

**PRELIMINARY DRAFT—DO NOT QUOTE OR CITE**

**Labor Market Conditions, Employment Status, and the Likelihood of Cohabitation  
Among New Parents**

**Lauren M. Rich  
School of Social Work and Population Studies Center  
University of Pennsylvania**

**Sara McLanahan  
Center for Research on Child Wellbeing  
Princeton University**

**Irwin Garfinkel  
School of Social Work  
Columbia University**

**April, 2000**

Paper to be presented at the June 1-2, 2000 Conference on Families, Labor Markets, and the Well-Being of Children, sponsored by the Canadian Employment Research Forum and Statistics Canada. An earlier version was presented at the 2000 Population Association of America meetings.

It is well known that there has been a substantial decline in the likelihood that a nonmarital pregnancy will result in marriage.<sup>1</sup> At the same time, cohabitation among both childless couples and unmarried parents has increased. Recent research, for example, shows that during the period 1990-1994 40% of unmarried parents were cohabiting at the time of their child's birth (Bumpass and Lu, 1999). Also, there is evidence that children residing with cohabiting parents may be better off economically than children of non-cohabiting parents (Manning and Lichter, 1996). Thus, to the extent that the well being of children with unmarried parents is of social concern, it is important to gain an understanding of the factors underlying unmarried parents' decisions to form households outside of marriage.

Previous studies have found that economic factors play an important role in determining whether a woman *marries* in the event of a nonmarital pregnancy (Lundberg and Plotnick, 1995; Parnell, Swicegood and Stevens, 1994). However, while some attention has been focused on the role of such factors in decisions to cohabit generally (Clarkberg, 1999), there are few published studies of the factors--economic or otherwise--underlying the decision to cohabit after a nonmarital birth (Manning, 1993).

This study examines whether men's and women's employment statuses affect the likelihood of cohabitation, given a nonmarital conception that results in a live birth. It also examines whether local economic conditions and welfare policies affect the decision to cohabit. The analysis is based on data obtained from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study (FFCWS), which contains extensive background and other information on both mothers and fathers. In addition, the cities from which the sample is drawn

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, between 1965 and 1989, the proportion of first births conceived outside of marriage that led to marriage before birth fell from over half to about one quarter (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991).

provide a range of different labor market and policy environments that might affect household formation.

## BACKGROUND

There is a large literature that investigates the potential association between economic variables—measured at both the aggregate and individual levels—and the marital and fertility behavior of men and women (Lichter et al., 1991; Mare and Winship, 1991; Smock and Manning, 1997; South and Lloyd, 1992; Testa et al., 1989; Zavodny, 1999). Overall, the results of these studies indicate that men's positive economic circumstances have a positive impact on the likelihood that men and women will marry, and a negative impact on nonmarital births. However, the results with respect to women's economic status are more mixed. Some studies find that women's positive economic circumstances significantly increase the likelihood of marriage, while others find no such effect.

Whether these results have any relevance for assessing the potential effects of economic variables on the likelihood of cohabitation depends, in part, on the nature and meaning of cohabitation relative to marriage. Following Manning (1993), there are at least three different ways to think about the meaning of cohabitation. On the one hand, cohabitation might be a transitional stage before marriage, with children either preceding or following the decision to cohabit. Secondly, cohabitation might be thought of as an alternative form of marriage, perhaps one that affords greater independence to women than traditional marriage. Third, cohabitation might be thought of as an alternative form of singlehood. There is evidence that the first interpretation is particularly relevant to European couples. However, because most studies of the relationship between

cohabitation and marriage in the U.S. have not included pregnancy status, it is not clear if this interpretation is as relevant for the U.S. (Manning, p. 840).

The three views of the nature of cohabitation have differing implications for the predicted effect of economic factors on the likelihood of cohabitation after a nonmarital birth. If cohabitation is a transitional stage preceding marriage, the effect of economic factors might be expected to differ in degree, but not in kind, from the effect of such factors on the likelihood of marriage. For example, a woman or man considering cohabitation as a transition to marriage might weigh the future economic prospects of his or her partner, though not as heavily as s/he would if s/he were considering marriage. In particular, for partners with uncertain but promising prospects, the period of cohabitation might be seen as a trial period during which partners are expected to demonstrate better prospects. Support for this view is found by Clarkberg (1999). His analysis of transitions to cohabitation and marriage among men indicate that men's earnings have a stronger effect on marriage than on cohabitation. He finds a similar result for the effect of men's incomes relative to their predicted incomes.<sup>2</sup> These results suggest that cohabitational unions are less dependent than marital unions on men's economic circumstances.

On the other hand, if cohabitation is primarily viewed as an alternative form of marriage—especially one offering more freedom and independence to women than traditional marriage--the effect of economic factors on the likelihood of cohabitation may differ in kind as well as degree. In particular, if women value their economic and other independence, they may be unwilling to enter cohabiting unions if their own economic

---

<sup>2</sup> This variable is included as a measure of how well an individual is doing relative to what would be expected.

circumstances are poor or uncertain. However, the economic prospects of their potential partners may be less important.

Finally, if cohabitation is thought of as an alternative form of singlehood, a partner's economic status might not matter. Alternatively, it may be that couples with poorer economic prospects are more likely to cohabit, in order to take advantage of economies of scale.

## RESEARCH DESIGN

### DATA

Data for this analysis is taken from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study.<sup>3</sup> This study will follow a new birth cohort of children born in 20 large American cities stratified by different labor market conditions and varying welfare and child support policy regimes.<sup>4</sup> The study is designed to provide previously unavailable information on: (1) the economic and social conditions of unwed fathers and mothers, (2) relationships between parents and between parents and children, (3) factors that encourage and discourage fathers' involvement in their children's lives, (4) child health and development in fragile families, and (5) the role of government and community programs in promoting good parenting and healthy child development.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Fragile Families Study has been designed and pretested by the principal investigators, Sara McLanahan of Princeton University and Irwin Garkinkel of Columbia University. Jeanne Brooks-Gunn (Columbia University) and Marta Tienda (Princeton University) are co-investigators, along with a network of junior scholars including the author, Sheila Ards (Benedict College), Waldo Johnson (University of Chicago), Mark Turner (Urban Institute), Maureen Waller (Public Policy Institute of California), and Melvin Wilson (University of Virginia).

<sup>4</sup>The cities are: Austin, Texas; Baltimore, Maryland; Birmingham, Alabama; Boston, Massachusetts; Chicago, Illinois; Corpus Christi, Texas; Detroit, Michigan; Indianapolis, Indiana; Jacksonville, Florida; Nashville, Tennessee; New York City; Newark, New Jersey; Oakland, California; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Richmond, Virginia; San Antonio, Texas; Santa Ana, California; Toledo, Ohio; and Virginia Beach/Norfolk, Virginia.

When the study is completed, the sample will be representative of all nonmarital births in cities with populations of 200,000 or more. Within thirteen cities, 250 nonmarital births will be sampled from up to eight hospitals. An additional 75 marital births from the same hospitals will be sampled to serve as a matched control group. In the remaining cities, 75 nonmarital and 25 marital births will be sampled from up to five hospitals. Hospitals will be selected by sorting them by area of the city and making the selection probability for each hospital proportional to the number of nonmarital births expected there.

In the study mothers are approached and interviewed in the hospital within 24 hours after they have given birth. Fathers are interviewed either at the hospital or outside the hospital as soon as possible after the birth. Follow-up interviews with both parents will be conducted when the child is 12, 24, 36 and 48 months old.

This paper is based on data collected from the first seven cities in the study: Austin, Texas; Baltimore, Detroit, Newark, New Jersey; Oakland, California; Philadelphia; and Richmond. Data for the cities of Austin and Oakland were collected over a three-month period beginning in the spring of 1998. Data for the remaining cities were collected over a three-month period beginning in the fall of 1999. A total of xxx unmarried mothers were approached in selected hospitals in these cities. Mothers were deemed eligible to participate in the study if they were over the age of fifteen. Of the xxx mothers who were approached, 1,756 (or xx%) agreed to participate.

Interviewers also approached and interviewed fathers when they were present at the hospital; fathers not present at the hospital were located using contact information provided by mothers who agreed to participate in the study. Of the 1,756 unmarried

women who agreed to participate in the study, 1,249 (or 71%) of their partners were contacted and agreed to be interviewed.

This data set is particularly useful for an analysis of cohabitation because it includes data on both partners. However, an important disadvantage is that cohabitation status at the time of conception is not known.<sup>5</sup> In addition, although a control sample of married couples is included in the study, couples who married after the birth of their child cannot be identified at baseline. Thus, a model analyzing the range of possible relationship statuses at birth cannot be estimated.

## VARIABLES

The dependent variable for this analysis is a dichotomous variable indicating whether a couple was living together at the time of the birth of their child. Both mothers and fathers were asked whether they were living with the other parent. In the small number of cases where there was disagreement between the mother's and father's answers, the mother's response was coded.

The primary independent variables are the employment status of both the mother and the father. Mothers were asked in what month and year they last worked at a job lasting two consecutive weeks or more, either full- or part-time. The responses to this question were used to construct a dichotomous variable indicating whether or not the mother had worked in the past year (i.e. prior to her pregnancy).

Both mothers and fathers were asked about the employment status of the father in the week prior to the survey. Employment status according to the father's report is based on the question: 1) "Last week, did you do any regular work for pay"? The responses to

---

<sup>5</sup> More specifically, this data was not collected at baseline. However, it will be collected in the year one follow-up.

this question were used to create a dichotomous variable indicating whether or not the father was employed in the past week. In cases where the father was not interviewed, his employment status was coded based on the mother's answer to the following question: "What was baby's father doing most of last week--working at a regular job, going to school, or something else?" Fathers who were reported to have spent most of the week working at a regular job were coded as employed.

As an additional measure of economic well being we control for mother's and father's income in the past year. We were also interested in making a preliminary assessment of the effect of labor market conditions and welfare/paternity policies on the likelihood of cohabitation.<sup>6</sup> We did this, first, by including dummy variables for the city of residence. In subsequent specifications we also included measures of the local unemployment rate, state or county TANF benefit level for a family of three, proportion of TANF applications denied, and rate of paternity establishment.

Finally, we include a variety of control variables. One set of controls consists of standard demographic and family background characteristics, i.e. age, race/ethnicity, educational attainment, and whether the mother and father lived with both parents as an adolescent. In addition, as a measure of the strength of the couple's relationship, we include a measure for the length of the relationship in years. We also control for moderate to frequent attendance at religious services. Finally, because Latinos make up a significant proportion of the sample, we control for whether the mother and/or father are immigrants.

## METHOD

---

<sup>6</sup> A fuller assessment can be made after additional cities are added to the sample.

The relationship between mother's and father's employment status and the likelihood of cohabitation at birth is estimated using a maximum likelihood logit model. We estimate three different specifications. The first specification contains demographic and family background characteristics. The second specification adds city dummies to the baseline model. The last specification replaces the city dummies with city-specific information on labor market conditions and welfare/paternity establishment policies. Because of the racial/ethnic differences suggested by the analysis of the descriptive statistics, separate regressions are estimated for African-Americans and Latinos.<sup>7</sup>

## RESULTS

Variable means for the entire sample (Table 1) show that 45 percent of the couples said they were cohabiting at the time of the interview. Also, among couples who were cohabiting, both mothers and fathers were more likely to have been employed and to have higher incomes than their counterparts among couples who were not cohabiting. In addition, cohabiting mothers and fathers were more likely to be immigrants, to have lived with both parents as adolescents, to be Hispanic, and to live in Austin, Newark, or Oakland. Finally, fathers in cohabiting couples had higher levels of education. On the other hand, cohabiting couples were less likely to be African-American, and the women in such couples were less likely to attend religious services.

An examination of the variable means broken down by racial/ethnic group reveals significant differences. Among African-Americans (Table 2), the cohabitation rate is 40 percent, while among Hispanics it is 65 percent (Table 3). In addition, there appear to be differences in the relationship between the likelihood of cohabitation and background characteristics. Among African-American cohabiting couples, mothers and fathers are

---

<sup>7</sup> There were not enough individuals in the white or "other" category to warrant a separate analysis.

more likely to be employed and to have higher incomes. In addition, cohabiting mothers are less likely to attend religious services, and couples are less likely to reside in Detroit and more likely to reside in Newark.

Among Hispanics, however, fathers in cohabiting and non-cohabiting couples are about equally likely to be employed. In addition, cohabiting fathers earn less than non-cohabiting fathers. Also, mothers in cohabiting couples are less likely to be employed, while income across the two groups appears to be about the same. Family structure during adolescence appears to matter for Hispanics, but not African-Americans. Among both Hispanic mothers and fathers, living with both parents as an adolescent is associated with a greater likelihood of cohabitation. Also, in contrast to African-Americans, attendance at religious services encourages cohabitation among Hispanics. Finally, cohabiting Hispanic couples have been in relationships longer than have non-cohabiting couples.

Table 4 shows labor market conditions and policy variables for the cities from which the sample is drawn. The average unemployment rate across the seven cities is 3.9 percent. Thus, the rates in Austin and Richmond are significantly below the average, while the rate in Newark is significantly above. The remaining cities are clustered around the average. There is also a significant amount of variation in TANF benefits, with Oakland significantly above the average and Austin significantly below it.<sup>8</sup> However, the proportion of TANF applications denied does not appear to be correlated with the level of benefits; while Austin has relatively low benefits and a higher than average denial rate, Richmond also has relatively low benefits but a lower than average denial rate. Finally, paternity establishment rates are similar across the three areas, with

the exceptions of Oakland and Philadelphia. Overall, if one focuses primarily on the unemployment rates and TANF benefit levels, the seven cities lie along a continuum with two types of labor market/welfare policy environments at the poles: favorable labor market/restrictive welfare (Austin, Richmond) and unfavorable labor market/generous welfare (Detroit, Newark).

Table 5 shows results of logistic analyses of the likelihood of cohabitation for African-Americans. The results in column one indicate that, controlling only for background characteristics, both mother's and father's employment status is positively and significantly related to the likelihood of cohabitation. It should be noted, however, that the size of the coefficient on mother's employment is more than twice the size of the coefficient on father's employment. Furthermore, the coefficient on father's employment is only marginally significant, while the coefficient on mother's employment is significant at the 5% level. In addition, the effect of mother's income is positive and highly significant, while that of fathers is not significant. Most of the remaining variables are insignificant, with the exception of mother's attendance at religious services, mother's immigrant status, and father's family structure as an adolescent. The negative and significant effect of mother's religious attendance is similar to other findings in the literature. Also, the negative effect of a father living with both parents as a teen may reflect the selection of fathers from such backgrounds into marriage as opposed to cohabitation.

Adding city dummies in column two does not significantly alter these results, except that the coefficient on father's employment becomes statistically insignificant. The results also indicate that black couples who reside in Detroit are significantly less

---

<sup>8</sup> Taking into account differences in the cost of living would narrow these disparities.

likely to be cohabiting at the time of birth (relative to couples in Richmond), while black couples residing in Newark are significantly more likely to be cohabiting. Both Newark and Detroit had higher unemployment rates than Richmond, and both also had higher TANF benefits. The major difference between the two cities lies in rates of denial of TANF applications; the rate in Newark is significantly below that in Richmond, while the rate in Detroit is significantly above it.

In column 3 we employ direct measures of city labor market and policy variables. As in column 2, the coefficients on the employment, income and background variables are very similar to those estimated in column 1. In addition, consistent with the city-level policy differences discussed above, all labor market and policy variables are insignificant with the exception of the proportion of TANF applications denied. This result is consistent with the estimated importance of women's economic status on the likelihood of cohabitation since, in areas where there are higher rates of TANF application denials, women may be less well off economically.

Table 6 shows results of logistic analyses of the likelihood of cohabitation for Hispanics. As expected from the analysis of the descriptive statistics, the results differ significantly from those obtained for African-Americans. Most notably, the employment status of mothers and fathers, and the income of mothers, are not significantly related to the likelihood of cohabitation. Furthermore, the effect of father's income and father's age are negative and significant; however, these effects disappear when the analysis controls for labor market and policy variables. Finally, the coefficient on length of relationship is positive and highly significant, and remains so after the addition of city level variables.

Two general conclusions can be drawn from these results. First, they indicate that Hispanic father's characteristics may be more important than mother's characteristics as determinants of the likelihood of cohabitation. They also indicate that Hispanic fathers who are more attractive partners—as measured by income and age—are less likely to cohabit. This may suggest that Hispanic fathers (and therefore couples) who are better off are more likely to transition directly into marriage from singlehood, perhaps at some point after the birth. Finally, it is not clear how to interpret the positive and significant coefficient on length of relationship.

## DISCUSSION

Our analysis reveals significant differences in the likelihood and determinants of cohabitation among urban African-Americans and Hispanics. African-American couples are much less likely than Hispanic couples to be cohabiting at the time of their child's birth. In addition, the most important factor affecting African-Americans' decision to cohabit is the woman's economic position. This result stands in contrast to the results of studies of the relationship between men's and women's economic status and the likelihood of marriage. These studies indicate that men's economic status is more important than women's as a determinant of marriage. Therefore, one interpretation of the results in this paper is that they indicate that cohabitation among African-American couples might be viewed as an alternative form of marriage, rather than as a transitional stage preceding marriage.

Among the Hispanic couples in this sample, the economic status of women is not associated with the likelihood of cohabitation. On the other hand, there is some evidence that the economic status of men matters. These results differ from those obtained for

African-Americans, and may reflect cultural differences between African-Americans and Hispanics regarding the roles of men and women. In addition, the direction of the effect of Hispanic men's income suggests that those who are better off may choose not to cohabit. This result suggests that, among Hispanics, cohabitation is not viewed as an alternative form of marriage. Rather, cohabitation may be viewed as a trial period during which men seek to better their economic position. However, additional analyses making use of the longitudinal nature of the FFCWS are necessary in order to provide support for this conclusion.

## References

- Bumpass, Larry and Hsien-Hen Lu. 1999. Trends in cohabitation and implications for children's family contexts in the U.S." CDE Working Paper No. 98-15. Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Clarkberg, Marin. 1999. The price of partnering: The role of economic well-being in young adults' first union experiences. *Social Forces* 77(3):945-68.
- Lichter, Daniel T., Felicia B. LeClere, and Diane K. McLaughlin. 1991. Local marriage markets and the marital behavior of black and white women. *American Journal of Sociology* 96(4):843-67.
- Lundberg, Shelly and Robert D. Plotnick. 1995. Adolescent premarital childbearing: Do economic incentives matter? *Journal of Labor Economics* 13:177-200.
- Manning, Wendy D. 1993. Marriage and cohabitation following premarital conception. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 55:839-850.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and D. T. Lichter. 1996. Parental cohabitation and children's economic well-being. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 58(4):998-1010.
- Mare, Robert D. and Christopher Winship. 1991. Socioeconomic change and the decline of marriage for blacks and whites. In *The Urban Underclass*, ed. Christopher Jencks and Paul E. Peterson. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- Parnell, Allan M., Gray Swicegood, and Gillian Stevens. 1994. Nonmarital pregnancies and marriage in the United States. *Social Forces* 73:263-287.
- Smock, Pamela J. and Wendy D. Manning. 1997. Cohabiting partners' economic circumstances and marriage. *Demography* 34(3):331-41.
- South, S. J., and K. M. Lloyd. 1992. Marriage markets(?) and nonmarital fertility in the United States. *Demography* 29:247-64.
- Testa, Mark, N. M. Astone, M. Krogh, and K. Neckerman. 1989. Employment and marriage among inner-city fathers. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 501:79-91.
- Zavodny, Madeline. 1999. Do men's characteristics affect whether a nonmarital pregnancy results in marriage? *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61:764-73.

**Table 1. Means of Variables used in the Analysis (Total Sample)**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Total Sample</b>	<b>Couples cohabiting at the time of birth</b>	<b>Couples not cohabiting at time of birth</b>
Proportion Cohabiting Father Employed Last Week	0.45	---	---
Mother Employed Past Year	0.73	0.78	0.69
Father's Income	0.89	0.91	0.88
Mother's Income	\$17,544	\$18,849	\$16,564
Father's Age	\$7,747	\$9,077	\$6,884
Mother's Age	27.0	27.4	26.7
Father's Ed. < HS	24.0	24.4	23.6
Father's Ed. = HS	0.37	0.36	0.37
Mother's Ed. < HS	0.42	0.42	0.55
Mother's Ed = HS	0.41	0.39	0.42
Father Immigrant	0.36	0.35	0.37
Mother Immigrant	0.14	0.18	0.07
Father w/both parents as teen	0.13	0.16	0.06
Mother w/both parents as teen	0.38	0.40	0.35
Father attends religious services	0.33	0.35	0.31
Mother attends religious services	0.25	0.25	0.24
Father African- American	0.34	0.31	0.35
Mother African- American	0.71	0.63	0.79
Father Latino	0.70	0.63	0.77
Mother Latino	0.20	0.25	0.14
Length of Relationship	0.19	0.24	0.13
Couple Resides in:	4.06	4.28	3.86
Austin	0.13	0.16	0.11
Baltimore	0.14	0.14	0.16
Detroit	0.14	0.11	0.18
Newark	0.15	0.18	0.13
Oakland	0.14	0.16	0.11
Philadelphia	0.15	0.14	0.15

**Table 2. Means of Variables used in the Analysis (African-Americans)**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Total Sample</b>	<b>Couples cohabiting at the time of birth</b>	<b>Couples not cohabiting at time of birth</b>
Proportion Cohabiting Father Employed Last Week	0.40	---	---
Mother Employed Past Year	0.69	0.73	0.65
Father's Income	0.91	0.94	0.88
Mother's Income	\$16,828	\$18,524	\$15,527
Father's Age	\$7,612	\$9,259	\$6,624
Mother's Age	27.2	27.6	26.9
Father's Ed. < HS	24.0	24.5	23.6
Father's Ed. = HS	0.33	0.29	0.36
Mother's Ed. < HS	0.47	0.47	0.47
Mother's Ed = HS	0.37	0.34	0.38
Father Immigrant	0.40	0.39	0.41
Mother Immigrant	0.02	0.04	0.01
Father w/both parents as teen	0.02	0.04	0.01
Mother w/both parents as teen	0.30	0.29	0.31
Father attends religious services	0.28	0.29	0.27
Mother attends religious services	0.25	0.25	0.25
Length of Relationship	0.34	0.30	0.36
Couple Resides in:	4.32	4.63	4.11
Austin	0.05	0.05	0.04
Baltimore	0.19	0.18	0.20
Detroit	0.19	0.15	0.21
Newark	0.15	0.18	0.13
Oakland	0.09	0.10	0.08
Philadelphia	0.17	0.17	0.17

**Table 3. Means of Variables used in the Analysis (Hispanics)**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Total Sample</b>	<b>Couples cohabiting at the time of birth</b>	<b>Couples not cohabiting at time of birth</b>
Proportion Cohabiting	0.62	---	---
Father Employed Last Week	0.88	0.89	0.86
Mother Employed Past Year	0.80	0.78	0.84
Father's Income	\$14,456	\$13,928	\$16,636
Mother's Income	\$5,472	\$5,955	\$5,032
Father's Age	26.1	25.7	26.7
Mother's Age	23.7	23.4	24.1
Father's Ed. < HS	0.65	0.65	0.64
Father's Ed. = HS	0.23	0.22	0.25
Mother's Ed. < HS	0.66	0.66	0.66
Mother's Ed = HS	0.24	0.22	0.27
Father Immigrant	0.63	0.65	0.57
Mother Immigrant	0.57	0.57	0.58
Father w/both parents as teen	0.67	0.70	0.57
Mother w/both parents as teen	0.55	0.58	0.49
Father attends religious services	0.32	0.35	0.25
Mother attends religious services	0.47	0.49	0.44
Length of Relationship (years)	3.26	3.73	2.46
Couple Resides in:			
Austin	0.38	0.37	0.38
Baltimore	0.02	0.03	0.01
Detroit	0.03	0.03	0.02
Newark	0.22	0.20	0.25
Oakland	0.25	0.24	0.26
Philadelphia	0.08	0.08	0.08

**Table 4. Labor Market and Policy Variables for the Seven Cities**

<b>City</b>	<b>Unemployment Rate (%)</b>	<b>TANF Benefit Level (\$)</b>	<b>TANF Applications Denied (%)</b>	<b>Paternity Establishment Rate</b>
<b>Austin</b>	2.8	188	57.3	43.5
<b>Baltimore</b>	4.3	388	46.9	54.1
<b>Detroit</b>	4.4	459	35.2	39.7
<b>Newark</b>	5.6	424	8.5	39.6
<b>Oakland</b>	3.9	565	42.3	116.4
<b>Philadelphia</b>	4.0	403	19.1	171.1
<b>Richmond</b>	2.4	291	22.5	43.0
<b>Total</b>	3.9	388	33.1	72.5

Sources: Unemployment rates are from the Bureau of Labor Statistics web site ([www.bls.gov](http://www.bls.gov)). Benefit levels and applications denied were obtained from data collected from state or county TANF departments. Paternity establishment rates are from the Office of Child Support Enforcement's 1997 Annual report.

**Table 5. Logit Analysis of the Likelihood of Cohabitation at the Time of Birth (African-Americans)**

Variable			
Father Employed	*0.25 (.15)	0.24 (.16)	0.24 (.16)
Mother Employed	**0.59 (.25)	***0.63 (.26)	**0.63 (.26)
Father's Income (in thousands)	0.01 (.01)	0.01 (.01)	0.01 (.01)
Mother's Income (in thousands)	**0.01 (.01)	**0.01 (.01)	**0.02 (.01)
Father's Age	0.00 (.01)	0.00 (.01)	0.00 (.01)
Mother's Age	0.01 (.02)	0.01 (.02)	0.01 (.02)
Father's Ed. <HS	-0.24 (.21)	-0.28 (.21)	-0.24 (.21)
Father's Ed. =HS	-0.10 (.19)	-0.12 (.19)	-0.11 (.19)
Mother's Ed. <HS	0.15 (.20)	0.14 (.20)	0.15 (.20)
Mother's Ed =HS	-0.01 (.18)	-0.03 (.18)	-0.01 (.18)
Father Immigrant	0.60 (.56)	0.54 (.57)	0.58 (.57)
Mother Immig.	***1.23 (.49)	*0.86 (.51)	*0.91 (.50)
Father w/both parents as teen	*-0.27 (.17)	*-0.29 (.17)	*-0.30 (.17)
Mother w/both parents as teen	0.03 (.15)	0.01 (.15)	0.01 (.15)
Father attends religious services	0.05 (.18)	0.05 (.18)	0.04 (.18)
Mother attends religious services	***-0.44 (.15)	***-0.43 (.15)	***-0.43 (.15)
Length of relationship	0.02 (.02)	0.01 (.02)	0.02 (.02)
Austin	---	-0.57 (.54)	---
Baltimore	---	-0.18 (.23)	---
Detroit	---	**-.50 (.23)	---
Newark	---	**0.48 (.25)	---
Oakland	---	-0.44 (.50)	---
Philadelphia	---	-0.13 (.23)	---
Unemployment rate	---	---	0.14 (.10)
TANF benefit	---	---	-0.00 (.00)
TANF applications denied	---	---	***-0.02 (.01)
Paternity establishment	---	---	-0.00 (.00)
Constant	***-1.22 (.47)	**-.1.08 (.51)	-0.69 (.64)
N	1,093	1,093	1,093
Log-Likelihood	-661.02	-652.08	-654.40

## Notes:

1) \*\*\*denotes significance at the 1% level

\*\*denotes significance at the 5% level

\*denotes significance at the 10% level

2) All regressions contain missing dummy variables for father's variables.

**Table 6. Logit Analysis of the Likelihood of Cohabitation at the Time of Birth (Latinos)**

Variable			
Father Employed	0.44 (.53)	0.29 (.55)	0.31 (.53)
Mother Employed	-0.17 (.46)	-0.17 (.47)	-0.24 (.47)
Father's Income (in thousands)	** -0.05 (.02)	* -0.04 (.02)	-0.02 (.02)
Mother's Income (in thousands)	0.03 (.03)	0.03 (.03)	0.04 (.03)
Father's Age	* -0.08 (.05)	* -0.08 (.05)	-0.06 (.05)
Mother's Age	-0.01 (.04)	-0.02 (.04)	-0.03 (.04)
Father's Ed. <HS	0.06 (.60)	0.22 (.63)	0.19 (.61)
Father's Ed. =HS	-0.13 (.63)	-0.01 (.65)	-0.03 (.63)
Mother's Ed. <HS	-0.01 (.63)	0.00 (.64)	0.03 (.62)
Mother's Ed =HS	-0.20 (.65)	-0.18 (.68)	-0.24 (.65)
Father Immigrant	-0.27 (.50)	-0.20 (.51)	0.22 (.47)
Mother Immig.	0.43 (.43)	0.72 (.47)	0.46 (.44)
Father w/both parents as teen	0.49 (.40)	0.54 (.41)	0.58 (.41)
Mother w/both parents as teen	0.51 (.35)	0.47 (.36)	0.45 (.35)
Father attends religious services	0.33 (.46)	0.31 (.46)	0.34 (.46)
Mother attends religious services	0.24 (.36)	0.20 (.37)	0.22 (.36)
Length of relationship	***0.18 (.06)	***0.18 (.06)	***0.17 (.06)
Austin	---	-0.87 (1.12)	---
Baltimore	---	-0.74 (1.68)	---
Detroit <sup>3</sup>	---	---	---
Newark	---	-1.17 (1.12)	---
Oakland	---	-1.71 (1.16)	---
Philadelphia	---	-1.17 (1.20)	---
Unemployment rate	---	---	-0.82 (1.05)
TANF benefit	---	---	-0.00 (.00)
TANF applications denied	---	---	-0.03 (.05)
Paternity establishment	---	---	-0.00 (.01)
Constant	**3.10 (1.53)	**3.10 (1.53)	6.99 (5.60)
N	237	237	237
Log-Likelihood	-120.62	-117.49	-121.12

## Notes:

1) \*\*\*denotes significance at the 1% level

\*\*denotes significance at the 5% level

\*denotes significance at the 10% level

2) All regressions contain missing dummy variables for father's variables.

3) In column two this variable was dropped due to collinearity.

