

Long-Term Cohabitation: Determinants and the Consequences for Children

Ryan H. Bogle

Bowling Green State University

Though a great deal of prior research has examined the stability of cohabiting unions and child wellbeing in cohabiting unions, little research has attempted to integrate these two concepts. Using 4 waves of the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Survey, I examine the determinants of long-term cohabitation among unwed parents, and the consequences of different stable unions for children. Preliminary findings indicate that higher expectations to marry and lower conflict increases odds of marriage relative to long-term cohabitation, while high of partner disagreement increases odds of dissolution. Taking background characteristics into consideration, children in long-term cohabiting unions appear to experience more paternal drug use relative to those in married parent families, and higher maternal involvement relative to those with parents who transitioned from cohabitation to marriage. Although some racial and socioeconomic differences exist, children in long-term cohabiting unions do not fare much worse than children in other stable family structures.

INTRODUCTION

Childbearing within cohabiting unions has become increasingly common in the United States, with estimates from 1997-2001 finding that 53% of all nonmarital births were to cohabiting parents (Kennedy & Bumpass 2008). These changes in fertility behavior have prompted some concern regarding the wellbeing of the children residing in these households (Acs & Nelson 2002; Cherlin 2003). Such concern is not unwarranted; cohabiting unions are more apt to dissolve relative to married couples, and children in cohabiting unions often fare worse relative to children residing with married parents (Bumpass & Lu; Lichter et al., 2006; Manning & Brown 2006; Manning & Smock 2005). Though prior studies on the relative wellbeing of children in cohabiting unions are numerous, many rely upon simple indicators of family structure rather than the accounting for duration of these unions. Though the majority of unwed parents break-up a sizeable minority do maintain coresidence without marrying (Carlson 2007). This minority, hereafter referred to as long-term cohabiting parents, is relatively unexplored in current family and sociological literature. Such a dearth in research is unfortunate; a more complete understanding of long-term cohabiting parents would not only help scholars to comprehend the conditions under which unwed parents stay together, but would also generate a more complete picture of the effects of cohabitation upon child wellbeing. Thus, by shifting the focus from cohabitation to stable cohabitation, researchers would be in a better position to evaluate the potential dangers of cohabitation upon child wellbeing.

Drawing on four waves of Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study data this research addresses two key questions. First, I examine how baseline demographic and social characteristics are related to the odds that a focal child experiences a stable long-term cohabiting

family rather than their parent's dissolution or transition to marriage. Second, I consider how children raised in different types of *stable* families (long-term cohabiting, cohabiting transition to marriage, or marriage) fare in terms of parental involvement and material hardship.

The current investigation contributes to prior research in three distinct ways. First, while many cohabiting couples dissolve a sizeable minority does not, this minority is woefully underrepresented in current research, this investigation attempts to bring the reality of long-term cohabitation into the foreground. Second, prior research has often showcased the instability of cohabiting unions, this investigation hopes to move beyond instability to unveil the circumstances which support continued co-residence. Third, prior research has shown that children often fare better in marriage relative to cohabitation, it remains unknown if a similar pattern holds true for long-term cohabitation, this investigation attempts to remedy this. Findings from this research will greatly contribute to our understanding of

BACKGROUND

Children in Cohabiting Unions

While current research focusing explicitly upon long-term cohabitation parents is lacking, literature on the stability of cohabiting unions for children has increased dramatically over the past decade, with growing attention towards distinguishing how children come to experience parental cohabitation (Brown 2002; Manning 2002; Manning, Smock, & Majumdar 2004). There are two paths through which children encounter parental cohabitation: children are either born to two-biological cohabiting parents (hereafter cohabiting parents) or experience cohabitation when a custodial parent initiates a residential relationship with a new romantic partner (Manning, Smock, & Majumdar 2004). Consequently, any one cohabitating family could accommodate both ranges of children's experiences, and current estimates suggest that nearly two-fifths of all

children will spend *some* time in cohabiting unions by age 12 (Kennedy & Bumpass 2008).

Though children's experience of cohabitation is widespread, very little research has examined how the duration of various family structures impacts the children residing in them.

Children are often found to encourage stability among married parents, however extant research has demonstrated that the experience of a premarital birth does not hasten or delay the end of a cohabiting couples' union (Manning 2002, 2004). Indeed, evidence from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study has found a level of instability roughly equal to that observed in the general cohabiting population; five years after their child's birth 45% of cohabiting parents had broken up (Fragile Families 2007), compared to 40% of all cohabiting couples breaking-up five years after the unions initiation (Bumpass & Lu 2000). Consequently, the rates of union stability for these groups are similar, nonetheless the resulting family structure differs to some degree. The transition to marriage is far more common among cohabiting couples in general, while long-term cohabitation is more prevalent among cohabiting parents; five years after the unions initiation 50% of cohabiting couples had married and 10% were engaged in long-term cohabitation, among cohabiting parents 26% were married and 26% were still cohabiting five years after the child's birth (Bumpass & Lu 2000; Fragile Families 2007). Although long-term cohabiting couples constitute a non-trivial section of the cohabiting population regardless of context (Smock, Casper, & Wyse 2008), this apparent divergence in family behavior is unacknowledged in existing literature.

While long-term cohabitation provides a family structure similar to that found in married parent families, there is reason to suspect that children in these unions may experience divergent outcomes. Among all children born into cohabiting unions, those with parents who never marry face the highest risk of parental dissolution relative to children in other family structures (Wu &

Musick 2008). Moreover, cohabiting parents face significant economic and social disadvantages relative to married parent families (for a review see Manning 2002). Given the higher prevalence of long-term co-residence among cohabiting parents, it is critical for researchers to understand both the characteristics which engender long-term cohabitation and how these characteristics impact the lives of children. Thus, long-term cohabiting parents present an opportunity for a more complete understanding of the impact of family structure upon child well-being.

The Determinants of Union Formation and Dissolution

Ultimately, long-term cohabitation is the result of selection out of cohabitation through either dissolution or marriage. Thus, to understand long-term cohabitation it is critical to acknowledge the key determinants of the transition to marriage and dissolution. A large body of qualitative work has thoroughly demonstrated that unmarried parents highly value marriage, and cherish it as a future goal (Edin & Kefalas 2005; Edin, Kefalas, & Reed 2004; Edin & Reed 2005; Gibson-Davis, Edin, & McLanahan 2005; Smock, Manning, & Porter 2005). Women, poor women and unwed mothers especially, have very high standards for marriage and a substantial list of requirements needed to produce a successful marriage (Edin, Kefalas, & Reed 2004). Among these requirements, achievement of an acceptable level of economic resources and improvements in couples' relationship quality are often cited as the most valid reasons for delaying marriage. Reasons for dissolution are often more closely tied to the quality of the parent's relationship, revolving around infidelity, mistrust, and other paternal behaviors destructive to the union (Reed 2007). Thus, the qualitative evidence seems to imply that the composition of long-term cohabiting parents may simultaneously contain couples with *similar* levels of relationship quality and *lower* material resources relative to those in married families. To more fully investigate this I next review current quantitative research on the determinants of

marriage and dissolution among cohabiting parents, with particular attention towards socioeconomic status and material resources, relationship quality of the current union, and individual characteristics.

Socioeconomic Status and Material Resources

Findings reported by Carlson et al. (2004) suggest that maternal education is positively associated with the transition to marriage, transition to cohabitation, or continued cohabitation among all new unwed mothers. Using the same data, Osborne (2005) more directly examined the impact of family structure upon union stability by conducting separate analyses for new cohabiting parents and visiting parents. Osborne finds that higher levels of educational attainment among new cohabiting mothers are positively associated with the transition to marriage relative to continued cohabitation. The earnings of the fathers in these unions does not seem to be associated with union transitions in any meaningful way, while higher levels of paternal education actually decreases the odds of entering cohabitation or continued cohabitation among all new unwed fathers (Carlson et al., 2004; Osborne 2005). Maternal employment appears to be related to the stability of cohabiting parents unions; however these effects vary by race/ethnicity (Manning, Smock, & Majumdar 2004). Relative to no maternal employment, part-time employment decreases the odds of parental separation among children with white mothers, while full-time employment increases the odds of parental separation among children with Hispanic mothers. More recently, Gibson-Davis (2009) has shown that increases in parental earnings are in fact associated with an increased likelihood of marriage among unwed parents, however it should be noted that parents who break-up are excluded from her analysis for methodological reasons. Thus, available quantitative research seems to support qualitative

evidence; gains in economic resources seem to increase the likelihood of marriage among unwed parents.

The impact of socioeconomic characteristics upon union dissolution appears to be less direct. Sociodemographic and economic differentials do not appear to account for much of the greater instability observed among cohabiting parents who never marry relative to those who do (Wu & Musick 2008). Thus, although maternal education and gains income are positively related to marriage, socioeconomic characteristics seem to be less influential upon the decision to exit a cohabiting union. Indeed, when money does figure into the decision to dissolve, it appears to be related to how parents (fathers especially) spend their money, and not how much is available (Reed 2007).

Quality of the Current Romantic Union

Evidence on the role of relationship quality in cohabiting unions is somewhat less clear; while the economic situation of a couple may strengthen through thrift, occupational promotion, and continued education, the process by which one improves the emotional health of a romantic relationship is somewhat ambiguous. Prior research has clearly demonstrated that marriage does tend to be selective of individuals with higher levels of relationship quality. Indeed, a higher level of emotional support does seem to promote stability and marriage among unwed parents, though it appears to be less critical for cohabiting parents specifically (Carlson et al., 2004; Osborne 2005; Osborne et al., 2007). However it is important to note that Carlson et al. (2004) and Osborne (2005) only examine the relationship trajectories of cohabiting parents up to one year after the focal child's birth, leaving considerable room for future selection.

Among cohabiting parents high levels of couple disagreement appears increase the likelihood of dissolution relative to continued co-residence (Carlson et al., 2004; Osborne 2005;

Osborne et al., 2007). While qualitative evidence does imply that good relationship quality is critical to preventing dissolution (Reed 2007), other evidence suggests that while relationship quality is an important aspect of marriage as a package, it does not typically ensure hasty union formalization once the desired level of quality is reached (Edin & Kefalas 2005; Smock et al., 2005). Indeed, unlike changes in economic resource, changes in relationship quality do not appear to impact the likelihood of unwed parents transitioning to marriage (Gibson-Davis 2009). Additional evidence from stably cohabiting couples and parents finds that relationship quality varies little relative to married couples or those who transition to marriage (Carlson 2007; Willets 2006). The extant research suggests that although relationship quality positively impacts union stability, it may have a limited effect upon the transition to marriage. Indeed, among unwed parents still together five years after the birth of a joint child, relationship quality is significantly higher relative to that found in parents who broke-up some time prior to the child's fifth birthday (Fragile Families 2007).

A distinct but related aspect to relationship quality is that of paternal characteristics and paternal involvement with children. An association between paternal involvement and the decisions to marry, continue cohabiting, or break-up, is relatively unexplored in the current sociological literature. Early "signs" of paternal involvement may be important determinants of future relationship stability; cohabiting parents have far higher odds of transitioning to marriage and continued cohabitation if the father visited the hospital during his child's birth (Osborne 2005). Qualitative evidence implies that fathers' unwillingness to provide financial support encourages dissolution, however there is less evidence on the role of paternal involvement in union decisions (Edin & Kefalas 2005).

Taken together, the literature focuses most strongly on transitions to marriage among cohabiting parents, and very little prior work has acknowledged long-term cohabitation as a viable family structure for children. This work moves beyond prior studies, and attempts to examine not only long-term cohabitation, but also to generate a more complete understanding of the conditions under which cohabiting parents remain together. I next focus on child well-being in cohabiting unions. Though prior research has examined a wide variety of outcomes for children, I pay close attention to the quality of the home environment in cohabiting unions, specifically the experience of material hardship, quality of parenting and parental characteristics.

Cohabitation and Child Well-Being

Material Hardship

In terms of economic outcomes, children in cohabiting unions fare better economically relative to single-mother families, and worse relative to married parent families, though variation exists across children's experience of cohabitation (Acs & Nelson 2002; Brown 2002; Manning & Brown 2006; Manning & Lichter 1996). Using official poverty estimates, Brown (2002) finds that children in two biological parent cohabiting families are considerably poorer than their married counter parts, more closely resembling single mother households. Using alternative measures of material hardship (social poverty, food insecurity, and housing insecurity), Manning and Brown (2006) find that, controlling for an array of demographic characteristics, children in cohabiting parent families are no more likely to experience material hardship relative to children in married parent families. However, considerable racial differences exist; the general finding above holds true for both Hispanics and blacks, however white cohabiting parent families are significantly more likely to experience both food and housing insecurity relative to their married

counterparts. Moreover, though Manning and Brown (2006) distinguish cohabiting families from cohabiting step-families, this study does not take duration of cohabitation into account.

Parenting & Parental Characteristics

Evidence from the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study finds that cohabiting biological fathers are not substantially different from married biological fathers in terms of parenting, with married fathers out-performing cohabiting fathers in only their cooperative parenting (Berger et al., 2008). Hofferth and Anderson (2003) find that unmarried biological fathers have less hourly engagement with their children, and exhibit less warmth compared to married biological fathers. Some research has also found that fathers in cohabiting parent families are more likely to engage in corporal punishment relative to those in marital unions (Gibson-Davis 2008). Moreover, unmarried fathers are more likely to be involved in a number of problematic behaviors relative to their married counterparts (Waller & Swisher 2006). Behaviors such as physical abuse, involvement in criminal activity, and substance use can act as a major drain on fathers' resources and time, impacting both the quality of the romantic union and the father-child relationship (Waller & Swisher 2006). While research on parenting among cohabiting families has overtly focused on fathers, unwed mothers may (and often do) engage in similar risky behaviors (Edin & Kefalas 2005). Mothers in cohabiting parent families were found to have lower levels of positive engagement with children relative to mothers in married parent families (Gibson-Davis 2008). Given that material hardship is probably more common among long-term cohabiting parents, harmful parental characteristics could engender a very toxic environment for children. Though it seems reasonable that many of the most risky parents would have dissolved their unions long before the focal child's fifth birthday, such an assumption remains unknown.

DATA

This study uses data from all four waves of the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, a national longitudinal survey following a birth cohort of 4,898 children born to unmarried and married parents in 20 large U.S. cities between 1998 and 2000. Baseline data are collected from both parents shortly after the birth of the focal child, with follow-up waves occurring 12, 36, and 60 months after the focal child's birth.

Fragile Families collects information on a wide variety of subjects, including parental and focal child health, the father-mother relationship, parenthood and parental characteristics, relationships with extended kin, and socioeconomic and demographic information. One of the core goals of Fragile Families is to understand the “conditions and capabilities of new unwed parents”, making this dataset ideally suited to examine characteristics of emerging long-term cohabiting parents, and the consequences of these unions for children (Reichman et al., 2000).

Analytic Sample

Of the 4,898 new parents interviewed at the baseline, 1,388 mothers identified themselves as currently cohabiting with the father of the focal child and provided complete information on their relationship status at the 12, 36, and 60 month follow-ups. The duration of these unions were then calculated from a retrospective variable collected at the 12 month follow-up, asking mothers the year and month their union with the father began. Only 1,284 of the baseline cohabiting mother were found to have provided complete information on the duration of their cohabiting union. Among those couples with accurate information, 618 couples (approximately 48%) had been cohabiting for less than a year and a half, with an average duration of six months. At the most, parents cohabiting for less than a year and a half couple only have been engaged in co-residence for less than nine months prior to conception of the focal

child, a *very short* period of duration. After taking into account missing information on selected variables and the loss of individuals between waves, the final result was an analytic sample of 508 low duration cohabiting parents. This was a dramatic but necessary reduction in sample size; parents cohabiting beyond a year and a half at base are excluded as it is likely that the selection process has already taken effect for this group in a significant way. Moreover, a short initial duration ensures that these parents have relative similar levels of duration by the 60 month follow-up (ranging from five to six and a half years). Including parents with greater initial periods of co-residence would result in a group of individuals with widely varying durations, complicating any conclusions drawn from the analysis. At the 60 month follow-up 255 (50%) parents had dissolved their union, 136 (27%) were married, and 117 (23%) were still cohabiting. The second analysis requires that all parents who dissolved their unions be excluded, and stably married parents (since baseline) be included, resulting in a sample of 406 couples, with approximately 117 long-term cohabiting parents, 136 parents who transitioned to marriage, and 121 parents who were stably married since the baseline interview.

METHODS

For the first stage of my analysis I use multinomial logistic regression, a method using maximum-likelihood estimation to predict the statistical likelihood of being in categories of a given variable relative to a reference category. The dependent variable is cohabiting parent's union status 60 months after the birth of the focal child, with categories of dissolution, marriage, and long-term cohabitation acting as the reference group. Utilizing information provided at the baseline survey, I examine the impact of couples' relationship quality, socioeconomic characteristics, fatherhood, and parental characteristics. Odds ratios will be presented and showcase how baseline demographic and social characteristics influence long-term cohabitation.

The second stage of analyses focuses on children raised in stable two-parent families from birth to age five and contrast how children fare when raised in long-term cohabiting parent, long-term stable married parent, and cohabiting families that transition to marriage. Here I use multiple linear regression and logistic regression to determine the effect of three stable union types (long-term cohabitation, long-term marriage, and cohabiters who transitioned to marriage) on several key indicators of child wellbeing; parental risk factors, parental involvement, and material hardship. In this second stage of analyses I control for maternal race, age, family background, parental fertility and education.

RESULTS

The Determinants of Long-Term Cohabitation

Preliminary results (Table 1) reveal that only a small number of characteristics are related to cohabiting parent's transition to marriage or dissolution. Higher mother-reported chances of marriage increase the odds that parents will be married by the focal child's fifth birthday relative to long-term cohabitation. Higher rates of poor conflict resolution and male-partner violence seem to increase the odds of long-term cohabitation relative to marriage by the child's fifth birthday. No other relationship quality factors seem to be related to cohabiting parents' transition to marriage. However, higher levels of couple disagreement increase the odds of dissolution relative to long-term cohabitation. The use of public assistance at the time of the focal child's birth increases the odds of dissolution relative to long-term cohabitation. No other variables were found to be significant in the preliminary analysis. Further analysis is required to more fully understand why some cohabiting parents marry, dissolve, or continue to cohabit.

The Consequence of Long-Term Cohabitation for Children

Preliminary analyses (Table 2 and Table 4) indicated that children in long-term cohabiting unions fare no worse relative to their counterparts in married parent families, in terms of housing insecurity and parental involvement, however significant variation by race and background does appear to have an impact upon maternal involvement. All things being equal, mothers who transitioned to marriage are significantly less likely to be as involved with their child relative to mothers in long-term cohabiting unions. In terms of the experience of food and health insecurity (Table 2), children in long-term married families fare significantly better relative to children in long-term cohabiting parent families, however the effect disappears once background characteristics are controlled for. Finally, children in long-term cohabiting unions are more likely to experience paternal drug use relative to those in long-term married families (Table 3). This effect remains present even after controlling for background characteristics.

DISCUSSION

While based on findings from preliminary analyses, the determinants of long-term cohabitation seem to be driven most by the couple's relationship quality, while socioeconomic factors and parental characteristics are seemingly unrelated; the single exception was the use of public assistance. Though it becomes apparent that long-term cohabitation does not contain the most emotionally healthy parents, they are far from the worst. Indeed, preliminary findings indicate that high couple disagreement selection parents *out* of cohabitation. Moreover, the effect of public assistance also suggests that long-term cohabiting parents may be able to provide more material resources for their children. Indeed, preliminary findings from the second analysis reveal that children in long-term cohabiting unions do not face more material hardship relative to their counterparts in married parent families. The only apparent negative consequence of long-term cohabitation appears to be an association with paternal drug use; fathers in long-term

cohabiting unions were more likely to have used drugs relative to married fathers. Most importantly, results seem to indicate that children may not suffer much in long-term cohabitation.

Future discussion will focus on the implications of these findings, and findings that result from a more complete analysis. Though the current research has accounted for a great deal of possible determinants, there is some evidence that other factors may be at work (Edin & Kefalas 2005). Moreover, the second analysis implies that there may be differences in material and social resources according to race and social class, these patterns will be explored further as this research progresses.

REFERENCES

- Acs, G., & Nelson, S. (2002). The kids are alright? Children's well-being and the rise in cohabitation. *Assessing the New Federalism*, Policy Brief B-48. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- Berger, L., Carlson, M., Bzostek, S., & Osborne, C. (2008). Parenting practices of resident fathers: The role of marital and biological ties. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70(3), 625-639.
- Brown, Susan L. (2002). Child well-being in cohabiting families. In Alan Booth & Ann C. Crouter (Eds.), *Just living together: Implications of cohabitation for children, families, and social policy* (pp. 173-187). Mahwah, NJ. Erlbaum.
- Carlson, M., McLanahan, S., & England, P. (2004). Union formation in fragile families. *Demography*, 41(2), 237-261.
- Carlson, M. (2007). Trajectories of couple relationship quality after childbirth: Does marriage matter? Center for Research on Child Wellbeing Working Paper #2007-11-FF.
- Carlson, M., McLanahan, S., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2006). Do good partners make good parents? Relationship quality and parenting in two-parent families. Center for Research on Child Wellbeing Working Paper #2006-34-FF.
- Casper, L., & Sayer L. (2000). "Cohabitation transitions: Different attitudes and purposes, different paths. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Population Association of America, Los Angeles, CA, March 20-April 1.
- Edin, K., & Kefalas, M. (2005). *Promises I Can Keep: Why Poor Women put Motherhood Before Marriage*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Edin, K., Kefalas, M., & Reed, J. (2004). A peek inside the black box: What marriage means for poor unmarried parents. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(4), 1007-1014.
- Edin, K., & Reed, J. (2005). Why don't they just get married? Barriers to marriage among the disadvantaged. *The Future of Children*, 15(2), 117-137.
- Fragile Families. (2007). Parents' relationship status five years after a non-marital birth. *Fragile Families Research Brief* 39.
- Graefe, Deborah Roempke., & Lichter, Daniel T. (1999). Life course transitions of American children: Parental cohabitation, marriage, and single motherhood. *Demography*, 36(2), 205-217.
- Hofferth, S., & Anderson, K. (2003). Are all dads equal? Biology versus marriage as a basis for paternal involvement. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 65(1), 213-232.

- Kennedy, Sheela., & Bumpass, Larry. (2008). Cohabitation and children's living arrangements: New estimates from the United States. *Demographic Research*, 19(47), 1663-1692.
- Manning, W. (2001). Childbearing in cohabiting unions: Racial and ethnic differences. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 33(5), 217-223.
- Manning, W. (2002). The implications of cohabitation for children's well-being. In A. Booth & A. Crouter (Eds.), *Just living together: Implication of cohabitation for children, families, and social policy* (pp. 121-152). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Manning, W. (2004). Children and the stability of cohabiting couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(4), 674-689.
- Manning, W., & Brown, S. (2006). Children's economic well-being in married and cohabiting parent families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(2), 345-362.
- Manning, W., & Bulanda, R. (2008). Parental cohabitation experiences and adolescent behavioral outcomes. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 27(5), 593-618.
- Manning, W., & Lichter, D. (1996). Parental cohabitation and children's economic well-being. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 58(4), 998-1010.
- Manning, W., & Smock, P. (1995). Why marry? Race and the transition to marriage among cohabitators. *Demography*, 32(4), 509-520.
- Manning, W., Smock, P., & Majumdar, D. (2004). The relative stability of cohabitating and marital unions for children. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 23(2), 135-159.
- Osborne, C. (2005). Marriage following the birth of a child among cohabiting and visiting parents. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67(1), 14-26.
- Osborne, C., Manning, W., & Smock, P. (2007). Married and cohabiting parents' relationship stability: A focus on race and ethnicity. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69(5), 1345-1366.
- Reed, J. (2007). Anatomy of the breakup: How and why do unmarried couples with children break up? In P. England, & K. Edin (Eds.), *Unmarried couples with children* (pp. 133-155). New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Reichman, N., Teitler, J., Garfinkel, I., & McLanahan, S. (2000). Fragile families: Sample and design. *Children and Youth Service Review*, 23(4/5), 303-326.
- Smock, P. (2000). Cohabitation in the United States: An appraisal of research themes, findings, and implications. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1), 1-20.

- Smock, P., Casper, L., & Wyse, J. (2008). Nonmarital cohabitation: Current knowledge and future directions for research. *Population Studies Center Research Report 08-648*. Population Studies Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Smock, P., & Greenland, F. (2010). Diversity in pathways to parenthood in the U.S.: Patterns, implications, and emerging research directions. *Journal of Marriage and Family* (forthcoming).
- Smock, P., Huang, P., Manning, W., & Bergstrom, C. (2006). Heterosexual cohabitation in the United States: Motives for living together among young men and women. *Population Studies Center Research Report 06-606*. Population Studies Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Smock, P., and Manning, W. (1997). Cohabiting partners' economic circumstances and marriage. *Demography*, 34(3), 331-341.
- Smock, P., & Manning, W. (2004). Living together unmarried in the United States: Demographic perspectives and implications for family policy. *Law and Policy*, 26(1), 87-17.
- Smock, P., Manning, W., & Porter, M. (2005). Everything's there except money: How money shapes decisions to marry among cohabitators. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67(3), 680-696.
- Waller, M., & Swisher, R. (2006). Fathers' risk factors in fragile families: Implications for "healthy" relationships and father involvement. *Social Problems*, 53(3), 392-420.
- Willems, M. (2006). Union quality comparisons between long-term heterosexual cohabitation and legal marriage. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27(1), 110-127.
- Wu, L., & Martinson, B. (1993). Family structure and the risk of a premarital birth. *American Sociological Review*, 58(2), 210-232.
- Wu, L., & Musick, K. (2008). Stability of marital and cohabiting unions following a first birth. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 27(1), 110-127.

Table 1. Relative Risk of Union Transition Between Child's Birth and Five Years, Relative to Stable Long-Term Cohabitation

Variable	Cohabitors	
	Separation	Marriage
Relationship Quality		
Couple Harmony		
Chances of Marriage	1.14	1.99 ***
Couple Interaction	1.06	1.11
Partner Support	1.23	0.83
Couple Conflict		
Couple Disagreement	2.06 *	0.67
Poor Conflict Resolution	1.03	0.55 *
Partner Violence	0.48	0.00 ***
Socioeconomic Characteristics		
Financial Strain		
Public Assistance	1.64 *	0.94
Income & Education		
Maternal Yearly Income ^a	1.00	1.00
Paternal Yearly Income ^a	1.00	1.00
Maternal Educational Attainment ^b	1.11	1.11
Paternal Educational Attainment ^b	1.03	1.19
Fatherhood & Parental Characteristics		
Paternal Involvement		
Pre-Fathering	0.06	0.57
Parental Risk Factors		
Paternal Substance Abuse	0.68	0.00
Maternal Substance Use	1.94	1.93
<i>N</i>	508	508

SOURCE: Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study 1998-2005

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$.

a Values for *Maternal & Paternal Yearly Income* contain mean substitution, *Maternal Yearly Income* contains 65 substituted cases and *Paternal Yearly Income* contains 54 substituted cases. Analysis with

b Values for *Maternal & Paternal Educational Attainment* 1=less than high school, 2=high school or equivalent, 3=some college or technical/vocational school, 4=college or graduate degree

Table 2. Relative Risk of Experience of Material Insecurity at Five Years for Stable Unions

Variable	Food & Health Insecurity	Housing Insecurity
Relationship at 5 Years (Reference = Long-Term Cohabitation)		
Long-Term Marriage	0.46	0.94
Cohabitation to Marriage	0.97	1.30
Mother's Race (Reference = Non-Hispanic White)		
Non-Hispanic Black	0.28 ***	0.55 *
Hispanic	0.31 **	0.45 **
Other	0.36	0.44
Age		
Mother's Age	0.97	0.96
Father's Age	1.01	0.98
Family Background		
Mother in Intact Family at Age 15	0.62	0.61 *
Fertility History		
Mother Has Prior Children	1.13	0.91
Father Has Prior Children	2.01 *	1.58
Education (reference = less than High School)		
Mother-High School Degree	0.77	1.20
Mother- Some College or More	0.59	1.50
Father-High School Degree	1.10	1.11
Father-Some College or More	0.95	0.98
<i>N</i>	406	406

SOURCE: Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study 1998-2005

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$.

Table 3. Relative Risk of Experience of Parental Drug Use at Five Years for Stable Unions

Variable	Maternal Drug Use	Paternal Drug Use
Relationship at 5 Years (Reference = Long-Term Cohabitation)		
Long-Term Marriage	0.56	0.34 *
Cohabitation to Marriage	1.16	0.62
Mother's Race (Reference = Non-Hispanic White)		
Non-Hispanic Black	1.04	0.68
Hispanic	0.20 *	0.61
Other	0.39	0.75
Age		
Mother's Age	1.14 *	0.97
Father's Age	0.92	0.98
Family Background		
Mother in Intact Family at Age 15	0.84	0.40 *
Fertility History		
Mother Has Prior Children	0.27 *	0.46
Father Has Prior Children	2.21	1.83
Education (reference = less than High School)		
Mother-High School Degree	0.77	0.94
Mother- Some College or More	0.53	0.82
Father-High School Degree	3.78	1.76
Father-Some College or More	3.57	3.47
<i>N</i>	406	363

SOURCE: Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study 1998-2005

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$.

Table 4. Regression Coefficients Estimates of Parental Involvement by Stable Family Structure

Variable	Maternal Involvement	Paternal Involvement
	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>
Relationship at 5 Years (Reference = Long-Term Cohabitation)		
Long-Term Marriage	-0.23	-0.15
Cohabitation to Marriage	-0.30 *	-0.18
Mother's Race (Reference = Non-Hispanic White)		
Non-Hispanic Black	-0.39 **	0.08
Hispanic	-0.61 ***	-0.23
Other	0.02	0.24
Age		
Mother's Age	0.00	-0.02
Father's Age	-0.01	-0.01
Family Background		
Mother in Intact Family at Age 15	-0.06	0.06
Fertility History		
Mother Has Prior Children	-0.16	-0.10
Father Has Prior Children	0.03	0.04
Education (reference = less than High School)		
Mother-High School Degree	0.11	0.14
Mother- Some College or More	0.02	-0.06
Father-High School Degree	0.02	-0.10
Father-Some College or More	-0.07	0.14
<i>N</i>	404	405

SOURCE: Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study 1998-2005

* $p \leq .05$, ** $p \leq .01$, *** $p \leq .001$.