MARCIA J. CARLSON *Columbia University*

FRANK F. FURSTENBERG JR. *University of Pennsylvania**

The Prevalence and Correlates of Multipartnered Fertility Among Urban U.S. Parents

*Recent trends in marriage and fertility have increased the number of adults having children by more than 1 partner, a phenomenon that we refer to as multipartnered fertility. This article uses data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study to examine the prevalence and correlates of multipartnered fertility among urban parents of a recent birth cohort (*N = *4,300). We find that unmarried parents are much more likely to have had a child by a previous partner than married parents. Also, race/ethnicity is strongly associated with multipartnered fertility, as is mothers' young age at first birth, and fathers' history of incarceration. To the extent that childrearing across households diminishes parental resources, multipartnered fertility has important consequences for children's well-being.*

Remarkable changes in family demography occurred in Western industrialized countries during the last half of the 20th century, ushering in a transformation in a wide range of family behaviors and practices, especially with respect to marriage and fertility. At the nexus of these two major areas of change is a new reality of contemporary family demography that has received only limited attention by researchers and policymakers alike: The fact that today a significant fraction of adults have (or will have) biological children by more than one partner. We refer to this phenomenon as *multipartnered fertility*, building on the previous (unpublished) research of Furstenberg and King (1999) and Mincy (2002). We provide a theoretical and descriptive overview about multipartnered fertility in the United States today using data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study. In future work, we will explore the consequences of multipartnered fertility for children, families, and society using new longitudinal data as they become available.

BACKGROUND

Given the historical centrality of marriage to family relationships and reproduction, changes in marriage patterns necessarily have powerful implications for social life. Since the 1950s, marriage has become less central in the life course as individuals are marrying later and divorcing more often and as unmarried cohabitation has arisen as a precursor to—and for some couples a substitute for—legal marriage (Moynihan, Smeeding, & Rainwater, 2004; Wu & Wolfe, 2001). Moreover, public opinion data indicate a greater social acceptance of these nonmarital behaviors (Axinn & Thornton, 2000) and that marriage is today viewed as a less important transition in early adulthood (Furstenberg, Kennedy, McLoyd, Rumbaut, & Settersten, 2004); at the

Columbia University School of Social Work, 1255 Amsterdam Avenue, New York, NY 10027 (mjc2001@columbia.edu).

*Sociology Department, University of Pennsylvania, 3718 Locust Walk, Philadelphia, PA 19104.

Key Words: fertility, fragile families, nonmarital childbearing, parenting.

same time, marriage has retained important symbolic value in American culture (Cherlin, 2004; Edin & Kefalas, 2005).

Alongside the changes in marriage, large-scale changes in attitudes and behaviors related to fertility have also occurred. Improvements in contraceptive technology and the availability of abortion have increased women's control over their own fertility at the same time that the cultural prohibition on sexual activity outside of marriage has lessened. With increased sex outside of marriage, women are at greater risk of getting pregnant and having a nonmarital birth. The nonmarital birth rate has increased dramatically between 1940 and 2004, from only 4% in 1940 to nearly 36% today (Hamilton, Ventura, Martin, & Sutton, 2005; Ventura & Bachrach, 2000). Further, declines in the so-called "shotgun marriages" (those that occur between the conception and the time of birth) have contributed to the increases in nonmarital childbearing (Akerlof, Yellen, & Katz, 1996; Ventura & Bachrach).

Taken together, these changes in nuptiality and fertility practices imply that a decreasing proportion of families at any given time include married parents coresiding with only their joint biological children, that a growing number of parents are rearing children across multiple households, and that an increasing share of children have kin relations that include a stepparent, stepsibling, and/or half sibling. The family forms emerging from the recent trends in marriage and childbearing, variably described in the literature as "divorce and remarriage chains," "complex households," or "the new extended family" (Bohannan, 1968; Cherlin & Furstenberg, 1994; Furstenberg, 1987; Johnson, 1988), are likely to continue to rise in the future, particularly for African Americans whose marriage rates are substantially lower—and nonmarital birth rates higher—than for the population as a whole.

Children stand to lose parental resources in the context of high rates of multipartnered fertility. Furstenberg and his colleagues suggest that fathers' allegiances shift when they leave one family and move on to assume family obligations with a new partner (Furstenberg, 1995; Furstenberg & Cherlin, 1991; Furstenberg & Harris, 1992). Indeed, empirical evidence demonstrates that fathers visit nonresident children less frequently (Manning & Smock, 1999) and provide less economic support (Manning & Smock, 2000) when they have new coresident biological children. Further, couples who have a child outside of marriage are less likely to cohabit or marry following the baby's birth if the father (but not the mother) already has children by a previous partner (Carlson, McLanahan, & England, 2004). Therefore, multipartnered fertility (at least by fathers) appears to affect children's access to their parents' resources (both time and money) and union stability beyond the effects resulting from family structure alone. Given the importance of family relationships for children's healthy development, these circumstances portend that children reared in the context of multipartnered fertility may be at greater risk of adverse outcomes. Yet, until recently, existing data sources provided virtually no information about families formed by childbearing with multiple partners.

We use new data from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study to examine multipartnered fertility and its correlates among the parents of a recent urban birth cohort in the United States. Given that our data are primarily cross-sectional, we emphasize the descriptive nature of our analyses, and we draw no inferences about causal relationships among our variables. First, we present frequencies on the level of multipartnered fertility for mothers and fathers. Then, we estimate multivariate regression models to examine the associations of various individual characteristics and couple relationship status with multipartnered fertility. Finally, we discuss the implications of our findings for future research and public policy.

Previous Research

To our knowledge, with the exception of a handful of mostly unpublished papers (summarized below), no research in the social sciences has explicitly focused on the level and correlates of multipartnered fertility. Furstenberg and King (1999) examined multipartnered fertility among a sample of low-income teenage mothers in Baltimore; they found that about half of mothers in this disadvantaged sample had births by at least two men but that these patterns were not replicated among the next generation. Mincy (2002), using an early subsample of the Fragile Families Study, explored the bivariate relationships between multipartnered fertility and parents' age, race/ethnicity, and family structure at the time of their baby's birth; he found that over a third of mothers and fathers have had children by more than one partner and that rates were higher among parents who were older, Black, or

unmarried. Harknett and Knab (in press) have shown reduced social support in kin networks among couples who have children by other partners in the Fragile Families Study. Gibson-Davis and Edin (2004), using the qualitative data from the Fragile Families Study, found that multipartnered fertility did not reduce fathers' support toward the focal child, but it was often a source of tension in the couple relationship. Meyer, Cancian, and Cook (2005) found that, among a sample of mothers receiving cash welfare benefits in Wisconsin, about three fourths had children by more than one father, creating challenges for the effective collection of child support. Guzzo and Furstenberg (2005) examined multipartnered fertility among women aged 19–25 using data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health; they found that the overall frequency is low in this young age group, but there are important differences by the race/ethnicity and by the relationship with the focal child's father. Taken together, these studies suggest that multipartnered fertility is not uncommon, at least within particular U.S. subpopulations, and that this phenomenon has important implications for family and child well-being.

To the extent that multipartnered fertility results from the disjuncture between union stability and fertility, studies about the factors associated with union formation or dissolution and with childbearing behaviors can shed light on potential correlates of multipartnered fertility. We briefly discuss four categories of variables about parents that may be related to the decisions and actions about partnering and fertility over time and hence may be associated with multipartnered fertility: individual demographic characteristics, economic capacities, social-psychological characteristics, and couple relationship status.

Demographic characteristics. Early childbearing increases the likelihood of multipartnered fertility because starting earlier yields greater time at risk of subsequent childbearing and hence higher completed fertility (Morgan & Rindfuss, 1999). Race/ethnicity is linked to family formation, as African Americans are more likely to have children as teenagers than either Whites or Hispanics (Hanson, Morrison, & Ginsburg, 1989; Lerman, 1993) and are less likely to marry (Lichter, LeClere, & McLaughlin, 1991). Youth who live with both biological parents throughout childhood are less likely to have a child as a teenager (McLanahan & Sandefur, 1994) and less likely to marry (South, 2001).

Economic capacities. Educational achievement and aspirations are negatively associated with early childbearing (Plotnick, 1992; Rindfuss, Morgan, & Offutt, 1996; Thornberry, Smith, & Howard, 1997). Further, highly educated individuals are more likely to marry (Goldstein & Kenney, 2001), whereas those with lower education are more likely to cohabit, more likely to marry at earlier ages if they do marry, and more likely to divorce, compared to individuals with higher education (Martin & Bumpass, 1989; Raley, 2000). Employment (at least by men) is positively associated with marriage (Lichter et al., 1991; Manning & Smock, 1995), and individuals in better physical health are more likely to marry (Lillard & Panis, 1996).

Social-psychological characteristics. Individual attitudes, values, and personal characteristics also have an important influence on family formation behaviors. Religious beliefs and participation (especially among conservative Protestants) generally encourage marriage and discourage cohabitation and childbearing outside marriage (Lehrer, 2000; Wilcox, 2002). Drug or alcohol abuse and infidelity within marriage are strongly associated with low marital quality and divorce (Amato & Rogers, 1997; Sayer & Bianchi, 2000; White, 1990). Fathers who have been incarcerated are much less likely to be cohabiting or married about a year after their baby's birth (Western, Lopoo, & McLanahan, 2004).

Relationship status. Marital unions are typically of longer duration than cohabiting unions and are more likely to include childbearing (Bumpass & Lu, 2000; Manning, 1995). A recent analysis of young adults indicated that individuals who marry are both more likely to have additional children and to confine their children to a single partnership (Guzzo & Furstenberg, 2005).

METHOD

Data

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, & McLanahan, 2001, for information on study design). The study follows a birth cohort of 3,712 children born to unmarried parents and, less well known, also includes a comparison group of 1,186 children born to married parents—in 20 large U.S. cities. The sample, when weighted, is representative of all nonmarital births to parents residing in cities with populations over 200,000 and nearly representative of births to married parents in large cities (because the sampling frame was designed around unmarried births). (Analyses of 1999 Vital Statistics data show that the age and educational distributions of suburban births are very similar to those of urban births for both married and unmarried mothers; only the racial composition is different, with a greater share of suburban births occurring to White non-Hispanic mothers [Bulle, 2005].)

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 occur when the child is about 1, 3, and 5 years old. Response rates for the baseline survey are 87% for unmarried mothers and 82% for married mothers. Fathers were also interviewed in 88% of cases of married fathers and 75% of unmarried fathers. 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 this study are likely to be a highly select group of men, namely, men who are unusually committed to the child and/or to the mother. At the 1-year follow-up, 90% of unmarried mothers, 91% of married mothers, 70% of unmarried fathers, and 82% of married fathers who were eligible (had a completed baseline mother interview) were interviewed.

In this article, we use data from the baseline interviews with mothers and fathers and from the 1-year follow-up survey with mothers. Our sample includes 4,300 couples about which we have valid indicators of their previous fertility (fewer cases are shown in particular tables, depending on missing data). The Fragile Families Study is a sample of births, so our results can be generalized to the parents of this cohort of children born in large U.S. cities between 1998 and 2000. From the child's perspective, the figures shown represent the initial family configuration into which they are born, but over the course of childhood, they may experience one or both of their parents having additional children by subsequent partners. Therefore, the total prevalence of multipartnered fertility for this population is underestimated here and will only increase over time because (most) parents are not at the end of their reproductive years.

Unlike many studies using the Fragile Families data, we combine the unmarried and married samples (and apply weights for the descriptive statistics to adjust for the oversampling of nonmarital births) to yield a large national sample of urban births. Information about the (weighted) sample, overall and by multipartnered fertility status, is shown in Table A1; there are notable differences in parents' demographic, economic, and social-psychological characteristics across categories of multipartnered fertility. Overall, the weighted sample is racially diverse: 39% of mothers are White non-Hispanic, 22% are Black non-Hispanic, 31% are Hispanic, and 8% are of another race. Nearly one fourth of both mothers and fathers were born outside the United States. Twenty-two percent of mothers had their first child as a teenager (age 18 or younger), 16% at ages 19 – 20, 43% in their 20s, and 19% at age 30 or older. About 27% (24%) of mothers (fathers) have less than a high school education, 30% (28%) have a high school degree, 19% (24%) attended some college, and 24% (23%) have a college degree or higher.

Measures

The Fragile Families Survey does not include a complete fertility history for either mothers or fathers, so we use several indicators of parents' previous childbearing from the 1-year survey to determine multipartnered fertility. We use mothers' reports about both parents' fertility to preserve a larger sample because (as noted above) a smaller fraction of fathers were interviewed. With respect to their own fertility, each mother reports whether she has any children by other men and if so, by how many fathers. With respect to the father's fertility, the mother reports whether he has any children by another woman. (For cases where both the mother and the father were interviewed at 1 year, 90% of couples agree about whether the father has a child by someone else. [The fathers are asked a related but different

question: Whether they have biological children living elsewhere.] Of the 10% of cases with discrepant reports, two thirds are where the mother reports the father has another child and the father reports none, and one third is where the father reports children living elsewhere but the mother says the father has no children by another partner.)

Our independent variables include individual characteristics about mothers and fathers, all reported at the baseline survey unless otherwise indicated. We use mothers' reports about fathers for several variables where available (age, race/ethnicity, education, employment status, incarceration history) in order to have information about the full sample of fathers. These secondhand reports could be less reliable than self-reported measures, but we find that agreement is high in the father-interviewed sample where we can compare mother and father reports. (Reported age is correlated at $r = .98$, and parents provide identical responses in the majority of cases for the other variables: 95% for race/ethnicity, 77% for education, 88% for employment, and 83% for incarceration.)

Mother's age at first birth is calculated from her report about the ages of children living with her at the time of the 1-year survey from the household roster because we do not have a direct report of her age at first birth. By this measure, we could be overestimating the age at first birth for mothers who have previous children who do not live with them. Because children typically live with mothers, we suspect this is not a significant problem. (Separate analyses of data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1988 wave [$N = 4{,}840$], when the mothers were in their 20s as are the majority of Fragile Families mothers, indicated that this approach is reasonable. The mean estimated age at first birth is only .74 years different from the mean actual age at first birth, and the estimated is within 1 year of the actual for 92.5% of cases.) We include a variable for the total number of births the mother has ever had (parity) from the 1-year survey. (Information about fathers' age at first birth or total number of births is not available.) We include fathers' age at the time of the focal child's birth: younger than 20, ages 20 – 24, ages 25 – 29, and age 30 and older (reference). We measure current age for mothers as a single dummy for age 21 or older (as the continuous measure would be highly correlated with age at first birth).

Family structure history is represented by a dichotomy for whether each parent reported having lived with both of their parents at age 15. Parents' race/ethnicity is specified as a series of dummy variables: Black non-Hispanic (reference), White non-Hispanic, Hispanic, and other non-Hispanic race. A separate dummy variable reflects when the parents differ on race/ethnicity. Parents' immigrant status is represented by a dummy variable for whether each was foreign born. Parents' education is specified as less than high school, high school degree or General Educational Development (GED) (reference), some college, or bachelor's degree. We include a dummy variable for each parent's employment status; for mothers, it is whether they worked in the year prior to their baby's birth, and for fathers, it is mothers' report about whether the father was working in the week prior to the baseline survey. (As the mothers had just given birth, few if any of them would have worked in the week before the survey.) We represent each parent's health status by a dummy variable for whether their self-reported health was *poor* or *fair*.

We measure the frequency of each parent's religious attendance as a continuous variable, ranging from 1 = *not at all* to 5 = *once a week or more*. Parents' distrust of the opposite gender is represented by their responses to two statements: (a) "Men (women) cannot be trusted to be faithful" and (b) "In a dating relationship, a man (woman) is largely out to take advantage of a woman (man)." Response choices range from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 4 = *strongly agree*, and the two items are averaged into a single measure. Mothers and fathers report about their own substance problems by responding (*yes*/*no*) to the question "In the past year, has drinking or using drugs ever interfered with your work on a job or with your personal relationships?" We include self-reports about whether each parent thought about getting an abortion before the focal child's birth (an imperfect proxy for whether the focal birth was intended). For fathers, we add a dummy variable indicating that the mother reports that he ever spent time in jail or prison (from the 1-year survey). Finally, we include variables to represent parents' relationship status at the time of the focal child's birth. Compared to the reference group of married parents, unmarried parents are categorized as cohabiting, visiting (romantically involved but living separately), or not romantically involved at the time of the baby's birth.

Analytic Approach

First, we present frequencies on the level of multipartnered fertility for mothers (by number of births, by number of fathers) followed by frequencies on multipartnered fertility among couples (overall and by marital status). For all of our descriptive analyses, we focus on the weighted frequencies, which adjust for marital status, age, race, and education, but we also show the unweighted frequencies and sample sizes to provide more complete information about the data. For our multivariate analyses, we estimate logistic regression models for mothers' and fathers' multipartnered fertility, respectively, using unweighted data (because we include the variables for which the weights adjust) to preserve the full sample; replication of the estimates with weighted data yields similar findings. Given the descriptive nature of the work, we include *all* mothers (fathers) in the analyses, even those who have had only one birth and hence are not at risk of multipartnered fertility, and we include all independent variables simultaneously.

We use several procedures for dealing with missing data. Among items reported by mothers, for any variables with more than 10 missing observations, we assign the missing cases to the overall mean and include a flag variable to indicate the case has missing data on a particular variable. For father-reported variables, we follow a similar procedure and we include a dummy to indicate that the father was missing on a particular variable (when he was interviewed). We include an additional dummy variable to indicate if the father did not participate in the baseline survey, and we assigned values on the substantive variables to the means. This approach allows us to use the full sample, but only cases with valid information affect the regression estimates on particular variables. (The results are nearly identical when we limit our analyses to complete cases [results not shown].)

BIVARIATE RESULTS

We begin by looking at the fertility of all mothers in the Fragile Families Survey because we have more detailed information about mothers than fathers. These figures can also be seen from the child's perspective, as they reflect the parental configurations into which a recent cohort of children is born. Table 1 describes the fertility of 4,209 mothers by total number of births (parity), and within such by the number of fathers of their children. For 39% of mothers, the Fragile Families focal child is their first birth. For another 38% of mothers across higher order births, all their children have been with the same father. Thus, altogether, about three fourths of women have had children by a single man (although in time, many of these women may go on to have children by subsequent partners). Of the remaining one quarter of women who had children by more than one partner, the vast majority (84%) had children by two fathers, 15% by three fathers, and less than 2% by four or more fathers. As would be expected, at higher parities, a greater share of mothers have had children by multiple partners: 24% of mothers with two births, 48% of three births, 47% of four births, and 72% of five or more births. These figures indicate that large family size is confounded with multipartnered fertility, a fact that has not been highlighted in the vast demographic literature on fertility and family size.

Table 2 shows frequencies on couples' multipartnered fertility, overall and by marital status. When we take account of fathers' fertility (in addition to mothers'), the fraction of all couples with no other parental partners (either first births or where all previous children were with each other) drops to 64%. Thus, for over a third of couples who have recently had a child together, one or both of the partners has a previous child by another partner; for 14% of all couples, only the father has a child by another parent; for 12%, only the mother has a child by another parent, and for the remaining 11%, both the mother and the father have one or more children by another partner.

Multipartnered fertility varies notably by marital status: Unmarried couples are much more likely to have children from a previous relationship. In fact, in the *majority* of unmarried couples—59%—one or both parents already have at least one child by another partner; in 22% of cases, only the father has another child; in 17%, only the mother has a previous child; in the remaining 20% of cases, both the mother and the father have children by a previous partner. The proportions are much lower among couples who are married at the time of their baby's birth. Overall, in 21% of married couples, either one or both partners has children by another partner (8% the father only, 8% the mother only, and 5% both). This difference in multipartnered fertility by marital status is even more striking in

Table 1. *Distribution of Mothers by Total Number of Births (Parity) and of Fathers*

	Weighted % of Sample	Weighted % of Each Parity	Unweighted % of Sample	Unweighted Number of Cases
All (*N*)	100.0		100.0	4,209
One birth	39.4	100.0	37.7	1,588
Two births	32.0	100.0	33.5	1,409
One father	24.2	75.7	18.8	790
Two fathers	7.8	24.4	14.7	619
Three births	17.8	100.0	16.1	677
One father	9.2	51.9	6.0	254
Two fathers	7.0	39.5	7.7	323
Three fathers	1.5	8.6	2.4	100
Four births	5.8	100.0	7.3	306
One father	3.1	52.7	2.1	89
Two fathers	1.8	31.2	3.1	132
Three fathers	0.9	14.9	1.6	68
Four fathers	0.1	1.2	0.4	17
Five or more births	5.0	100.0	5.4	229
One father	1.4	28.5	1.0	41
Two fathers	2.4	47.4	2.3	98
Three fathers	0.9	18.5	1.3	53
Four fathers	0.2	3.9	0.5	22
Five fathers	0.1	1.7	0.3	13
Six or more fathers	0.0	0.0	0.0	2

Note: Although 4,300 mothers provided information about whether they had children by another partner, only 4,209 reported about the number of partners. Thus, we use the latter as the total sample size here.

light of the fact that married mothers and fathers in the sample are, on average, 5 – 6 years older than their unmarried counterparts.

Multivariate Results

As noted in the Method section, we estimate logistic regression models for whether the mother and whether the father has children by a previous partner, respectively. The reader should note that odds ratios, exp(*b*), are presented for ease of interpretation; an odds ratio equal to exactly 1.0 indicates that a given independent variable has no association with a given dependent variable, and an odds ratio higher (lower) than 1.0 indicates that a given independent variable has a positive (negative) association with the dependent variable.

Table 3 shows results predicting the mother's having children by more than one partner. Mother's age at first birth is highly predictive of having children by more than one partner even controlling for her total number of births: Mothers whose first birth was as a young teen (ages 14 – 16) are nearly six times as likely, and ages 17 – 18 are more than twice as likely, to have had children by multiple fathers, compared to mothers who delayed childbearing until the age of 30 or older. These findings replicate the previous results of Furstenberg and King (1999) using a sample of teen mothers. Mothers' total number of births is positively related to multipartnered fertility: Each additional birth is linked with a 3.5-fold increase in the odds that the mother has had children by at least two different men. Older mothers are more likely to have had births by more than one partner; they have simply had more time in which to experience childbearing and/or relationship instability. Mothers who lived with both of their biological parents at age 15 are nearly one fifth less likely to have had children by more than one father. Race/ethnicity is strongly linked to multipartnered fertility: Black non-Hispanic mothers are significantly more likely than mothers of all other race/ethnic backgrounds to have had children by more than one father. Couples who differ on race/ethnicity are more likely to have had children by multiple fathers (44% of mixed-race couples compared to 34% of same-race couples); also, in 40% of mixed-race

Table 2. *Couples' Multipartnered Fertility by Marital Status at Time of Birth*

	Weighted % of (Sub) Sample	Unweighted % of (Sub) Sample	Unweighted Number of Cases
All couples (*N*)[a]	100.0	100.0	4,160
No other partners	63.8	46.8	1,946
Father MPF only	13.6	17.9	744
Mother MPF only	11.6	16.3	678
Both parents MPF	11.1	19.0	792
Unmarried couples	100.0	100.0	3,099
No other partners	41.1	37.7	1,168
Father MPF only	22.0	20.3	628
Mother MPF only	16.8	18.8	583
Both parents MPF	20.1	23.2	720
Married couples	100.0	100.0	1,061
No other partners	78.6	73.3	778
Father MPF only	8.1	10.9	116
Mother MPF only	8.1	9.0	95
Both parents MPF	5.2	6.8	72

Note: MPF = multipartnered fertility.

[a]Includes couples where both mother and father have valid fertility information.

couples, the mother or the father is Black non-Hispanic, and these couples are nearly twice as likely to have had multipartnered fertility than mixed-race couples where neither partner is Black non-Hispanic (results not shown).

Turning to mothers' economic capacities, education is not significantly related to having had children by more than one partner net of the other covariates. Mothers who worked in the year before their baby's birth are more likely to have children by two or more fathers; they could be employed in order to support their earlier children. Self-reported health status does not appear to be associated with mothers' multipartnered fertility.

With respect to social-psychological attributes, more religious mothers are less likely to have had a child by more than one partner. Distrust of men and having a substance problem are positively correlated with multipartnered fertility, but the estimates are outside acceptable levels of statistical significance ($p = .13$ and $p = .11$, respectively). Having thought about getting an abortion with respect to the focal child is significantly related to mothers' having had children by multiple partners.

Parents' relationship status at the time of their baby's birth is strongly linked to multipartnered fertility. Compared to married mothers, all three categories of unmarried mothers (cohabiting, visiting, and nonromantic) are much more likely to have borne children by more than one man. Certainly, marital status may be a consequence of partners' fertility history, as relationships complicated by offspring from previous partnerships may be less likely to have progressed to marriage before the focal child's birth.

Next, we examine the correlates of fathers' having children by more than one partner (Table 4). Fathers' age at the time of the focal baby's birth is positively related to having had a child by more than one partner. Men who lived with both biological parents at age 15 are less likely to have had a child by more than one partner. Similar to mothers, Black non-Hispanic men are much more likely to have had a child by another partner than men of all other race/ethnic backgrounds. Immigrant fathers, however, are less likely to have done such.

With respect to fathers' economic capacities, we find that men with a college degree are two thirds less likely to have had children by a previous partner. Employment status is not linked to multipartnered fertility, but men in fair/poor health are significantly more likely to have had children by more than one partner. Religiosity, distrust of women, and having a substance problem are not linked to multipartnered fertility for men. Fathers with some history of incarceration, however, are more than twice as likely to have had children by two or more partners. Fathers who thought about having an abortion—a crude proxy for whether the pregnancy was intended—are

Table 3. *Logistic Regressions Results: Mothers' Multipartnered Fertility*

	Odds Ratio (*z*)
Mother's demographic characteristics	
Age at first birth (reference = 30 and older)	
14 – 16	5.99** (7.20)
17 – 18	2.30** (4.06)
19 – 20	1.31 (1.39)
21 – 24	1.08 (.38)
25 – 29	.80 (−1.08)
Total number of births (parity)	3.47** (23.75)
Aged 21 or older (at 1-year survey)	4.68** (9.63)
Lived with both parents at age 15	.82* (−2.12)
Race/ethnicity (reference = Black non-Hispanic)	
White non-Hispanic	.72* (−2.47)
Hispanic	.62** (−4.08)
Other	.44** (−2.73)
Parents are of different race/ethnicity	1.36* (2.31)
Immigrant	.99 (−.07)
Mother's economic capacities	
Education (reference = high school degree)	
Less than high school	.88 (−1.11)
Some college	1.10 (.81)
Bachelor's degree or higher	.74 (−1.41)
Worked last year	1.28* (2.13)
Health is fair/poor	1.05 (.32)
Mother's social-psychological characteristics	
Frequency of religious attendance (range = 1 – 5)	.93* (−2.03)
Distrust of men (range = 1 – 4)	1.13 (1.53)
Substance problem	1.53 (1.59)
Thought about an abortion	1.22* (1.97)
Couple's relationship status at baby's birth (reference = married)	
Cohabiting	4.01** (9.90)
Visiting	4.87** (10.24)
Not romantic	5.62** (9.64)
χ^2 (30 *df*)	2047.63
Unweighted number of cases (*N*)	4,161

†$p < .10$. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Table 4. *Logistic Regressions Results: Fathers' Multipartnered Fertility*

	Odds Ratio (*z*)
Father's demographic characteristics	
Age at baby's birth (reference = 30 and older)	
Younger than 20	.06** (−15.82)
20 – 24	.17** (−16.98)
25 – 29	.48** (−7.36)
Lived with both parents at age 15	.75** (−3.18)
Race/ethnicity (ref = Black non-Hispanic)	
White non-Hispanic	.40** (−7.74)
Hispanic	.64** (−4.52)
Other	.54** (−2.70)
Parents are of different race/ethnicity	1.02 (.20)
Immigrant	.65** (−3.16)
Father's economic capacities	
Education (reference = high school degree)	
Less than high school	1.07 (.68)
Some college	.92 (−.80)
Bachelor's degree or higher	.33** (−6.26)
Worked last week	.89 (−1.11)
Health is fair/poor	1.44* (2.35)
Father's social-psychological characteristics	
Frequency of religious attendance (range = 1 – 5)	.98 (−.62)
Distrust of women (range = 1 – 4)	.99 (−.11)
Substance problem	1.01 (.05)
Ever in jail (mother report)	2.21** (9.03)
Thought about an abortion	1.37** (2.89)
Couple's relationship status at baby's birth (reference = married)	
Cohabiting	2.38** (7.54)
Visiting	2.99** (8.50)
Not romantic	4.71** (9.57)
Father not interviewed at baseline	.57 (−0.85)
χ^2 (34 *df*)	1135.13
Unweighted number of cases (*N*)	4,136

†$p < .10$. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

also more likely to have children by multiple partners.

The parents' relationship at the time of birth is again important: Compared to married fathers, all three types of unmarried fathers are much more likely to have had children by more than one partner (ranging from twice as likely for cohabiting fathers to nearly five times as likely for men who had no romantic relationship with the baby's mother at the time of the birth). There is no significant difference in multipartnered fertility between fathers who did versus did not participate in the baseline survey.

We also estimated regression models for father's multipartnered fertility using fathers' own reports of their fertility (results not shown). This

limits our sample to those fathers who were interviewed. Our findings are extremely similar to those using mothers' reports, except that there are no significant differences for *other* non-Hispanic fathers (non-White, non-Black) versus Black non-Hispanic fathers. Also, when fathers' reports are used, there is no significant association of fathers' fair/poor health or father having thought about an abortion with multipartnered fertility.

Discussion

These results provide new descriptive information about multipartnered fertility, which is the long-term consequence of the changes in family demography in recent decades that have weakened the link between marriage and parenthood. Today, children experience a diverse array of family configurations: Nearly 36% of all children are born outside of marriage (Hamilton et al., 2005), and half of all children will spend some time in a single-parent family, often followed by remarriage or cohabitation (Bumpass & Raley, 1995). These figures suggest that a substantial fraction of all children will spend some time living away from one of their biological parents and possibly living with a nonbiological parent figure (either a legal stepparent or the cohabiting partner of one of their biological parents) along with step-siblings or half siblings.

Historically, parents' legal and biological ties to children came together in what anthropologists and sociologists called the "isolated nuclear family," where married parents shared a household with their own children (Davis, 1949; Parsons, 1955; Popenoe, 1988; Stacey, 1990). The diminishing congruence between families and households creates ambiguities in familial norms and roles and competing expectations and obligations (Furstenberg & King, 1999; Schneider, 1980). Parents are increasingly rearing children across multiple households and must make difficult choices about how to allocate their time, resources, and emotion; in all likelihood, such circumstances diffuse the total level of parental investment that children will receive.

This representative sample of a recent birth cohort in large U.S. cities sheds light on the families into which children are born, providing information about the characteristics of parents who have had children by more than one partner. Consistent with Furstenberg and King (1999), mothers who have a first child at early ages are more likely to have children by more than one partner. The relationship between young age at first birth and multipartnered fertility persists even controlling for the mother's total number of births. This relation implies that it is not only that mothers who start early have greater years at risk of childbearing. Instead, having a first child as a teenager is either associated with other individual characteristics that foster instability in relationships (such as emotional immaturity) or the experience of teen childbearing itself and the associated stresses diminish women's ability to manage their subsequent relationships and fertility—or both. From a demographic perspective, the strong link between parity and multipartnered fertility is notable because it suggests that greater sibship size is often consonant with children in a given family not all sharing the same two biological parents.

One of the most striking results from the present research concerns the significant association between race/ethnicity and multipartnered fertility, even controlling for various individual characteristics of parents (including for mothers, their total number of births). Black non-Hispanic mothers and fathers are much more likely than parents of other race/ethnic backgrounds to have had children by more than one partner. This finding underscores research that has pointed to the unique nature of family formation and kin relationships among African Americans (Mincy & Pouncy, 1997; Patterson, 1998; Stack, 1974; Wilson, 1987). Some have argued that certain cultural aspects of marriage and family among Blacks are attributable to larger historical/institutional experiences such as slavery (Patterson), whereas others contend that any differences in family patterns by race simply reflect the low socioeconomic status and poor job prospects among African American men (Tucker, 2000; Wilson)—and/or the high level of gender distrust (Edin, 2000; Furstenberg, 2001)—both of which deter marriage among inner-city Blacks.

Another notable finding is that fathers' incarceration is strongly related to multipartnered fertility, even controlling for a host of other correlates: Fathers who have spent time in jail or prison are more than twice as likely to have had a child by another partner. This finding is consistent with research showing that incarceration has negative consequences for union formation and family cohesion (Western et al., 2004). Incarceration history may be a proxy for other attributes of men that predict unstable partnerships

and/or the experience of spending time in jail or prison may increase the chances that an existing partnership will dissolve, hence increasing men's availability for new partnerships. We suspect that both are operative and could be mutually reinforcing.

Overall, the factors most strongly correlated with multipartnered fertility (of those measured for both mothers and fathers)—race/ethnicity and relationship status—are the same for men and women, but we do find several gender differences. Employment is positively related—and religion negatively related—to a higher likelihood of having children by a previous partner for mothers but not fathers, whereas being an immigrant and being in poor health are important for fathers but not for mothers.

Our findings regarding multipartnered fertility have important implications for public policy. The Bush administration intends to promote healthy marriage among low-income couples to foster family stability and improve child well-being. To the extent that a sizable fraction of unmarried parents have children by previous partners, many new marriages will not create "traditional" nuclear families. Instead, families would be formed where one or both of the new spouses has responsibility for children with whom they do not live and/or shares a residence with children to whom they are not related. In such circumstances, the already-strained resources—both time and money—of low-income parents would by necessity be spread across households, yielding diminished overall parental investment in children, compared to families with two biological parents and only their common child(ren) that are typically envisioned by marriage advocates. Research suggests that children in stepfamilies often do not fare any better than children in single-parent families, despite the fact that they often have higher economic resources (McLanahan & Sandefur, 1994).

There are several limitations to this research that bear attention. First, the Fragile Families data provide new information about multipartnered fertility, but as noted earlier, the measures should be considered as indicators; detailed fertility histories are not available, different items are used to measure multipartnered fertility for mothers and fathers, and the sample is one of births and hence cannot be generalized to all women or to all couples but to parents of a recent birth cohort. Second, we use mothers' reports of fathers' fertility, and we recognize that mothers may have imperfect information about fathers' previous children. To the extent that mothers may underreport fathers' other children (particularly for nonresident fathers who may be more likely to have had multiple partners), our estimates of total multipartnered fertility may be too low. A third limitation is that our estimates do not pertain to couples outside large cities. Multipartnered fertility could be either higher or lower in suburban and rural areas, and our results pertain only to parents having births in large U.S. cities.

This article represents a first step at understanding the importance of multipartnered fertility for family demography. We present descriptive analyses of the level and correlates of multipartnered fertility by the parents of a recent cohort of children at a single point in time, noting that the total prevalence of this phenomenon will only increase over time. In future work, we will use forthcoming data from the Fragile Families Study to analyze multipartnered fertility prospectively to better understand the underlying causal processes, as well as the consequences for parenting, relationship stability, and children's well-being. To the extent that families play a critical role in shaping children's development and well-being—and that parental investment is diminished in the context of multipartnered fertility—this is an important topic that merits further investigation.

NOTE

This research was supported by a grant to Marcia Carlson from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), Demographic and Behavioral Sciences Branch (K01HD042776). We are grateful to seminar participants at Columbia University and Princeton University and to three anonymous reviewers for their very helpful comments. We appreciate the generous financial support of the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study provided by NICHD (R01HD36916) and a consortium of private foundations.

REFERENCES

Akerlof, G. A., Yellen, J. L., & Katz, M. L. (1996). An analysis of out-of-wedlock childbearing in the United States. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *111*, 277 – 317.

Amato, P. R., & Rogers, S. J. (1997). A longitudinal study of marital problems and subsequent divorce. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *59*, 612 – 624.

Axinn, W. G., & Thornton, A. (2000). The transformation in the meaning of marriage. In L. J. Waite (Ed.),

The ties that bind: Perspectives on marriage and cohabitation (pp. 147 – 165). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Bohannan, P. (Ed.). (1968). *Divorce and after*. New York: Anchor Books.

Bumpass, L. L., & Lu, H. (2000). Trends in cohabitation and implications for children's family contexts. *Population Studies*, *54*, 29 – 41.

Bumpass, L. L., & Raley, R. K. (1995). Redefining single-parent families: Cohabitation and changing family reality. *Demography*, *32*, 97 – 109.

Carlson, M., McLanahan, S., & England, P. (2004). Union formation in fragile families. *Demography*, *41*, 237 – 262.

Cherlin, A. (2004). The deinstitutionalization of American marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *66*, 848 – 861.

Cherlin, A. J., & Furstenberg, F. F., Jr. (1994). Stepfamilies in the United States: A reconsideration. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *20*, 359 – 381.

Davis, K. (1949). *Human society*. New York: MacMillan.

Edin, K. (2000). What do low-income single mothers say about marriage? *Social Problems*, *47*, 112 – 133.

Edin, K., & Kefalas, M. (2005). *Promises I can keep: Why poor women put motherhood before marriage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Furstenberg, F. F., Jr. (1987). The new extended family: The experience of parents and children after remarriage. In K. Pasley & M. Ihinger-Tallman (Eds.), *Remarriage and stepparenting: Current research and theory* (pp. 42 – 61). New York: Guilford.

Furstenberg, F. F., Jr. (1995). Changing roles of fathers. In P. L. Chase-Lansdale & J. Brooks-Gunn (Eds.), *Escape from poverty: What makes a difference for children?* (pp. 189 – 210). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Furstenberg, F. F., Jr. (2001). The fading dream: Prospects for marriage in the inner city. In E. Anderson & D. S. Massey (Eds.), *Problem of the century: Racial stratification in the United States* (pp. 224 – 247). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Furstenberg, F. F., Jr., & Cherlin, A. J. (1991). *Divided families: What happens to children when parents part*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Furstenberg, F. F., Jr., & Harris, K. M. (1992). The disappearing American father? Divorce and the waning significance of biological parenthood. In S. J. South & S. E. Tolnay (Eds.), *The changing American family: Sociological and demographic perspectives* (pp. 197 – 223). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Furstenberg, F. F., Jr., Kennedy, S., McLoyd, V., Rumbaut, R. G., & Settersten, R. A., Jr. (2004). Growing up is harder to do. *Contexts*, *3*, 33 – 41.

Furstenberg, F. F., Jr., & King, R. B. (1999). *Multipartnered fertility sequences: Documenting an alternative family form*. An earlier version was presented at the annual meetings of the Population Association of America, Chicago, IL, April 1998.

Gibson-Davis, C. M., & Edin, K. (2004, October). *The effect of multiple partner fertility on father involvement*. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, Atlanta, GA.

Goldstein, J. R., & Kenney, C. T. (2001). Marriage delayed or marriage foregone? New cohort forecasts on first marriages for U.S. women. *American Sociological Review*, *66*, 506 – 519.

Guzzo, K. B., & Furstenberg, F. F., Jr. (2005, March). *Multiple partner fertility among young adults: The influence of first birth characteristics*. Presented at the Eastern Sociological Society, Washington, DC.

Hamilton, B. E., Ventura, S. J., Martin, J. A., & Sutton, P. D. (2005). *Preliminary births for 2004. Health E-Stats*. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics.

Hanson, S. L., Morrison, D. R., & Ginsburg, A. L. (1989). The antecedents of teenage fatherhood. *Demography*, *26*, 579 – 596.

Harknett, K., & Knab, J. T. (in press). *More kin, less support: Multipartnered fertility and perceived support among mothers. Journal of Marriage and Family.*

Johnson, C. L. (1988). *Ex familia: Grandparents, parents, and children adjust to divorce*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Lehrer, E. L. (2000). Religion as a determinant of entry into cohabitation and marriage. In L. J. Waite (Ed.), *The ties that bind: Perspectives on marriage and cohabitation* (pp. 227 – 252). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Lerman, R. I. (1993). A national profile of young unwed fathers. In R. I. Lerman & T. J. Ooms (Eds.), *Young unwed fathers: Changing roles and emerging policies* (pp. 27 – 51). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Lichter, D. T., LeClere, F. B., & McLaughlin, D. K. (1991). Local marriage markets and the marital behavior of black and white women. *American Journal of Sociology*, *94*, 843 – 867.

Lillard, L. A., & Panis, C. W. (1996). Marital status and mortality: The role of health. *Demography*, *33*, 313 – 327.

Manning, W. D. (1995). Cohabitation, marriage, and entry into motherhood. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *57*, 191 – 200.

Manning, W. D., & Smock, P. J. (1995). Why marry? Race and the transition to marriage among cohabitors. *Demography*, *32*, 509 – 520.

Manning, W. D., & Smock, P. J. (1999). New families and nonresident father-child visitation. *Social Forces*, *78*, 87 – 116.

Manning, W. D., & Smock, P. J. (2000). "Swapping" families: Serial parenting and economic support for children. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *62*, 111 – 122.

Martin, T. C., & Bumpass, L. L. (1989). Recent trends in marital disruption. *Demography*, *26*, 37 – 51.

McLanahan, S., & Sandefur, G. (1994). *Growing up with a single parent: What hurts? What helps?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Meyer, D. R., Cancian, M., & Cook, S. T. (2005). Multiple-partner fertility: Incidence and implications for child support policy. *Social Service Review*, *79*, 577 – 601.

Mincy, R. B. (2002). *Who should marry whom?: Multiple partner fertility among new parents* (Working paper #2002-03-FF). Unpublished manuscript, Center for Research on Child Wellbeing, Princeton University.

Mincy, R. B., & Pouncy, H. (1997). Paternalism, child support enforcement, and fragile families. In L. M. Mead (Ed.), *The new paternalism: Supervisory approaches to poverty* (pp. 130 – 160). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Morgan, S. P., & Rindfuss, R. R. (1999). Reexamining the link of early childbearing to marriage and to subsequent fertility. *Demography*, *36*, 59 – 75.

Moynihan, D. P., Smeeding, T. M., & Rainwater, L. (Eds.). (2004). *The future of the family*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Parsons, T. (1955). *Family, socialization, and interaction processes*. New York: Free Press.

Patterson, O. (1998). *Rituals of blood: Consequences of slavery in two American centuries*. New York: Basic Civitas.

Plotnick, R. D. (1992). The effects of attitudes on teenage premarital pregnancy and its resolution. *American Sociological Review*, *57*, 800 – 811.

Popenoe, D. (1988). *Disturbing the nest: Family change and decline in modern societies*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Raley, R. K. (2000). Recent trends and differentials in marriage and cohabitation: The United States. In L. J. Waite (Ed.), *The ties that bind: Perspectives on marriage and cohabitation* (pp. 19 – 39). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Reichman, N., Teitler, J., Garfinkel, I., & McLanahan, S. (2001). Fragile Families: Sample and design. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *23*, 303 – 326.

Rindfuss, R. R., Morgan, S. P., & Offutt, K. (1996). Education and the changing age pattern of American fertility: 1963 – 1989. *Demography*, *33*, 277 – 290.

Sayer, L. C., & Bianchi, S. M. (2000). Women's economic independence and the probability of divorce. *Journal of Family Issues*, *21*, 906 – 943.

Schneider, D. M. (1980). *American kinship: A cultural account*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

South, S. J. (2001). The variable effects of family background on the timing of first marriage: United States, 1969 – 1993. *Social Science Research*, *30*, 606 – 626.

Stacey, J. (1990). *Brave new families*. New York: Basic Books.

Stack, C. B. (1974). *All our kin: Strategies for survival in a black community*. New York: Harper & Row.

Thornberry, T. P., Smith, C. A., & Howard, G. J. (1997). Risk factors for teenage fatherhood. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *59*, 505 – 522.

Tucker, M. B. (2000). Marital values and expectations in context: Results from a 21-city survey. In L. J. Waite (Ed.), *The ties that bind: Perspectives on marriage and cohabitation* (pp. 283 – 301). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Ventura, S. J., & Bachrach, C. A. (2000). *Nonmarital childbearing in the United States, 1940 – 99* (National Vital Statistics Reports 48(16)). Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics.

Western, B., Lopoo, L. M., & McLanahan, S. (2004). Incarceration and the bonds between parents in fragile families. In M. Patillo, D. Weiman, & B. Western (Eds.), *Imprisoning America: The social effects of mass incarceration* (pp. 21 – 45). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

White, L. K. (1990). Determinants of divorce: A review of research in the eighties. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *52*, 904 – 912.

Wilcox, W. B. (2002). *Then comes marriage: Religion, race, and marriage in urban America*. Philadelphia, PA: The Center for Research on Religion and Urban Civil Society, University of Pennsylvania.

Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wu, L. L., & Wolfe, B. (Eds.). (2001). *Out of wedlock: Causes and consequences of nonmarital fertility*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Table A1. *Sample Characteristics by Couples' Multipartnered Fertility Status*

	Total	Neither Has MPF[a]	Father MPF Only	Mother MPF Only	Both Parent MPF
Demographic characteristics					
Mother's age at first birth (years)					
14 – 16	7.6	7.2	4.8	11.3	9.0
17 – 18	14.6	9.3	12.1	32.9	29.0
19 – 20	15.6	11.2	27.9	20.4	20.5
21 – 24	20.6	19.0	28.1	21.0	20.5
25 – 29	22.5	28.3	14.8	10.6	11.0
30 and older	19.2	25.0	12.4	3.9	10.0
M age at first birth	23.98	25.33	22.90	20.17	21.53
M number of mother's total births (parity)	2.07	1.79	1.58	3.22	3.09
Parents have other biological children together	47.1	51.6	39.9	51.0	25.8
Father's age at focal child's birth (years)					
Younger than 20	4.9	6.0	3.1	4.1	1.3
20 – 24	20.2	17.0	23.5	42.6	11.7
25 – 29	24.0	25.2	22.0	19.3	24.2
30 and older	50.9	51.8	51.4	34.1	62.9
Family background					
Mother lived with both parents at age 15	54.1	63.7	42.6	30.8	37.1
Father lived with both parents at age 15	61.1	68.3	40.6	55.5	42.5
Mother's race/ethnicity					
White non-Hispanic	39.4	48.4	23.7	29.9	16.5
Black non-Hispanic	21.7	12.8	35.0	27.1	51.4
Hispanic	30.7	28.8	36.9	35.8	29.1
Other	8.2	10.0	4.5	7.2	3.0
Parents are of different race/ethnicity	14.7	12.8	22.0	12.9	18.8
Nativity					
Mother is foreign born	23.9	27.2	19.5	14.2	20.7
Father is foreign born	23.7	26.0	16.8	17.6	23.4
Economic capacities					
Mother's education					
Less than high school	26.8	22.6	28.8	37.9	36.8
High school degree	30.4	25.1	41.8	38.2	38.7
Some college	19.4	19.4	19.7	15.1	23.5
Bachelor's degree or higher	23.5	33.0	9.7	8.8	1.0
Father's education (mother report)					
Less than high school	24.2	21.5	26.7	28.6	32.9
High school degree	28.3	22.2	39.0	37.2	43.5
Some college	24.4	23.2	30.5	26.7	21.2
Bachelor's degree or higher	23.1	33.1	3.9	7.5	2.4
Employment status					
Mother worked in past year	72.9	73.3	74.0	77.0	65.0
Father worked in past week	88.5	91.7	79.1	86.2	82.9
Poor/fair health					
Mother	7.3	5.0	13.1	7.7	13.1
Father	6.9	4.9	10.9	6.8	15.8
Social-psychological characteristics					
M frequency of church attendance (range = 1 – 5)					
Mother	3.26	3.39	3.24	2.84	2.97
Father	3.07	3.17	2.95	2.81	2.89

Table A1. *Continued*

	Total	Neither Has MPF[a]	Father MPF Only	Mother MPF Only	Both Parent MPF
M distrust of other gender (range = 1 – 4)					
Mother	1.97	1.92	2.12	1.98	2.12
Father	1.90	1.86	2.00	1.95	1.98
Substance problem					
Mother	1.1	.9	2.5	.4	1.6
Father	3.0	1.4	9.9	2.2	5.2
Father ever in jail (mother report)	16.7	10.1	34.9	17.7	33.5
Thought about an abortion					
Mother	14.9	8.7	27.1	22.0	28.4
Father	8.8	6.2	12.2	14.4	15.6
Couple's relationship status at baby's birth					
Married	60.6	74.6	36.1	42.6	28.4
Cohabiting	21.4	14.4	27.8	41.1	33.3
Visiting	12.2	7.1	23.6	12.6	27.2
Not romantic	5.9	4.0	12.6	3.7	11.0
Father not interviewed at time of birth	89.1	93.3	75.2	89.3	81.8
Unweighted number of cases (*N*)	4,160	1,946	744	678	792

Note: All figures are weighted by national sampling weights. MPF = multipartnered fertility.

[a]Includes first births and parents whose other children are only with each other.