92-06

Are Adolescent Mothers Just Single Mothers?

Nan Marie Astone

Department of Population Dynamics
The Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health

Presented to the Conference on
Outcomes of Early Childbearing:
An Appraisal of Recent Evidence

May 18 and 19, 1992
Bethesda, Maryland

REVISED JUNE 1992

Support for the preparation of this paper was provided by the W.T. Grant Foundation Faculty Scholars Program. I am grateful to Greg Duncan, Saul Hoffman and William Marsiglio for helpful comments on an earlier draft, to Robert Davis and Judy Gehret for computational assistance and to Tobey Harvey for secretarial help.

BACKGROUND

The odds that an American child will be poor are profoundly affected by the economic well-being of that child's mother. For this reason research on those factors which are associated with the economic status of mothers has been and remains of interest to scholars and policy-makers who are concerned about child welfare. Two such factors are adolescent motherhood and single motherhood, each of which are the subject of an independent research tradition. These two traditions are quite distinct, using different conceptual models, different methods and often different sources of data, despite their common concern---the poverty of women and the resultant poverty of their co-resident children. A strategy for research which combines elements of both traditions has a number of advantages. The most important is the potential it has for illuminating the complex interaction between early childbearing, low marriage rates, and race which so many scholars and policy-makers believe lies at the heart of the problems that afflict the youth---especially the black youth---of America.

Researchers concerned with the negative effects of adolescent childbearing on women's economic well-being generally focus on how an early birth interacts with a woman's <u>own</u> economic activity. Specifically they document the association between early birth, early school leaving (Hofferth and Moore 1979; Marini 1984; Rindfuss, Bumpass and St. John 1980; Upchurch and McCarthy 1989; 1990) and high subsequent fertility (Moore and Hofferth 1978; Trussell and Menken 1978). According to this perspective, early birth, early school leaving and fast paced subsequent fertility all lead to low

occupational attainment, low earnings attainment and high levels of welfare receipt among teenage mothers (Hofferth 1987). The role that marriage plays in mediating the association between adolescent motherhood and poverty has been neglected within this tradition.

By contrast, scholars concerned with the poverty of mother-only families have focused almost exclusively on marriage. Specifically, they follow women over time as they move into and out of marriage and evaluate how their economic status is affected by their marital status. The conclusion from these studies is that single mothers--both never and formerly married--are much more likely to be poor than married mothers (Bane and Ellwood 1983; Garfinkel and McLanahan 1986; Duncan and Hoffman 1985).

Adolescent mothers and single mothers are groups with a great many common members. Adolescent mothers are more likely than older mothers to be single when they give birth and thus form a mother-only family immediately (O'Connell and Rogers 1984). Women with non-marital births have lower marriage rates than other women (Bennett and Bloom 1991) and thus are highly likely to remain single mothers. In addition, adolescent mothers have higher divorce rates than other teenagers (McCarthy and Menken 1979) so even those who are married at the time of the birth are more likely to form mother-only families subsequently. The overlap in membership between the two groups presents problems for researchers and policy-makers trying to synthesize the results of research on each.

The findings from each of these research traditions tells an important piece of the story of why American women and their children are so vulnerable to poverty. The results of the mother-only family research reveals how large a difference there is in the economic well-being of women who have access to a male worker's earnings and those who do not. The results of the adolescent motherhood research suggest a reason why this is the case: namely that motherhood can interfere with both the development of a woman's potential to support herself and her children through her own economic activity, and her ability to exercise this potential. This is especially true when motherhood occurs early in life. Unfortunately, we lack a complete, coherent understanding of how these two pieces of the story fit together. In the language of economists: we need to know how adolescent childbearing affects both women's marriage market and women's labor market opportunities.

More specifically, adolescent motherhood researchers should be mindful of 1) the economic contribution of other household members to a mother's economic well-being, especially when selecting their dependent outcomes; and 2) the higher probability that adolescent mothers are also single mothers, when comparing early and later childbearers. The result of the fact that they have not been mindful of these two factors is that we do not know to what extent the negative effect of adolescent motherhood on poverty is mediated by the fact that they are more likely than older childbearers to be single mothers.

Some empirical research on the social and economic consequences of adolescent childbearing substantiates the value of looking at the effects of

adolescent childbearing, net of marital status. In a non-representative sample of black adolescent mothers who were followed over time, Furstenberg and his colleagues (1987) found that stable marriage was the pathway to the highest level of economic success for these women. Predictably, however, stable marriages in this group were rare. Another study which looked at the economic consequences of simultaneous teenage birth and teenage marriage versus teenage birth alone (Teti and Lamb 1989) found that adolescent mothers who married as teenagers were no better off than single adolescent mothers. This study did not separate those whose marriages remained intact and those whose did not, however, therefore it did not actually address the issue of single motherhood. Finally, bivariate tables from a study of black adolescent welfare mothers (Duncan and Hoffman 1990) suggest that being married at the time of the birth or subsequently may improve a black adolescent mother's long term economic well-being.

In this paper I make a first step towards filling the gap in our knowledge. I am specifically interested in three questions: What are the differences in the probability of being a single mother by race and age at first birth both initially and five years after the birth? How does age at first birth affect total household income for blacks and whites during the five years after the birth? How much of the negative effect of early childbearing on household income is due to the higher likelihood that early childbearers are single mothers for blacks and whites?

DATA AND METHODS

Overview

The strategy I employ to answer my research questions is adapted from that of the mother-only family researchers. It has three important characteristics. First, I compare the income of mothers to mothers, that is early childbearers to later childbearers, rather than early childbearers to adolescents who have not given birth. I assume that motherhood itself has some effect on household income and I want to evaluate the impact of age at birth on income, net of the effect of the transition to motherhood itself. Second, I take a dynamic approach. I look at the effect of age at birth on household income for the five years following the birth. In the models which include marital status I take into account changes in marital status which occur over that time. Third, I look at the effect of age at birth on household income net of household income the year before the birth. This is to insure that unmeasured factors which cause both early childbearing and low income do not cause me to observe a spurious relationship between early childbearing and low income (Geronimous and Korenman 1991).

Data

The data for my study are from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID). This is a longitudinal study of American individuals and their families. Two sub-samples, drawn in 1968, comprise PSID's sample: one sub-sample is representative of U.S. households in 1968 and the other is a sample

of disadvantaged American households in 1968. All individuals living in the original set of households have been surveyed annually since 1968, whether or not they are living in the same dwelling or with the same people. PSID also collects information on an original sample member's new household and all its members. Thus, the number of individuals for whom the PSID has gathered some information increased from 18,000 in 1968 to a total of over 36,000 in 1987. The number of family units increased similarly from 5,000 to 7,000. The central focus of data collection from 1969 until the present has been on the sources and level of income in each survey household. The dates of critical demographic events have also been recorded for most respondents to the study.

For the present study I made several selections. First, my sample was limited to black or white, non-hispanic women who are members of the sample[1]. Second, I was specifically interested in women who gave birth for the first time during the panel years. In order to insure that I had data on income the year before the birth and for five years after the birth I selected women whose first birth occurred between 1969 and 1982.

PSID collects more extensive information from household heads or the domestic partner's of household heads (formal or informal) then it does from other sample members. For example, information on social and family background factors are available when the respondent is a household head or partner thereof. After I made the selections I just described, based on sex, race and year of first birth, I discovered that 96 percent of those selected on these criteria had been either heads of household or partner's thereof at some point during the panel years. Consequently, I limited the analysis to

this group, for whom the background information was available. Recent work suggests that parents are highly likely to be household heads (Santi 1988; 1990) and that mothers who are not household heads (alone or in partnership) at the time of their first birth, become household heads (alone or in partnership) within a few years of motherhood (Parish, Hao and Hogan 1991). Thus, selecting those who at some point headed their own household (alone or in partnership) should not be a major source of bias in the analysis. Note that the individual did not have to be a household head or partner thereof at the time she gave birth, just at some point during the years from 1968 through 1987.

Any data which are collected prospectively are subject to sample attrition; this is particularly the case for a study like the PSID which has been going on for twenty-five years. In light of 1) this attrition, 2) the two different sub-samples which comprise the PSID, and 3) the fact that my dependent outcome is income, a variable which was a criteria for selection into one of the two sub-samples, all analyses reported in this paper are weighted, as recommended by the staff of the PSID (Hill 1992).

After using the appropriate weights, my sample contained 646 white women who gave birth for the first time from 1969 through 1982 and 630 similar black women.

Variables

In what follows I employ the following notation: the year of a respondent's first birth is t; all other years I refer to in the text or tables are indexed to t. So for example, I refer to the year before the birth as t-1 and to the third year after the birth as t+3.

DEPENDENT VARIABLES The dependent variables in these analyses are the income/needs ratio of the respondent's household in t+1 through t+5. The component variables in the income/needs ratio are: 1) the total money income of all members of the household in which the respondent resides, transformed into 1967 dollars; and 2) an assessment of the minimum amount of money a household of that size and with that particular age and sex composition required in 1967. The latter is analogous, but not identical to the U.S. Bureau of the Census poverty definition. For example, an income/needs ratio of 2 means that the total money income of the household is twice what that household minimally requires to function well. A full description of the income/needs ratio is found in the PSID User's Guide (ICPSR 1984).

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES There are two independent variables. The first is age at first birth which distinguishes among four groups: 1) those who gave birth for the first time at age 18 or younger (which I shall refer to as **very early** childbearers below); 2) at age 19 or 20 (which I shall refer to as **relatively early** childbearers in subsequent text); 3) from age 21 through 24; and 4) age 25 or older. Preliminary analyses using age at birth coded in single years of age indicated that these were homogeneous groups with respect to the dependent

outcomes for both races. The reference category for this variable in the multivariate analyses is 18 or less.

The second independent variable is the respondent's marital career; this is a variable which summarizes their marital status at the time of the birth and currently. It distinguishes among four groups. 1) Those respondents who were single[2] at the time of their first birth and are currently[3] single comprise the first group. 2) Respondents who were single when they first became mothers, but who are currently married[4] make up the second group. The third and fourth groups are analogous to the first two for those married at the time of the birth: 3) married at birth, currently single; and 4) married at birth, currently married. The reference category for this variable in the multivariate analyses is married at the birth, currently married.

CONTROL VARIABLES Five control variables are included in the multivariate analyses. Three of them measure factors commonly included in models of socioeconomic attainment and earnings: 1) region of origin (northeast, north central, south, west); 2) size of place of origin (rural, small town/suburb, big city) and 3) parental education (less than high school, high school graduate, at least some college). The latter is either the mother's or father's education, whichever is higher (or whichever was non-missing in cases where either mother's or father's education but not both was unavailable).

The fourth control variable is calendar year of the birth (1969 through 1982) which I include to account for differences in real income which occur

over time (as opposed to inflation, for which the dependent outcome is adjusted).

Appendix Table A1 gives the univariate statistics on the first four control variables.

The fifth control variable is income/needs ratio in t-1. I include this variable in all my models as a control for unmeasured differences between early childbearers and later childbearers which might affect both age at first birth and income. The distribution of this variable is in the first column of Table 1.

Analytic Techniques

The effects of the independent variables on the dependent outcomes were estimated using ordinary least squares regression. All coefficients reported are net of the five control variables. In the main text I report only coefficients of interest; Appendix Table A2 reports the results of the full models and gives the value of the adjusted R-squared for each model.

Table 1 reports univariate statistics on the income/needs ratio in t-1 and in t+1 through t+5. The table shows that the distributions of all six income indicators are skewed to the right, so I took a log transformation of all six so as to meet the assumptions of OLS regression.

RESULTS

Univariate and Bivariate Findings

How much more likely are black women to be early childbearers and how much more likely are black mothers and early childbearers of both races to be single mothers? Many scholars have addressed these questions and my descriptive analyses confirm what they have found.

Table 2 reports the percent distribution of age at first birth separately by race in both single years of age and in terms of the age groupings which I used in the multivariate analysis. This table reveals familiar racial differences in the timing of motherhood (Bianchi and Spain 1986; Sweet and Bumpass 1987). Over 40 percent of black women who made the transition to motherhood during the time I observed did so at age 18 or less; the white percentage is less than half of the blacks percentage (16). Thirty percent of the white women who become mothers for the first time between 1969 and 1982 were over 25, while only fifteen percent of the black women reach the quarter-century mark without having a baby.

Table 3 contains the distribution of marital status at t, separately by race and by age at first birth. As expected, this table reveals that the majority of black mothers give birth for the first time outside marriage (65 percent), while just a little more than ten percent of white women are unmarried at the time of motherhood. For both races, early childbearing is associated with out-of-wedlock childbearing; the association is stronger for

whites than blacks. Among blacks there do not appear to be important differences between very early and relatively early childbearers with respect to marital status at birth. For whites there are differences between these groups; the percentage of relatively early childbearers (those who give birth at 19 or 20) who are unmarried at the time of the birth is half the percentage for very early childbearers (17 as compared to 31).

Table 4 is similar to Table 3, except that it gives marital status in year t+5, rather than t. Early childbearers are more likely to be single five years after the birth than older childbearers, like the similar finding for year t, this pattern is more pronounced for whites than blacks. Table 4 reveals the addition mechanism propelling white early childbearers along the road to single motherhood: the percent of white early childbearers who are separated or divorced is much higher than among white women who made the transition to motherhood later (25 for the very early childbearers compared to 7 for those who delay childbearing until after age 25). This pattern does not exist for blacks; the percentage of mothers separated or divorced in t+5 is similar for all age-at-first birth groups.

With respect to the racial differences in single motherhood, not only are black mothers highly likely to be single mothers at the time of the birth by comparison to whites, as Table 3 and past research shows, but they are also more likely than white women to be single mothers at the end of the five years following their first birth (see Table 5). Of the approximately 65 percent of black women who gave birth outside marriage, less than one-quarter of these were married five years after the birth[5]. By contrast, over forty percent of

the whites who were single at the time of the birth were married in t+5. Moreover, blacks who are married at the time of the birth are more likely than whites to be unmarried in t+5. Nineteen percent of the blacks who were married when they became mothers are currently single in t+5[6] compared to only 12 percent of the whites.

Multivariate Findings

Do adolescent mothers live in households with lower ratios of income to needs than mothers who were older the first time they gave birth? To answer this question I regressed the income/needs ratio of the respondent's household in the five years following the birth on age at first birth, net of the control variables. The results are under the heading "model 1" in Table 6 (that is, the first, third, fifth, seventh and ninth columns of Table 6.

For both races there is a substantial effect of age at birth on the household income/needs ratio during the five years immediately following the birth. The effect is slightly different for blacks and whites. Among blacks, differences between very early and relatively early childbearers exist in years t+1 through t+3 and then fade away. For whites, there are significant differences between the two youngest groups of childbearers in four of the five years I looked at. The relationship between household income and age at birth for blacks appears to be non-linear; in tables not shown I find that there are no significant differences between the household income/needs ratios of black women who give birth between 21 and 24 on the one hand and black women who delay births until age 25 or older on the other. For whites, by

contrast, the relationship between age at first birth and household income during the years following the birth does appear to be linear, with significant (tables not shown) differences between those who give birth at age 21 through 24 and those who delay births substantially (until 25 or older).

How much of the effect is due to differences in the probability that an early childbearer of either race is a single mother? To address this issue, I re-ran the model I just discussed, adding the marital career variable. The results are also in Table 6 under the heading "model 2" (the second, fourth, sixth, eighth and tenth columns). A comparison of the coefficients from the two models will provide the answer to the question.

These findings are broadly similar for blacks and whites. The fact that very early childbearers have different marital careers than women who become mothers at older ages accounts for a large part of the difference in household income we observed between very early childbearers and relatively early childbearers; although for both blacks and whites small differences between the two youngest groups of childbearers remain after marital career is taken into account.

Table 6 shows that substantial differences in household income remain between very early childbearers and those who delay a birth until age 21 or later for both blacks and whites after marital career is controlled. A substantial part of these differences are accounted for by marital career, however: about a third of the difference between those who give birth between 21 and 24 and very early childbearers is due to differences in marital career

and about a fourth of the difference between those who delay motherhood until age 25 is also due to differences in marital career[7].

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

In this paper I examined the differences in marital behavior and household income among mothers who give birth at different ages. Specifically I showed how much more likely very early childbearers (those who give birth for the first time at age 18 or younger) are to be single mothers and asked whether the positive effect of age at birth on household income persists after this is taken into account.

My results suggest that delaying the transition to motherhood until age 21 has a positive impact on household income in the years immediately following the birth for both whites and blacks, regardless of whether a woman is a single or married mother. In addition, there appears to be a further improvement in household income which accrues to whites as a result of delaying a birth until age 25 or more. There is no evidence of the latter effect among blacks at all.

The apparent advantage which women who delay a birth until age 19 or 20 have is less clear, this effect appears weak and inconsistent in models which control for single motherhood.

A number of specific avenues for further research are suggested by these results. I find two in particular very intriguing. First, is the negative

effect of non-marital childbearing on marriage rates which is known (Bennett and Bloom 1991) stronger for blacks than whites? Table 4 suggests that it may be. Does it vary by age at non-marital birth?

Second, what are the mechanisms through which the negative effect of age at birth on household income operate? The pattern of my results suggests two hypotheses. 1) The differences between relatively early and very early childbearers lie exclusively in their marriage market opportunities (both in terms of quantity of partners and quality of partners) not in their own labor market opportunities. 2) Differences between later childbearers and early childbearers lie in both marriage market and labor market opportunities. Research on differences by age at first birth in women's educational attainment (see Astone and Upchurch 1992a; 1992b), occupational attainment and marriage patterns is necessary to test these hypotheses as well as continuing research on income. With respect to the latter, an important next step for the current project is to disaggregate the effect of age at first birth into the components of total household income (ie. the woman's own earnings, the earnings of other family members, transfer payments).

Endnotes

1. In other words someone who is a PSID respondent solely because she is living with a sample member are not included in this analysis. For example, the wife of a man whose parents headed a 1968 sample household is a PSID respondent, but is excluded from this analysis.

2. For the sake of fluency of expression I use the word single to mean "unmarried," that is: never married or separated-divorced.

3. By currently I mean during the year in question: t+1, t+2 etc.

4. A respondent was considered married (either at the time of first birth or currently) no matter which marriage they were in. A respondent was considered unmarried regardless of whether they were never married or are separated/divorced. A large majority of the respondents who had ever married were only married once (85 percent), so I did not distinguish those in a first marriage from those in a higher order marriage in the variable used in the multivariate analysis.

5. That is 14.4 (the percent who were single at the time of the birth and married in t+5) divided by 65.1 (the percent who were single at the time of the birth) quantity times 100.

6. The percentage of blacks who are married at birth, currently single is 6.7. This percentage, divided by 35.1 (the percentage of blacks married at the time of the birth) and quantity multiplied by 100 is 19.

7. The effects of marital career itself on household income are outside the scope of this paper, but interesting none-the-less. Interested readers may find the relevant regression coefficients in Appendix Table A2. In brief, single motherhood has a strong negative effect on total household income for both blacks and whites, regardless of whether or not a woman was married at the time she gave birth. Married women who were single at the time they gave birth also have low household incomes, relative to those who were married at the time of the birth and who are still married, but this effect is less consistent than the effect of single motherhood. These results, like the ones reported in the main text of the paper, are broadly similar for whites and blacks.

Literature Cited

Astone, N.M. and D.M. Upchurch. 1992a. "Early Family Formation, Leaving High School and Earning a GED: A Comparison of Three Cohorts." Hopkins Population Center Working Paper.

Astone, N.M. and D.M. Upchurch. 1992b. "The Timing and Sequencing of Marriage and Motherhood: Implications for Post-Secondary Attainment." Hopkins Population Center Working Paper.

Bane, M.J. and D. Ellwood. 1983. "The Dynamics of Dependence: The Routes to Self-Sufficiency." Prepared for Assistant Secretary of Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health and Human Services.

Bennett, N. and D.E. Bloom. 1991. "The Influence of Non-marital Childbearing on the Formation of Marital Unions." Presented to the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Bianchi, S.M. and D. Spain. 1986. American Women in Transition. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Duncan, G.J. and S. Hoffman. 1985. "A Reconsideration of the Economic Consequences of Marital Dissolution." Demography 22(4):485-498.

Duncan, G.J. and S. Hoffman. 1990. "Welfare Benefits, Economic Opportunities, and Out-of-Wedlock Births Among Black Teenage Girls." Unpublished, ISR, University of Michigan.

Farley, R. 1988. "After the Starting Line." Demography 25:477.

Furstenberg, F.F. Jr., J. Brooks-Gunn, and S. Philip Morgan. 1987. Adolescent Mothers in Later Life. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Garfinkel, I. and S.S. McLanahan. 1986. Single Mothers and Their Children. Washington D.C. The Urban Institute.

Geronimous, A.T. and S. Korenman. 1991. "The Socioeconomic Consequences of Teen Childbearing Reconsidered." Working Paper no. 3701. Cambridge, Massachusetts: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Hill, M.S. 1992. The Panel Study of Income Dynamics: A User's Guide. Sage: Newbury Park: California.

Hofferth, S.L. and K.A. Moore. 1979. "Early Childbearing and Later Economic Well-Being." American Sociological Review 44:784-815.

Hofferth, S.L. 1987. "Social and Economic Consequences of Teenage Childbearing." In Risking the Future, eds. S.L. Hofferth and C. Hayes, 123-144. Washington D.C.: National Academy Press.

ICPSR. 1984. PSID User's Guide. Institute for Survey Research, University of Michigan.

Marini, M.M. 1984. "Women's Educational Attainment and the Timing of Entry Into Parenthood." American Sociological Review 49(4):491-511.

McCarthy, J. and J.L. Menken. 1979. "Marriage, Remarriage, Marital Dissolution and Age at First Birth." Family Planning Perspectives 11(1):21-30.

Moore, K.A. and S.L. Hofferth. 1978. "The Consequences of Age at First Childbirth: Family Size." Working Paper 1146-02. Washington D.C. Urban Institute.

O'Connell M. and C.C. Rogers. 1984. "Out-of-Wedlock Births, Premarital Pregnancies and Their Effect on Family Formation and Dissolution." Family Planning Perspectives 16(4);157-162.

Parish, W.L., L. Hao and D.P. Hogan. 1991. "Family Support Networks, Welfare, and Work among Young Mothers." Journal of Marriage and the Family 53(1): 203-215.

Rindfuss, R.R., L. Bumpass and C. St. John. 1980. "Education and Fertility: Implications for the Roles Women Occupy." American Sociological Review 45(3):431-447.

Santi, L.L. 1988. "The Demographic Context of Recent Changes in the Structure of American Households." Demography 25(4):509-520.

Santi, L.L. 1990. "Household Headship Among Unmarried Persons in the United States, 1970-1985." Demography 27(2):219-232.

Sweet, J.A. and L.L. Bumpass. 1987. American Families and Households. New York: Sage.

Teti, D.M. and M.E. Lamb. 1989. "Socioeconomic and Marital Outcomes of Adolescent Marriage, Adolescent Childbirth, and Their Co-occurrence." Journal of Marriage and the Family 51:203-212.

Trussell, J.T. and J. Menken. 1978. "Early Childbearing and Subsequent Fertility." Family Planning Perspectives 10:209-218.

Upchurch, D.M. and J. McCarthy. 1989. "Adolescent Childbearing and High School Completion in the 1980s: Have Things Changed?" Family Planning Perspectives 21(5):199-202.

Upchurch, D.M. and J. McCarthy. 1990. "The Timing of a First Birth and High School Completion." American Sociological Review 55:224-234.

Table 1. Weighted univariate statistics on household income/needs ratio by race and year since first birth. Panel Study of Income Dynamics, household heads and domestic partners of household heads who gave birth for the first time between 1969 and 1982.

Year Since Birth	t-1	t+1	t+2	t+3	t+4	t+5
Race						
Blacks						
minimum	0.010	0.030	0.020	0.060	0.060	0.030
1st quartile	0.590	0.692	0.753	0.706	0.679	0.702
median	1.043	1.241	1.384	1.350	1.487	1.381
3rd quartile	2.200	2.240	2.142	2.192	2.390	2.338
maximum	8.250	8.470	11.490	9.130	8.090	7.980
n	623	611	616	617	617	558
Whites						
minimum	0.280	0.180	0.010	0.070	0.060	0.210
1st quartile	1.970	1.760	1.850	1.750	1.761	1.875
median	2.866	2.660	2.740	2.710	2.678	2.635
3rd quartile	4.281	3.627	3.710	3.630	3.673	3.764
maximum	14.510	18.890	22.030	23.240	20.350	17.240
n	645	642	644	645	645	588

Note: t = year of first birth.

Table 2. Weighted percent distribution of age at first birth by race. Panel Study of Income Dynamics, household heads and domestic partners of household heads who gave birth for the first time between 1969 and 1982.

Race	Blacks	Whites
a. Age at First Birth in Single Years	%	%
14 or younger	1.3	0.4
15	6.3	0.4
16	10.5	2.6
17	12.1	4.6
18	10.5	8.6
19	11.9	8.6
20	12.6	10.5
21	8.7	8.2
22	4.4	9.2
23	4.7	9.0
24	1.5	7.6
25	4.3	5.9
26	4.7	5.4
27	0.9	4.0
28	1.3	4.3
29	2.3	3.3
30 or older	2.1	7.5
b. Age at First Birth Group	%	%
18 or less	40.8	16.5
19 and 20	24.5	19.1
21 to 24	19.3	34.1
25+	15.4	30.4
n	630	646

Table 3. Weighted percent distribution of marital status at first birth by age at first birth and race. Panel Study of Income Dynamics, household heads and domestic partners of household heads who gave birth for the first time between 1969 and 1982.

Age at First Birth	Total	≤ 18	19-20	21-24	25+
Race					
Blacks					
n	623	253	153	120	97
Marital Status at First Birth	%	%	%	%	%
Single					
never married	63.3	78.8	75.9	31.4	42.8
separated-divorced	1.7	0.4	1.4	0.6	7.0
Married					
first marriage	34.9	20.7	22.7	68.1	49.6
higher order marriage	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
Whites					
n	637	103	123	218	193
Marital Status at First Birth	%	%	%	%	%
Single					
never married	9.9	30.5	16.0	3.9	1.8
separated-divorced	2.0	0.0	0.8	3.6	2.2
Married					
first marriage	83.9	69.5	83.2	89.6	85.7
higher order marriage	4.2	0.0	0.0	2.9	10.4

Table 4. Weighted percent distribution of marital status at t+5 by age at first birth and race. Panel Study of Income Dynamics, household heads and domestic partners of household heads who gave birth for the first time between 1969 and 1982.

Age at First Birth	Total	≤ 18	19-20	21-24	25+
Race					
Blacks					
n	624	254	153	120	97
Marital Status at t+5	%	%	%	%	%
Single					
never married	44.6	51.0	56.0	25.6	33.1
separated-divorced	12.8	14.3	8.7	13.5	14.3
Married					
first marriage	39.9	33.3	34.3	55.4	46.6
higher order marriage	2.8	1.4	1.0	5.5	5.9
Whites					
n	635	101	123	217	194
Marital Status at t+5	%	%	%	%	%
Single					
never married	4.7	15.8	7.5	1.8	0.5
separated-divorced	13.3	25.0	13.7	13.7	6.6
Married					
first marriage	73.8	52.9	73.2	77.0	81.4
higher order marriage	8.2	6.2	5.6	7.5	11.5

Note: t = year of first birth.

Table 5. Weighted percent distribution of marital career by race and by year since first birth. Panel Study of Income Dynamics, household heads and domestic partners of household heads who gave birth for the first time between 1969 and 1982.

Year since First Birth Race	t+1	t+2	t+3	t+4	t+5
Blacks					
single at birth, currently single	60.8	57.0	53.0	53.0	50.7
single at birth, currently married	4.3	8.1	12.2	12.1	14.4
married at birth, currently single	4.7	4.4	5.6	7.3	6.7
married at birth, currently married	30.3	30.5	29.2	27.6	28.2
n	633	623	622	621	621
Whites					
single at birth, currently single	10.4	9.0	8.1	7.3	7.0
single at birth, currently married	1.5	2.9	3.8	4.7	5.0
married at birth, currently single	3.2	5.6	7.6	9.3	11.2
married at birth, currently married	84.9	82.4	80.4	78.7	76.8
n	637	636	634	632	632

Note: t = year of first birth.

Table 6. Weighted OLS regression coefficients for household income/needs ratio on age at first birth before and after adjusting for marital career by year since birth and race. Panel Study of Income Dynamics, household heads and partners of household heads who have birth for the first time betweeen 1969 and 1982.

Blacks

Year Since Birth	t+1		t+2		t+3		t+4		t+5	
model	1	2[a]	1	2[a]	1	2[a]	1	2[a]	1	2[a]
Age at Birth										
19-20	.16*	.11	.29**	.20**	.23**	.19**	.08	.03	.13	.08
21-24	.54**	.34**	.67**	.43**	.64**	.48**	.44**	.30**	.41**	.28**
25+	.36**	.28**	.44**	.34**	.35**	.30**	.32**	.30**	-.01	-.07

Whites

Year Since Birth	t+1		t+2		t+3		t+4		t+5	
model	1	2[a]	1	2[a]	1	2[a]	1	2[a]	1	2[a]
Age at Birth										
19-20	.24**	.22**	.19*	.09	.21**	.15*	.12	.05	.17*	.08
21-24	.42**	.38**	.26**	.13	.41**	.32**	.32**	.21**	.37**	.26**
25+	.64**	.59**	.52**	.39**	.53**	.44**	.49**	.38**	.56**	.43**

Note: Effects reported are all net of region of origin, size of place of origin, parental education, calendar year, income/needs ratio in t-1 and controls for missing data. Reference category for age at birth is 18 or less.

[a] Adjusted for marital career.

* $p < 0.05$
** $p < 0.01$

Table A1. Weighted univariate statistics on variables in the analysis by race. Panel Study of Income Dynamics, household heads and partners of household heads who gave birth for the first time between 1969 and 1982.

Race	Blacks	Whites
Variable	%	%
Region of origin		
northeast	16.2	23.4
north central	18.4	38.0
south	61.2	23.8
west	4.2	14.8
n	611	628
Size of place of origin		
rural	18.0	16.3
small town/suburb	31.0	51.0
big city	51.0	32.7
n	610	621
Parental Education		
less than high school	58.8	29.1
high school graduate	27.3	37.4
at least some college	13.9	33.5
n	616	645
Calendar Year of First Birth		
1969	5.1	8.2
1970	8.8	5.3
1971	7.5	6.5
1972	9.0	7.9
1973	5.4	7.7
1974	4.8	5.7
1975	5.3	7.1
1976	6.3	5.7
1977	8.2	.7
1978	9.6	6.6
1979	9.0	8.5
1980	5.4	7.8
1981	6.3	6.6
1982	9.1	8.6
n	630	646

Table A2. Weighted OLS regression coefficients for income/needs ratio on age at first birth, marital creer, income/needs ratio in t-1, region of origin, size of place of origin, parental eduction and calendar year by race and year since birth. Panel Study of Income Dynamics, household heads and domestic partners of household heads who gave birth for the first time between 1969 and 1982.

Year Since Birth	t+1		t+2		t+3		t+4		t+5	
Race	B	W	B	W	B	W	B	W	B	W
Independent Variable										
Age at Birth										
19-20	.11	.22**	.21**	.09	.19**	.15*	.03	.05	.08	.09
21-24	.34**	.38**	.43**	.13	.48**	.32**	.30**	.21**	.28**	.26**
25+	.28**	.59**	.34**	.39**	.30**	.44**	.30**	.38**	-.07	.43**
Marital Career										
single at birth, currently single	-.49**	-.31**	-.69**	-.50**	-.53**	-.42**	-.63**	-.37**	-.66**	-.47**
single at birth, currently married	-.04	-.12	-.24*	.14	-.27**	-.25*	-.09	-.24*	-.23*	-.17
married at birth, currently single	.10	-.32**	-.48**	-.30**	-.39**	-.22**	-.60**	-.40**	-.71**	-.42**
Income/needs t-1	.49**	.30**	.31**	.38**	.36**	.27**	.35**	.24**	.40**	.20**
Region of Origin										
north central	.10	-.04	-.06	-.18**	-.01	-.07	.09	-.10	-.20	-.01
south	.03	-.05	-.02	-.06	.14	-.05	.26**	-.04	.23*	-.05
west	-.03	-.06	-.00	-.19*	.17	-.18*	.23	-.16*	.37*	-.04
missing	.13	.08	.08	-.03	.26	.12	.33	.28	.58*	.16
Size of Place of Origin										
rural-farm	.05	.03	-.16	.08	-.15	.00	-.11	-.03	-.10	-.14*
big city	.01	.06	-.08	.13*	-.04	.10*	-.07	.06	.12	-.00
missing	.18	.11	-.23	.12	.32	.06	.61**	.11	.37	.07
Parental Education										
high school graduate	.12*	.01	-.02	.00	-.03	.11*	-.02	.12*	.17*	.08
at least some college	.04	.01	.01	-.01	.07	.08	.05	.10	-.06	.10
missing	.62**	-.89	-.22	-.66	.02	-2.96*	.34	-1.62**	.43*	-.37

Table A2, con't.

	t+1		t+2		t+3		t+4		t+5	
	B	W	B	W	B	W	B	W	B	W
Calendar Year of Birth										
1970	-.25	.20	-.15	.24*	-.19	.12	.09	-.02	.14	-.02
1971	-.05	.16	-.02	.01	-.24	.02	-.21	-.04	-.06	.15
1972	-.24	.31**	-.18	.15	-.30*	-.13	-.26	-.07	-.07	.11
1973	-.12	.04	.07	-.19	-.17	-.11	-.25	-.17	-.05	-.04
1974	-.24	.07	-.22	-.05	-.34*	-.14	-.22	-.29*	-.10	-.13
1975	-.26	.22*	-.24	.07	-.30	.05	-.44**	-.12	-.54**	-.01
1976	-.28	.17	-.22	.10	-.23	-.22	.01	-.31*	.02	-.25*
1977	-.03	.16	-.09	-.01	-.38*	-.22*	-.28	-.41**	-.24	-.27**
1978	.06	.23*	.11	-.01	-.31*	-.04	-.08	-.27*	-.25	-.07
1979	-.10	-.03	-.19	-.18	-.57**	-.36**	-.45**	-.32**	-.32*	-.10
1980	-.22	-.04	-.27	-.08	-.74**	-.21*	-.44**	-.18	-.36*	-.06
1981	-.10	.07	.06	-.12	-.32	-.15	-.20	-.20	-.07	-.06
1982	-.40**	.01	-.40	-.07	-.47**	-.15	-.49**	-.06	—	—
n	611	642	616	644	617	645	617	645	558	588
R^2	.55	.37	.40	.34	.40	.34	.46	.28	.43	.33

Note: Reference category for age at birth is 18 or less, for marital career is married at birth, currently married for region is northeast, for size of place is small town-suburb, for parental education is less than high school and for calendar year is 1969.

* $p \leq .05$
** $p \leq .01$