DRAFT

Transitions, Trajectories or Timing? Untangling the Effects of Family Structure on Young Adults' Attitudes toward Marriage

Kathryn A. Henderson[1], David F. Warner[2], and Glen H. Elder, Jr.[1]

[1]*University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*
[2] *Case Western Reserve University*

INTRODUCTION

Children of divorce experience divergent pathways from adolescence to adulthood. While some youths who experience family structure instability are at increased risk of early marriage others tend to delay marriage or forgo marriage altogether. While a number of prior studies have examined the impact of family structure on family formation behavior, studies of attitudes about marriage are less common (but see Manning 2007}. However, as they underlie differences in behavior, attitudes about marriage and family formation are important to examine as well.

Most prior studies on the relationship between family instability in childhood and marriage attitudes and behaviors focus on family status at a single point in time. However, contemporary families are increasingly complex and a single snapshot of family status is insufficient to capture the heterogeneity of experiences. Further, young adults' outcomes are shaped by the accumulation of experiences from birth through adolescence. Therefore, it is necessary to consider a wide range of family status measures. Although there is extensive longitudinal research investigating the consequences of family disruption in childhood, few studies include a dynamic measure of family status. When previous studies do go beyond a snapshot measure of family status by incorporating additional measures, they tend to confound measures of timing and duration (Heard 2007; Hao & Zie 2002). Therefore, in this paper we draw on a life course perspective to examine the link between young adults family structure history and their attitudes toward marriage, employing measures that differentiate between transitions, trajectories and the timing of family structure changes.

The delay of marriage among young adults is often attributed to the diminishing importance of marriage, particularly among children of divorce. Scholars argue that experience with family disruption in childhood undermines pro-marriage feelings (Goldscheider& Waite 1993). Empirical evidence supports the idea that adolescents who have experienced divorce have more positive feelings toward divorce (Amato & Booth 1991). However, others insist that children of divorce are not forgoing marriage altogether, but rather delaying marriage so that they may make investments in their education and occupations before beginning their families (Amato & Booth 1997).

Undoubtedly there are consequences to children of experiencing family dissolution. Children whose parents divorce experience increases in emotional distress (Chase-Landsdale & Hetherington 1990; Furstenberg 1990); they have poorer academic achievement and school attendance, are at increased risk of dropping out of school, are less likely to attend college, are at an increased risk of being idle (in neither work nor school) (Astone & McLanahan 1991; Heard 2007; McLanahan and Sandefur 1994), and are more likely to be teenage parents (McLanahan & Bumpass 1988; Wu & Martinson 1993). In turn, young adults with higher levels of education and stable, full-time employment are more likely to get married (Cherlin 1992). Thus, children from continuously married two-parent families may face fewer obstacles to marriage as adults. In fact, the decline in the marriage rate has been accompanied by a commiserate increase in non-marital cohabitation, often with children (Bumpass, Sweet, & Cherlin 1991). These findings suggest that much of the impact of experience with divorce as a child and attitudes about marriage in the future may be operating through the social roles and expectations formed in adolescence.

Another way that family disruption may impact young adults' attitudes about marriage is rooted in their relationships with their parents. Children whose parents divorce when they are very young are less likely to have close relationships with their non-resident biological parent than are children whose parents divorced after they were able to form bonds with both of their biological parents (Furstenberg & Cherlin 1991). Attachment research shows that children who grow up with close relationships with their parents are better able to form successful and satisfying relationships in adulthood (Gray & Steinberg 1999; Roisman, Madsen, Henninghausen, Sroufe, & Collins 2001). Adolescent males who feel close to their fathers and step-fathers felt less likely to divorce in the future (Risch, Jodl, & Eccles 2004). Finally, children who experience divorce are less likely to have a model of a successful marriage and subsequently tend to have more positive attitudes toward divorce (Amato & Booth 1991).

FAMILY STRUCTURE OVER THE LIFE COURSE

The life course perspective offers an appropriate framework for studying the impact of family structure instability in childhood and adolescence on young adults' attitudes towards marriage because of its dual emphasis on timing in lives and lifelong development. The principle of *timing* purports that the causes and consequences of life transitions, such as a parental divorce, vary according to their timing in an individual's life (Elder, Johnson, & Crosnoe 2003). For example, marital dissolution is associated with higher rates of poverty (Duncan & Brooks-Gunn, 1997), lower educational achievement (Heard 2007), poorer physical and mental health, and behavior problems that result from loss of access to parental supervision and social capital (Allison & Furstenberg 1989; Booth & Amato 2001; McLanahan & Sandefur, 1994; Seltzer 1994). Children who experience divorce earlier are at increased risk of growing up

under negative circumstances that may provide obstacles to forming successful marital relationships in adulthood

An alternative argument is that timing matters, not because of the developmental impact of divorce, but rather because of its role in determining *duration* of exposure to various negative circumstances. The cumulative effect of negative environments, such as limited economic resources or parental supervision, may have serious consequences in later life. For example, there is consistent evidence that the length of time children are in poverty negatively effects their mental health (Duncan, Brooks-Gunn, and Klebanov 1994; McLeod & Shanahan 1996). Further, Li and Wojkiewicz (1992) find that duration in a single parent family or stepfamily is negatively related to educational attainment. Yet, long-term exposure to a given condition also offers stability and an opportunity to establish adaptive strategies (Hao & Xie 2002).

However, longer durations in various family types may be less disruptive to adolescents than the number of transitions they experience. *Transitions* between different family types result in emotional turmoil, particularly for children because in addition to changing access to resources, they uproot family traditions, routines, and expectations (Hetherington, Cox, & Cox 1978; Wallerstein & Kelly 1980). Evidence suggests that children experience similarly stressful periods after divorce and remarriage (Bray 1999; Hetherington, et al. 1978) and the type of transition is not as important as the frequency with which they occur (Cherlin et al. 1991; Wojkiewicz 1993; Wu 1996; Wu & Martinson 1992). Remarriage is often considered beneficial for children of divorced parents because it improves a family's economic standing. However, children from step-families experience emotional strain and behavioral problems at rates comparable to those in single parent families. Further, children in step-families show more

problems than those in stable single-parent families (Kim, Hetherington, & Reiss 1999; McLanahan & Sandefur 1994; Sweeney 2007).

A life course perspective argues that the effects of family transitions on children depend on the number, type, and sequence of transitions they experience. Transitions between family types are embedded in *trajectories* over time. As such, trajectories incorporate both transitions and sequencing, thus providing a more refined measure of adolescents' family experiences.

In this paper we study the impact of various family structures in childhood and adolescence on attitudes towards marriage in young adulthood. We expand on previous research in this area by exploring, not only the composition of adolescents' family structure at a single point in time, but also the timing and duration of single parenthood and the number and sequence of family status transitions on marital attitudes. We argue that family structure instability in childhood will affect marital expectations, in part, through the establishment of different social roles in the transition to adulthood. Therefore, we also examine the ways in which adolescents' educational, occupational and family formation behaviors may mitigate the effects of family instability on attitudes towards marriage. Finally, we explore whether the effects of family structure instability operate similarly for both males and females.

METHOD

DATA

Data for these analyses are from Waves I and III of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (AddHealth), which is an ongoing, nationally representative study of adolescents aimed at understanding causes and consequences of adolescent health and health risk behaviors. A sample of high schools and their feeder middle or junior high schools was selected through a stratified, school-based, cluster sampling design (Harris et al., 2003). Adolescents in

grades 7 to 12 in 1995 were administered In-School Questionnaires. A random subsample of approximately 20,000 adolescents was selected to complete In-Home Questionnaires. Additional interviews were conducted with a resident parent, usually the mother. The initial in-home sample contained 20,745 adolescents ages 11 to 21. Parental interviews were completed for 17,394 adolescents (84%). In 2001-2002 Wave III interviews were conducted with ---- (X%) of the original adolescent sample. By Wave III respondents ranged in age from 18 to 27 years, with a mean of 21.8 years.

[sample size/characteristics/attrition]

MEASURES

Attitudes towards marriage. We used three dependent variables in this analysis to capture different aspects of respondents' feelings about marriage. These included a 5-category item measuring the extent to which respondents agreed or disagreed with the statement that "it is important to be married right now, " a 4-cateogry item measuring the extent to which respondents believed it was important for them to be "married someday" in the future, and a 5-category assessment of the respondents' "chance" of being "married in 10 years." All variables were coded such that higher values indicate a stronger preference for marriage.

Family structure. Yearly indicators of family structure, spanning from birth to respondents' age at Wave I were constructed using a) adolescents' reports of the type and duration of family residence, b) residential histories with non-residential parents, and c) resident parents' reports of their marriage and cohabitation histories (Harris 1999). Using these yearly indicators, we

7

created five sets of family structure measures. *Family structure status* measures the composition of the adolescent's residential household at Wave I and is composed of 5 mutually exclusive dichotomous variables. These include residence with both biological or adoptive parents, residence with a single biological parent and having never lived with the other biological parent, residence with a divorced biological parent, residence with a biological parent and a step-parent or partner, and residence with neither biological parent. *Family structure timing* indicates the life stage in which adolescents first experienced single parenthood; 0-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-14 years, 15+ years or not at all through age at Wave I. *Family status duration* measures the number of years the adolescent lived in a single parent residence from birth to age at Wave I. *Family status transitions* indicates the number of transitions between between different family structures adolescents have experienced from birth to age at Wave I. *Family status trajectories* categorize the sequence of statuses adolescents experience. Less than 5% of respondents experience more than two transitions during this time period, therefore, the trajectories capture the first three statuses only. Although the family structure status variables distinguish between residence with single parent and residence with a divorced parent, variables that measure timing, duration, and sequence do not. Likewise, the trajectory variables do not distinguish between marriage between both of the adolescents' biological parents and marriage between one biological parent and one step-parent. For example, the Continuously Married category includes respondents who live with both biological parents and respondents who have lived with one biological parent and one step-parent for their whole lives. It is also important to note that in all of the family structure history measures we are unable to distinguish between married parents and cohabiting parents given that the data were collected in reference to household composition and not marital status. Our measures of family structure history are summarized in Table 1.

Control variables. Additionally, the analysis controls for relevant personal characteristics, including age, sex, race, family income, and welfare status in all models. Extant family research suggests that the effects of family structure histories on attitudes towards marriage operate through a number of educational, occupational and family formation behaviors. Therefore, final models also control for social roles and expectations at Wave I and Wave III, including education, employment and enrollment status, whether the respondent has children, their relationship histories and religiosity. Table 2 presents the coding for each of these variables in more detail, as well as descriptive statistics for all of the variables used in the analysis.

ANALYTIC STRATEGY

The data have been weighted for the sampling design and longitudinal analyses. We used ordered logistic regression because the outcomes are all non-normally distributed ordered variables. Additionally, we used Heckman's (1979) selection bias model to correct parameter estimates for differential selectivity due to early marriage because respondents who were married at Wave III were not asked about their attitudes toward marriage. Given that family structure instability is associated with a heightened risk of early marriage (Amato and Booth 1997), the exclusion of these respondents is potentially problematic. First, we estimated a logit model to distinguish characteristics of respondents who were married by Wave III. Second, we included in the current models a selection instrument (λ) based on the inverse Mills ratio of the logit results.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations for the attitudes toward marriage, family structure history, social roles and expectations and personal characteristics of respondents in Add Health. Overall, while most do not feel that it is important to be married now, young adults generally hold favorable attitudes toward marriage. Respondents disagreed with the statement that "it is important to be married right now" ($M = 2$.41) but that it was more than "somewhat important" to be "married someday." Moreover, respondents indicated that they had better than a "50/50 chance" of being married within the next ten years (M=3.29). This pattern of results is consistent with other studies showing generally pro-marriage attitudes (Manning 2007) and the fact that about 90% of the U.S. population eventually marries (Cherlin 1992).

Table 2 also indicates that adolescents experienced a fair amount of heterogeneity in their family of origin experiences, depending on the family structure history used. Only two-thirds of adolescents were living with both biological parents at the time of the first interview (~67%); 16% were living with a divorced parent and about 4-5% each were living with a single biological parent (and never lived with both biological parents), a divorced parent or in some other non-biological parent arrangement. However, slightly less than two-thirds of adolescent respondents' had never lived in a single parent family (~60%), indicating that about 11% of those who were living in a two-biological parent family had lived in a single-parent family at some point in their lives ([67.33-59.94]/67.33= 10.98). The age-distribution of the timing when first lived in a single-parent family shows that most respondents were in the pre-school years when they first lived in a single parent family (~24%) and very few (< 2%) were in late-adolescence. Most adolescents spent very few years living in a single parent family (M= 3.20), although when we

consider the length of time among those who ever lived in a single-parent family it is considerably longer at 8.67 years (not shown). While most adolescents experienced less than one transition (*M*=.56), those who experienced any family changed had only slightly more than one-transition (*M*= 1.36, not shown). The heterogeneity of family structure experiences is most apparent when we consider alternate specifications of family structure history. While about 68% of respondents had a single-status trajectory of always living with in a Married (or cohabiting) parent or in a Single parent household (61% and 7%, respectively), 32% of the sample had more complicated family of origin trajectories. About 11% of the sample experienced a change from Married to Single and 5% from Single to Married. Nine percent of adolescents experienced more complicated trajectories, those involving two or more changes in family structure, with Married-Single-Married slightly more common than Single-Married-Single. Seven percent of the sample experienced some other family trajectory that involved time spent in a non-biological parent household.

[Insert Table 2 about Here]

The remainder of Table 2 presents descriptive statistics for the indicators of social roles and expectations we hypothesized to mediate the link between family structure history and attitudes toward marriage, as well as the personal characteristics we control for in the analysis. We leave it to the reader to inspect these in greater detail. However, we will point out that respondents had a high degree of participation in the normative social roles of work and school by Wave III, as about 70% of respondents employed and 42% enrolled in post-secondary education. By contrast, fewer respondents were living with a partner (~15%) or had become parents (~13%), although about one-quarter of respondents indicated that they have previously cohabited.

Multivariate Analyses

To examine the effects of family structure history on young adults' attitudes toward marriage, we estimated a series of ordered logistic regression models that examined the effect of alternate specifications of family structure history on each of our dependent variables—the importance of being married now, of being married someday, and the chance of being married in ten years. For each family structure history specification, we first estimated a model that included only controls for personal characteristics (Models 1,3,5) and then tested whether social roles and expectation mediated the relationship (Models 2,4,6). We first present the full results for the effect of current family structure on attitudes toward marriage in Table 3 and discuss these findings in detail. We summarize the findings across models with alternate specifications of family structure history in Table 4 (full tables available upon request).

The results in Table 3 demonstrate that young adults who were living with a continuously single or divorced parent at the first interview placed less importance in marriage both now and in the future when they were interviewed five years later, and this was only partially attenuated by adult social roles and expectation. Specifically looking at the effects of family structure net of differences in personal characteristics, young adults in continuously single parent families had odds 21% lower and those in divorced-parent families had odds 9.5% lower of agreeing with the statement that "it is important to be married now" than those in continuously married two-parent families (Model 1). Likewise, the odds of stating that it was important to be married someday were 27.4% and 11.8% lower for adolescents who were living in continuously single parent families and divorced parent family, respectively (Model 3). We find no relationship between the type of family that an adolescent lived in at Wave I and their belief five years later about the chance that they will be married in ten years.

[Insert Table 3 about Here]

In models 2,4, and 6 we add social roles and expectations to account for potentially confounding effects given that previous research identifies truncation of schooling, employment instability, cohabitation and early parenthood as consequences of single-parent families and family disruption and the negative association between these factors and marriage (McLanahan 1994; Amato and Booth 1997). Conversely, the adoption of adult social roles is associated with greater likelihood of marriage and our findings bore out this association with respect to attitudes. Young adults who were employed, parents, cohabiting or dating placed greater importance on being married now and in the future and were also more likely to think that they would be married in ten years. Formerly married young-adults were substantially less likely to view it as important to be married and to think that they would be married (again) in 10 years. The normative-timing of marriage associated with social contexts is also evident from the effects of church attendance, years of education and school enrollment. Those who attended church more regularly were more likely to view marriage now and in the future as important and think they had a greater chance of being married in 10 years. Education and school enrollment were also positively associated with the likelihood of marriage and the importance of marriage someday, but negatively associated with the importance of being married now—potentially because respondents felt that completing schooling is a prerequisite for marriage (Hogan and Astone 1986; Shanahan 2000), although we cannot test either idea directly.

However, accounting for social roles and expectations had little effect on the direction or magnitude of the current family structure effects observed, with two exceptions. Young adults who were living with a single-parent were similar to those living with two biological parents once social roles and expectations were included in the model (model 4). This indicates that part

of the reason that young adults living in single-parent families were less likely to see marriage as important for the future is due to their greater involvement in social roles traditionally confined to marriage—particularly cohabitation and parenthood (not shown). We also found that once we adjusted for social roles and expectations, young adults who were living in a divorced parent household when first interviewed were less likely to believe that they had a good chance of being married in 10 years—with odds 23% lower than those who were living in a two biological parent household. The mechanisms behind this finding are unclear, although supplemental analyses indicate that this effect emerges once we control for employment status at Wave 1, suggesting that young adults who were in divorced parents were less likely to be employed. Nevertheless, we found overall that young adults who were living in a single-or divorced- parent family viewed marriage as less important than those in other family structures.

As we argued above, however, a life course perspective requires an examination of the transitions and trajectories that define family structure history, including when the transition to a single parent family occurs in the lives of individuals and how long individuals live in a single parent family. Table 4 summarizes the results from models using these alternate family structure history specifications in panels B-E. Panel A replicates the results presented in Table 3 to facilitate comparisons.

[Insert Table 4 about Here]

The results in Table 4 demonstrate the utility of examining the components of family structure history and their effects on attitudes toward marriage. Timing, duration, the number of transitions and trajectories of family structure are each related to attitudes toward marriage. The overall conclusion from Table 4 is that young adults who experienced living in a single-family early in their lives and who witnessed multiple changes in the composition of parents-figures in

their households place less importance in marriage overall and are less likely to be think they will be married in ten years. Unlike with the results for current family structure, social roles and expectations are significantly associated with the effect of these alternative family history measures on attitudes toward marriage. However, the complexity of the results requires more detailed discussion.

Consider the timing of when a young adult first lived in a single parent family, where those who were between the ages of six and ten (6-10) placed less importance on both being married now and someday, an effect that was robust in the presence of indicators of adult social roles and expectations (Panel B, Models 1-4). Young adults who experienced a single-parent family first in early childhood (ages 0-5), however, placed less importance on being married someday and forecast lower changes of being married in the next 10 years only prior to adjusted for adults social roles (Panel B, Models 3-6); once we accounted their greater likelihood of being neither employed nor enrolled in school, young adults who experienced single-parenthood early in life were statistically similar to those from continuously married two biological parent families (not shown). Interestingly, accounting for a lower likelihood of cohabitation and dating decreases the odds that young adults who first experienced single-parenthood in early adolescence agree with the idea that it is important to be married now (not shown).

The generally summary measures of duration and number of family transitions have little effect on attitudes toward marriage. We did find that, consistent with the timing effects, a longer time spent in a single-parent family decreased the importance that young adults place on being married in the future (Panel C). The number of family structure transitions experienced by young adults also decreased the odds of importance of being married someday (Panel D), although this

effect was fully mediated by the lower educational attainment and likelihood of school enrollment associated with higher-order transitions (not shown).

Turing to Panel E, we found that our summary measures of the sequence of family transitions—trajectories of family structure—revealed several significant linkages between experiences in the family of origin and young adults' attitudes toward marriage. The odds of stating that marriage someday was important were about 24% lower for young adults who lived in a continuously single parent family compared to those in continuously married two parent families (Model 3), although this effect was due to adult social roles and expectations (Model 4). The lower importance placed on being married in the future is largely due to the fact that young adults from continuously single parent families have lower educational attainment and are less likely to be in school (not shown). Similarly, young adults from continuously single parent families forecast lower chances of being married in 10 years (Model 5), and though slightly attenuated, this effect remained in the presence of adult social roles and expectations (Model 6).

Those young adults who experienced a change from a two biological parent family to a single parent family also placed less importance on being married someday (Model 3). Moreover, once we adjusted for their lower educational attainment and school enrollment, they were less likely to agree that it was important to be married now and to see themselves married in 10 years (Models 2 and 6, respectively). We found a similar pattern of results among those with the more complex family history trajectories denoting change from a single-parent to a married-parent to a married–parent household or some period spend in a non-parent household, although not with respect to the likelihood of marriage in ten years which was not statistically significant.

Interestingly, those who experienced a change from a single parent to a two-parent family were more likely to agree with the statement—with odds 126% higher—that it is important to be married now (Model 1), although this effect was no longer statistically significant in the full model. Supplemental analyses showed that the lower expectation of going to college at Wave 1 largely drove the reduction in statistical significance, consistent with the lower educational attainment of offspring in remarried households (Amato and Booth 1997).

Although not the focus of the present study, it is important to note that the effects of the various personal characteristics on attitudes toward marriage were generally in line with our expectations (See Table 3). Older and female respondents were more likely to agree with the importance of marriage now and in the future and to state a greater chance of being married some. Family income was negatively related to the importance of being married now, but positively associated with both the importance of marriage in the future and respondent's perception of the likelihood that they would be married in ten years. Black and Hispanic respondents were less likely to view marriage someday as important, compared to whites; after accounting for the effects of social roles and expectations, Blacks also anticipated lower chances of being married in ten years. The pattern of results was generally similar across models with alternate specifications of family structure history.

Gender Differences in the Effect of Family Structure History

Given previous literature on gender-differences in the consequences of family disruption for young adults educational, employment and family formation behavior (McLanahan and Sandefer 1994; Amato and Booth 1997), we tested whether there were gender-differences in the effects of family structure history on attitudes toward marriage. Using a stratified modeling approach and a Chow test for the equality of coefficients between models, we found no

significant gender differences in any of the specifications of family structure history. The effects of family structure experiences on attitudes toward marriage, it would appear, operate similarly for young men and women.

Taken as a whole, our findings suggest that young adults with early and recurrent experience with a single parent family place less importance in being married now, being married in the future and rate their chance of being married in ten years lower then young adults in continuously married two-biological parent families. The effects of family structure, variously measured, appear to operate similarly for young men and women. Moreover, our findings indicate that a lower expectation and attainment of education, as well as lower likelihood of employment, figure prominently in the lower importance that young adults with early and recurrent experience in single-parent families place on marriage.

DISCUSSION

[To be Added…]

REFERENCES

Allison, PD, Furstenberg, FF Jr. (1989) How marital dissolution affects children: Variations by age and sex. *Child Development,* 25, 540-549.

Astone, N. M., and McLanahan, S. S. (1991). Family Structure, parental practices, and high school completion. *American Sociological Review,* 56, 309-320.

Chase-Landsdale, P.L. and Hetherington, E. M. (1990). The impact of divorce on life-span development: Short and long term effects. In *Life Span Development and Behavior,* ed. PB Baltes, DL Featehrman, RM Lerner, 10:105-150. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Elder, G. H., Jr., Johnson, M.K., and Crosnoe, R. (2003). The emergence and development of life course theory. In *Handbook of the Life Course,* eds. J.T. Mortimer and M.J. Shanahan. Pp.3-19. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Furstenberg, Frank F. (1990). Divorce and the American family. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 16, 379-403.

Goldstein, J.R., and Kenney, C.T. (2001). Marriage delayed or marriage forgone? New cohort forecasts of first marriage for U.S. women. *American Sociological Review, 66,* 506-519.

Hao, Lingxin, and Xie, Guihua. (2002). The complexity and endogeneity of family structure in explaining children's misbehavior. *Social Science Research,* 31, 1-28.

Harris, K.M. (1999). *Families, communities, and adolescent behaviors. Subproject of Add Health Study.* (NICHD award No. POI-HD 31921). Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.

Harris, K.M., Florey, F., Tabor, J.W., Bearman, P.S., Jones, J., & Udry, J.R. (2003). *The national longitudinal study of adolescent health: Research design.* ….stuff about website

Heard, H.E. (2007). Fathers, mothers, and family structure: Family trajectories, parent gender, and adolscent schooling. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 69,* 435-450.

Heckman, J. J. (1979). Sample selection bias as a specification error. *Econometrica,* 47, 53-161.

Hetherington, E.M., Cox, M. and Cox, R. (1978). The aftermath of divorce. In J.H. Stevens & M. Mathews (Eds.), *Mother-child father-child relationships* (pp. 149-176). Washington Dc: National Association for the Education fo Young People.

Kim, J., Hetherington, E.M., and Reiss, D. (1999). Associations among family relationships, antisocial peers, and adolescents' externalizing behaviors: Gender and family type differences. *Child Development, 70,* 1209-1230.

McLanahan, Sara S., and Bumpass, Larry L. (1988). Intergenerational consequences of marital disruption. *American Journal of Sociology,* 94, 130-152.

McLanahan, Sara, and Sandefur, Gary D. (1994). *Growing up with a single parent: What hurts, what helps.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Risch, Sharon C., Jodl, Kathleen M., and Eccles, Jaquelynne S. (2004). Role of the father-adolescent relationship in shaping adolescents' attitudes toward divorce. *Journal of Marriage and the Family,* 66, 46-58.

Roisman, G.J., Madsen, S.D., Hennighausen, K.H., Sroufe, L.A., and Collins, W.A. (2001). The coherence of dyadic behavior acrss parent-child and romantic relationships as mediated by the internalized representation of experience. *Attachment and Human Development,* 3, 156-172.

Seltzer, J. (1994). Consequences of marital dissolution for children. *Annual Review of Sociology, 20,* 235-266.

Sweeney, Megan M. (2007). Stepfather families and the emotional well-being of adolescents. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 48, 33-49.

Trent, K. and South, S.J. (1992). Sociodemographic status, parental background, childhood family structure, and attitudes toward family formation. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 54,* 427-439.

Wallerstein, J., and Kelly, J. (1980). *Surviving the breakup: How children and parents cope with divorce.* New York: Basic Books.

Wu. L.L. (1996). Effects of family instability, income, and income instability on the risk of a premarital birth. *American Sociological Review, 61,* 386-406.

Wu, L.L., and Martinson B.C. (1993). Family structure and the risk of a premarital birth. *American Sociological Review,* 58, 21-232.

Table 1. Alternate Specifications of Family Structure History in the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health)

Construct	Categories
Current Status	
Composition of the R's residential household at Wave I measured by 5 mutually exclusive dummy variables. Two biological parents is the reference category.	Two Biological Parents Single Parent Divorced Parent Step-Parent No Biological Parents
Timing of First SPF	
Life stage in which R first experienced residence with a single parent measured by 5 mutually exclusive dummy variables. Never is the reference category.	Never 0-5 Years 6-10 Years 11-14 Years 15+ Years
Duration Spent in SPF	
Total number of years R lived in a single parent household (0-21)	# of Years in SPF
Number of Transitions	
Total number of transitions between different family statuses R experienced until age at Wave I (0-7)	# of Transitions
Trajectories	
Sequence of residence (first three) from birth until age at Wave I measured by 7 mutually exclusive dummy variables. Continuously married is the reference category.	Married Single Married-Single Single-Married Married-Single-Married Single-Married-Single Other

Table 2. Percentages, Means and Standard Deviations for Attitudes toward Marriage, Family Structure History, Social Roles and Expectations and Personal Characteristics

Variable	Description	% , M	SD
Attitudes toward Marriage			
Importance Now	Agree or Disagree with the statement: "It is important to be married right now" (5=Strongly Agree, 1=Strongly Disagree)	2.41	1.38
Importance in Future	"How important is it to be married someday" (4=Very Important,1=Not important at all)	3.29	.85
Likelihood in 10 years	"How likely is it that you will be married in 10 years" (5=Almost certain 1=Almost no chance)	3.93	1.11
Family Structure History [a]			
Current Status [b]			
Two Biological Parents	=1, otherwise=0; reference category	67.33	
Continuously Single Parent	=1, otherwise=0	4.18	
Divorced Parent	=1, otherwise=0	16.15	
Step-Parent	=1, otherwise=0	4.79	
No Biological Parents	=1, otherwise=0	4.04	
Timing of First SPF [b]			
Never	=1, otherwise=0; reference category	59.94	
0-5 Years	=1, otherwise=0	24.36	
6-10 Years	=1, otherwise=0	6.26	
11-14 Years	=1, otherwise=0	4.48	
15+ Years	=1, otherwise=0	1.76	
Duration	# of years spent in a SPF (0-21)	3.20	
Transitions	# of family structure transitions (0-7)	54.64	
Trajectories [b]			
Married	=1, otherwise=0; reference category	61.17	
Single	=1, otherwise=0	6.86	
Married-Single	=1, otherwise=0	10.81	
Single-Married	=1, otherwise=0	4.60	
Married-Single-Married	=1, otherwise=0	5.10	
Single-Married-Single	=1, otherwise=0	4.14	
Other		7.30	
Social Roles and Expectations (WI)			
Employment Status	=1 if Worked for pay outside of home at least 10 hours per week in last four weeks, otherwise=0	55.10	
College Expectations	Likelihood that R will go to college (5=High, 1=Low)	4.22	1.10
Church Attendance	How often R attended religious services in past year (4=Once a week, 1=Never)	2.75	1.21
Social Roles and Expectations (WIII)			
Education	Highest grade of schooling completed (6-22)	13.34	1.96
Enrollment Status	=1 if R currently attending regular school , otherwise=0	41.70	
Employment Status	=1 if R currently working for pay at least 10 hours a week, otherwise=0	69.48	
Church Attendance	How often R attended religious services in past year (Once a week=4, Never=0)	2.21	1.03
Parental Status	=1 if R has a biological child, otherwise=0	13.34	
Relationship Status [b]			
Cohabiting	=1 if in a cohabiting relationship, otherwise=0	14.95	
Dating	=1 if dating but not living together, otherwise=0	14.86	
Single	=1 if not romantically involved, otherwise=0; reference category	70.19	
Formerly Married	=1, otherwise=0	2.09	
Formerly Cohabited	=1, otherwise=0	23.13	
Personal Characteristics			

Age	Age at Wave I, in continuous years (11-21)	15.94	1.70
Female	=1, otherwise male=0	50.80	
Race/Ethnicity [b]			
White	=1, otherwise=0; reference category	50.08	
Black	=1, otherwise=0	22.98	
Hispanic	=1, otherwise=0	15.14	
Other	=1, otherwise=0	11.80	
Log of Family Income	Natural log of household income from all sources in 1994 (0-6.91)	3.62	.77
Welfare Status	= 1 if any resident parent receives public assistance, otherwise=0	8.52	

[a] See Text and Table 1 for full details.
[b] Mutually exclusive dummy variables.

Source: National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, (Add Health) (N=11,332)

Table 3. The Effect of Current Family Structure on Attitudes toward Marriage, Odds Ratios from Ordered Logistic Regression Models

	Importance of Marriage Now		Importance of Marriage in Future		Likelihood of Marriage in 10 Years	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Current Family Structure Status [a]						
Single Parent	.788*	.726**	.726**	.873	.969	.783
Divorced Parent	.905*	.862***	.882*	.819**	1.036	.768*
Step-Parent	.919	.822*	.851	.992	.867	1.026
No Biological Parents	1.039	.848	1.051	.768	1.116	.820
Social Roles and Expectations (WI)						
Employment Status		1.070*		1.126*		1.166**
College Expectations		.951*		1.034		1.042
Church Attendance		.982		1.069**		1.043
Social Roles and Expectations (WIII)						
Education		.949***		1.067***		1.058**
Enrollment Status		.678***		1.254***		1.079
Employment Status		1.174**		1.115*		1.186***
Church Attendance		1.288***		1.319***		1.098
Parental Status		1.660***		.949		1.348***
Relationship Status [b]						
Cohabiting		2.695***		1.422***		3.098***
Dating		1.324***		1.238**		1.596***
Formerly Married		.556***		.475***		.673*
Formerly Cohabited		1.104		.928		1.118
Personal Characteristics						
Age	1.192***	1.158***	1.011	.985	1.064*	.978
Female	1.536***	1.497***	1.225***	1.081	1.400***	1.314***
Race [c]						
Black	1.099	.988	.743***	.682***	1.042	.713**
Hispanic	1.117	.992	.866*	.824*	1.111	1.074
Other	.909	.944	.987	.911	1.103	.948
Log of Family Income	.836***	.909**	1.180***	1.101**	1.018	1.195*
Welfare Status	1.239**	1.099	.838*	.970	.833	.885

* p<.05 ** p<.01 *** p<.001 (one-tailed test)
[a] Consistently married is the omitted category.
[b] Single, not dating is the omitted category.
[c] Non-Hispanic white is the omitted category.

Table 4. Cross-Model Comparisons of the Effect of Current Family Structure on Attitudes toward Marriage when using Alternate Family Structure History Specifications, Odds Ratios from Ordered Logistic Regression Models

	Importance of Marriage Now [a]		Importance of Marriage in Future [a]		Likelihood of Marriage in 10 Years [a]	
Family Structure Specification [b]	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
A Current Status [c]						
Single Parent	.788*	.726**	.726**	.873	.969	.783
Divorced Parent	.905*	.862**	.882*	.819**	1.036	.768*
Step-Parent	.919	.822*	.851	.992	.867	1.026
No Biological Parents	1.039	.848	1.051	.768	1.116	.820
B Timing of First SPF [d]						
0-5 Years	1.055	.961	.812***	.915	.885*	.939
6-10 Years	.844*	.816*	.819*	.826*	.926	.908
11-14 Years	.862	.801*	.892	.887	.940	.902
15+ Years	1.012	.905	1.037	1.013	.995	.905
C Duration						
# of Years in Single Parent Family	.999	.994	.984***	.992*	.989*	.992
D Transitions						
# of Transitions	1.012	.966	.926**	.958	.987	1.004
E Trajectories [e]						
Single	1.019	.956	.763**	.904	.817*	.851*
Married-Single	.891	.847*	.851*	.831**	.920	.835**
Single-Married	1.256*	1.089	.983	1.161	1.019	1.152
Married-Single-Married	.926	.873	.820	.896	.892	.945
Single-Married-Single	.908	.795*	.755*	.832*	.986	.985
Other	1.012	.842*	.795*	.808*	.896	.891

[a] Model 1 includes the family structure indicators and personal characteristics. Model 2 adds social roles and expectations from Waves I and III. See Table 3 for full specification.
[b] Each panel A-E represents a set of separate estimations for the family structure specification indicators. Panel A replicates the results presented in Table 3.
[c] Two biological parents is the omitted category.
[d] Never is the omitted category.
[e] Continuously married is the omitted category.
* p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001 (one-tailed test)