations for racial/ethnic variation in family formation also discuss how conditions within the family shape views of opportunities and desires for the future, especially for career and employment. These aspirations in turn affect family formation patterns. Parental education and income are predictive of lower non-marital fertility (Wu 1996; Wildsmith and Raley 2006), as well as delaying first marriage (Thornton 1991; Avery, Goldscheider, and Speare 1992; Amato and Booth 1997). Greater parental education is one factor in shaping children’s educational and occupational aspirations and views of opportunity costs for early family formation (Amato and Booth 1997; Wildsmith and Raley 2006; Plotnick 2007). Other research also suggests differences in parenting styles by social class that influence children’s views on school and work (Lareau 2002). In sum, the socioeconomic conditions of the family of origin shape children’s ideas about education and work that also influence attitudes and opportunity costs for family formation, especially early family formation.

Overall, based on the structural conditions and cultural traditions of non-Whites one would expect distinct family patterns among these groups. In addition, one can see that it is difficult to discuss the cultural or structural explanations for race/ethnic variation
in marriage and family life without drawing in the other explanation. As described above, for African Americans what are often described as cultural patterns seem to be, at least partially, rooted in a long history of adapting to social and economic circumstances that limit entry into marriage. In addition, for Mexican Americans even though their socioeconomic characteristics are more similar to those of Blacks than Whites, their marriage patterns suggest that cultural factors may come into play in spite of economic factors that limit entrance into legal marriage. This suggests that it is important to consider the intersection of structural and cultural factors when looking at family life across race/ethnic groups. Some research addresses this issue when discussing how socioeconomic and cultural forces shape individual attitudes about what is viewed as the normative life course including attitudes about marriage and family life.

It is also possible to hypothesize varying effects of cultural values in the face of economic factors which further underscores the need to consider structural and cultural conditions together. As noted by Raley, Durden, and Wildsmith (2004), it is possible to interpret ideas about Mexican familism differently depending on economic characteristics. Generally, familism is argued to discourage non-marital fertility due to the value placed on limiting sexual activity to marriage, especially for women. However one might argue that the value placed on family roles may influence some individuals to have children outside of marriage when marriage is not economically feasible.

This review of structural and cultural explanations for race/ethnic variation in marriage and family life engenders questions about how the role of cohabitation may vary across race/ethnic groups and warrants a more detailed examination of this topic. The literature suggests that motivations for cohabitation potentially vary across
race/ethnic groups. For non-Whites, cohabitation may operate more as an alternative
marriage based on economic barriers to marriage or cultural traditions that encourage
cohabitation as an acceptable family state for childbearing. The present study addresses
race/ethnic variation with a focus on fertility-related behaviors, current fertility
intentions, and attitudes about family life. Using information on two proximate
determinants of fertility (frequency of sexual intercourse and contraceptive use), current
fertility intentions, and attitudes about family life this study examines whether the role of
cohabitation varies across racial and ethnic groups. Does cohabitation serve the same
role for Whites, Blacks, and Mexican Americans?

**Proximate Determinants of Fertility**

Bongaarts (2003) outlines seven proximate determinants of fertility. These
factors are posited to mediate the effects of social, economic, psychological, and
environmental factors on fertility. They include the onset of cohabitation (through
marital or cohabiting union formation), the onset of sterility, postpartum infecundability,
fecundability, contraception, intrauterine mortality, and induced abortion (Bongaarts
2003). The first determinant, onset of cohabitation, is related to the amount of a woman’s
reproductive life span that she is exposed to the possibility of childbearing. High levels
of non-union childbearing question the utility of this determinant; however, generally this
factor is a major influence on overall fertility rates. The second determinant, onset of
sterility, signals the end of a woman’s reproductive life span. The third determinant,
postpartum infecundability, influences fertility because practices that lengthen or shorten
the duration of postpartum infecundability impact the time after the birth of one child
before a woman can become pregnant with another. The fourth determinant,
fecundability is the probability of conception for a given month. Bongaarts and Potter (1983) suggest that fecundability is directly related to frequency of intercourse. The fifth determinant, contraceptive use, clearly influences fertility through its use to decrease the risk of conception. The sixth determinant, intrauterine mortality, refers to the occurrence of spontaneous abortions and stillbirths that influences overall fertility. The seventh determinant, induced abortion, directly influences fertility because it refers to the intentional termination of a pregnancy.

Past research indicates variations in these factors over marital status groups (Bachrach 1987), and variations in fertility rates by racial and ethnic group membership (Loomis and Landale 1994; Manning and Landale 1996; Manning 2001), however, how the proximate determinants vary by race for marital status categories has not been examined. Comparing fertility-related behaviors across race/ethnicity and marital status is an important area for study since these comparisons can shed light on how the fertility-related behavior of cohabiters compares to that of married and single individuals and add to the literature on the role of cohabitation and variation in this role across race/ethnicity. The focus of this study is on providing a more detailed description of racial and ethnic variation in the role of cohabitation on fertility by examining if and how the proximate determinants of fertility vary by race/ethnicity for cohabiters and comparing cohabiters to single and married individuals. The study focuses on frequency of sexual intercourse and contraceptive use. The aim of this study is not to use the proximate determinants of fertility to decompose racial and ethnic differences, but rather to compare two of the proximate determinants that past research underscores as important factors in the fertility of cohabiting individuals across race/ethnic groups (Bachrach 1987). This approach
allows a better understanding of what is behind the racial/ethnic fertility differences among cohabiters. For example, this analysis will shed light on whether the documented race/ethnic fertility differences are potentially the result of certain groups being more likely to use less effective contraceptive methods and therefore having a greater exposure to the risk of pregnancy even though they are using contraception in an effort to avoid pregnancy.

**Fertility Intentions**

In addition to examining the two aforementioned determinants of fertility, the current study will also examine variations in fertility intentions across groups. Multiple studies suggest that a major factor determining the place of cohabitation in the family system is whether it is regarded as an appropriate family form for having children (Manning and Landale 1996; Smock 2000; Musick 2002). The current study will further describe racial and ethnic variation across union status groups by looking at current fertility intentions. If cohabitation is becoming more normative and moving toward being an alternative to marriage, it is expected that the current fertility intentions of cohabiters will more closely approximate those of married individuals than singles.

While many studies look at fertility rates among cohabiters, few studies look at whether births to cohabiters were intended or unintended and those that do use retrospective reports of intention (e.g. Manning 2001; Musick 2002). Rates of intended childbearing among cohabiting women are higher than those for unmarried women not living with their partner (Manning 2001). These studies also suggest racial/ethnic differences in fertility intentions among cohabiters with non-Whites reporting higher levels of intended fertility within cohabiting unions. This pattern is strongest for
Hispanic women (Manning 2001; Musick 2002). Retrospective reports provide valuable information, however, some researchers suggest that post birth measures of intention may overestimate the extent to which the birth was intended (Ryder and Westoff 1969, Williams and Abma 2000).

Researchers highlight the concern of over-reporting of pregnancy intendedness using retrospective reports and offer three avenues for future research (Bachrach and Newcomer 1999). They suggest conducting more prospective studies to compare retrospective reports to prospective reports, refining the measurement of intention used in retrospective reports, and working on models that elucidate what factors predict reporting biases. In addition to offering these suggestions, they offer a general note of caution to researchers that the difference between a pregnancy or birth being intended versus unintended may not be as clear cut as researchers have portrayed it to be. They argue that the intendedness of a pregnancy or birth is more of a continuum than a dichotomy since intendedness includes two components. The first component is the intentionality or planning for the pregnancy and the second is the affective response to the pregnancy. They caution against the view of intendedness as a dichotomy and the “misplaced concreteness” that would result.

Williams and Abma (2000) examine individuals’ reports of their intentions to become pregnant or avoid pregnancy in a given interval of time and then ask the respondent at a later point about the wantedness of any births that occurred in that time interval. They find evidence of switching intention reports of women who indicated they wanted to delay any births in a given interval or avoid any future births. Their results are interpreted cautiously because they note that situational changes may have occurred in
that altered the respondent’s fertility intentions causing the retrospective report of
caredness to appear inconsistent with the prospective report of intentions. This type of
inconsistency would not reflect issues with birth intention reporting, but rather being
unable to account for situational changes that influenced the respondent’s desire for an
additional child. In contrast, Joyce, Kaestner, and Korenman (2002) suggest that there is
some evidence for switching of intention reports, but the level is small enough that
retrospective intention reports do not bias estimates of the fraction of births that are
unintended.

Prior research has not reached a definitive conclusion on whether prospective or
retrospective fertility intention reports are more accurate. Both methods add to our
knowledge of fertility intentions, but both seem to have weaknesses. This study
examines current fertility intentions across marital status categories and racial and ethnic
groups. The aim is to determine if cohabitors from certain racial or ethnic groups are
more or less likely than others to be currently seeking a pregnancy. Variation in this
factor would suggest differences in whether individuals from each of these groups see
cohabitation as an acceptable family form for childbearing. In addition, cohabitors are
compared to single and married individuals to see if their current fertility intentions are
more like those of single or married individuals or are distinct. Examining current
fertility intentions among cohabitors adds new information to the literature that has only
incorporated retrospective reports for this marital status group.

**Men and Fertility Research**

Researchers call attention to the lack of fertility research that includes men
(Becker 1996; Forste 2002; Goldscheider and Kaufman 1996; Green and Biddlecom
Even a cursory review of research in this area reveals that studies using only data from women are predominant. Three reasons have been offered for why women are better represented than men in fertility research (Goldscheider and Kaufman 1996). They include that women’s reproductive spans are easier to define than men’s, that women are at home more often so they should be easier to interview, and that after a divorce or separation children are more likely to live with their mothers than their fathers. This issue also relates back to the idea of separate spheres and that taking care of the home and children is seen as a woman’s responsibility. Following this line of reasoning survey research on fertility and children would be directed towards women rather than men since this area is seen as a woman’s domain.

Past research also indicates that a major issue in including men in fertility research is that when men are surveyed they are more likely than women to underreport their fertility (Forste 2002) and that men are less likely to respond to the question measuring their total number of children compared to women (Bachu 1996). Bachu (1996) adds that there is variation in men’s non-response patterns by race, ethnicity, age, and marital status with non-White, younger, and never married men more likely to not report their total number of children.

There are a small number of studies that specifically address whether the inclusion of reports of men’s fertility desires contributes additional information beyond what is obtained from women and discuss reasons why the inclusion of data from men is valuable. Some research focuses on fertility within marriages and obtaining reports from both spouses, while others look at reports from individuals who are not married.
Concerning spousal reports within marriage, the argument is that if childbearing is characterized by negotiations between husbands and wives over their own potentially competing interests then research in this area needs to include men as well as women (Green and Biddlecom 2000). Williams and Thomson (1985) find a moderate to high correlation between husband and wife reports of the fertility desires of their spouse with the actual reports from the spouse. This suggests that husbands and wives are aware of their spouse’s desires. This moderate correlation between proxy and own reports would add to the argument that gathering information from the male partner in addition to the female partner may be redundant. However, other researchers argue for the value of obtaining data from both partners. Thomson, McDonald, and Bumpass (1990) find that couples at a given parity that have opposing desires for having a or another child had fertility rates that were at the midpoint between couples where both spouses wanted to stay at the same parity or have another child. This suggests that there is a negotiation over discrepancies in husbands and wives desires and reports from both partners are valuable. Thomson (1997) finds that husband’s desires do play into the couple’s later childbearing behavior and when there is a disagreement between a husband’s and wife’s desires the husband’s desires carry approximately the same weight as the wife’s desires. Taken together these studies highlight the value of including data from both men and women in fertility research.

Goldscheider and Kaufman (1996) underscore the need for including male respondents in fertility research in light of increasing non-marital births. They argue that with the rise in births outside of marriage, incorporating men in fertility research is of increasing importance because of the variation in the provision of resources and
commitment of men across unions. They further add that past research suggests that unmarried women are likely to be less knowledgeable and able to report on their partner’s fertility intentions and desires than married women.

The current study is not able to gather data from the male partners of the main female sample however; a separate male sample from the 2002 National Survey of Family Growth is available. While not allowing for couple level analyses, this male sample will allow for a replication of the analysis conducted on the female sample for men.

**Race/Ethnic Differences in Attitudes**

One aim of this study examines whether attitudinal variation is a factor in differences in the role of cohabitation across race/ethnic groups. Attitudes about women’s independence and career orientation as well as family life are examined. While the previous section on race/ethnic differences in family life offers some insights into structural and cultural factors that potentially influence attitudes about women’s independence and career orientation and family life, this section looks at research focused specifically on attitudes.

Variation in attitudes about women’s independence and career orientation fall within the broad line of research on gender role attitudes. These examinations typically include measures that gauge views on factors such as maternal employment and relationships between spouses. The evidence for race/ethnic differences in gender role attitudes is somewhat inconsistent. Some research on variation among Blacks and Whites suggests no differences (Kane and Kyyro 1998; Furdyna, Tucker, and James 2008) while other work suggests more egalitarian gender role attitudes among Blacks.
compared to Whites (Dugger 1988; Harris and Firestone 1998). There is little survey research specifically on gender role attitudes among Hispanic Americans and what does exist suggests more traditional attitudes among this group compared to Whites and Blacks (Harris and Firestone 1998). In addition, Harris and Firestone (1998) suggest that differences in gender role attitudes across race/ethnic groups are diminishing over time.

The explanations for these differences often center on the structural and cultural factors outlined previously as influential on racial/ethnic differences in family life. Researchers examining differences in gender role attitudes between Blacks and Whites point toward the on average more equal economic position of Black women and Black men compared to Whites as one factor. Historically Black women have participated in the labor force in greater numbers than White women and are less likely to be economically dependent on men (Kane 2000). This more equal economic position is argued to translate into more egalitarian gender role attitudes among Black men and women compared to Whites.

Among Mexican Americans arguments about gender role attitudes often center on Mexican cultural norms that emphasize patriarchy and traditional gender roles (Hondagneu-Sotelo 1992). Although, some researchers argue that too much emphasis has been placed on patterns of male dominance within Mexican families resulting in an inaccurate characterization of extreme male dominance (Hondagneu-Sotelo 1992; Gonzalez-Lopez 2004). Others also call attention to the importance of recognizing the dynamic nature of gender relations among Mexican Americans and acknowledging generational and regional variation in gender roles (Hondagneu-Sotelo 1992).
Investigations of race/ethnic variation in attitudes about family life are more plentiful than those on gender roles. Some of these attitudinal differences, such as familism among Mexican Americans that results in a greater emphasis on the family over the individual, were discussed in the section on race/ethnic differences in family life. Studies more specifically targeted toward race/ethnic differences in attitudes about family life are reviewed here.

Among Mexican Americans, and more generally Hispanics, the overwhelming conclusion of research is a greater emphasis and importance placed on family life and roles. One of the dominant themes among research on the family attitudes of Mexican Americans is increased importance and desire for marriage compared to Whites (Oropesa 1996; Oropesa and Gorman 2000; Tucker 2000). Oropesa (1996) adds that for Mexican American girls marriage is often viewed as the pinnacle of womanhood. In addition, among Hispanic adolescent females East (1998) finds a desire for family transitions at younger ages and a faster pace. Mexican Americans also hold less favorable views towards non-marital childbearing compared to Whites and more favorable attitudes toward cohabitation, especially when it includes plans for later marriage (Oropesa 1996).

Research on variation in attitudes about family life among Blacks highlights greater acceptance of non-nuclear family forms. Pagnini and Morgan (1996) argue that among Blacks there is a long history of greater acceptance of childbearing outside of marriage and less pressure to marry in response to a non-marital pregnancy. East (1998) also finds that Black adolescent girls endorse early ages for first sexual intercourse and a desire to marry at older ages compared to Whites. Other research suggests that compared to Whites, Blacks place a greater emphasis on the importance of adequate income for
marriage and perceive greater economic gains to marriage (Tucker 2000). While highlighting some differences in attitudes about family life between Blacks, Whites, and Mexican Americans, Tucker (2000) also notes similarity across these groups in factors such as expectations for marriage and the importance of marriage before childbearing. Other research also calls attention to greater levels of similarity than difference across race/ethnic groups in attitudes about family life. Tucker and Mitchell-Kernan (1995) find few differences across race/ethnicity in attitudes about marriage and family life except for a greater emphasis on sufficient income for marital success among Blacks and more importance placed on having children as part of a successful marriage for Latinos.

Overall, research provides evidence for race/ethnic variation in gender role attitudes suggesting Mexican Americans endorse more traditional and Blacks less traditional attitudes compared to Whites. Attitudinal research also suggests variation in ideas about family life. Compared to Whites, Mexican Americans are likely to place greater importance on marriage and family overall and a desire for earlier family transitions. For Blacks, the evidence suggests a greater acceptance of non-traditional family forms including childbearing outside of marriage.

**Hypotheses**

The major research question addressed in this study is whether the role of cohabitation varies across race and ethnicity. As a general hypothesis I expect cohabitation for Blacks and Mexicans to operate more as an alternative form of marriage. For Whites, I expect cohabitation to act more as a precursor to marriage with White cohabiters resembling single individuals more than married individuals. This is based on the literature on structural and cultural explanations for race/ethnic differences in family
life as well as the existing research that looks at race/ethnic differences in fertility among cohabiters. My expectations are the same for men and women.

For the comparison of the proximate determinants of fertility, I expect that there will not be racial or ethnic variations in the frequency of intercourse, but there will be variation in the use of contraception and the use of more effective contraception as compared to less effective contraception, with White cohabiters being more likely to use contraception and more effective contraception than Black or Mexican cohabiters. I expect that socioeconomic characteristics will at least partially mediate this relationship. This expectation is based on the social characteristics hypothesis.

For the comparison of current fertility intentions, I expect that Black and Mexican cohabiters will be more likely to report that they are currently seeking a pregnancy than White cohabiters. I expect differences between Black and Mexican cohabiters to emerge in this section. I expect Mexican cohabiters to have the highest reports that they are currently seeking a pregnancy.

For the comparison of value orientations I expect that cohabiting individuals will have more liberal values on women’s independence and career orientation and family life than single or married individuals and that White women will have more liberal values than Black and Mexican American women. I do not expect to find that cohabiters who are seeking a pregnancy will endorse the most liberal attitudes.
Chapter 2: DATA AND METHODS

Data

The National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG) is a national probability sample of United States households designed and administered by the National Center for Health Statistics. It contains information on marriage, cohabitation, family life, sexual activity, contraceptive use, pregnancy, infertility, and health. The survey includes respondents ages 15 to 44. The NSFG started in 1973 and includes cycles in 1976, 1982, 1988, 1995, and 2002. Each cycle includes a new sample of respondents. The NSFG samples included only women until 2002 when an independent sample of men was added. The survey is representative of the female household population ages 15-44 for cycles up to 1995 and with the added sample of men in 2002, is now representative of the household population ages 15-44. Starting in 2006 the NSFG became a continuous survey. The data used in the present study are from the 1995 and 2002 cycles. For more detailed information on the 2002 sample design see the user’s guide available at http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/about/major/nsfg/nsfgdoc.htm. For more information about the 1995 sample see the user’s guide available at http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/about/major/nsfg/nsfg1-5doc.htm.

White, Black, and Mexican American respondents who are currently married, cohabiting, and single (but in a current sexual relationship) are included. Since the focus of the study is on fertility behaviors, such as contraception, only those respondents who were sexually active in the 3 months prior to the interview and are not pregnant or postpartum are included. Additionally, since there are a number of explanatory variables about the respondent’s mother’s characteristics during the respondent’s adolescence, any
women who report that they did not have a mother figure during adolescence are excluded.

The sample size for the 2002 data file is 7,643 women and 4,928 men. The sample size for the 1995 wave is 10,847 women. Due to the small sample size of currently cohabiting women, the female respondents from the 1995 and 2002 waves are pooled. Including the restrictions listed above for inclusion criteria, the sample is 10,927 women pooled over the two waves and 2,178 men. From the original pooled sample of 18,490 women, 73 women are excluded because they report not having a mother figure, 4,901 single women are excluded because they are not in a current sexual relationship, 704 women are excluded because although they report a current sexual partner, they have not had sex in the three months prior to the interview, and 1,885 women are excluded because of they are not White, Black, or Mexican American. There are 2,980 single women, 1,167 cohabiting women, and 6,780 married women. Of the 10,927 women 7,278 are white (1,544 single women, 719 cohabiting women, and 5,015 married women), 2,424 are Black (1,224 single women, 275 cohabiting women, and 925 married women), and 1,225 are Mexican American (212 single women, 173 cohabiting women, and 840 married women).

From the original sample of 4,928 men, 25 men are excluded because they report not having a mother figure while growing up, 2,029 single men are excluded because they are not in a current sexual relationship, 321 men are excluded because although they report a current sexual partner they have not had sex in the three months prior to the interview and do not have information on contraceptive use, and 375 men are excluded because they are not White, Black, or Mexican American. Of the 2,178 men, 1,266 are
White (583 single men, 135 cohabiting men, and 548 married men), 538 are Black (310 single men, 72 cohabiting men, and 156 married men), and 374 are Mexican American (98 single men, 62 cohabiting men, and 214 married men).

For the third section that examines attitudes, the pooled sample of women is not used because there are only two attitude measures asked in both waves. For this analysis each wave of women is analyzed separately. The sample size for women in the 1995 wave using the selection criteria previously outlined is 6,698. Of the 6,698 women, 4,568 are White (823 single, 409 cohabiting, and 3,336 married), 1,512 are Black (745 single, 158 cohabiting, 609 married), and 618 are Mexican (90 single, 67 cohabiting, 461 married). The sample size for women from 2002 is 4,229. Of the 4,229 women, 2,710 are White (721 single, 310 cohabiting, 1,679 married), 912 are Black (479 single, 117 cohabiting, 316 married), and 607 are Mexican American (122 single, 106 cohabiting, 379 married).

Variables

Dependent Variables

Multiple outcome variables are investigated. For sections one and two, the outcome variables are two proximate determinants of fertility, frequency of sexual intercourse and contraceptive use, and current fertility intentions.

In 1995 female respondents were asked to indicate over the last three months how frequently they had intercourse. The response set included once a month or less, two to three times a month, once a week, two to three times a week, and four or more times a week. In 2002 female and male respondents were asked to indicate how many times they had sex with an opposite sex partner in the last four weeks. To make the measures
comparable, frequency of sexual intercourse in 2002 is coded using the categories from the 1995 survey and then, following Bachrach (1987), a dummy variable is created indicating frequent sexual intercourse (several times a week or more).

Contraceptive use is measured by asking the female respondents to report up to four contraceptive methods used in the current month. Male respondents are asked to report contraceptive use for the last three months. The response set includes no method, birth control pills, condoms, partner’s sterilizing operation, respondent’s sterilizing operation, withdrawal, injectables, implants, rhythm method, safe period by temperature, diaphragm, female condom, foam, jelly or cream, cervical cap, suppository, sponge, IUD, morning after pill or emergency contraception, other method, own sterility, partner’s sterility, and the contraceptive patch. NCHS created a summary variable for contraceptive use that indicates the most effective method of birth control that the respondent reported using. Two measures of contraceptive use are created. The first is a dummy variable indicating that the respondent is not currently using any type of contraception and the second classifies the level of effectiveness of contraceptive use by the respondent and her partner. Following Bachrach (1987) the method is grouped into three categories: no method, a less effective method, and a more effective method. Respondents using birth control pills, sterilizing operation, injectables, and implants are coded as using more effective contraception. All other users are coded as using a less effective method and those who report no method used in the last three months are coded as not using any contraception.

For the outcome variable measuring current fertility intentions, respondents who report that they are sexually active and not using any contraceptive methods are asked if...
they are currently seeking a pregnancy. Respondents who answer yes to this question are coded as currently seeking a pregnancy. Respondents who answer no to this question are coded as not using contraception and not seeking a pregnancy. Respondents who are sexually active and currently using at least one method of contraception are coded as using contraception and not currently seeking a pregnancy.

For section three, the outcome variables are a series of attitudinal measures that are used to create latent variables corresponding to values outlined by Lesthaeghe as underlying the second demographic transition. The attitudinal measures available in the 1995 survey assess issues related to women’s independence and career orientation. In the 1995 survey respondents were asked to rate how much they strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree that “A man can make long range plans for his life, but a woman has to take things as they come (plans)” and “Young girls are entitled to as much independence as young boys (girlindp).” These two measures are seen as reflecting views on female autonomy or independence. Respondents were also asked to rate a series of measures that appear to relate to women’s career orientation and career versus family involvement. These measures include “A pre-school child is likely to suffer if his mother works (suffer),” “A working mother can establish just as warm and secure a relationship with her children as a mother who does not work (warm),” “It is much better for everyone involved if the man is the achiever outside of the home and the woman takes care of the home and family (achieve),” “A woman should have exactly the same job opportunities as a man (jobopp),” “Men should share the work around the house with women such as doing dishes, cleaning, and so forth (menshr),” “A woman should not let bearing and rearing children stand in the way of a career if she wants it (career),” “On the
job, men should not refuse to work under women (boss),” “Women are much happier if they stay at home and take care of their children (stayhome),” “Men and women should be paid the same money if they do the same work (samemon),” “Women should be considered as seriously as men for jobs as executives or politicians or even President (womnpres),” “If anything happened to one of the children while the mother was working she could never forgive herself (forgive),” “A woman’s job should be kept for her when she is having a baby (keepjob),” “You usually find the happiest families are those with a large number of children (bigfam),” and “There should be free child-care centers so that women could take jobs (freecare).” One additional item was included that measured the statement “Sex seems to exist mainly for the man’s pleasure (sex).”

In 2002, the attitudinal questions measure issues related to the respondent’s views on family life. Respondents were asked about the statements “It is better for a person to get married than to go through life being single (better),” “Divorce is usually the best solution when a couple can’t seem to work out their marriage problems (staytog),” “Sexual relations between two adults of the same sex are all right (samesex),” “Any sexual act between two consenting adults is all right (anyact),” “It is all right for unmarried 18 year olds to have sexual intercourse if they have strong affection for each other (sxok18),” “The rewards for being a parent are worth it, despite the cost and work it takes (chreward),” “It is okay for an unmarried female to have a child (chsuppor),” “Gay or lesbian adults should have the right to adopt (gayadopt),” “A young couple should not live together unless they are married (okcohab),” “A working mother can establish just as warm and secure a relationship with her children as a mother who does not work (warm),” and “It is better for everyone if the man earns the main living and the
woman takes care of the home and family (achieve),” and “It is more important for a man to spend a lot of time with his family than to be successful at his career (family).” In 2002, the same four response categories were available including strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree, however, respondents who insisted that they did not agree or disagree with a statement were coded separately. Responses were recoded as strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree.

Appropriate item recoding was conducted so that higher scores correspond to more liberal, less traditional, values. A factor analysis was conducted on the attitude measures at each wave to determine the ideal number of factors from the variables. Since only two items were asked at both waves, separate analyses were conducted at each wave. Only variables with factor loadings of at least .4 were retained and items were summed to create an index of attitudes for each wave. The analysis of the items from 1995 resulted in one factor comprised of the items suffer, warm, achieve, jobopp, menshr, career, boss, stayhome, girlindp, samemon, womnpres, and keepjob with a range of 12-48. This factor represents attitudes about women’s independence and career orientation. The analysis of the items from the 2002 cycle resulted in one factor using the items samesex, anyact, sxok18, chsuppor, gayadopt, okcohab, and achieve with a range of 7-35. This factor measures attitudes about family life. Both the 1995 (alpha=.826) and 2002 (alpha=.804) factors had high reliability.

**Independent Variables**

The independent variables are the racial and ethnic origin of the respondent and their current marital status. Racial and ethnic origin is measured in the survey with three questions. The respondent is first asked if they are of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin.
If they indicate yes, they are asked if they are Puerto Rican, Cuban, Mexican, or a member of some other group. All respondents are then asked to identify their racial background. The response set includes American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Black or African American, and White. If the respondent reports multiple racial origins they are then asked to pick the group that best describes their racial background. The NCHS team used the Hispanic origin and race questions to create a variable indicating if the respondent is Hispanic, non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic Black, and non-Hispanic other. For respondents who indicate that they are of Hispanic origin the additional question of what Hispanic group they belong to is used to identify Mexican Americans and create a variable indicating if the respondent is non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic Black, Mexican, and other racial/ethnic group. Only non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic Black, and Mexican Americans are used in the analysis.

As for current marital status, in 1995 respondents are asked to indicate if they are married, widowed, divorced, separated due to marital difficulties, or never married. They are subsequently asked about the current members of their household and can identify a household member as their male partner. In 2002 respondents are asked if they are married, not married but living together with a partner of the opposite sex, widowed, divorced, separated due to marital difficulties, or if they have never been married. At both waves NCHS creates a recoded marital status variable that measures respondents as currently married, not married but living with a partner of the opposite sex, widowed, divorced, separated, and never married and not living with a partner of the opposite sex. This analysis focuses on individuals who are single, cohabiting, and married.
Control Variables

Following past research in this area numerous control variables are included in the analysis. A variety of family background, socioeconomic, personal, and relationship and partner characteristics are included.

Family background characteristics. The family background characteristics include mother’s education, family structure, and the number of children the respondent’s mother has given birth to. Mother’s education is created from the NCHS constructed variable that reports mother’s completed education as less than high school, high school graduate, some college but no four-year degree, and four-year college degree and higher. A dummy variable was created indicating if the respondent’s mother has at least a high school degree. The family structure variable is created from the NCHS constructed variable that measures if the respondent lived with their two biological or adoptive parents from birth until either age 18, they moved out on their own, or the time of the interview. The respondent is asked to report the number of children their mother has. Responses are coded as zero through six or more children.

Socioeconomic characteristics. The socioeconomic characteristics in the models include household income, respondent’s level of education, and respondent’s work status. Household income was measured in each survey using a categorical variable where the respondent was asked to choose the income range that corresponded with their total household income from all sources in the year prior to the survey (1994 and 2001). Respondents could report their weekly, monthly, or yearly income. In 1995 there were 18 income categories used to gauge yearly income in 1994 including under $7,000, $7,000-8,499, $8,500-9,999, $10,000-11,999, $12,000-13,999, $14,000-15,999, $16,000-
17,999, $18,000-19,999, $20,000-24,999, $25,000-29,999, $30,000-39,999, then in ranges of $9,999 up to $99,999, and then a final category of $100,000 or more. In 2002 there were 14 income categories. Since the 1995 and 2002 cycles were pooled the income reported in 1995 was adjusted to reflect 2001 dollars by using the Consumer Price Index Inflator. To do this the midpoint of each income category was used and multiplied by 1.1950. The final variable measures income in ten thousands of dollars.

The respondent’s education is coded as having completed less than high school, high school, some college, and a four-year college degree or higher. Work status is coded as not currently working for pay, working less than full-time, and working full-time.

*Personal characteristics.* The respondent’s personal characteristics include parity, previous non-marital births\(^1\), age, current school enrollment, and religious affiliation. Respondent’s parity is measured as the total number of live births. Additionally, a variable indicates the number of live births the respondent has had outside of a marital relationship. This is a variable created by the NCHS team using the reports of the marital context of each birth. Respondent’s age is measured as the self-reported age at the time of interview. School enrollment is a dummy variable measured from the question asking the respondent if they are currently enrolled in school. Religion is the respondent’s current reported religious affiliation. The recoded variable provided by the NCHS categorizes religious affiliation as none, Catholic, Protestant, and Other religious affiliation. Based on past research religion is recoded as Catholic, non-Catholic affiliation, and no religious affiliation (Oropesa 1996).

\(^1\) This variable is not included in the analyses of sexual frequency presented in Chapters 4 and 5, but models of sexual frequency that include measures of non-marital births are available in the appendix. The inclusion of this variable does not change the conclusions of the analysis.
Relationship and partner characteristics. The respondent’s relationship and partner characteristics include the duration of the sexual relationship, partner’s education, and whether the respondent was previously married. The models for cohabiting respondents also include a measure of the partner’s work status (unavailable for single respondents and therefore not used in the models with all respondents) and an evaluation by the respondent of how likely they feel it is that they will marry their partner.

Relationship duration was measured as the duration of the sexual relationship. For cohabiting and married respondents it is possible to obtain the start date of their current relationship as well as the start date of their sexual relationship. However, it is only possible to obtain the start date of the current sexual relationship for single respondents, so for comparability the duration variable is measured as the duration of the current sexual relationship for all respondents. This variable is measured in years and was calculated by subtracting the century month of the start date of the sexual relationship from the interview date and dividing by twelve.

The partner characteristics include the partner’s work status and educational attainment as reported by the respondent. In 1995 the respondent is asked to report if their partner has no formal schooling, the exact grade of school from first grade through 12th grade, or the number of years of college and graduate or professional school completed. In 2002, the respondent is asked to report if their partner has completed less than a high school education, high school or GED, some college but no degree, a 2-year college degree, a 4-year college degree, or graduate or professional school. These variables are recoded into a four category education variable that measures educational attainment as less than high school, high school, some college, and a four-year college
degree or higher. A dummy variable indicating that the respondent’s partner has at least a high school education is then created. Partner’s work status is measured with a dummy variable indicating whether the partner is employed. A dummy variable indicating whether the respondent had previously been married is also included.

In 1995 cohabiting respondents were asked to indicate yes or no if they expected to marry their current partner. In 2002, cohabiting respondents were asked on a scale of 1 to 5 how likely it is that they will marry their partner with a 1 corresponding to no chance, 2 to a little chance, 3 to a 50-50 chance, 4 to a pretty good chance, and 5 to an almost certain chance. The 2002 response categories were recoded to match the dichotomous variable in 1995. Respondents who reported a pretty good chance or an almost certain chance were coded as indicating that they do expect to marry their current partner.

In addition, a few variables that were created and tested in initial models, but failed to predict the outcome variables were removed for parsimony. These variables included mother’s work status, whether the respondent’s parents were married at time of the respondent’s birth, and if the mother had her first child before age 18.

Methods

Imputation

The National Center for Health Statistics created a series of recoded variables for use in common reports they produce to encourage comparable measurement of commonly used variables and make for easier data use by analysts not affiliated with NCHS. In virtually all cases missing data on these recoded variables is imputed. The imputation can take one of two forms. It can be imputed based on other data in the
questionnaire or more often by using multiple regression imputation. NCHS recommends that analysts use the imputed cases for most analyses so that results are consistent with those in NCHS reports. As mentioned above some of these recoded variables were used in the current analysis and the NCHS imputed values were used.

For the small amount of missing data on the remaining variables, SAS Proc MI was used to repair the incomplete reports. Proc MI uses Bayesian procedures for the multiple imputation and five imputations of values are generated for missing data.

**Pooled Sample**

All analyses of female respondents that use the pooled sample from 1995 and 2002 include a dummy variable to control for the survey year.

**Weighting**

Since the NSFG is collected using complex survey sampling techniques the use of weights to adjust for differential selection and response rates is necessary to obtain accurate variance estimates. SUDAAN software is used to analyze the five imputed datasets and account for the design parameters and weights.

**Analytic Strategy**

The analytic strategy is an additive modeling technique. The models for the full sample of respondents include seven steps and those for the sample of cohabiters include five steps. The first model for the full sample includes the predictors of race and ethnicity, model two adds marital status, model three adds family background characteristics, model four adds socioeconomic characteristics, model five adds personal characteristics, model six adds relationship and partner characteristics, and model seven adds interaction terms for race/ethnicity and marital status. The first model for the
sample of cohabiting respondents includes the predictors of race and ethnicity, the second model adds family background characteristics, the third model adds socioeconomic characteristics, the fourth model adds personal characteristics, and the fifth model adds relationship and partner characteristics. Predictor variables were checked for multicollinearity.

**Section 1: Comparison of the Proximate Determinants of Fertility and Fertility Intentions for Female Respondents**

The first analysis is a logistic regression model predicting frequent sexual intercourse for the full sample of women. The second analysis is a logistic regression model predicting non-use of contraception. The third analysis is a multinomial logistic regression model predicting non-use of contraception, the use of a less effective method of contraception, or the use of a more effective method of contraception. The fourth analysis uses a multinomial logistic regression model to predict current fertility intentions among the full sample of women including currently not intending a pregnancy (using contraception), intending a pregnancy (not using contraception and indicates a pregnancy is desired), or not using contraception, but not intending a pregnancy. An interaction term between race/ethnicity and marital status is included in the final model. Interactions between race/ethnicity and marital status are included to test whether the influence of marital status varies by race/ethnicity.

The second part of section one includes using logistic and multinomial logistic regression models to predict the frequent sexual intercourse, non-use of contraception, method of contraceptive use, and fertility intentions for the sample restricted to currently cohabiting women. The same models listed in Part A are run for currently cohabiting women.
Section 2: Replication for Men.

The first part of section two replicates the logistic regression models predicting frequency of intercourse, contraceptive use, and fertility intentions from Part A of Section One for the full sample of men. The second part of Section Two replicates the logistic regression models predicting frequency of intercourse, contraceptive use, and fertility intentions from Part B of Section One for the sample of cohabiting men.

Section 3: Comparison of Values and Attitudes Associated With the Second Demographic Transition

Factor analytic techniques were used to create indices from the attitudinal measures at each cycle for the sample of women. ANOVA models are used to compare these indices at each wave for women by marital status, race/ethnicity, and for cohabiting women by current fertility intention².

² SUDAAN does not include ANOVA procedures available in SAS. As suggested by the makers of SUDAAN, Proc Regress is used to test for differences in means and the reflevel statement is used to change the comparison group.
Chapter 3: DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS

Women

Table 3.1 presents the descriptive results for the outcome variables for the pooled sample of women. The outcome variables include frequency of sexual intercourse, contraceptive method use, fertility intentions, and attitudes about women’s independence and career orientation and family life. Frequencies are presented for all respondents broken down into the three race/ethnic groups of White, Black, and Mexican American. Subsequently frequencies are shown for each marital status group (single, cohabiting, and married) broken down by the three race/ethnic groups.

The first section shows the distribution of frequency of sexual intercourse in detailed categories as well as the summary measure used in the analysis indicating the percentage of respondents who report having frequent sex defined as more than once a week. As for women in all marital statuses combined, rates of frequent sexual intercourse among cohabiting women are roughly equal among Mexican Americans (53.46%) and White women (51.95%) followed by Black women (43.54%).

The second outcome variable is contraceptive method use. Looking first at the incidence of not using any contraception for women in all marital status groups combined, Black women report the highest rate of non-use of contraception (16.39%), followed by Mexican American women (13.37%) and White women (11.47%). This race/ethnic pattern in the non-use of contraception holds for cohabiting and married women, with Black women being the most likely to report not using any contraception and White women the least likely. For single respondents, Mexican American women are the most likely to report not using any contraception followed by Blacks and Whites.
Overall, White women report the highest levels of using more effective contraceptive methods (70.44%) while Black and Mexican American women report similar lower levels of more effective contraceptive method use (66.44% and 67.66%). This pattern was similar among single and cohabiting women.

The third outcome variable is fertility intentions. This variable further specifies individuals’ contraceptive status by categorizing those who are currently using some form of contraception and then, for those who do not report using contraception, indicating whether or not they report that this non-use is because they are currently seeking a pregnancy. For respondents across all marital status groups Mexican American women are the most likely to report that they are not using contraception because they are currently seeking a pregnancy (7.04%) while Black women have the highest reports of not using contraception, but reporting they are not seeking a pregnancy (9.79%). For cohabiting women, Mexican Americans report the highest levels of not using contraception because they are seeking a pregnancy (9.42%). This means that nearly one in ten cohabiting Mexican American women report that they are actively seeking a pregnancy. For Black women this is the case for approximately one in every thirteen women (7.76%) and this is true for less than one in twenty cohabiting White women (4.43%). As for cohabiting women who are not using contraception and not intending a pregnancy, Black women have the highest reports (11.39%), followed by White women (7.07%), and Mexican American women (4.91%).

These descriptive statistics suggest a different pattern of contraceptive use and intention across the three race/ethnic groups for cohabiting women. Overall, White women are the most likely to use any method of contraception as well as a more effective
method. Among cohabiters, the percentage of Mexican American and Black women who report they are seeking a pregnancy is around twice as high as that for Whites. Nearly one in ten Black women overall and one in ten Black cohabiters report that they are not using contraception, but not intending a pregnancy. This is approximately twice the percentage in this group for White and Mexican American cohabiters. Among this sample of sexually active women, the descriptive statistics suggest that of these three race/ethnic groups, Black women have the greatest risk of an unintended pregnancy.

The last two outcomes are the indices of attitudes for the separate samples of women from the 1995 and 2002 cycles. The index for 1995 is the sum of twelve items that tap respondents’ attitudes about women’s independence and career orientation (labeled as gender roles in Table 3.1). Higher scores indicate more liberal, less traditional, ideas about women’s independence and career orientation. For women of all marital statuses combined, White and Black women have roughly equal scores on the index of attitudes (38.85 and 38.65). Mexican American women have slightly more traditional reports on their views on women’s independence and career orientation (35.56). The pattern across the three race/ethnic groups for cohabiting women is similar to that for single women with White cohabiters reporting the most liberal ideas about women’s independence and career orientation (39.11), followed by Black women (38.27), and Mexican American women (35.93).

The index for 2002 is the sum of seven items that tap respondents’ attitudes about family life. Higher scores indicate more liberal, less traditional, ideas about family life. For women from all marital status groups combined as well as in each marital status group the overall pattern is for Whites to report the most liberal attitudes about family
life, with Blacks and Mexicans reporting more traditional attitudes than Whites that are similar to each other.

Table 3.2 illustrates the sample characteristics for the control variables organized into the blocks that are used in the regression models. Greatest attention is paid to the characteristics for women in all marital status groups combined and for cohabiting women. The first block of variables is those measuring family background characteristics. For each marital status White women are most likely to report that their mother had at least a high school education and Mexican American women are the least likely. Nearly three-quarters (72.85%) of Mexican American women in all marital statuses combined report that their mother has less than a high school education. White and Mexican American women (69% for each) report higher levels of growing up in an intact family than Black women (45%) and Mexican women consistently report the highest maternal fertility levels (e.g., 4.83 overall) followed by Blacks (e.g., 3.98 overall) and Whites (e.g., 3.38 overall).

The second block of sample characteristics presented in Table 3.2 is the respondents’ socioeconomic characteristics. Generally, Whites report the highest levels of household income, Blacks the second highest, and Mexican Americans the lowest. For the respondent’s own education, Whites are the most likely to report having attained a 4-year college degree or higher while Mexican American women are the most likely to report less than a high school education. For cohabiting women, Whites report the highest level of full-time work (55.60%), followed by Blacks (45.17%), and Mexican Americans (35.47%). These figures suggest that of these three race/ethnic groups Whites
have the most favorable socioeconomic characteristics and Mexican Americans the least favorable.

The third block of variables is the personal characteristics of the respondent. For the combined union statuses and married respondents, Mexican American women report the highest parity and Whites the lowest. For cohabiting respondents, Black and Mexican American women report higher nearly equal parities (1.96 and 1.92) with Whites reporting an average of 1.01. For cohabiting women, Mexican Americans have the highest mean number of non-marital births (1.52), followed by Blacks (1.44), and Whites (.45). These figures reflect the documented higher levels of non-marital fertility among Blacks and Mexican Americans.

As far as current school enrollment among cohabiters White women report the highest levels of enrollment (.18) among the three race/ethnic groups. The next personal characteristic is the respondent’s religious affiliation and the major theme for this variable is that Mexican American women consistently report the highest levels of Catholic religious affiliation. Overall and for cohabiters, around three-fourths of Mexican American women identify as Catholic (73.82% for Mexican Americans overall). For women across all marital statuses, around four-fifths of Black women report a religious affiliation other than Catholicism (primarily Protestant affiliation).

The last section of variables is relationship and partner characteristics. The first variable is the duration since the start of the current sexual relationship. Overall, White women report the longest sexual relationships while for cohabiters, Blacks have the longest sexual relationships (6.11 years), followed by Mexican Americans (6.02), and Whites (4.52). Rates of partner employment are roughly equal among cohabiters across
the three race/ethnic groups. Across all marital status groups, White women report the highest levels of partner education and Mexican American women the lowest. Rates of previous marriage are highest for Whites and lowest for Mexican Americans. Among cohabiters, nearly two-fifths of White women report being previously married (37%), compared to just over one-fourth of Black women (26%), and one-fifth of Mexican American women (20%). For all marital status groups, Black and White women had nearly equal rates of ever cohabiting around 55% followed by just under one-half of Mexican American women. Nearly eight out of ten cohabiting White women report that they expect to marry their partner while this is true for just under two-thirds of Blacks and Mexican Americans.

**Men**

The next two tables show the outcome and control variables, respectively, for men. Only patterns that differ from those for women are highlighted. Table 3.3 shows the sample characteristics for the outcome variables for men. For the first outcome, frequent sexual activity, the overall pattern for cohabiting men is somewhat similar to that for cohabiting women with Mexican Americans reporting the highest rates of frequent sexual intercourse and Blacks the lowest. However, the difference between Mexican Americans and Whites is larger for men than for women. In addition, the percentage of cohabiting men who report frequent sexual activity in each race/ethnic group is lower than that for women.

For the second outcome, contraceptive method use, the results for cohabiting men show the same race/ethnic pattern as that for women with Whites reporting the lowest and Blacks the highest levels of non-use. However, compared to the reports from
women, men in all race/ethnic groups report higher levels of non-use. Just over one in ten cohabiting White women (11.5%) reported non-use compared to nearly one in five men (18.35%). For cohabiting Blacks, approximately one in five women (19.15%) compared to nearly half of men (45.67%) report non-use. Among cohabiting Mexican Americans, around one in seven women (14.33%) reported non-use while over one in three men did (37.09%). This gender difference in non-use of contraception is also shown in some of the reports produced by NCHS using the 2002 NSFG.

The third outcome variable shown in Table 3.3 is the fertility intentions of men. The race/ethnic pattern in the fertility intentions of cohabiting men is similar to that for women with Black men the most likely to report they are non-users who are not seeking a pregnancy and Mexican American men to report they are non-users who are seeking a pregnancy. The distribution of the fertility intention variable shows that the greater number of men reporting non-use compared to women seem to fall into the category of non-users who are not seeking a pregnancy. Compared to the approximately one in ten (11.39%) cohabiting Black women who report that they are non-users, but not seeking a pregnancy, over one in three (36.89%) of men report this intention. While around one in twenty (4.91%) cohabiting Mexican American women report non-use, but not seeking a pregnancy, nearly one in four men do (24.78%).

Table 3.4 illustrates the sample characteristics for the control variables for the sample of men. Overall, full-time employment rates for cohabiting men are higher and show a different race/ethnic pattern than for women. Cohabiting Mexican American men have the highest full-time employment rates (80.04%), followed by Blacks (72.68%), and
Whites (70.17%). Among cohabiting women, Whites had the highest full-time employment rate and Mexican Americans the lowest.

The final group of variables is the relationship and partner characteristics. Among cohabiting women, Blacks report the longest sexual relationship duration, however, among men Mexican Americans report the longest durations. For cohabiting men, Blacks and Whites report similar levels of previous marriage at just under twenty percent compared to nearly two in five White women (37%) and just over one in four Black women (26%). For individuals in all marital statuses combined, the race/ethnic pattern in rates of previous cohabitation among men was similar to that for women, although the percentage is nearly ten points higher for each group. Finally, among cohabiting men, Whites and Blacks have similar higher levels of their perceived chance of marriage to their partner compared to a lower percentage for Mexican Americans. Among women, the reports for Blacks were more similar to the lower perceived chances reported by Mexican Americans.

A major theme that emerges from reviewing the descriptive statistics for the control variables for women and men is that non-Whites, especially Mexican Americans, on average have less favorable socioeconomic characteristics. These socioeconomic differences are well documented in prior research. An area where this disparity is most evident is in differences in mother’s and own educational attainment. Mexican Americans consistently report the lowest levels of maternal education as well as own education. In addition, Mexican Americans generally report the lowest household income of the three race/ethnic groups. Non-Whites also generally report higher levels of maternal fertility, own fertility, and non-marital births. This portrayal suggests, as the
review in Chapter 1 outlines, that non-Whites face greater socioeconomic barriers that may influence their family formation patterns.
Table 3.1. Descriptive Statistics for Outcome Variables for Female Respondents (n=10,927)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Single Respondents</th>
<th>Cohabiting Respondents</th>
<th>Married Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Black Mexican</td>
<td>White Black Mexican</td>
<td>White Black Mexican</td>
<td>White Black Mexican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of Sexual Intercourse</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month or less</td>
<td>11.94 18.02 13.28</td>
<td>17.16 24.39 26.08 7.46 14.81</td>
<td>8.26 11.00 10.94 11.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 times a month</td>
<td>21.66 24.91 19.08</td>
<td>23.94 29.61 26.69 15.42 23.81 18.30 21.86 19.29</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>26.30 21.66 23.35</td>
<td>21.5 20.03 20.51 25.17 17.84 19.97 27.91 24.89</td>
<td>24.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 times a week</td>
<td>30.93 27.08 32.69</td>
<td>24.79 18.37 21.97 33.96 33.60 33.92 32.36 36.09</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more times a week</td>
<td>9.17 8.34 11.61</td>
<td>12.62 7.60 4.75 17.99 9.94 19.54 6.87 8.79</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequent Sexual Intercourse (2-3 times+)</strong></td>
<td>40.10 35.42 44.30</td>
<td>37.41 25.97 26.72 51.95 43.54 53.46 39.23 44.88</td>
<td>46.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contraceptive Method Type %</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A more effective method</td>
<td>70.44 66.44 67.66</td>
<td>71.98 67.05 63.22</td>
<td>71.31 61.22</td>
<td>62.05 69.85 67.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fertility Intentions %</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracepting</td>
<td>88.53 83.61 86.63</td>
<td>90.37 86.58 83.10</td>
<td>88.50 80.85</td>
<td>85.67 87.98 80.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contracepting and intending a pregnancy</td>
<td>5.32 6.60 7.04</td>
<td>1.25 3.28 3.83</td>
<td>4.43 7.76</td>
<td>9.42 6.68 10.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contracepting and not intending a pregnancy</td>
<td>6.15 9.79 6.33</td>
<td>8.38 10.14 13.07</td>
<td>7.07 11.39</td>
<td>4.91 5.35 8.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>7278 2424 1225</td>
<td>1544 1224 212</td>
<td>719 275</td>
<td>173 5015 925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1995 Sample (n=6,698)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes about women’s roles (12-48)</td>
<td>38.85 38.65 35.56</td>
<td>40.13 39.09 37.58</td>
<td>39.11 38.27</td>
<td>35.93 38.48 38.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4568 1512 618</td>
<td>823 745 90</td>
<td>409 158</td>
<td>67 3336 609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2002 Sample (n=4,229)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2710 912 607</td>
<td>721 479 122</td>
<td>310 117</td>
<td>106 1679 316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Cell entries represent percentages unless otherwise indicated

*b* Cell entries represent means
Table 3.2. Descriptive Statistics for Female Respondents (n=10,927)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family background(^a)</th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Single Respondents</th>
<th>Cohabiting Respondents</th>
<th>Married Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>19.97</td>
<td>35.60</td>
<td>72.85</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>80.03</td>
<td>64.40</td>
<td>27.15</td>
<td>84.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two biological or adoptive parents</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother fertility variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>20.89</td>
<td>43.39</td>
<td>17.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>35.11</td>
<td>38.37</td>
<td>32.18</td>
<td>28.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>29.25</td>
<td>27.39</td>
<td>17.91</td>
<td>34.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work status %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working for pay</td>
<td>26.81</td>
<td>31.54</td>
<td>42.22</td>
<td>24.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working less than full-time</td>
<td>26.70</td>
<td>17.23</td>
<td>19.25</td>
<td>30.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full-time</td>
<td>46.50</td>
<td>51.22</td>
<td>38.53</td>
<td>44.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-marital births</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>32.38</td>
<td>31.29</td>
<td>30.54</td>
<td>26.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current school enrollment</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>26.68</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>73.82</td>
<td>30.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic affiliation</td>
<td>59.60</td>
<td>83.51</td>
<td>18.37</td>
<td>49.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship and partner characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of sexual relationship</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's work status(^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than high school</th>
<th>High school and above</th>
<th>Previously married</th>
<th>Ever cohabited</th>
<th>Cohabitor's chance of marriage to partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner's education %</td>
<td>10.23  14.52  40.90</td>
<td>89.77  85.48  59.10</td>
<td>.24   .18   .16</td>
<td>.54   .57   .48</td>
<td>.78   .60   .60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.21  15.44  32.25</td>
<td>84.56  76.75  84.28</td>
<td>.19   .28   .28</td>
<td>.42   .48   .48</td>
<td>----   ----   ----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.72  17.14  50.12</td>
<td>82.86  91.46  94.88</td>
<td>.25   .37   .37</td>
<td>.47   .52   .52</td>
<td>----   ----   ----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.54   12.53  41.01</td>
<td>87.47  58.99  51.78</td>
<td>.26   .20   .21</td>
<td>.20   .14   .13</td>
<td>----   ----   ----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N                  7278  2424  1225  1544  1224  212  719  275  173  5015  925  840

* Cell entries represent means unless otherwise indicated
* Work status is unavailable for the sexual partners of single respondents
* Question applies to currently cohabiting respondents
Table 3.3. Descriptive Statistics for Outcome Variables for Male Respondents (n=2,178)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Single Respondents</th>
<th>Cohabitating Respondents</th>
<th>Married Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of Sexual Intercourse</strong>%&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month or less</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 times a month</td>
<td>16.41</td>
<td>21.36</td>
<td>20.41</td>
<td>22.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>22.98</td>
<td>18.91</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>22.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 times a week</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>11.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more times a week</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>25.99</td>
<td>41.77</td>
<td>34.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contraceptive Method Use</strong> %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No method</td>
<td>25.91</td>
<td>31.59</td>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>13.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A less effective method</td>
<td>24.03</td>
<td>30.75</td>
<td>27.16</td>
<td>35.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A more effective method</td>
<td>50.06</td>
<td>37.66</td>
<td>39.53</td>
<td>50.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fertility Intentions</strong> %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contraceping</td>
<td>74.09</td>
<td>68.41</td>
<td>66.68</td>
<td>86.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contraceping and intending a pregnancy</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contraceping and not intending a pregnancy</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>24.12</td>
<td>24.89</td>
<td>13.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Cell entries represent percentages
Table 3.4. Descriptive Statistics for Male Respondents (n=2,178)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
<th>Single Respondents</th>
<th>Cohabiting Respondents</th>
<th>Married Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Background</strong>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Education %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>22.24</td>
<td>70.18</td>
<td>10.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School and above</td>
<td>88.20</td>
<td>77.76</td>
<td>29.82</td>
<td>89.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two biological or adoptive parents</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Fertility Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Income (2001 Dollars)</td>
<td>51,833</td>
<td>37,218</td>
<td>33,320</td>
<td>46,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>17.82</td>
<td>40.05</td>
<td>15.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>33.34</td>
<td>43.61</td>
<td>33.63</td>
<td>30.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>29.47</td>
<td>28.32</td>
<td>17.87</td>
<td>39.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college and above</td>
<td>26.57</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>14.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Status %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Full time</td>
<td>74.07</td>
<td>67.58</td>
<td>74.16</td>
<td>54.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-marital births</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>32.46</td>
<td>31.27</td>
<td>31.12</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current School Enrollment</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>22.78</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>76.69</td>
<td>26.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic affiliation</td>
<td>55.76</td>
<td>74.99</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>47.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship and Partner Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of Sexual Relationship</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's Work Statusb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's Education %</td>
<td>Less than High School</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>40.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School and above (reference group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously married</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever cohabited</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitor's chance of marriage to partner(^c)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Cell entries represent means unless otherwise indicated

\(^b\)Work status is unavailable for the sexual partners of single respondents

\(^c\)Question applies to currently cohabiting respondents
Chapter 4: SEXUAL FREQUENCY, CONTRACEPTIVE USE, AND FERTILITY INTENTIONS: WOMEN

One avenue to gauge the role of cohabitation in the family system is to evaluate the acceptability of childbearing in this type of union. The argument is that the more acceptable childbearing is in cohabiting unions the more cohabitation resembles marital unions (Manning and Landale 1996; Smock 2000; Musick 2002). This purpose of this chapter is to examine fertility-related behaviors and intentions to evaluate racial/ethnic variation in the role of cohabitation. Frequency of sexual intercourse, non-use of contraception, contraceptive method effectiveness, and fertility intentions are investigated.

Past research examines fertility rates and reports of birth intentions in cohabiting unions to shed light on the role of cohabitation. While research on birth intentions has focused solely on retrospective reports, this study makes a new contribution by examining current fertility intentions of cohabiters. Researchers have questioned the use of retrospective reports due to the possibility of individuals changing their views on the intendedness of a birth with the passage of time. In addition, frequency of sexual intercourse and contraceptive use are examined to investigate variation in exposure to risk factors for pregnancy across racial/ethnic groups. This provides more information on the reasons behind the documented fertility differentials among cohabiters from different race/ethnic groups. As a first step these outcomes are compared among women in all types of unions. They are then evaluated for the subset of cohabiting women to look for variation across race/ethnicity.

Based on the literature in this area it is expected that there will be no difference in sexual frequency among cohabiting women across race/ethnicity, but that there will be
differences in contraceptive use. It is expected that Black and Mexican American women will be more likely to not use any contraception and to use less effective methods of contraception compared to White women. At least some mediation by socioeconomic characteristics is expected for contraceptive use. Finally, it is expected that cohabiting non-White women will be more likely to report that they are not using contraception because they are seeking a pregnancy. The analysis of this last outcome variable provides the strongest test of race/ethnic variation in the role of cohabitation since it ascertains variation in stated intentions to become pregnant that are argued to reflect views on the acceptability of childbearing in cohabitation.

**Frequency of Sexual Intercourse**

Table 4.1 shows the results of a logistic regression predicting frequent sexual intercourse (defined as several times a week or more often) for the full sample of women. This analysis tests for variation in one aspect of exposure to pregnancy across race/ethnic and marital status groups. The baseline model includes only the identifiers of race/ethnicity and shows that Black women have lower odds of engaging in frequent sexual activity compared to White women. This is not the case for Mexican American women who are more likely to report frequent sexual intercourse. After all of the control variables are added in Models 2 through 6 the odds ratios for race/ethnicity are no longer significant (the odds ratio for Black is marginally significant). Of the control variables added to the models, marital status, education, age, sexual relationship duration, and previous marriage are predictive of sexual frequency. Being single or married compared to cohabiting, having less than a high school education, older age, and longer sexual relationship duration all decrease the odds of frequent sexual intercourse. Respondents
who have been previously married are more likely to report frequent sexual intercourse. The final model adds interaction terms for race/ethnicity and marital status. The results show that adding the interaction terms improves the explanatory power of the model; however, the differences do not appear to occur across race/ethnicity for cohabiters. Interpreting the main effects shows that sexual frequency is not significantly different for Black and Mexican American cohabiters compared to White cohabiters.

Table 4.2 shows the results of a logistic regression predicting frequent sexual intercourse for the subsample of women who are currently cohabiting. The first model that only includes race/ethnic identifiers shows no racial and ethnic differences in frequency of sexual intercourse among cohabiting women, as suggested by the final model in the analysis of all women. Few variables emerge as significant predictors of frequent sexual intercourse among cohabiting women. The final model shows that older age (OR=.95) and school enrollment (OR=.57) decrease the odds of frequent sexual intercourse, while being previously married (OR=1.69) and expecting to marry their current partner (OR=1.82) increase the odds that cohabiting women have frequent sexual intercourse.

Overall the results suggest little difference in frequency of sexual intercourse across race/ethnicity once other variables are controlled. In the analysis for all women, the differences in frequency of sexual intercourse were mediated by union status. For the analysis of sexual frequency for cohabiting women, no race/ethnic differences were found in sexual frequency. Only a few other variables, including age, school enrollment, previous marriage, and marriage expectations, predicted sexual frequency among cohabiters. These results suggest that variation in the frequency of sexual intercourse is
not a likely factor in variation in fertility rates of cohabiters across race/ethnicity. Since sexual frequency is only one factor in exposure to the risk of pregnancy, the next step is to look at variation in contraceptive use.

**Non-use of Contraception**

The results of a logistic regression predicting non-use of contraception are shown in Table 4.3. The first model indicates that for Black women the odds of not using any form of contraception are one and a half times higher than for Whites (OR=1.50). There is no statistically significant difference in non-use of contraception between Mexican American and White women. The Black/White difference in non-use of contraception is robust to the addition of the control variables in Models 2 through 6. Looking at Model 6, the results for the control variables show that some college education (OR=.81), working less than full-time (OR=.76), full-time labor force participation (OR=.76), parity (OR=.56), school enrollment (OR=.58), and sexual relationship duration (OR=.97) decrease the odds that a women reports not using any contraceptive method. Prior non-marital births (OR=1.29) and age (OR=1.02) are positively related to non-use of contraception. The addition of the interaction terms in Model 7 reveals that the impact of marital status does not vary across race/ethnicity. The analysis for the subsample of cohabiting women is run for substantive interests.

Table 4.4 presents the results of the logistic regression predicting non-use of contraception for the subsample of women who are cohabiting. The first model shows that compared to cohabiting White women, the odds of not using contraception are almost twice as high for cohabiting Black women (OR=1.78). As in the analysis for women from all marital statuses there is no significant difference between Mexican
American and White women. In Model 3, higher educational attainment and full-time employment are negatively related to not using contraception and reduce the significance of the racial difference in non-use of contraception. This suggests that at least part of the Black/White difference in non-use of contraception is related to variation in educational attainment and/or employment. Personal characteristics are added in Model 4 and show that women at higher parity are less likely to not use contraception and the odds ratio for current school enrollment is approaching significance. In the final model, relationship and partner characteristics are added. None of these indicators emerge as significant predictors of non-use of contraception, although the variable representing Black racial identification regains significance at the .05 level.

Overall, the results of this analysis suggest that Black women have a higher likelihood of not using contraception while in a sexually active relationship. For the model for all women, higher educational attainment, labor force participation, parity, current school enrollment, and sexual relationship decrease the likelihood of not using contraception. Women with higher numbers of non-marital births and those who are older are more likely to not use contraception. The Black/White difference in non-use of contraception found in the analysis of all women was also revealed for the subsample of cohabiting women. For cohabiting women, higher educational attainment, full-time labor force participation, and higher parity reduce the likelihood of not using contraception. This difference in non-use of contraception among Black and White cohabiting women is a potential factor in variation in fertility rates. Since these are all sexually active women, Black women have increased exposure to pregnancy. The next analysis looks at
contraceptive use in more detail by examining non-use of contraception, the use of a less effective method of contraception, or a more effective method.

**Contraceptive Method Use**

Table 4.5 illustrates the results of a multinomial logistic regression analysis predicting the type of contraceptive use for all women. The reference group is those using at least one of the most effective methods of contraception. Odds ratios are presented for using no contraception or a less effective method of contraception compared to the reference group. The first model shows that compared to White women, the odds of not using any method of contraception compared to a more effective method are nearly one and a half times higher for Black women (OR=1.49). This result is expected based on the analysis presented in Table 4.3. The effect for Black racial identification on the use of no contraceptive method is robust to the controls added in Models 2 through 6. No racial/ethnic differences emerge for the use of a less effective method of contraception for Blacks or for either method for Mexican Americans.

Summarizing the effects of the control variables in Model 6, the results indicate that education beyond high school, labor force participation, parity, school enrollment, and sexual relationship duration are negatively related to using no method of contraception. Prior non-marital births, age, and Catholic religious affiliation increase the odds of being a non-user. Full-time labor force participation and parity decrease the odds of using a less effective method of contraception, while women whose mothers had greater numbers of children and those at older ages are more likely to use a less effective method of contraception.
The interaction terms between race/ethnicity and marital status are added in Model 7. This model indicates that among cohabiters, the odds of using no contraceptive method are more than two times higher for Blacks than for Whites (OR=2.23). Among cohabiters, the odds of using a less effective method of contraception compared to a more effective method are 1.54 times higher for Blacks than for Whites and are approaching significance. Changes in the other coefficients after the addition of the interaction terms are minimal. The odds ratio for the interaction terms indicate that the effect of marriage on using a less effective method of contraception is significantly different for Blacks and Whites. For Whites, the relationship is positive and non-significant. For Blacks, the relationship is negative. The results of the Wald test (p=.0056) for the interaction terms indicate that adding the set of interaction terms does increase the explanatory power of the model and that the influence of marital status on contraceptive use varies by race/ethnicity.

Table 4.6 presents the results of a multinomial logistic regression analysis predicting contraceptive use for currently cohabiting women. In the first model, the results indicate that compared to White women, the odds of using no method of contraception compared to a more effective method are nearly twice as high for Black women (OR=1.88). No significant differences emerge between Mexican American and White women for using no contraception or a less effective method. The odds ratios for race/ethnic identification change minimally with the addition of the family background and socioeconomic characteristics in Models 2 and 3. After personal characteristics are added in Model 4, Black women’s odds of using a less effective method of contraception are significantly higher than the odds for White women. Black women are almost twice
as likely to use no method (OR=1.97) and just over one and one-half times as likely to use a less effective method (OR=1.62) compared to a more effective method of contraception. The addition of the relationship and partner characteristics in Model 6 has little impact on the odds ratios for race/ethnicity. As for the control variables, having a mother with a high school or greater education increases the odds of using less effective methods of contraception. Respondents with less than a high school education themselves are more likely to use a less effective method of contraception, while those with educational attainment beyond high school and full-time labor force participation are less likely to use no method of contraception. Finally, higher parity is negatively related to using both no method and a less effective method of contraception.

Overall the results for the analysis for all women suggest that compared to White women, Black women are more likely to not use contraception. The major racial/ethnic variation in contraceptive use appears to center on a Black/White difference in using any method compared to not using contraception more than a difference in using more or less effective methods of contraception. Based on the hypothesis for this analysis, it is surprising that no differences in contraceptive use emerged between Whites and Mexican Americans. Additionally, most of the other significant predictors of contraceptive use in the analysis emerged for not using contraception rather than using a less effective method.

For cohabiting women, the Black/White difference in non-use of contraception also emerged. However, the results also indicate that compared to White women, Black women are more likely to use a less effective method of contraception compared to a more effective method. Models for non-use and type of contraceptive method use
suggest that variation in contraceptive use may play a role in racial/ethnic differences in fertility within cohabiting unions for Black and White women. At this point it is unknown whether this variation in contraceptive method use is related to a desire for pregnancy. The next two models look at fertility intentions to examine that issue.

**Current Fertility Intentions**

Table 4.7 illustrates the results of a multinomial logistic regression predicting current fertility intentions for all women. The reference category is currently using contraception and not intending a pregnancy. Odds ratios are presented for not using contraception and not intending a pregnancy and not using contraception and intending a pregnancy. The first model shows that the odds of being a non-user who is not seeking a pregnancy are over one a half times higher (OR=1.66) for Blacks than for Whites. The odds of being a non-user who is seeking a pregnancy are 1.31 times as high for Blacks compared to Whites. For Mexican American women, the odds ratio for not using contraception and intending a pregnancy is approaching significance and suggests that they are more likely to be intending a pregnancy compared to using contraception.

The second model adds marital status and shows that the odds ratio for Black women of being a non-user who is not seeking a pregnancy lessens slightly and the odds ratio for seeking a pregnancy increases. The results also show that single women have lower odds of reporting that they are seeking a pregnancy compared to cohabiters. The indicator for married is approaching significance and suggests a positive relationship with pregnancy seeking.

Family background, socioeconomic, personal, and relationship and partner characteristics are added in Models 3 through 6. These results suggest that women’s
education, employment, and personal characteristics influence fertility intentions. More variables emerge as predictors of non-use without pregnancy seeking than for seeking a pregnancy. Higher educational attainment, labor force participation, school enrollment, and parity decrease the odds of being a non-user who is not seeking a pregnancy. Catholic religious affiliation increases the odds that a woman is a non-user who is not seeking a pregnancy. As for non-use and seeking a pregnancy, higher numbers of non-marital births are positively related to this outcome while parity, current school enrollment, and sexual relationship duration decrease the likelihood of this intention.

The final model, Model 7, adds the race/ethnic and marital status interactions. This model indicates that among cohabitors, the odds of not using contraception and intending a pregnancy are more than two times higher for Blacks (OR=2.38). The effect of marriage on not using contraception and not intending a pregnancy is significantly different for Mexican Americans and Whites. For Mexican American women, marriage increases the likelihood of not using contraception and not intending a pregnancy (OR=1.41).

Table 4.8 presents the results of a multinomial logistic regression predicting current fertility intentions for women who are cohabiting. In the first model, the odds of being a non-user who is not seeking a pregnancy are nearly twice as high for cohabiting Black women (OR=1.92) compared to Whites. Model 2 adds family background characteristics and the results suggest that women who report growing up in a family with two biological or adoptive parents are less likely to report that they are currently seeking a pregnancy. The addition of these background characteristics reduces the odds for Black women seeking a pregnancy to borderline significance and brings the coefficients for
Mexican American women for this outcome to borderline significance. In addition, the odds ratio for Black women who are non-users, but not seeking a pregnancy is now approaching significance.

Socioeconomic, personal, and relationship and partner characteristics are added in Models 3 through 6. In the final model, women with greater than a high school education as well as those who are full-time labor force participants have lower odds of being a non-user who is not seeking a pregnancy compared to using contraception. Women who grew up in households with two-biological or adoptive parents and those with a four-year college degree are less likely to be a non-user who is seeking a pregnancy. In addition, women at a higher parity, those currently enrolled in school, and women whose partners are employed also have lower odds of being a non-user who is seeking a pregnancy.

The addition of these variables brings the odds ratios for cohabiting Black and Mexican American women who are non-users and seeking a pregnancy to statistical significance. Compared to cohabiting White women, the odds of not currently using contraception and seeking a pregnancy are more than twice as high for Blacks (OR=2.37) and nearly four times higher for Mexican Americans (OR=3.66).

Overall the model of fertility intentions for all women suggests that compared to White women, Black women are much more likely to not be using contraception and currently seeking a pregnancy as well as not seeking a pregnancy. Among the subsample of cohabiting women, the results suggest that Black women are more likely to be non-users who are seeking a pregnancy. In addition, among cohabiting women, Mexican Americans are also much more likely than Whites to report that they are not using contraception and seeking a pregnancy. These results suggest substantial racial/ethnic
variation in pregnancy seeking among cohabiting women. Cohabiting non-White women are substantially more likely to report that they are currently seeking a pregnancy than cohabiting White women.

**Chapter Summary**

The aim of this chapter was to evaluate racial/ethnic variation in the role of cohabitation by focusing on fertility-related behaviors and intentions. Following the argument that the more acceptable cohabitation is as a state for childbearing the more it resembles marriage, this analysis examined differences in sexual frequency, contraceptive use, and fertility intentions. By examining sexual frequency and contraceptive use it was possible to gauge differences in the risk of exposure to pregnancy among cohabiters across race/ethnicity. The examination of variation in sexual frequency showed no differences across race/ethnicity among cohabiting women and supported the hypothesis. This suggests that differences in fertility rates among cohabiting women across race/ethnicity are likely not a result of differences in sexual frequency that would alter one aspect of women’s exposure to the risk of pregnancy.

The examination of differences in contraceptive use showed that Black women are nearly twice as likely as White women to report not using any contraceptive methods and cohabiting Black women are also over one and a half times as likely to report using a less effective method of contraception compared to a more effective method than White women. This supported the expectations for contraceptive use among Black women, but not for Mexican American women. These women are in sexually active relationships and this difference in contraceptive use suggests that cohabiting Black women are at a greater risk of pregnancy compared to White women due to the increased incidence of using
either no method or a less effective method of contraception. Just looking at contraceptive use alone does not reveal whether this non-use is related to a real desire to become pregnant or simply a lack of use due to reasons such as limited access to contraception or for other reasons. The final analysis of fertility intentions helps unpack this issue.

Looking at current fertility intentions provided a test of differences across race/ethnicity in the desire for pregnancy among cohabiting women. The results indicate that non-White cohabiting women are substantially more likely to report that they are currently seeking a pregnancy. Cohabiting Black women had over twice the likelihood and Mexican American women nearly four times the likelihood of White women to report that they were not contracepting and intending a pregnancy. This suggests substantial variation in pregnancy seeking among cohabiting women across race/ethnicity and variation in the role of cohabitation across these groups.
Table 4.1. Odds Ratios of Frequent Sexual Intercourse (several times weekly or more) for Female Respondents (n=10,927)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.82*</td>
<td>.87+</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.86+</td>
<td>.84*</td>
<td>.87+</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>1.21*</td>
<td>1.17+</td>
<td>1.21*</td>
<td>1.19+</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.64***</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td>.67***</td>
<td>.73***</td>
<td>.81*</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two biological or adoptive parents</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother fertility variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (2001 Dollars, in ten thousands)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.98*</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.83*</td>
<td>.81*</td>
<td>.81*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college and above</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working for pay</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working less than full time</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Full time</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.97***</td>
<td>.97***</td>
<td>.97***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current school enrollment</td>
<td>.86+</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.85+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>.89+</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.89+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic religious affiliation (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious affiliation</td>
<td>.88+</td>
<td>.87+</td>
<td>.87+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship and partner characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of sexual relationship</td>
<td>.99*</td>
<td>.99*</td>
<td>.99*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>.86+</td>
<td>.87+</td>
<td>.87+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously married</td>
<td>1.19*</td>
<td>1.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity and marital status interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black*Single</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black*Married</td>
<td>1.67*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American*Single</td>
<td>.56+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American*Married</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle 5 survey</td>
<td>1.15*</td>
<td>1.15*</td>
<td>1.15*</td>
<td>1.18**</td>
<td>1.15*</td>
<td>1.14*</td>
<td>1.15*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

*a Wald test for addition of interaction terms p=.0000
Table 4.2. Odds Ratios of Frequent Sexual Intercourse (several times weekly or more) for Cohabiting Female Respondents (n=1,167)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two biological or adoptive parents</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother fertility variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (2001 Dollars, in ten thousands)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.67+</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college and above</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.50+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working for pay (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working less than full time</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full time</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>1.13+</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.95***</td>
<td>.95***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current school enrollment</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic affiliation (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious affiliation</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship and partner characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of sexual relationship</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's work status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously married</td>
<td>1.69**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitator's chance of marriage to partner</td>
<td>1.82***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cycle 5 survey</strong></td>
<td>1.53**</td>
<td>1.56**</td>
<td>1.51**</td>
<td>1.51**</td>
<td>1.37*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.50***</td>
<td>1.61***</td>
<td>1.56***</td>
<td>1.51***</td>
<td>1.60***</td>
<td>1.62***</td>
<td>2.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>.79+</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.77+</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.63***</td>
<td>1.72***</td>
<td>1.82***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family background</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>.85+</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.84+</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two biological or adoptive parents</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother fertility variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socioeconomic characteristics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income (2001 Dollars, in ten thousands)</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>.82*</td>
<td>.81*</td>
<td>.81*</td>
<td>.81*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college and above</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working for pay (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working less than full time</td>
<td>.80*</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td>.76*</td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full time</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal characteristics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-marital births</td>
<td>1.34***</td>
<td>1.29**</td>
<td>1.27****</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.02*</td>
<td>1.02*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current school enrollment</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>1.20+</td>
<td>1.20+</td>
<td>1.21+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic religious affiliation (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious affiliation</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship and partner characteristics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration of sexual relationship</td>
<td>.97**</td>
<td>.97**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously married</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity and marital status interactions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black*Single</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black*Married</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American*Single</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American*Married</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle 5 survey</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td>.74***</td>
<td>.73***</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td>.71***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

*a Wald test for addition of interaction terms p=.1260
Table 4.4. Odds Ratios of Not Using Contraception for Cohabiting Female Respondents
(n=1,167)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.78*</td>
<td>1.82*</td>
<td>1.66+</td>
<td>1.75+</td>
<td>1.87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two biological or adoptive parents</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother fertility variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.86*</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (2001 Dollars, in ten thousands)</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college and above</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working for pay (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working less than full time</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full time</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-marital births</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current school enrollment</td>
<td>.47+</td>
<td>.44+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic religious affiliation (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious affiliation</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship and partner characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of sexual relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's work status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously married</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitor's chance of marriage to partner</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle 5 survey</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.66+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001
Table 4.5. Odds Ratios of Contraceptive Use for Female Respondents (n=10,927)
Odds of Using no method or a less effective method compared to a more effective method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.49***</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.60***</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.54***</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.50***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.78+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.66***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>.86+</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two biological or adoptive parents</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother fertility variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.04+</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.05*</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.07**</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (2001 Dollars, in ten thousands)</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.98+</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.74**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>.81*</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.79*</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.78*</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college and above</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.84+</td>
<td>.83+</td>
<td>.80+</td>
<td>.84+</td>
<td>.80+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working for pay (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working less than full time</td>
<td>.81*</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.74**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full time</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.87+</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.73***</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.73***</td>
<td>.70***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-marital births</td>
<td>1.34***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.29***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.27***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current school enrollment</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>1.23*</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.24*</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.24*</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic religious affiliation (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious affiliation</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Relationship and partner characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>.98*</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>.97**</th>
<th>1.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration of sexual relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously married</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Race/ethnicity and marital status interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>.74</th>
<th>.90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black*Single</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black*Married</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American*Single</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American*Married</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>.62***</th>
<th>.39***</th>
<th>.61***</th>
<th>.39***</th>
<th>.61***</th>
<th>.39***</th>
<th>.62***</th>
<th>.38***</th>
<th>.56***</th>
<th>.36***</th>
<th>.56***</th>
<th>.36***</th>
<th>.56***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cycle 5 survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

* A more effective method is defined as contraceptive sterilization, pill, injectable, and IUD. All others are less effective methods.

b Wald test for addition of interaction terms p=.0056
Table 4.6. Odds Ratios of Contraceptive Use for Cohabiting Female Respondents (n=1,167)
Odds of using no method or a less effective method compared to a more effective methoda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.88*</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.92*</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.74*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother’s education</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.62*</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two biological or adoptive parents</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mother fertility variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.87+</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Socioeconomic characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income (2001 Dollars, in ten thousands)</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.88*</td>
<td>1.57+</td>
<td>2.20**</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college and above</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Work status

| Not working for pay (reference)        | .---    | .---    | .---    | .---    | .---    |
| Working less than full time            | .70     | 1.11    | .69     | 1.05    | .74     |
| Employed full time                     | .69+    | 1.50    | .57*    | 1.30    | .60*    |

Personal characteristics

| Parity                                 | .53***  | .68**   | .52**   | .64**   |
| Non-marital births                     | 1.30    | 1.03    | 1.26    | 1.04    |
| Age                                    | 1.03    | 1.03*   | 1.02    | 1.02    |
| Current school enrollment              | .46+    | .89     | .43+    | .89     |

Religion

| Catholic                               | 1.13    | 1.44    | 1.12    | 1.45    |
| Non-Catholic religious Affiliation     | .---    | .---    | .---    | .---    |
| No religious affiliation               | 1.15    | 1.20    | 1.11    | 1.16    |
### Relationship and partner characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cycle 5 survey</th>
<th>1.04</th>
<th>1.04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration of sexual relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's work status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously married</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitor's chance of marriage to partner</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cycle 5 survey: .58* .40*** .59* .40*** .59* .42*** .55* .38*** .52* .37***

*p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

A more effective method is defined as contraceptive sterilization, pill, injectable, and IUD. All others are less effective methods.
### Table 4.7. Odds Ratios of Fertility Intentions for Female Respondents (n=10,927)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Do not Intend</th>
<th>Do not Intend</th>
<th>Do not Intend</th>
<th>Do not Intend</th>
<th>Do not Intend</th>
<th>Do not Intend</th>
<th>Do not Intend</th>
<th>Do not Intend</th>
<th>Do not Intend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.66***</td>
<td>1.31*</td>
<td>1.49**</td>
<td>1.81***</td>
<td>1.40*</td>
<td>1.81***</td>
<td>1.35*</td>
<td>1.73***</td>
<td>1.48***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.33+</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.36+</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.39+</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.45*</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.58***</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>.78+</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two biological or adoptive parents</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother fertility variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (2001 Dollars, in ten thousands)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.95**</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.96+</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.36*</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.35+</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.35+</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college and above</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td>1.61***</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>1.26+</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working for pay (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working less than full time</td>
<td>.75*</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.73*</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.73*</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full time</td>
<td>.80*</td>
<td>1.19+</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.81+</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.82+</td>
<td>.70***</td>
<td>.82+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-marital births</td>
<td>1.13+</td>
<td>1.58***</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.48***</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.45***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.02+</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current school enrollment</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>1.39*</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.39*</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.39*</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic religious affiliation (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious affiliation</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Relationship and partner characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>.99</th>
<th>.96**</th>
<th>.99</th>
<th>.96**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration of sexual relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously married</td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Race/ethnicity and marital status interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>.71</th>
<th>1.29</th>
<th>1.01</th>
<th>.69</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black*Single</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black*Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American*Single</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American*Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cycle 5 survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>.65***</th>
<th>.88</th>
<th>.66***</th>
<th>.85</th>
<th>.65***</th>
<th>.85</th>
<th>.64***</th>
<th>.91</th>
<th>.61***</th>
<th>0.84</th>
<th>.61***</th>
<th>0.84</th>
<th>.61***</th>
<th>0.85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

+ p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

* Wald test for addition of interaction terms p=.0566
Table 4.8. Odds Ratios of Fertility Intentions for Cohabiting Female Respondents (n=1,167)
Odds of not using contraception and intending a pregnancy and not using contraception and not intending a pregnancy compared to using contraception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not</td>
<td>Intend</td>
<td>Do not</td>
<td>Intend</td>
<td>Do not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.92*</td>
<td>1.79+</td>
<td>1.86+</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>2.77+</td>
<td>.42+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two biological or adoptive parents</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother fertility variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (2001 Dollars, in ten thousands)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1.80+</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college and above</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working for pay</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working less than full time</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full time</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.59+</td>
<td>.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-marital births</td>
<td>1.40+</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current school enrollment</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.43+</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic religious affiliation (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious affiliation</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Relationship and partner characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Wave 0</th>
<th>Wave 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration of sexual relationship</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's work status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously married</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitor's chance of marriage to partner</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cycle 5 survey: .52* 1.03 .51* 1.05 .49* 1.12 .50* 1.00 .51* .89

*p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001
Chapter 5: SEXUAL FREQUENCY, CONTRACEPTIVE USE, AND FERTILITY INTENTIONS: MEN

The last chapter presented the results for the race/ethnic comparisons of fertility-related behaviors and intentions for women. The aim of that chapter was to examine how these outcomes vary across race/ethnicity to determine if the role of cohabitation, in relation to fertility-related behavior and intentions, varies across these groups. This chapter presents the same analyses for the sample of men. Again the aim is to look for racial and ethnic variation in the outcomes, but also to compare the reports of men to those of the female sample. As noted in the literature review, fertility research lacks data from men and the majority of what we know based on survey data relies on reports from women. Numerous researchers have called attention to this pattern and suggest more emphasis on incorporating men into fertility research. This study takes a step in that direction by examining fertility-related behaviors and intentions using the male respondents from the 2002 National Survey of Family Growth. The same hypotheses that were presented for women are expected for men.

**Frequency of Sexual Intercourse**

Table 5.1 illustrates the results of a logistic regression predicting frequent sexual intercourse (several times a week or more often) among male respondents. In Model 1, only identifiers of racial/ethnic affiliation are included and the results suggest that the odds of frequent sexual intercourse are over one and a half times higher for Mexican American men (OR=1.67) than for Whites. Model 2 adds the marital status predictors and shows that married respondents are less likely (OR=.66) to have frequent sexual intercourse than cohabiting respondents however this relationship becomes non-significant once control variables are added to the model.
The series of control variables are added in Models 3 through 6. The addition of these variables reveals few predictors of sexual frequency. Having a mother with an education beyond high school and older age reduces the odds of frequent sexual intercourse. Interaction terms between race/ethnicity and marital status are added in Model 7 and increase the explanatory power of the model. This suggests that there is variation in the influence of marital status on sexual frequency across the three race/ethnic groups. However, the conditional main effects for the race/ethnic and marital status categories once the interaction terms are added to the model suggest there are no significant race/ethnic differences in frequent sexual intercourse among cohabiting respondents which is a main focus of this research.

Table 5.2 shows the results of the parallel logistic regression analysis predicting frequent sexual intercourse among cohabiting respondents. As suggested by the interaction terms in the analysis for all men, there is no racial/ethnic difference among cohabiting men in the likelihood of frequent sexual intercourse. Few variables emerge as significant predictors of sexual frequency among cohabiting men. In Model 5, longer relationship duration decreases the odds of frequent sexual intercourse (OR=.90).

Overall, the results suggest that among cohabiting men there is no statistically significant variation in frequency of sexual intercourse that could play a potential role in racial/ethnic variation in pregnancy and childbearing. The results for men are consistent with those for the female sample of cohabiters presented in the previous chapter. The next step is to look at racial/ethnic variation in contraceptive use.

**Non-Use of Contraception**
The results of a logistic regression predicting non-use of contraception for the full sample of men are presented in Table 5.3. In the first model, the odds ratio for Mexican American men is approaching significance and suggests that the odds (OR=1.43) of not using any method of contraception are nearly one and a half times higher for these men compared to White men. With the addition of identifiers of marital status in Model 2, the coefficient for Black men gains statistical significance and shows that they are 64% more likely than White men to report not using any method of contraception. The odds ratio for Mexican men is now only approaching significance indicating that marital status has mediated at least some of the effect of Mexican American identification on non-use of contraception. The results of Model 2 also show that single men are over 50% less likely (OR=.46) and married men over 50% more likely (OR=1.57) to report non-use of contraception compared to cohabiting men.

Control variables are added sequentially in Models 3 through 6. The addition of the variables in Model 3 at least partially mediates the effect of Black racial identification on contraception use since the odds ratio is now only approaching significance. As for the impact of the other control variables, men with educational attainment beyond high school have lower odds of not using any method of contraception. In addition, men who are currently enrolled in school are approximately 50% less likely to not use contraception (OR=.49). Men at older ages and those of Catholic religious affiliation are more likely to not use contraception. In the last model before the interaction terms are added, the odds of not using contraception are approximately one and a half times higher for Black men compared to White men, however this association is only marginally significant.
The final model includes race/ethnic and marital status interaction terms. The addition of these terms does improve the explanatory power of the model. The main effects in this model show that Black cohabitors are nearly four times (OR=3.87) as likely to report not using contraception compared to White cohabiting men. The odds ratios for the interaction terms show that the effect of being single is significantly different for Blacks and Whites. For Blacks, the effect of being single is even lower than for Whites. This negative relationship is also shown for Mexican Americans, but is only marginally significant. In addition, the relationship between being married and non-use of contraception is significantly different for Mexican Americans and Whites. For Mexican Americans the relationship is negative.

Table 5.4 shows the logistic regression analysis predicting non-use of contraception for cohabiting men. As suggested by the race/ethnic and marital status interaction terms shown in Table 5.3, the first model of Table 5.4 shows substantial racial variation in non-use of contraception. The odds of not using contraception are nearly four times higher (OR=3.74) for cohabiting Black men compared to Whites. In addition, cohabiting Mexican American men are over twice as likely (OR=2.62) to not use any method of contraception than Whites. The addition of family background characteristics in Model 2 reduces the odds for Mexican American men to non-significance and the odds for Black men are reduced to just under three (OR=2.99) suggesting that variation in family background accounts for some of the racial/ethnic difference in non-use of contraception. The final model shows that with all controls, a four-year college degree or higher, part-time labor force participation, non-marital births, and having an employed
partner lower the odds of not using contraception. Higher parity increases the odds of non-use. In the final model, the odds ratio for Black men is only marginally significant.

Overall the results suggest differences in contraceptive use across racial and ethnic groups. The largest difference is that Black men have higher odds of reporting not using any contraceptive method compared to White men. This relationship was present for cohabiting Black men, although partially mediated by personal and relationship characteristics. This difference could play a role in Black/White pregnancy and childbearing differences among cohabiters. For cohabiting men higher educational attainment, working but not full time, prior non-marital births, and an employed partner decrease the odds of not using contraception. These results are similar to those for cohabiting women that also showed a Black/White difference and a relationship for employment; however for women higher parity was associated with decreased odds of not using contraception.

**Contraceptive Method Use**

Table 5.5 shows the results of a multinomial logistic regression predicting the type of contraceptive method use among all men. Odds ratios are presented for using no method or a less effective method compared to the reference category (using a more effective method of contraception). In Model 1, compared to White men, Black men have higher odds of reporting not using any contraceptive method (OR=1.62) and a less effective method (OR=1.70) compared to using a more effective contraceptive method. Compared to White men, Mexican American men have higher odds of using no contraceptive method (OR=1.63) compared to a more effective method. The odds ratio for the use of a less effective method suggests Mexican American men are more likely to
use a less effective method (OR=1.43), but it is only approaching significance. The addition of the marital status variables in Model 2 has minimal impact on the odds ratios for the race/ethnic identifiers, but the coefficient for Mexican American men’s use of a less effective method that was only of borderline significance in Model 1 is now significant at the .05 level and remains significant through Model 6. The odds ratio for Mexican American men’s use of no contraceptive method is reduced to non-significance with the addition of family background characteristics in Model 3 and remains non-significant through the rest of the models. Once other controls are added in Models 3 through 6, the results for the marital status indicators show that compared to cohabitors, single respondents are more likely to use less effective methods compared to more effective methods.

The series of control variables added in Models 3 through 6 shows that men at older ages have a higher likelihood of not using any method of contraception compared to a more effective method, while those with education beyond high school and those currently enrolled in school have a lower likelihood. Finally, men who report longer sexual relationship durations have slightly lower odds of using a less effective method of contraception compared to a more effective method.

The final model, Model 7, includes the interaction terms for race/ethnicity and marital status. The Wald test shows that the inclusion of the interaction terms is of borderline significance (p=.0632) for improving the explanatory power of the model. The conditional main effects show that cohabiting Black men are nearly five times as likely (OR=4.88) as cohabiting White men to report not using any contraceptive method.
Table 5.6 shows the parallel analysis for cohabiting men. The first model shows the pattern for Black men suggested by the interaction terms in the full model. Compared to cohabiting White men, cohabiting Black men have over four times the likelihood (OR=4.44) of not use any method of contraception compared to a more effective method. Mexican American men have over twice the likelihood (OR=2.60) of using no contraceptive method. The addition of the family background characteristics in the second model reduces the size of the odds ratio for Black men and the coefficient for Mexican American men is no longer statistically significant.

The control variables added in Models 3 through 5 show that men with a four-year degree, working less than full-time, of Catholic religious affiliation, and those with employed partners are less likely to report not using any method of contraception. Men working full-time have a lower likelihood of using a less effective method of contraception compared to a more effective method. Older age reduces the odds of using both no method as well as a less effective method of contraception. The final model, with all controls, shows that the only racial/ethnic difference in contraceptive use with these controls is that compared to White men, Black men have nearly four times the likelihood of using no contraceptive method compared to the reference group of a more effective method of contraceptive use.

Overall, the results suggest that the most substantial difference in contraceptive use for cohabiting men is the Black/White gap in the use of any contraceptive method. This is a potential factor in race/ethnic variation in pregnancy and childbearing in cohabiting unions. Educational attainment also emerged as a predictor of contraceptive use and generally higher educational levels were associated with lower non-use of
contraception. Also, for cohabiting men engagement in the labor force lowered the likelihood of not using contraception and using a less effective method. The finding of the Black/White difference in non-use of contraception among men was consistent with the findings for women, however, the differences in the use of a less effective method of contraception were not the same. For women, the increased likelihood of Blacks to use a less effective method of contraception compared to Whites was found for cohabitators, but not for all women. The reverse was true for men. The next step is to see how contraceptive use fits into current fertility intentions.

**Current Fertility Intentions**

Table 5.7 illustrates the results of a multinomial logistic regression predicting current fertility intentions for the sample of men. Odds ratios are presented for not using contraception, but not intending a pregnancy and not using contraception and intending a pregnancy compared to the reference group of using some form of contraception. The first model shows no differences in fertility intentions across the race/ethnic groups. Once the marital status indicators are added in the second model, a significant difference for Black men emerges. Compared to White men, the odds of not using contraception and intending a pregnancy are nearly twice a high for Black men (OR=1.78). As for marital status, compared to cohabiting men, single men have half the likelihood (OR=.51) of reporting that that are not using contraception and not intending a pregnancy and one-fourth the likelihood that they are not using contraception and intending a pregnancy (OR=.25). In addition, the odds of not using contraception and seeking a pregnancy are over twice as high (OR=2.42) for married men compared to cohabitators.
The series of control variables added in Models 3 through 6 show that men at higher parity, older ages, and those who report Catholic religious affiliation have higher odds of being a non-user who is not seeking a pregnancy. Higher educational attainment decreases the odds of being a non-user who is not seeking a pregnancy. Men at a higher parity also have lower odds of being a non-user who is seeking a pregnancy. In the final model, interaction terms are added for race/ethnicity and marital status. The addition of these terms does not add to the explanatory power of the model (p=.1170).

It was not possible to run Table 5.8 is because the sample sizes for the outcome cells were too small.

**Chapter Summary**

The goal of this chapter was to replicate the analysis in the preceding chapter for the sample of men. This analysis adds to our understanding of racial/ethnic variation in the role of cohabitation as well as contributes to the literature on fertility-related behavior using reports from men. Researchers have called attention to the lack of fertility research that incorporates male reports and this study takes a step in that direction by utilizing the male data.

Overall, the data for men show a similar pattern as that for women. As for women, there were no differences in sexual frequency among cohabitors across the race/ethnic groups and Black men reported had a higher likelihood of not using contraception compared to White men. The higher likelihood of the use of a less effective method of contraception among Black cohabitors compared to White cohabitors that was found for women was not found for men. Unfortunately, the smaller sample size of men precluded running the analysis of fertility intentions for cohabitors.
Table 5.1. Odds Ratios of Frequent Sexual Intercourse (several times weekly or more) for Male Respondents (n=2,178)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (reference)</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>1.46**</td>
<td>1.67**</td>
<td>1.65**</td>
<td>1.70**</td>
<td>1.70**</td>
<td>1.70**</td>
<td>1.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting (reference)</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two biological or adoptive parents</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother fertility variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (2001 Dollars, in ten thousands)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (reference)</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college and above</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working for pay (reference)</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working less than full time</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full time</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>.91+</td>
<td>.91+</td>
<td>.91+</td>
<td>.91+</td>
<td>.91+</td>
<td>.91+</td>
<td>.91+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.97**</td>
<td>.97*</td>
<td>.97*</td>
<td>.97*</td>
<td>.97*</td>
<td>.97*</td>
<td>.97*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current school enrollment</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic religious affiliation (reference)</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious affiliation</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship and partner characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of sexual relationship</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously married</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity and marital status interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black*Single</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black*Married</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American*Single</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American*Married</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

* Wald test for the addition of interaction terms p=.0098
Table 5.2. Odds Ratios of Frequent Sexual Intercourse (several times weekly or more) for Cohabiting Male Respondents (n=269)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Family background**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother's education</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family structure</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two biological or adoptive parents</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother fertility variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Socioeconomic characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income (2001 Dollars, in ten thousands)</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college and above</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work status</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not working for pay (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working less than full time</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full time</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parity</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current school enrollment</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic religious affiliation (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious affiliation</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relationship and partner characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of sexual relationship</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner's work status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner's education</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously married</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitator's chance of marriage to partner</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001
Table 5.3. Odds Ratios of Not Using Contraception for Male Respondents (n=2,178)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.64*</td>
<td>1.51+</td>
<td>1.45+</td>
<td>1.58+</td>
<td>1.59+</td>
<td>3.87***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>1.43+</td>
<td>1.39+</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitng (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1.57*</td>
<td>1.49*</td>
<td>1.60*</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.98*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School and above</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two biological or adoptive parents</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.30+</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother fertility variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>1.15**</td>
<td>1.13*</td>
<td>1.09+</td>
<td>1.10+</td>
<td>1.10*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (2001 Dollars, in ten thousands)</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college and above</td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>.64***</td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working for pay</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working less than full time</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full time</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-marital births</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.04**</td>
<td>1.04*</td>
<td>1.04*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current school enrollment</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>1.42+</td>
<td>1.43*</td>
<td>1.46*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic religious affiliation (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious affiliation</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship and partner characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of sexual relationship</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously married</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity and marital status interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black*Single</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black*Married</td>
<td>.42+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American*Single</td>
<td>.35+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American*Married</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.10; *p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

*a Wald test for addition of interaction terms p=.0232
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3.74***</td>
<td>2.99**</td>
<td>2.81**</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.77+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>2.62*</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>.47+</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.40+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two biological or adoptive parents</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.47+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother fertility variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (2001 Dollars, in ten thousands)</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college and above</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>.04***</td>
<td>.02***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working for pay (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working less than full time</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full time</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.24*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-marital births</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current school enrollment</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic religious affiliation (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious affiliation</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship and partner characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of sexual relationship</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's work status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously married</td>
<td>.15+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitator’s chance of marriage to partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001
Table 5.5.  Odds Ratios of Contraceptive Use for Male Respondents (n=2,187)
Odds of Using no method or a less effective method compared to a more effective method*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.62*</td>
<td>1.70***</td>
<td>1.90**</td>
<td>1.52**</td>
<td>1.79*</td>
<td>1.60**</td>
<td>1.94**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>1.63*</td>
<td>1.43+</td>
<td>1.61*</td>
<td>1.51*</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.62*</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>2.44***</td>
<td>.67+</td>
<td>2.38***</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>2.44***</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1.69**</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.61*</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.72*</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.53+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two biological or adoptive parents</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.37+</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother fertility variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>1.12*</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.10*</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (2001 Dollars, in ten thousands)</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college and above</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.70+</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.71+</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.70+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working for pay (reference)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working less than full time</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full time</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-marital births</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.04**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.05**</td>
<td>1.03+</td>
<td>1.05**</td>
<td>1.03+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current school enrollment</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>1.43+</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.45+</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.48*</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic religious affiliation (reference)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious affiliation</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Relationship and partner characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>.97</th>
<th>.95**</th>
<th>.97</th>
<th>.94**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration of sexual relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously married</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.58+</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.58+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Race/ethnicity and marital status interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>.29*</th>
<th>1.09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black*Single</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black*Married</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American*Single</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American*Married</td>
<td>.45+</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A more effective method is defined as contraceptive sterilization, pill, injectable, and IUD. All others are less effective methods.

+ p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001

Wald test for addition of interaction terms p=.0632
Table 5.6. Odds Ratios of Contraceptive Use for Cohabitating Male Respondents (n=269)
Odds of using no method or a less effective method compared to a more effective method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4.44***</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>3.48**</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>2.60*</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Family background**
Mother's education
- Less than high school (reference) | .--- | .--- | .--- | .--- | .--- | .--- | .--- | .--- |
- High school | .41+ | .65 | .42* | .63 | .45+ | .96 | .39 | .96 |

Family structure
- Two biological or adoptive parents | .60 | .65 | .63 | .64 | .56 | .57 | .42+ | .61 |

Mother fertility variables
- Number of children | 1.20 | 1.00 | 1.19 | .99 | 1.16 | .96 | 1.20 | .97 |

**Socioeconomic characteristics**
Income (2001 Dollars, in ten thousands) | 1.06 | .97 | 1.04 | .92 | 1.11 | .95 |

Education
- Less than high school | 1.09 | .94 | 1.55 | 1.09 | 1.06 | .94 |
- High school (reference) | .--- | .--- | .--- | .--- | .--- | .--- |
- Some college | .56 | .74 | .52 | .67 | .44+ | .60 |
- 4-year college and above | .10** | 2.49+ | .05*** | 1.88 | .03*** | 1.46 |

Work status
- Not working for pay (reference) | .--- | .--- | .--- | .--- | .--- | .--- |
- Working less than full time | .07** | .24* | .07** | .21* | .05** | .19+ |
- Employed full time | .42 | .19** | .48 | .19* | .50 | .18* |

**Personal characteristics**
Parity | 1.08 | .52 | 2.85+ | .79 |

Non-marital births | .83 | 1.75 | .25+ | 1.17 |

Age | 1.08* | 1.09** | 1.14** | 1.13** |

Current school enrollment | .67 | 1.08 | .70 | .95 |

Religion
- Catholic | .45+ | .99 | .39* | 1.02 |
- Non-Catholic religious affiliation (reference) | .--- | .--- | .--- | .--- |
- No religious affiliation | .37+ | 1.69 | .38+ | 1.71 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship and partner characteristics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration of sexual relationship</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner’s work status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner’s education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high School (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously married</td>
<td>.11+</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitor’s chance of marriage to partner</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a A more effective method is defined as contraceptive sterilization, pill, injectable, and IUD. All others are less effective methods.

+ p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001
Table 5.7. Odds Ratios of Fertility Intentions for Male Respondents (n=2,178)
Odds of not using contraception and not intending a pregnancy and not using contraception and intending a pregnancy compared to using contraception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Do not Intend</th>
<th>Intend</th>
<th>Do not Intend</th>
<th>Intend</th>
<th>Do not Intend</th>
<th>Intend</th>
<th>Do not Intend</th>
<th>Intend</th>
<th>Do not Intend</th>
<th>Intend</th>
<th>Do not Intend</th>
<th>Intend</th>
<th>Do not Intend</th>
<th>Intend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White (reference)</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.60+</td>
<td>1.78+</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.84+</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.91+</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.14+</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.14+</td>
<td>3.32**</td>
<td>9.97+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>6.36+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.25+</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.25+</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.28+</td>
<td>.64+</td>
<td>.28+</td>
<td>.64+</td>
<td>.27+</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitting (reference)</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>2.42+</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>2.31+</td>
<td>1.47+</td>
<td>2.17+</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>3.26+</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3.38+</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>9.03+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two biological or adoptive parents</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother fertility variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>1.19**</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.15*</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (2001 Dollars, in ten thousands)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>2.10+</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>2.23+</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>2.13+</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>2.08+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (reference)</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>1.81+</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college and above</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>2.08+</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working for pay (reference)</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working less than full time</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full time</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>3.96+</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>4.20+</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>4.05+</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>3.98+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>1.17**</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>1.15*</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>1.15+</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-marital births</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.84+</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.05**</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.05**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.05**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current school enrollment</td>
<td>.57+</td>
<td>.37+</td>
<td>.57+</td>
<td>.37+</td>
<td>.57+</td>
<td>.38+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>1.47*</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.48*</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.50*</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic religious affiliation (reference)</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious affiliation</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Relationship and partner characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of sexual relationship</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>.98</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>.97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously married</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Race/ethnicity and marital status interactions

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black*Single</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black*Married</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.18+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American*Single</td>
<td>.34+</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American*Married</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Wald test for addition of interaction terms p=.1170
+ p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001
Chapter 6: EXAMINATION OF ATTITUDES ABOUT WOMEN’S INDEPENDENCE AND CAREER ORIENTATION AND FAMILY LIFE

The second demographic transition framework offers ideas on how value changes influence contemporary family patterns. Lesthaeghe (1995) argues that increased individualism, the rising economic independence of women, increased market orientations, higher expectations for personal relationships, and secularization influence contemporary family patterns including the increase in non-marital cohabitation and fertility. His research, along with that of others, has linked these values with contemporary changes in family life in Europe and offers support for second demographic transition perspective for this context (Surkyn and Lesthaeghe 2004). One path to establishing this link has been to show selection into less traditional family forms on the basis of less conservative values. This link, however, has not been shown in the United States in a comprehensive manner like it has for Europe. There is research showing the influence of a more limited set of values on specific family patterns in the United States. For example, there is evidence of the selection of more liberal and less religious individuals into cohabitation (Thornton, Axinn, and Hill 1992; Clarkberg, Stolzenberg, and Waite 1995). I am not aware of any examinations of value selection into parenthood within cohabitation for the U.S. context. On a related note, there is also evidence that cohabitation is selective of individuals from lower socioeconomic backgrounds in the United States (Thornton, Axinn, and Teachman 1995; Bumpass and Lu 2000). This suggests that cohabitation may be an attractive alternative to marriage for some individuals whose socioeconomic conditions hinder entry into legal marriage that works independently or along with the influence of values on family formation choices.
Another factor that may complicate ideas about selection into cohabitation among individuals with less traditional values is the long history of consensual unions in Latin America. This may be influential in family formation patterns among Hispanics in the United States and on views of the acceptability of childbearing within cohabiting unions (Oropesa and Landale 2004). Current evidence suggests that birth rates among cohabiting Hispanics are higher than those of cohabiting non-Hispanic Whites (Manning 2001). The results presented in Chapter 4 show that among cohabiting women Mexican Americans are substantially more likely to report that they are actively seeking a pregnancy compared to White women. If Mexican American women are a driving force behind intended fertility within cohabiting unions in the United States and their behavior is guided by a tradition of consensual unions that does not necessarily align with more liberal values then this would not provide support for the second demographic transition framework in the U.S. context.

The goal of this chapter is to examine how values are related to the fertility intentions of cohabiting women. The data for the analyses for women presented in Chapter 4 was based on the pooled sample of women from the 1995 and 2002 cycles. In each of these cycles an array of attitudinal items was asked of the respondents. However, the same questions were not asked in both cycles so a pooled analysis of attitudinal variation is not possible and separate analyses are conducted for the women at each cycle. In 1995, the measures reflect attitudes about women’s independence and career orientation. In 2002, the measures tap respondents’ feelings about family life. The items from 1995 correspond with views about women’s economic independence. The items from 2002 align more closely with ideas about individualism and a focus on
increased value of personal satisfaction from relationships more than adherence to traditional family norms.

Because of the cross-sectional design of the National Survey of Family Growth, attempting to analyze the impact of attitudes on the outcomes in this study raises issues of causal order. In an effort to gain some understanding on how variation in values may be a factor in racial and ethnic variation in the role of cohabitation and fertility intentions of cohabiters a series of ANOVA models were run.

Overall, I expect to find that across the marital status groups cohabiters will show the most liberal values. I expect this finding based on past research that evidences a selection of less traditional individuals into cohabiting unions. I do not expect to find more liberal values among women who are seeking a pregnancy compared to those who are not. Although not tested here, based on prior research about fertility in cohabiting unions I expect that socioeconomic characteristics and the tradition of consensual unions among Hispanics will be factors in the fertility behavior of cohabiting unions. Overall, research suggests that fertility within cohabiting unions is more similar to that within marriage for Hispanic and Black women, but not for non-Hispanic White women. There is no existing evidence of great variation in attitudes about family life across racial/ethnic groups of the nature that would suggest that value orientations associated with the second demographic transition framework are behind these differences in fertility within cohabiting unions. To be sure, much research on the family patterns of Hispanic women cites familism as a pervasive force in family life. This value refers to an emphasis on family roles and giving preference to the family over the individual. That stands in contrast to the idea that increased individualism is a factor in contemporary family
formation. Finding more liberal values among cohabiting women who are seeking a pregnancy would lend support to the second demographic framework in explaining U.S. family patterns, however, I do not expect this result.

**Women’s Independence and Career Orientation**

The results of a series of ANOVA models examining differences in attitudes about women’s independence and career orientation based on the 1995 sample of women are presented in Table 6.1. The first panel shows an ANOVA comparing women from all marital status categories by their racial/ethnic background and then women from each of the three marital status groups; single, cohabiting, and married. For women over all marital statuses White and Black women report significantly more liberal attitudes about women’s independence and career orientation than Mexican American women, but no significant differences between Black and White women are found. This pattern of Mexican American women endorsing the most traditional attitudes about women’s independence and career orientation holds across all marital status groups. As for the comparison of the attitudes of cohabiting women to those in other marital statuses, the results indicate that the values of cohabiting women are slightly more traditional than those of single women. The only difference between cohabiting and married women is that among Whites, cohabiters are slightly more liberal than married women. Overall, the patterns suggest that cohabiters do not stand out as being a more liberal group than single and married women as would be expected from the second demographic transition framework. Of course this analysis does not control for factors such as age that may be related to differences in attitudes.
The second panel of Table 6.1 shows the results of an ANOVA model comparing attitudes about women’s independence and career orientation for currently cohabiting women across race/ethnicity and current fertility intentions. First, looking within each fertility intention outcome we see that among women who report using contraception White women report the most liberal attitudes, followed by Blacks, and Mexican Americans. There are no significant differences across race/ethnicity for the remaining two fertility statuses.

This panel also shows a comparison of attitudes across the three fertility intentions within each race/ethnic group. For White women the results indicate no significant differences in attitudes between women who are using contraception and those who are currently seeking a pregnancy. However, White women who report not using contraception, but not intending a pregnancy have significantly more traditional attitudes than those women who report using contraception. No significant differences are shown for Black women across the three fertility intention groups. For Mexican American women, those who report not using contraception because they are seeking a pregnancy have significantly more liberal attitudes about women’s independence and career orientation than those who are currently using contraception. The finding for cohabiting Mexican American women showing that those who are seeking a pregnancy endorse more liberal attitudes than those who are using contraception and not seeking a pregnancy does hint at support for the second demographic transition framework, however, looking at the table overall there are not large differences in attitudes among women seeking a pregnancy that would support the idea that women who seek a pregnancy are a select group of liberal women.
Family Life

Table 6.2 shows the results of a series of ANOVAs examining differences in attitudes about family life for the 2002 sample of women by race, marital status, and fertility intentions. Higher scores on this outcome variable correspond with more liberal, less traditional, ideas about family life. The first panel in Table 6.1 compares attitudes of all women across race and ethnicity. The results indicate that overall and across the three marital statuses, White women report significantly more liberal ideas about family life than Black or Mexican American women. The scores for Black and Mexican American women are not significantly different.

The first panel also shows comparisons within each race/ethnic group across the three marital status categories. For all three race/ethnic groups the results consistently show that married women’s attitudes about family life are lower, meaning more traditional, than those of single and cohabiting women. No statistically significant differences emerge between the attitudes of single and cohabiting women. As in Table 6.1 that examined attitudes about women’s independence and career orientation, the results here do not suggest that cohabiters are a selective group of more liberal individuals at least for attitudes about family life.

The second panel of Table 6.2 shows the results of ANOVAs across race/ethnicity and the variable summarizing current fertility intentions. The first column illustrates the results across race/ethnicity for women who are currently using contraception. The results are similar to those for cohabiting women overall showing that White women have significantly more liberal attitudes about family life with no significant differences
between the attitudes of Black and Mexican American women. This pattern is the same across all three fertility intention groups.

The results of the ANOVA models comparing attitudinal differences across fertility intentions within each race/ethnic group are also shown in the third panel. When looking at Whites we see that cohabiting women who report that they are not using contraception because they are currently seeking a pregnancy have significantly more liberal ideas about family life than women who report they are currently using contraception. Additionally, White women who report that they are not using contraception, but do not intend a pregnancy have significantly lower, more traditional, ideas about family life than those seeking a pregnancy. No significant differences emerge among Black or Mexican American women across the three fertility intention groups. Overall, White women report the most liberal ideas about family life, with cohabiting White women who are currently seeking a pregnancy reporting the most liberal attitudes across the three fertility intention groups.

Chapter Summary

The results in Chapter 4 for the fertility intentions of women suggest that cohabiting Black and Mexican American women are substantially more likely to be seeking a pregnancy than White women. The second demographic transition framework that guides this research suggests that women who view cohabitation as an alternative to marriage and an acceptable arena for childbearing should endorse less traditional values. This chapter set out to test the following two hypotheses by examining variation in attitudes about women’s independence and career orientation and family life across marital status, race/ethnicity, and fertility intentions among cohabiters:
1. Cohabitors will endorse the most liberal attitudes across the three marital status categories.

2. Cohabiting women who are currently seeking a pregnancy will NOT report more liberal attitudes than those with other fertility intentions.

Regarding the first hypothesis, the results did not reveal that cohabitors were the most liberal group across all marital statuses. For attitudes about women’s independence and career orientation, single women reported more liberal views and there was no difference among single and cohabiting women on views about family life. This hypothesis was not supported.

For the second hypothesis, while a couple of the findings of these tests suggest weak support for the second demographic transition framework, overall the results do not suggest that less traditional value orientations are associated with fertility intentions among cohabiting women. If the results had revealed that across all groups, and especially for Black and Mexican American women, cohabiting women who were seeking a pregnancy endorsed the most liberal attitudes about women’s independence and career orientation and family life that would provide evidence for the second demographic transition framework in the United States. It was found that cohabiting Mexican American women who were seeking a pregnancy had more liberal attitudes about women’s roles than those with other fertility intentions as did White women who were seeking a pregnancy on attitudes about family life, but consistent support was not found across all race/ethnic groups for either of the outcomes. These results support the second hypothesis that pregnancy seeking among cohabiting women is not selective of those with the most liberal attitudes.
Table 6.1. ANOVA of Liberal Attitudes about Women’s Independence and Career Orientation by Race/Ethnicity, Marital Status, and Fertility Intentions among Cohabiters (range 12-48), Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>All Women</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Cohabiting</th>
<th>Married</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=1,658</td>
<td>n=634</td>
<td>n=4,406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>38.85</td>
<td>40.13^bd</td>
<td>39.11^bc</td>
<td>38.48^cd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>38.65</td>
<td>39.09^ad</td>
<td>38.27^a-c+</td>
<td>38.18^d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>35.56^ab</td>
<td>37.58^abd</td>
<td>35.93^abc</td>
<td>35.09^abc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohabiting Women by Fertility Intention (n=634)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Contra Intend</th>
<th>Do not Intend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>39.19^b</td>
<td>37.70^f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>38.42^a</td>
<td>38.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>35.83^abe</td>
<td>36.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Significantly Different from Whites
^b Significantly Different from Blacks
^c Significantly Different from Single
^d Significantly Different from Cohabiting
^e Significantly Different from Non-Users Who Intend a Pregnancy
^f Significantly Different from Contraceptive Users
Table 6.2. ANOVA of Liberal Attitudes about Family Life by Race/Ethnicity, Marital Status, and Fertility Intentions among Cohabitors (range 7-35), Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>All Women</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Cohabiting</th>
<th>Married</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>23.04^b</td>
<td>25.72^a</td>
<td>26.09^b</td>
<td>21.63^bcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>21.30^a</td>
<td>22.61^a</td>
<td>22.63^a</td>
<td>19.22^acd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>20.82^a</td>
<td>22.59^a</td>
<td>22.79^a</td>
<td>19.84^acd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohabiting Women by Fertility Intention (n=533)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Using</th>
<th>Not Using</th>
<th>Not Using</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>26.00^b^de</td>
<td>27.97^bf</td>
<td>26.17^bde^e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>22.83^a^f</td>
<td>17.55^a</td>
<td>22.84^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>22.72^a</td>
<td>23.41^a</td>
<td>21.31^a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Significantly Different from Whites  
^b Significantly Different from Blacks  
^c Significantly Different from Single  
^d Significantly Different from Cohabiting  
^e Significantly Different from Non-Users Who Intend a Pregnancy  
^f Significantly Different from Contraceptive Users
Chapter 7: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The second demographic transition refers to the changes in family life that have occurred in more developed countries since the 1960s. These changes include a rise in the divorce rate, a decline in fertility, and a rise in the age at first marriage followed later by a rise in pre-marital and post-marital cohabitation and non-marital fertility. Lesthaeghe (1995) also offers insights into changes in values that underlie these transformations in family life. They include an increase in individualism, women’s economic independence, market orientations, secularization, and a rise in expectations from personal relationships.

In response to the rise in cohabitation, researchers have worked to delineate the role of cohabitation in the U.S. family system in comparison to singlehood and marriage. Some of the most recent work on this topic describes cohabitation as an alternative to being single, yet cautions that in the United States being single is associated with a substantial amount of childbearing (Heuveline and Timberlake 2004). These researchers also highlight the heterogeneity in general family trends across race/ethnicity and underscore that their characterization of cohabitation for the United States as a whole neglects potential racial/ethnic diversity in this family form.

It is surprising that more research is not dedicated to studying racial/ethnic variation in cohabitation given the substantial differences across these groups in other aspects of family life, especially non-marital fertility. Past research offers insights into race/ethnic diversity in the role of cohabitation most notably with studies on childbearing within this union. It is argued that the more acceptable childbearing is within cohabiting unions the more it resembles marriage (Manning and Landale 1996; Smock 2000; Musick
2002). Generally, in relation to fertility, cohabitation appears to operate more like an alternative form of marriage for non-White groups, especially for Hispanics. Rates of childbearing within cohabiting unions are higher for non-Whites (Loomis and Landale 1994; Manning and Landale 1996; Bumpass and Lu 2000). Additionally, of cohabiting women who experience a pregnancy, Hispanic and Black women are less likely to marry before the birth of the child compared to Whites (Manning 2001).

While research has outlined the race/ethnic differences in fertility rates and changes in union status among cohabiters who experience a pregnancy, variation in fertility-related behavior such as contraceptive use that influences these differences is less clear, especially for more recent cohorts of women. In addition, little research investigates pregnancy intentions among cohabiters. The research that focuses on intentions uses retrospective reports (e.g. Manning 2001; Musick 2002) that have been argued by some to be biased in favor of over-reporting intention. This study took a new approach and looked at current fertility intentions of cohabiters. This design adds to the literature using retrospective reports to increase knowledge about pregnancy intentions among cohabiters which reflect views on the acceptability of childbearing in this union.

Using data from the 1995 and 2002 National Survey of Family Growth, this study examined racial/ethnic variation in the role of cohabitation with a focus on fertility-related behaviors and intentions to fill this gap in the literature. The fertility-related behaviors included two proximate determinants of fertility, sexual frequency and contraceptive use. Investigating these factors provides insight into how the reproductive behavior of cohabiters compares to that of married individuals and on potential variation within cohabitation across race/ethnic groups. It provides a closer look at what is behind
the race/ethnic fertility differences among cohabiters. Are these differences at least somewhat a result of variation in contraceptive use or sexual frequency? Examining current fertility intentions provides a test of whether there is variation in views of the acceptability of childbearing within cohabiting unions. Higher levels of intentions for a current pregnancy indicate greater acceptance of childbearing within cohabiting unions and are suggestive that cohabitation operates more like an alternative to marriage. Using this measure provides a stringent test of the acceptability of childbearing in cohabiting unions because it sidesteps a major issue faced when looking at fertility rates among cohabiters - that some of these births are not intended. In addition, a major strength of this work was to use the newly available data from men from the 2002 National Survey of Family Growth in an area of research that has overwhelmingly been restricted to data from women.

The general hypothesis underlying this research endeavor was that cohabitation operates more as an alternative to marriage for non-Whites. This hypothesis was founded on past research on racial/ethnic fertility differences among cohabiters mentioned above as well structural and cultural explanations offered for differences in general family patterns. These structural and cultural factors suggest that non-Whites face greater economic barriers to marriage entry and have more cultural support for extended family networks. Additionally, Mexican Americans may be influenced by a long history of consensual unions in Latin America that operate, at least for some, as surrogate marriages. These factors suggest that cohabitation is more likely to operate as an alternative form of marriage for non-Whites and more frequently be the setting for childbearing.
Three specific hypotheses were outlined for this study for men and women. First, concerning the two proximate determinants of fertility, sexual frequency and contraceptive use, no differences were expected in sexual frequency among cohabiters across the race/ethnic groups. However, non-Whites were expected to have lower levels of contraceptive use and lower levels of using more effective methods of contraception. Sexual frequency is an important area to investigate because, all other factors equal, differences in sexual frequency across these groups could lead to variation in the risk of pregnancy and childbearing among cohabiters. Contraceptive use patterns are important since they are the major determinant of the risk of pregnancy among sexually active individuals. Non-use of contraception could be the result of pregnancy seeking, barriers to obtaining contraception, or simply a failure of use. Additionally, certain groups may face more difficulty obtaining more effective methods of contraception and use less effective methods as a result putting them at a higher risk of pregnancy.

The second hypothesis regarding current fertility intentions was that non-Whites would be more likely than Whites to be seeking a pregnancy. Respondents who indicated that they were not currently using contraception were asked if it was because they were currently seeking a pregnancy. It was expected that Blacks and Mexican Americans would be more likely than Whites to report that they were seeking a pregnancy. This provided a test of race/ethnic variation in the acceptability of childbearing among cohabiters.

The third hypothesis focused on differences in attitudes associated with the second demographic transition. As outlined above, Lesthaeghe (1995) suggests a number of value changes that have influenced the transformations in family life in more
industrialized countries. Less traditional views on these values are argued to be related to less traditional ideas about family life. Going along with this idea, one hypothesis for this study was that cohabiters would endorse more liberal attitudes than individuals in other marital states since cohabitation is a less traditional family form. However, in opposition to the second demographic transition framework it was not expected that cohabiters seeking a pregnancy would endorse more liberal values compared to Whites. According to the second demographic transition framework more liberal views on the values outlined would be argued as a factor in less traditional family forms. However, based on the previous research in this area and the structural and cultural explanations for race/ethnic variation in family life this finding was not expected.

Chapter 4 used logistic regression models to examine sexual frequency, contraceptive use, and current fertility intentions of women and test the first two hypotheses. This analysis was replicated for men in Chapter 5. For each analysis differences were examined across marital status groups and then among the subset of cohabiting individuals. In relation to marriage and singlehood, both single and married women had a lower likelihood of frequent sexual intercourse compared to cohabiters even when controls for age and relationship duration were included in the analysis. For men, there were no significant differences in sexual frequency across the marital status groups once controls were added to the analysis. The results for women and men together suggest small differences in sexual frequency across marital status groups with cohabiters more likely to have frequent sexual intercourse. This finding corresponds with past research by Bachrach (1987). For the analysis of sexual frequency among cohabiters, no race/ethnic differences were found. Variation in sexual frequency does not
appear to be a factor in race/ethnic differences in fertility among cohabitors. This supports the hypothesis that sexual frequency does not vary across racial/ethnic groups among cohabitors.

Also tested in Chapters 4 and 5 were differences in contraceptive use. Two separate analyses of contraceptive use were conducted. The first looked only at differences in non-use of contraception compared to using any method. The second analysis took a closer look and examined differences in the use of more and less effective methods of contraception. Among both men and women, married individuals were more likely to not use any contraceptive method compared to cohabitors. Among cohabiting men and women, Blacks were nearly twice as likely as Whites (marginally significant for men) to not use any contraceptive method. Other factors equal, this suggests that Black cohabitors are at a higher risk of pregnancy due to the increased likelihood of not using any method of contraception.

The next analysis looked at variation in the use of no method or a less effective method of contraception in comparison to a more effective method among all women. The results for the use of no method shown in the previous analysis were revealed, but no differences emerged for the use a less effective method. This suggests that the major differences are in non-use compared to use as shown in the earlier analysis rather than in the use of less or more effective methods. The results for men showed the same finding for non-use of contraception, but also showed that compared to White men, Black men were more likely to use a less effective method of contraception compared to a more effective method. The major theme in contraceptive use is that Blacks have a greater
likelihood of not using any method of contraception compared to Whites although there is some evidence for differences in the use of less effective methods.

For cohabiting women, the results suggest that compared to White women, Blacks were more likely to use no method as well as a less effective method of contraception compared to a more effective method. The differences are sizeable with Black women over twice as likely to use no method and nearly twice as likely to use a less effective method. Among male cohabitors, compared to Whites, Blacks were nearly four times as likely to report not using any contraceptive method compared to a more effective method of contraception. This is a substantial difference in contraceptive use that has implications for racial/ethnic variation in the fertility of cohabiters. Overall, the results suggest that Black cohabiters are at a higher risk of pregnancy resulting from greater levels of non-use and less effective method use compared to Whites. At this point it is unknown if the differences in contraceptive use are related to differences in fertility intentions or other factors. The next step looked at variation in pregnancy seeking to further examine these differences.

The final analysis in Chapters 4 and 5 was the examination of fertility intentions. Overall, compared to White women, Blacks were more likely to report that they were not using contraception both because they were seeking a pregnancy as well as not seeking a pregnancy. Among men, the only difference that emerged was for Blacks to have a higher likelihood of not using contraception and seeking a pregnancy. Generally, compared to cohabiters single individuals had a lower likelihood and married individuals a higher likelihood of seeking a pregnancy.
Due to sample size limitations for men it was only possible to examine the current fertility intentions of cohabiters for women. The picture that emerged was that compared to Whites, Blacks and Mexican Americans were substantially more likely to report that they were not using contraception and seeking a pregnancy. Black women had over twice the likelihood and Mexican American women nearly four times the likelihood of White women to report this outcome. This provides strong evidence that for at least a portion of Black and Mexican American women cohabitation is seen as an acceptable union for pregnancy.

The results from the analysis of fertility intentions suggest that the answer to the main question guiding this research is that the role of cohabitation does vary across race/ethnic groups. For non-White women cohabitation more often operates as an alternative to marriage based on the criteria that acceptability of childbearing within cohabiting unions places it closer to marriage than singlehood. This confirms the general hypothesis outlined for this study and also fits with past research suggesting cohabitation is more of a family building state for non-Whites.

A few notes of caution are in order about the conclusions based on fertility intentions. It is not known in this study what the cohabiters’ response to a pregnancy would be. Some may be seeking a pregnancy while they are cohabiting, but plan to marry if they do become pregnant. Raley’s (2001) work shows that less than 10% of Black women who experience a pregnancy during cohabitation marry before the birth of the child while just over one-third of White women marry. This suggests that, at least for Black women, the overwhelming majority will remain cohabiting. Other research shows that Hispanic women are nearly twice as likely as White women to remain cohabiting.
after a pregnancy (Manning 2001). In addition, these measures of fertility intentions were only assessed at one point in time during the relationship and did not include reports from the partner on their fertility intentions.

The final area of investigation was the analysis of race/ethnic variation in attitudes about women’s independence and career orientation and family life. In Chapter 6, ANOVA models were used to examine differences in attitudes across marital status, race/ethnicity, and fertility intention groups for cohabiting women. For the attitudes about women’s independence and career orientation as well as family life, cohabiters did not emerge as endorsing the most liberal values of all marital status groups. This did not support the hypothesis. Among cohabiting women, while some results provided weak support that those women who were seeking a pregnancy had more liberal attitudes, overall the results did not support the ideas of the second demographic transition that individuals with less traditional family forms would hold more liberal views. While this test was not a comprehensive assessment of all the value changes argued to underlie contemporary transformations in family life it suggests that cohabiters who are seeking a pregnancy are not a select group of more liberal individuals whose family formation patterns reflect their views. The results of the analysis of fertility intentions suggest that cohabiting Blacks and Mexicans are more likely than Whites to seek a pregnancy and among cohabiters Whites endorsed the most liberal attitudes across the race/ethnic groups. These results suggest other factors are behind the race/ethnic differences in fertility intentions of cohabiters. Structural differences are one possibility. Another possibility is cultural differences not captured with the limited set of attitudinal items employed here.
Overall the picture that emerges from this research endeavor is that there is variation across race/ethnicity in the role of cohabitation. For Blacks and Mexican Americans the results suggest that pregnancy within cohabitation is more acceptable and that cohabitation operates at least for some individuals in these groups more like an alternative to marriage. However, for Whites cohabitation does not appear to act as an alternative to marriage. These results are consistent with past research that suggests cohabitation operates differently across race/ethnic groups. The results for White women echo recent findings by Schoen et al (2007) that family formation patterns for this group frequently involve cohabitation, but less often childbearing outside of marriage. While this research is able to suggest that the role of cohabitation varies across race/ethnic groups it is not possible to categorize the overall role of cohabitation in the United States or within each race/ethnic group as other researchers have (e.g. Heuveline and Timberlake 2004).

As a further test to examine the role of cohabitation, the models of non-use of contraception and fertility intentions were also run for the sample of single women and are included in the appendix. The results of the model for non-use of contraception suggest that among single women, both Blacks and Mexican Americans have a significantly higher likelihood of not using contraception. However, in contrast to the models for cohabiting women, once controls were added to the models the differences were no longer significant. This suggests that among single women the differences in non-use of contraception were explained by social characteristics. For fertility intentions, in the first model that only included the race/ethnic identifiers, both Black and Mexican American single women had a significantly higher likelihood of reporting that they were
seeking a pregnancy. As for contraceptive use, once controls were added to the model the race/ethnic differences were no longer significant (marginally significant for Black women), again suggesting that social characteristics explain these differences. These results suggest that although single Black and Mexican American women have a higher likelihood of reporting that they are not using contraception compared to Whites as well as seeking a pregnancy these differences are mediated by variation in social characteristics. Among cohabitors these differences are robust to the addition of these controls.

Among cohabiting Blacks, one in ten women report not using contraception, but not seeking a pregnancy. It is not known what the reasons for non-use of contraception are among these women who report that they are not seeking pregnancy. This lack of contraceptive use among sexually active women calls attention to rates of unintended pregnancy and abortion among cohabitors. A recent study suggests that unintended pregnancy and abortion rates are higher among unmarried women than married women and that the rate of both unintended pregnancy and abortion among cohabiting women is more than twice that of either married women or unmarried women who were not cohabiting (Finer and Henshaw 2006). In addition, compared to White women, Black and Hispanic women have higher rates of unintended pregnancies and abortions. Abortion appears to be a factor in the fertility behavior of cohabiting women and has differential usage rates across race/ethnic groups. Future research would benefit from giving more attention to this topic among the fertility patterns of cohabitors.

A major contribution of this research project was to incorporate data from the sample of men from the 2002 cycle of the National Survey of Family Growth. Generally,
the conclusions based on the data for men correspond with those for women, but at least one difference stands out. As described in Chapter 3, men’s reports of contraceptive use varied from those given by women. Although the men in this sample are not the partners of the women, one would expect similar reports of contraceptive use if men and women are equally effective reporters of this behavior. Focusing on cohabiting women, 11.5% of Whites, 19.5% of Blacks, and 14.33% of Mexican Americans reported not using any method of contraception. Among cohabiting men, 18.35% of Whites, 45.67% of Blacks, and 37.09% of Mexican Americans reported not using any method. These are sizeable differences in reports of non-use of contraception among a sexually active sample. The reasons for these differences are unclear. One possibility is that female cohabiting partners take the leading role in contraceptive use and males are less aware of the methods used. Another possibility could be related to question wording and difficulties assessing contraceptive use from men. Women in the NSFG are asked to report their contraceptive methods and include methods that men use. For men, two different styles of question wording were used to examine variation in response patterns as part of a wording experiment. Thirty percent of men were asked in one question to report methods used by themselves or their partner. The remaining seventy percent of men were asked about their contraceptive use in two questions. The first asked the respondent about their own use of contraception and the second asked about any methods used by their partner. This experiment may highlight a concern of the NSFG team that obtaining contraceptive reports from men requires a different approach or is more difficult. Reports from the 2002 cycle of the NSFG also show this gender difference in reports of non-use of contraception.
In Chapter 2, structural arguments for race/ethnic differences in family life were outlined. As a response, numerous control variables that measured structural characteristics were incorporated into this analysis, such as maternal education, household income, respondent education, and respondent work status. Surprisingly, when added to the models these variables generally had small effects on the odds ratios for race and ethnicity. Given the wealth of research that discusses economic barriers to marriage it was expected that socioeconomic factors would play a larger role in race/ethnic differences in the outcomes. Perhaps these measures were not adequate to address the structural barriers to the outcomes under study here, especially contraceptive use. Future research may benefit from looking at additional socioeconomic characteristics. One possibility that comes to mind is health insurance coverage. This factor may be more strongly related to fertility-related behaviors like the use of more effective methods of contraception that require interaction with health professionals. While the structural variables had less of an impact than anticipated this does not necessarily suggest that cultural factors must be at work. Future work should aim at testing different specifications of structural characteristics and also incorporate measures of cultural factors whenever possible in an effort to gain some understanding for these differences.

This study adds to the literature on cohabitation and racial/ethnic differences in the role of cohabitation. Building on past research in this area there are four major contributions of this study. First, this research took a closer look at fertility-related behaviors including sexual frequency and contraceptive use for a recent sample of women. While these differences have been examined in the past, they have not been
outlined for more recent cohorts, for Mexican American women, or across race/ethnicity among cohabitators. Examining these differences increases our understanding of what factors are behind fertility differences across these groups. Second, while much research looks at race/ethnic variation in fertility rates among cohabiting women little research focuses on intended and unintended fertility and the research that does uses retrospective reports of intention. This study adds new information by looking at current intentions for pregnancy among cohabitators. Research that looks solely at race/ethnic differences in fertility rates is capturing some differences in unintended fertility across the groups. Third, while the bulk of research on fertility among cohabitators, and in general, uses reports from women, this project incorporated data from men as well as women. Finally, after examining differences in fertility-related behaviors and intentions an examination of differences in attitudes was conducted to determine if, as outlined by the second demographic transition framework, those individuals engaged in less traditional family forms evidence more liberal attitudes about women’s independence and career orientation and family life. This advances our understanding of attitudinal motivations for variation in family behavior and tries to uncover explanations for race/ethnic differences in family life.

That most first unions are cohabitations indicates that this family form is a significant feature of the family landscape. Given the well documented racial/ethnic differences in family life and fertility among cohabitators this is an area that merits greater attention. These early family formation patterns potentially influence the later life course and may set the stage for race/ethnic variation in family life and childbearing especially for Blacks and Mexican Americans. Future research will benefit from increased attention
on the role of cohabitation with a focus on the heterogeneity of this union type across race/ethnic groups.
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Appendix

Supplementary Analyses
Table A1. Odds Ratios of Frequent Sexual Intercourse (several times weekly or more) for Women (n=10,927)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.82*</td>
<td>.87+</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.86+</td>
<td>.86+</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>1.21*</td>
<td>1.17+</td>
<td>1.21*</td>
<td>1.19+</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.64***</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td>.67***</td>
<td>.72***</td>
<td>.80*</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two biological or adoptive parents</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother fertility variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (2001 Dollars, in ten thousands)</td>
<td>.98*</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.83*</td>
<td>.81*</td>
<td>.81*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college and above</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working for pay (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working less than full time</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full time</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-marital births</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.97***</td>
<td>.97***</td>
<td>.97***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current school enrollment</td>
<td>.85+</td>
<td>.86+</td>
<td>.84+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>.89+</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.89+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic religious affiliation (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious affiliation</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.88+</td>
<td>.87+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship and partner characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of sexual relationship</td>
<td>.98*</td>
<td>.99*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>.85+</td>
<td>.87+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity and marital status interactions*</td>
<td>1.17*</td>
<td>1.16*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black*Single</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black*Married</td>
<td>1.67*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American*Single</td>
<td>.56+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American*Married</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle 5 survey</td>
<td>1.15*</td>
<td>1.15*</td>
<td>1.15*</td>
<td>1.18**</td>
<td>1.14*</td>
<td>1.13+</td>
<td>1.14*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Wald test for addition of interaction terms p=.0000
+ p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001
Table A2. Odds Ratios of Frequent Sexual Intercourse (several times weekly or more) for Cohabiting Women (n=1,167)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two biological or adoptive parents</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother fertility variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (2001 Dollars, in ten thousands)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.68+</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college and above</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.51+</td>
<td>1.51+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working for pay (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working less than full time</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full time</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-marital births</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.95***</td>
<td>.95***</td>
<td>.95***</td>
<td>.95***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current school enrollment</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>.59*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic religious affiliation (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious affiliation</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship and partner characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of sexual relationship</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's work status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously married</td>
<td>1.88***</td>
<td>1.88***</td>
<td>1.88***</td>
<td>1.88***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitator's chance of marriage to partner</td>
<td>1.82***</td>
<td>1.82***</td>
<td>1.82***</td>
<td>1.82***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle 5 survey</td>
<td>1.53**</td>
<td>1.56**</td>
<td>1.51**</td>
<td>1.50**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001
Table A3. Odds Ratios of Frequent Sexual Intercourse (several times weekly or more) for Male Respondents (n=2,178)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.76+</td>
<td>.75+</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>.70+</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>1.67**</td>
<td>1.66**</td>
<td>1.43+</td>
<td>1.44+</td>
<td>1.50+</td>
<td>1.57*</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.73+</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td>.72+</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two biological or adoptive parents</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother fertility variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (2001 Dollars, in ten thousands)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college and above</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working for pay (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working less than full time</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full time</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>.84*</td>
<td>.86*</td>
<td>.85*</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-marital births</td>
<td>1.22*</td>
<td>1.21*</td>
<td>1.21*</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.97**</td>
<td>.97*</td>
<td>.97*</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current school enrollment</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic religious affiliation (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious affiliation</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship and partner characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of sexual relationship</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously married</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity and marital status interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black*Single</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black*Married</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American*Single</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American*Married</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Wald test for addition of interaction terms p=.0088
p<.001;
Table A4. Odds Ratios of Frequent Sexual Intercourse (several times weekly or more) for Cohabiting Men (n=269)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two biological or adoptive parents</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother fertility variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (2001 Dollars, in ten thousands)</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.17+</td>
<td>1.16+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college and above</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working for pay (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working less than full time</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full time</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-marital births</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current school enrollment</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic religious affiliation (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious affiliation</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship and partner characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of sexual relationship</td>
<td>.90*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's work status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>1.97+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously married</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabitor's chance of marriage to partner</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.46*</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.40+</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>1.86*</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two biological or adoptive parents</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother fertility variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socioeconomic characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (2001 Dollars, in ten thousands)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year college and above</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working for pay (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working less than full time</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full time</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>.78*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-marital births</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.04**</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.04*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current school enrollment</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>1.85**</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.78**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Catholic religious affiliation (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religious affiliation</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship and partner characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of sexual relationship</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously married</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle 5 survey</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.73+</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>.71*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001
Table A6. Odds Ratios of Fertility Intentions for Single Female Respondents (n=2,980)
Odds of not using contraception and not intending a pregnancy and not using contraception and intending a pregnancy compared to using contraception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not</td>
<td>Intend</td>
<td>Do not</td>
<td>Intend</td>
<td>Do not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (reference)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2.72**</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>2.02*</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>1.63+</td>
<td>3.43*</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Family background**

Mother's education

- Less than high school (reference) --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
- High school and above .83 .62 .90 .81 .93 .97 .94 .96

Family structure

- Two biological or adoptive parents .62** .72 .65* .91 .64* .85 .62* .083

Mother fertility variables

- Number of children 1.05 1.17 1.05 1.12 1.04 1.07 1.04 1.07

**Socioeconomic characteristics**

Income (2001 Dollars, in ten thousands)

- 1.04     .86     1.02     .87+    1.02    .88+

Education

- Less than high school .74 1.22 .85 1.69 .90 1.71
- High school (reference) --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
- Some college .56** .42* .49** .49 .48** .49+ .46** .21*
- 4-year college and above .60+ .26* .47* .20* .46** .21*

Work status

- Not working for pay (reference) --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
- Working less than full time .54* .84 .51** .83 .49** .82
- Employed full time .67+ .80 .60* .56+ .59* .55+

**Personal characteristics**

Parity

- .75* .84 0.86 0.84

Non-marital births

- 1.05 .88 0.90 0.87

Age

- 1.03* 1.04* 1.04* 1.03

Current school enrollment

- 1.06 .35* 1.06 .35*

Religion

- Catholic 1.80 2.12 1.72* 2.08+
- Non-Catholic religious affiliation (reference) --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- --- ---
- No religious affiliation 1.00* 1.50+ 0.98 1.44
### Relationship and partner characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.01</th>
<th>1.04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration of sexual relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner’s education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (reference)</td>
<td>.---</td>
<td>.---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school and above</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previously married</strong></td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cycle 5 survey</strong></td>
<td>.72+</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.69+</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ p<.10; * p<.05; ** p<.01; *** p<.001
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