**Are Men Who Father Children with Young, Unwed Women 'Marriageable'?:**
**Implications for the Healthy Marriage Initiative\***

Leonard M. Lopoo
Syracuse University

Marcia J. Carlson
Columbia University

January 2007

**Are Men Who Father Children with Young, Unwed Women 'Marriageable'?:**
**Implications for the Healthy Marriage Initiative**

**Abstract**

While a considerable amount of research has explored the nature and consequences of childbearing by unmarried young women, little is known about the men who father children with these women. This study uses new data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study to describe the economic and social/behavioral capacities of men who have children with unwed, young mothers (ages 18 through 21), comparing them to men who have children with older and/or married women. Given that men and women tend to partner with those of a similar age, race/ethnicity, and education level, we examine whether these factors can account for differences in capacities across groups. We find that men who father children with unmarried, young women have decidedly worse characteristics compared to men who father children with women in any other marital status/age category. These findings suggest caution in promoting marriage among teenage mothers.

Keywords: Marriage Promotion, Fathers, Nonmarital Childbearing, Teenage Childbearing

The Healthy Marriage Initiative provides annual funding of $150 million (passed in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005) for activities related to healthy marriage promotion and fatherhood, including marriage education and training programs, public advertising campaigns, and high school educational programs (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2006). These efforts are designed to help parents enter and sustain healthy marriages, reflecting the growing interest among Federal lawmakers in reducing the number of children living in single-parent families (Dion, 2005). While only recently funded on a large scale, the Healthy Marriage Initiative was first enacted in 2002, and Congress has weighed in on the importance of marriage, particularly among poor families, for some time. For example, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 states that "Marriage is the foundation for a successful society" (Section 101, Public Law 104-193). Further, two of the explicit goals of the Temporary Assistance for Need Families (TANF) program are to "end the dependence of needy parents on government benefits by promoting job preparation, work and, marriage" and to "encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families" (U.S. Public Law 104-193, Section 401).

While marriage promotion in now part of current Federal policy, support for the program is far from universal (Lichter, Graefe, and Brown, 2003). Proponents of marriage promotion cite the research literature showing that married parents (and their children) fare better on a number of economic, health, and wellbeing outcomes than those who are unmarried (see, e.g., research literature by McLanahan and Sandefur (1994), Korenman and Neumark (1991), and Waite and Gallagher (2000)). Critics, on the other hand, claim that government should not interfere in the family lives of its citizens (Coltrane, 2001; Coontz and Folbre, 2002). They also raise concerns that encouraging single mothers to marry men who are physically and/or emotionally abusive

would be damaging to both the mother and child. Other scholars have pointed out that while research consistently shows those who are married fare better than those who are not, it is difficult to establish whether marriage is the causal explanation for the positive outcomes or is simply correlated with such (Lichter, 2001; Lichter, Graefe, and Brown 2003). If the latter is true, they argue, marriage per se may confer few beneficial effects on unmarried parents and children.

Interestingly, the Healthy Marriage Initiative does not make distinctions based on the age of the mother; it simply states that the government should promote healthy marriages that will provide a supportive environment for children. There is no reason to believe, however, that marriage will be equally beneficial (or equally detrimental) to women across the age distribution. There are well-known differences in marital patterns of young mothers versus older mothers. We know, for example, that unwed, teenage mothers are more than twice as likely to have never married by age 35 compared to women who did not have a out-of-wedlock birth (Lichter and Graefe, 2001), and when they do marry, more than half of teen mothers divorce within five years (Furstenberg, Brooks-Gunn, and Morgan, 1987).

The ideal approach for estimating causal effects is the randomized controlled experiment. Obviously, ethical (and practical) considerations preclude one from randomly assigning marriage to a treatment group. Nevertheless, to the extent that fathers may play a significant role in the lives of their children—and as co-parents with their partners—and that Congress has created an initiative designed to have people voluntarily enter marriages, it is important to understand more about the characteristics and capabilities of men who have children with young women. Hence, while we cannot actually estimate the causal impact of marriage per se, we can attempt to fill some of the gap in knowledge by examining the capacities of male partners who had children

with unmarried, young women and the extent to which they are 'marriageable', i.e. stably employed (or continuing their education) and free from behavioral problems that may inhibit their interactions in work or relationships. Heretofore, researchers have provided very little information on men partnered with teen or young mothers, primarily because of the lack of available data: men—and particularly non-resident fathers—are often under-represented in national surveys (Garfinkel, McLanahan and Hanson 1998).

Using new data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, our research attempts to shed light on the promise of marriage for young mothers who may choose to marry the biological father of their child. We evaluate the 'marriageability' of young, unwed fathers, an idea first raised by William Julius Wilson with respect to the declining number of low-educated men able to marry and support a family in poor urban areas (Wilson, 1987). Since it is useful to have a benchmark, we compare the men who partnered with young, unwed women to men who partnered with other groups of women defined by age and marital status: men who father children with unmarried, older women, men who father children with married, young women, and men who father children with married, older women. Also, we endeavor to understand if the differences in characteristics and capacities between men partnered with young, unwed mothers and the men in the other age/marital status groups can be accounted for by age, race/ethnicity, and education.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Having a child is not a single event but is the result of a chain of events which involve some measure of choice (intentional or not) at each stage. Sexual activity, the use (or misuse) of contraception, the decision to abort or carry the baby to term are all steps along the way to

bearing a child. Therefore, a sample of mothers is by definition selective of women who at each stage of the process made decisions, whether deliberately or otherwise, to allow (or not prevent) the birth of a child. A vast literature points to homogamy in marital and romantic unions either because individuals are likely to interact socially in settings with those similar to themselves (Kalmijn and Flap 2001) and/or because of intrinsic preferences (South 1991). Hence, we would expect the characteristics of the partners of young mothers to be similar to those of the women themselves, particularly with respect to age, race/ethnicity, and education.

As noted earlier, only a few studies have examined the men who father children with young mothers, mostly describing the disparities in age between these men and the mothers of their children. Using data from the National Maternal and Infant Health Survey (NMHIS), Landry and Forrest (1995) found that the men who fathered children with teen mothers were substantially older than the mothers: 65 percent of men who had children with women ages 15-19 were at least age 20 themselves. However, subsequent research yielded more tempered findings about age differences between young mothers and their partners. Both Lindberg et al. (1997) and Elo, King, and Furstenberg (1999) noted that across the age spectrum, women typically partner with men who are several years older, so it is not surprising that this pattern holds among teen mothers as well.

Several studies also suggest that the male partners of teen mothers have low human capital, which is consistent with their young age. Landry and Forrest (1995) reported that only 5.8 percent have more than a high school education. Lindberg et al. (1997) focused on young teens (ages 15-17) and found that men who father children with young teens were much less likely to have completed high school or have professional or managerial jobs than men who father children with older women.

Beyond these basic demographic characteristics, there is little research about the human capital and social-psychological capacities of men who father children with young women—and hence the quality of father and partner/co-parent that they would make for the child and mother, respectively. Recent literature suggests that low-income women with children (who are typically young) would often like to be married but sometimes remain single due to perceived barriers to marriage (Edin and Kefalas, 2005; Gibson-Davis, Edin, and McLanahan, 2005). One of the most important barriers to marriage is financial stability (Edin, 2000; Gibson-Davis et al. 2005), as a father that cannot contribute to the economic well-being of the family is seen as a liability and even a potential source of ridicule (Edin 2000). Low-income mothers also have lower expectations for marriage with men who have substance abuse problems and who are physically abusive toward them (Waller, 2001).

We would expect that, given their relatively young age, men who have children with young, unwed mothers will have lower economic capacities and relationship skills than older nonmarital fathers simply because they have had less time for educational attainment, to obtain experience in the labor market, and to develop emotional maturity. Also, we know that teen childbearing is much more common among African Americans than among other race/ethnic groups (Hamilton, Sutton, and Ventura 2004). Therefore, it is useful to understand differences in capacities that persist between men partnered with young versus non-young mothers, after adjusting for basic demographic characteristics.

DATA AND VARIABLES

We use data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, a national longitudinal study designed to examine the characteristics of unmarried parents, the relationships between

them, and the consequences for children (see Reichman, Teitler, Garfinkel and McLanahan 2001, for information on study design). The study follows a birth cohort of 4,898 children born in 20 large U.S. cities. Baseline interviews with mothers and fathers were conducted shortly after their child's birth. Mothers were interviewed in person in the hospital within 48 hours of the birth, and fathers were interviewed in person as soon as possible thereafter, either in the hospital or wherever they could be located. Follow-up interviews with both mothers and fathers occurred when the child was about one, three, and five years old. Response rates for the baseline survey are 87% for unmarried mothers and 75% for unmarried fathers.[1]

Mothers under age 18 were not included in all Fragile Families cities because some hospitals' Institutional Review Boards required that the baby's grandmother give permission for the mother to be interviewed; this extra step would have increased the cost of data collection and likely reduced response rates. Therefore, we restrict our sample to mothers age 18 and older; a choice that reduces our sample to 4,761.

In this paper, we use data primarily from the baseline Fragile Families interviews with mothers and fathers, including some retrospective information asked in the first follow-up from both parents. For fathers' demographic characteristics (age, race/ethnicity, and education) we use fathers' reports where available and when missing, we replace with mothers' reports in order to include all fathers in our analyses. Mothers' and fathers' ages are reported at the time of the baseline survey, just after the child's birth. Education data are missing for 195 fathers, two additional fathers were missing data on race/ethnicity, four were missing information on the father's age, and one case was missing data on mother's age. Our final sample size is 4,559. We

---

[1] The Fragile Families data are most representative of cohabiting fathers (90% response rate) and least representative of fathers who are not romantically involved with the child's mother at the time of birth (38% response rate). Moreover, among the latter group, the men who participated in the study are likely to be a highly select group of men, namely men who are unusually committed to the child and/or the mother.

define a young mother as one who was 18 through 21 years old at the time of the baby's birth. Of the 4,459 mothers in the analytical sample, 1,472 (or 33.0 percent) were classified as a young mother. Fathers' race/ethnicity is classified in four mutually-exclusive groups: non-Hispanic African American, Hispanic, non-Hispanic white, and non-Hispanic "other" race. Fathers' education is represented in four categories: less than high school, high school graduate, some college, and college graduate or higher.

Beyond the demographic characteristics, we focus on two categories of fathers' capacities—economic and social/behavioral; in other words, are fathers likely to be a reliable breadwinner and a stable partner for the mother? Fathers' *economic capability* is reflected by a measure of idleness (or more accurately, not being idle) based on whether father is productively engaged in work or school. In specific, mothers respond to the question asked in the baseline survey, "What was [BABY'S FATHER] doing most of last week – working at a regular job, going to school, or something else?" If she responded that he was working or in school, we set the variable to one; otherwise, we coded the variable to zero.[2]

We also use three social/behavioral measures. First, we include a measure of the father's *history of incarceration*. We follow Western, Lopoo, and McLanahan (2005) and use responses from the one-year interviews, where both mothers and fathers were asked if the father had ever been incarcerated. If either stated yes, the father is counted as having been incarcerated (coded 1 on a dummy variable). Second, we measure *physical violence* toward the mother based on her responses to several questions. The mother is asked at the one-year survey: "Couples sometimes get into fights. Were you ever cut, bruised, or seriously hurt in a fight with [FATHER]?" If she

---

[2] The sample sizes for the capacity measures vary for three reasons. First, some items are based only on mothers' reports, while other variables use information from the mother and/or the father; the differential response rates between mothers and fathers accounts for some of the difference. Second, as explained below, the incarceration data is collected in the first follow-up, and some cases were lost to attrition compared to the baseline instrument. Finally, there are different response rates for particular questions.

responds yes, she is asked when the violence occurred—before, during, or after the pregnancy with the focal child. We created a dummy variable equal to one for mothers who reported that they had been abused prior to and/or during the pregnancy. Third, we created an indicator variable for the *father's drug and alcohol abuse*. This variable is set equal to one if the mother responded yes to the baseline question, "Does the baby's father have trouble keeping a job/friends because of drugs/alcohol use?"

ANALYTIC STRATEGY

We begin by estimating the mean difference in the capacities of the men who fathered children with single, young (which we define as those between the ages of 18 and 21) mothers (SYM) and each of the three comparison groups. More specifically, we estimate the following logistic regression model for father $i$:

1)     $\Pr(Y_i = 1) = \Lambda(\alpha_0 + \mathbf{T_i}'\boldsymbol{\alpha_1})$,

where Y is the capacity outcome in question and **T** is a vector with three indicator variables for age-by-marital status groups. The first group is fathers who had a child with a single, non-young (age 22 or older) mother (SNYM), the second is fathers who married the mother of his child by the time of birth and the mother is young (age 18 through 21) (MYM), and the third is fathers married to the non-young mother (MNYM) of his child at the time of birth. The omitted category is our group of interest—men who partnered with SYM. Because the coefficient estimates do not easily convey the difference in the proportions, we also report the marginal effects for the coefficients in vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha_1}$, or the difference in the probability of outcome Y for the partners of SYM compared to each relevant group.

These marginal effect estimates provide answers to our primary research question: what are the differences in economic and social/behavioral capacities between the men who partner with SYM compared to the men in other age/marital status groups. Our second research question asks how important age, race/ethnicity, and education are in accounting for the differences in capacities across groups. In other words, if we hold constant age, race/ethnicity, and education levels (which we expect to be correlated with both age and marital status), are the men who partner with SYM similar to the men who partner with women who are older and/or married? To answer this question we add the demographic variables to the baseline model (Model 1) and examine the changes in the coefficients in $\alpha_1$ (Models 2-4).

RESULTS

Table 1 reports simple descriptive statistics for the men who partner with SYM and the fathers in the three other groups. In general, the men who partner with SYM appear to be younger and have lower levels of education. Nearly 19 percent of men who have children with SYM are teens, and over 74 percent are under age 25. The next youngest category of fathers is those who partner with MYM; however, only 5 percent of these men are teens, and just under two-thirds are under age 25. Interestingly, the mean difference in age between the mother and father is greatest for men partnered with MYM followed by those partnered with SYM. In other words, the age gap is much greater for young mothers than for older mothers.

Table 1 also shows that more than two-fifths of the men who partner with SYM have less than a high school education, while just over 35 percent of the men who partner with SNYM have less than a high school education, followed by the men who partner[3] with MYM at 34

---

[3] Obviously, these men are married to these women. For ease of exposition, we classify them as partners of married, non-young mothers (MNYM).

percent, and finally the men who partner with married, non-young mothers (MNYM) at just over 15 percent. At the other end of the educational spectrum, one-third of the men partnered with MNYM have a college degree, while only 1 percent of the men partnered with SYM have a college diploma.

Finally, we observe some racial and ethnic differences across groups. The majority (56-58 percent) of the men partnered with young mothers (both SYM and SNYM) are African American compared to around 20-27 percent of the partners of MYM and MNYM. The majority of the men who partner with MYM are Hispanic, while 43 percent of the men who partner with MNYM are white (this category had the largest proportion of whites among all age-by-marital status groups).

The bottom section of Table 1 also shows means in the measures of fathers' capacities across groups. Overall, we find that men partnered with young mothers have 'worse' characteristics. About three-fourths of men who had children with SYM were working or in school in the previous week, compared to 81 percent of the partners of SNYM, 90 percent of the partners of MYM, and 94 percent of the partners of MNYM. Partners of SYM were much more likely to have been incarcerated (44 percent) than their unwed counterparts partnered with older women (37 percent), married to young women (22 percent), or especially married to older women (8 percent). Also, men partnered with SYM were most likely to have been physically violent toward the mothers (8 percent) compared to other groups (1 to 6 percent). Men partnered with SYM were no more likely to have a drug or alcohol problem than men with SNYM (6 percent), but both groups were more likely to have a substance problem than either group of married fathers (2 percent).

In Table 2, we report our logistic regression results for the four capacity measures. We first show the bivariate model with only the age-by-marital status group variables (SYM as reference group) predicting the outcome variable (Model 1); then, we add each of our three demographic sets of variables sequentially in Models 2 through 4. For the measure of working or being in school, Model 1 shows that compared to the men who partner with SYM, the partners of women in every other group are significantly more likely to be working or in school. The difference with the partners of SNYM is 4.1 percentage points, for the partners of MYM the difference is 9.7 percentage points, and for the partners of MNYM, the difference is fully 15.7 percentage points; these results are, of course, similar to the mean differences shown in Table 1. In Model 2, we hold father age constant, and the difference between the partners of SYM and SNYM becomes statistically insignificant and trivial in size (the marginal effect is 0.5 percentage points). The differences for the partners of MYM and MNYM, however, remain even once we hold age, race/ethnicity, and education constant (Model 4). Furthermore, these differences are substantively quite large: the partners of MYM are 6.3 percentage points more likely to work or be in school compared to the partners of SYM. The difference for the partners of MNYM is even larger at 7.6 percentage points.

We find a similar pattern when we model the probability of fathers' incarceration. The men who partner with SYM are much more likely to have been incarcerated than men in any of the other categories. The marginal effect for the partners of the SNYM is 5.7 percentage points, for the partners of MYM it is 16.2 percentage points, and for the partners of MNYM, it is fully 33.0 percentage points. Given that 43.6 percent of the partners of SYM have been incarcerated, these differences are quite striking. As was the case for the idleness measure, once we control for age, the difference between the partners of SYM and SNYM is reduced in magnitude and is no

longer statistically significant. However, the differences persist and remain quite large between the men who partnered with SYM and both groups of married men. With age, race/ethnicity, and education controlled (Model 4), the men partnered with MYM are 13.4 percentage points less likely to have been incarcerated—and the men partnered with MNYM are over 24 percentage points less likely to have been incarcerated—than the SYM reference group.

The pattern of results is somewhat different for physical violence and father's having a substance problem. In the models for physical violence, we do not find statistically significant differences between those who partner with SYM and those who partner with SNYM; in other words, younger versus older age does not appear to differentiate the likelihood of violence among unmarried men. Compared to both groups of married men, however, the partners of SYM are significantly more likely to be abusive toward mothers. This finding persists across all models regardless of demographic controls, and the magnitude of the difference is similar when comparisons are made to either young or non-young married men, ranging between 2.9 and 3.9 percentage points.

Finally, in the models for drug or alcohol abuse, we only find statistically significant differences between the partners of SYM and the partners of MNYM, although the marginal effect for the MYM is quite large. Men who have married the non-young mothers of their children by the time of birth are about 3.1 to 4.6 percentage points less likely to abuse drugs or alcohol compared to the partners of SYM. Given that 6 percent of SYM abuse these substances, this represents about a 50 to 75 percent difference between men with young, unwed partners and men with older, married partners.

DISCUSSION

In this paper, we provide a descriptive portrait of the male partners of unwed, young mothers who had children between 1998 and 2000 in large U.S. cities. We present information on several of their economic and social/behavioral characteristics that has not been available in previous research. As a basis of comparison, we contrast their characteristics to those of men partnered with young, married mothers as well as with older mothers—both unmarried and married. We then examine the extent to which demographic differences (in age, race/ethnicity, and education) can account for the differences observed.

As would be expected, we find that the men who father children with unwed, young women are themselves young—nearly 19 percent are teenagers (ages 15-19), and another 56 percent are in their early 20s. The average age gap between young, unwed mothers and their partners (3.2 years) is higher (by about one year) than that between non-young mothers and their partners, whether married or not. The latter figures accord with previous studies suggesting that early estimates of dramatic age differences between teen mothers and their partners were overstated, although differences do still exist (Elo et al., 1999; Lindberg et al., 1997). We also find that the men partnered with unwed, young mothers have lower education levels, on average, than the men partnered with older mothers, particularly when compared to married men.

We were interested in the capacities of the men who have children with unmarried teen mothers in order to understand their potential for contributing economic and social resources to the mothers and their children. Extensive past research has documented the correlates and consequences of teen childbearing, but there has been only limited acknowledgement that each and every birth involves a man. The biological father is forever an important part of a child's life, even if absent (Furstenberg, Morgan and Allison 1987). Understanding the characteristics and capacities of fathers partnered with teen mothers provides an important baseline about the

extent to which these men may diminish or compound the challenges associated with "kids having kids" (Maynard 1997). The importance of this understanding is compounded in the context of the current Healthy Marriage Initiative, which endeavors to promote marriage among unwed parents.

Overall, we find that the men partnered with young, unmarried mothers have lower capacities than the men partnered with women in all three other age-by-marital status categories on a host of outcomes—they have lower education levels, are less likely to be working or in school, are more likely to have been incarcerated, are more likely to be abusive to their partners (compared to both married groups), and are more likely to have a substance problem (compared to those who partner with older, married women). Taken together, these descriptive statistics do not paint an encouraging portrait about the men by whom many young, unmarried girls become mothers and suggest that, on average, the disadvantages of young motherhood may be only be compounded by the poor 'quality' of the men to which they become connected through childbirth. In other words, while unmarried fathers overall are known to be of low socioeconomic status and have more social-behavioral problems compared to married fathers (Sigle-Rushton and McLanahan, 2003), the men who have children with very young, unwed mothers appear to be even more negatively selected.

At the same time, among unmarried fathers overall, we find that some of the differences between those partnered with young and non-young mothers can be largely—often entirely— accounted for by basic demographic differences between these two groups. With respect to economic capacities, fathers' young age is a key factor accounting for nearly 90 percent of the gap in employment/school status. Similarly, we find large differences in the likelihood of incarceration between men partnered with young versus non-young women, but these differences

disappear once we control for age. For both physical violence and substance abuse, we do not find a greater likelihood of problems among unmarried men partnered with young versus older women; in other words, among unmarried men, those with young women are not statistically distinguishable in terms of their likelihood of domestic abuse or substance abuse from those with older women.

When we compare the capacities of the partners of single young mothers to those partnered with married mothers—both young and old, we see persistent and large differences (with one exception of substance abuse between SYM and MYM): men who had children by young mothers have significantly lower capacities than married men, regardless of mother age. From these findings, one might be tempted to conclude that young unwed couples are disadvantaged precisely *because* they have not married and, thus, marriage could be a potential solution to the poor outcomes found among the partners of single, young mothers. However, this would only be the case if the only difference between married and unmarried mothers was the marriage itself, i.e., that getting married has a true causal effect on father capacities. The extreme view at the other end of the spectrum would be that the 'benefits' of marriage are entirely due to the fact that those with better capacities are more likely to marry (selection), and, thus, transitioning into marriage will have no effect on the father's propensity to work or to engage in crime, substance abuse, or domestic abuse. Most analysts contend that the truth lies somewhere in the middle and that the benefits of marriage are attributable to *both* selection and causation (Nock, 2005; Thomas and Sawhill, 2005). In other words, we have evidence that getting married does actually improve men's earnings (Korenman and Neumark, 1991; Nock, 1998) and health behaviors (Murray, 2000), while at the same time, it is well-known that those with better

economic prospects (Sigle-Rushton and McLanahan, 2003) and in better health (Lillard and Panis, 1996) are more likely to select into marriage in the first place.

Our results have important implications for public policy. To the extent that the Bush Administration endeavors to promote marriage among unwed couples (via the Healthy Marriage Initiative), our findings suggest that many men who have children with young mothers face an array of disadvantages making them rather poor prospects as marital partners. It seems reasonable to assume that to be a good candidate for marriage, a father should have obtained a high school degree, be currently employed, have no history of incarceration, not be violent toward the mother, and not have a problem with drugs or alcohol. In additional analyses not shown, we found that only 32 percent of the men partnered with unwed young mothers meet this modest threshold of "marriageability;" the comparable figure is only 39 percent among men partnered with non-young, unwed mothers, significantly higher but still sufficiently low to suggest caution about the marital prospects for unwed couples more generally regardless of maternal age. Among married men with young wives, 47 percent met this criterion and 74 percent of married men with older wives met this criterion. Further, the same characteristics that diminish the likelihood of a successful, stable marriage are also expected to deter fathers' long-term involvement with their children and/or to diminish the beneficial effects of such involvement when it does occur. While any program that improves the communication and relationship skills between parents seems useful, policy efforts to improve the human capital of these men, as well as efforts to reduce their participation in crime, abuse of substances, and domestic violence might also make for healthier marriages. Further research is warranted on the nature and consequences of involvement by fathers partnered with young mothers over time.

R<span style="font-variant: small-caps">EFERENCES</span>

Coltrane, Scott. 2001. "Marketing the marriage 'solution': Misplaced Simplicity in the Politics of Fatherhood." *Sociological Perspectives* 44:387-418.

Coontz, Stephanie and Nancy Folbre. 2002. "Marriage, Poverty, and Public Policy." A Discussion Paper from the Council on Contemporary Families. *The American Prospect* web exclusive accessed January 5, 2007 at http://www.prospect.org/webfeatures/2002/03/coontz-s-03-19.html.

Dion, M. Robin. 2005. "Healthy Marriage Programs: Learning What Works." *The Future of Children* 15(2):139-156.

Edin, Kathryn. 2000. "Few Good Men: Why Poor Women Don't Remarry." [Electronic version] *American Prospect* 11(4): 1-8.

Edin, Kathryn and Maria Kefalas. 2005. *Promises I Can Keep: Why Poor Women Put Motherhood Before Marriage*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Elo, Irma, Rosalind Berkowitz King and Frank F. Furstenberg, Jr. 1999. "Adolescent Females: Their Sexual Partners and the Fathers of Their Children." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61:74-84.

Furstenberg, Frank F., Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, and S. Philip Morgan. 1987. "Adolescent Mothers and Their Children in Later Life." *Family Planning Perspectives* 19(4): 142-151.

Furstenberg, Frank F., Jr., S. Philip Morgan and Paul D. Allison. 1987. "Paternal Participation and Children's Well-being." *American Sociological Review* 52: 695-701.

Garfinkel, Irwin, Sara S. McLanahan and Thomas L. Hanson. 1998. "A Patchwork Portrait of Nonresident Fathers." In *Fathers under Fire*, edited by Irwin Garfinkel, Sara S. McLanahan, Daniel R. Meyer and Judith A. Seltzer. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Gibson-Davis, Christina, Kathryn Edin, and Sara McLanahan. 2005. "High Hopes But Even Higher Expectations: The Retreat from Marriage Among Low-Income Couples." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67: 1301-1312.

Hamilton, B. E., Sutton, P. D., & Ventura, S. J. (2004, originally published in 2003). Revised birth and fertility rates for the 1990s and new rates for Hispanic populations, 2000 and 2001: United States. (National Vital Statistics Reports Vol. 51, No. 12). Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics.

Kalmijn, Matthijs and Henk Flap. 2001. "Assortatative Meeting and Mating: Unintended Consequences or Organized Settings for Partner Choices." *Social Forces* 79(4):1289-1312.

Korenman, Sanders and David Neumark. 1991. "Does Marriage Really Make Men More Productive?" *Journal of Human Resources* 26(2):282-307.

Landry, David J. and Jacqueline Darroch Forrest. 1995. "How Old Are U.S. Fathers?" *Family Planning Perspectives* 27(4): 159-161, 165.

Lichter, Daniel T., 2001. "Marriage As Public Policy." Progressive Policy Institute Policy Report. Accessed December 11, 2006 at http://www.ppionline.org/documents/marriage_lichter.pdf.

Lichter, Daniel T. and Deborah Graefe. 2001. "Finding a Mate? The Marital and Cohabitation Histories of Unwed Mothers." In *Out of Wedlock: Trends, Causes, and Consequences of Nonmarital Fertility* edited by Lawrence L. Wu and Barbara Wolfe (pp. 317-342). New York: Russell Sage.

Lichter, Daniel T., Deborah Roempke Graefe, and J. Brian Brown. 2003. "Is Marriage a Panacea? Union Formation Among Economically Disadvantaged Unwed Mothers." *Social Problems* 50(1): 60-86.

Lillard, Lee A. and Constantijn Panis. 1996. "Marital Status and Mortality: The Role of Health." *Demography* 33(3):313-327.

Lindberg, Laura Duberstein, Freya L. Sonenstein, Leighton Ku, and Gladys Martinez. 1997. "Age Differences Between Minors Who Give Birth and Their Adult Partners." *Family Planning Perspectives* 29(2): 61-66.

Maynard, Rebecca A (Editor). 1997. *Kids Having Kids: Economic Costs and Social Consequences of Teen Pregnancy*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

McLanahan, Sara S., & Sandefur, Gary D. 1994. *Growing Up with a Single Parent: What Hurts, What Helps?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Murray, John E. 2000. "Marital Protection and Marital Selection: Evidence from a Historical-Prospective Sample of American Men." *Demography* 37(4):511-521.

Nock, Steven L. 1998. *Marriage in Men's Lives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nock, Steven L. 2005. "Marriage as a Public Issue." *The Future of Children* 15(2):13-32.

Reichman, Nancy, Julien Teitler, Irwin Garfinkel and Sara McLanahan. 2001. "Fragile Families: Sample and Design." *Children and Youth Services Review* 23(4/5):303-326.

Sigle-Rushton, Wendy and Sara McLanahan. 2003. "For Richer or Poorer: Marriage as an Anti-Poverty Strategy in the United States." *Population* 57(3): 509-528.

South, Scott J. 1991."Sociodemographic Differentials in Mate Selection Preferences." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 53:928-940.

Thomas, Adam and Isabel Sawhill. 2005. "For Love and Money? The Impact of Family Structure on Family Income." *The Future of Children* 15(2):57-74.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. 2006. The Healthy Marriage Initiative website. Accessed December 11, 2006 at http://www.acf.hhs.gov/healthymarriage/

U.S. Public Law 193. 104th Congress. 22 August, 1996. *Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996*.

Waite, Linda J. and Maggie Gallagher. 2000. *The Case for Marriage: Why Married People Are Happier, Healthier, and Better Off Financially*. New York: Doubleday

Waller, Maureen R. 2001. "High Hopes: Unwed Parents' Expectations about Marriage." *Child and Youth Services Review* 23(6/7): 45-484.

Western, Bruce, Leonard M. Lopoo, and Sara McLanahan. 2005. "Incarceration and the Bonds Between Parents in Fragile Families." In *Imprisoning America: The Social Effects of Mass Incarceration*, edited by Mary Pattillo, David Weiman, and Bruce Western. (pp. 21-45). New York: Russell Sage.

Wilson, William Julius. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

**Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for the Fragile Families Sample**

| | Full Sample | Single, Young Mother (SYM) | Single, Non-Young Mother (SNYM) | Married, Young Mother (MYM) | Married, Non-Young Mother (MNYM) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Father's Demographic Characteristics* | | | | | |
| Father's age: 19 or younger | 0.067 | 0.187 | 0.022 | 0.050 | 0.000 |
| | (0.250) | (0.390) | (0.146) | (0.218) | (0.000) |
| Father's age: 20-24 | 0.298 | 0.556 | 0.230 | 0.614 | 0.068 |
| | (0.457) | (0.497) | (0.421) | (0.489) | (0.251) |
| Father's age: 25-29 | 0.261 | 0.190 | 0.311 | 0.238 | 0.263 |
| | (0.439) | (0.392) | (0.463) | (0.428) | (0.440) |
| Father's age: 30-34 | 0.181 | 0.049 | 0.197 | 0.079 | 0.330 |
| | (0.385) | (0.216) | (0.398) | (0.271) | (0.471) |
| Father's age: 35 or older | 0.192 | 0.018 | 0.240 | 0.020 | 0.340 |
| | (0.394) | (0.134) | (0.427) | (0.140) | (0.474) |
| Mother's mean age (years) | 25.54 | 19.55 | 27.40 | 19.84 | 30.23 |
| | (5.95) | (1.06) | (4.95) | (0.987) | (5.03) |
| Difference in age (years) | 2.682 | 3.237 | 2.456 | 4.079 | 2.263 |
| | (5.063) | (3.879) | (5.861) | (4.171) | (4.780) |
| Father has less than high school education | 0.325 | 0.419 | 0.351 | 0.337 | 0.154 |
| | (0.468) | (0.494) | (0.478) | (0.475) | (0.361) |
| Father has high school education | 0.341 | 0.400 | 0.358 | 0.376 | 0.230 |
| | (0.474) | (0.490) | (0.480) | (0.487) | (0.421) |
| Father has some college | 0.228 | 0.169 | 0.239 | 0.238 | 0.283 |
| | (0.420) | (0.375) | (0.427) | (0.428) | (0.451) |
| Father is college graduate | 0.106 | 0.011 | 0.051 | 0.050 | 0.333 |
| | (0.308) | (0.104) | (0.221) | (0.218) | (0.472) |
| Father is White | 0.192 | 0.121 | 0.109 | 0.248 | 0.433 |
| | (0.394) | (0.326) | (0.312) | (0.434) | (0.496) |
| Father is African American | 0.489 | 0.558 | 0.575 | 0.198 | 0.270 |
| | (0.500) | (0.497) | (0.494) | (0.400) | (0.444) |
| Father is Hispanic | 0.274 | 0.287 | 0.281 | 0.505 | 0.221 |
| | (0.446) | (0.453) | (0.449) | (0.502) | (0.415) |
| Father is Other | 0.045 | 0.034 | 0.035 | 0.050 | 0.076 |
| | (0.207) | (0.180) | (0.185) | (0.218) | (0.265) |
| N | 4559 | 1371 | 2009 | 101 | 1078 |
| | | | | | |
| *Father's Economic/Behavioral Capacities* | | | | | |
| Father worked or was in school last week | 0.830 | 0.759 | 0.812 | 0.900 | 0.935 |
| | (0.376) | (0.428) | (0.390) | (0.302) | (0.246) |
| | [N=4272] | [N=1239] | [N=1866] | [N=100] | [N=1067] |
| Father has been incarcerated | 0.315 | 0.436 | 0.367 | 0.215 | 0.080 |
| | (0.465) | (0.496) | (0.482) | (0.413) | (0.272) |
| | [N=4071] | [N=1251] | [N=1741] | [N=93] | [N=986] |
| Father cut, bruised, or seriously hurt mother prior to or during the pregnancy | 0.062 | 0.082 | 0.060 | 0.011 | 0.025 |
| | (0.297) | (0.341) | (0.238) | (0.105) | (0.185) |
| | [N=3865] | [N=1179] | [N=1621] | [N=91] | [N=974] |
| Father has a drug/alcohol problem | 0.051 | 0.060 | 0.060 | 0.020 | 0.024 |
| | (0.219) | (0.238) | (0.238) | (0.141) | (0.152) |
| | [N=4474] | [N=1348] | [N=1963] | [N=100] | [N=1066] |

**Table 2: Logit Model of Father's Outcomes**

| | Father Worked / School Last Week | | | | Father has been Incarcerated | | | | Father cut, bruised, or seriously hurt mother prior to or during the pregnancy | | | | Father has a drug/alcohol problem | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 |
| SNYM | 0.316*** (0.089) [0.041] | 0.041 (0.118) [0.005] | 0.091 (0.120) [0.011] | 0.093 (0.121) [0.011] | -0.284*** (0.076) [-0.057] | -0.122 (0.101) [-0.025] | -0.146 (0.101) [-0.029] | -0.127 (0.103) [-0.024] | -0.128 (0.163) [-0.005] | -0.162 (0.214) [-0.006] | -0.164 (0.214) [-0.006] | -0.170 (0.214) [-0.006] | 0.000 (0.149) [0.000] | -0.214 (0.200) [-0.009] | -0.203 (0.201) [-0.009] | -0.206 (0.201) [-0.008] |
| MYM | 1.05*** (0.340) [0.097] | 0.976*** (0.341) [0.092] | 0.726** (0.345) [0.071] | 0.654* (0.346) [0.063] | -1.04*** (0.259) [-0.162] | -1.07*** (0.260) [-0.165] | -0.936*** (0.262) [-0.149] | -0.873*** (0.265) [-0.134] | -1.78* (1.02) [-0.036] | -1.84* (1.01) [-0.037] | -1.84* (1.02) [-0.036] | -1.80* (1.02) [-0.033] | -1.14 (0.723) [-0.032] | -1.16 (0.724) [-0.033] | -1.26* (0.726) [-0.034] | -1.18 (0.728) [-0.028] |
| MNYM | 1.52*** (0.141) [0.157] | 1.14*** (0.178) [0.123] | 0.935*** (0.180) [0.100] | 0.718*** (0.182) [0.076] | -2.18*** (0.130) [-0.330] | -1.94*** (0.159) [-0.302] | -1.86*** (0.161) [-0.292] | -1.55*** (0.162) [-0.241] | -1.20*** (0.261) [-0.039] | -1.227*** (0.329) [-0.039] | -1.20*** (0.334) [-0.038] | -0.935*** (0.332) [-0.029] | -0.976*** (0.233) [-0.036] | -1.27*** (0.297) [-0.044] | -1.35*** (0.304) [-0.046] | -0.973*** (0.300) [-0.031] |
| N | 4272 | | | | 4071 | | | | 3865 | | | | 4474 | | | |
| Age | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Race | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| Father's Education | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes |

*Notes*: *** p < 0.01; ** p < 0.05; * p < 0.10; standard errors in parentheses; marginal effects in brackets.