MEASURING & PREDICTING COUPLE-LEVEL FERTILITY INTENTIONS

J. Bart Stykes
Doctoral Candidate
Bowling Green State University

Abstract

Unintended fertility has been identified as a pressing social problem in the contemporary United States. Drawing on a family systems framework and prior research on childbearing desires and fertility outcomes, I assert couples should be the primary unit of analysis in discussions of unintended fertility and develop a conceptual framework that discusses the importance of disagreement in couples' intentions. Using the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Birth Cohort, I develop a research design that assesses the "accuracy" of mothers' proxy reports of fathers' intentions and predicts couple-level fertility intentions. Results indicated the majority of mothers' proxy reports are "accurate," but a sizeable minority of mothers provided "inaccurate" proxy reports. Separately, a range of sociodemographic characteristics – most notably relationship ties at birth – is associated with couples' intentions. This suggests consideration of both parents' intentions informs a nuanced discussion of the childbearing context with implications for parent and child well-being. Both methodological and policy implications concerning couples' fertility intentions are discussed in relation to findings.

Thirty-seven percent of recent births to U.S. women were unintended, a level which has remained relatively stable since the 1980s (Mosher et al., 2012). Unintended fertility in the United States is also concentrated among disadvantaged, minority women (see Finer & Henshaw, 2006; Finer & Zolna, 2011; Maxson & Miranda, 2011; Musick, 2002; Musick et al., 2009), and researchers have linked unintended fertility to risky behavior during pregnancy, mothers' psychological distress, harsh parenting, and lower child well-being (e.g. Axinn et al., 1998; Barber et al., 1999; Joyce et al., 2000; Miller et al. 2009). Given the high prevalence of unintended fertility and its association with lower well-being, unintended fertility has emerged as a major social problem with implications for parents and children, and the concentration of unintended childbearing among relatively disadvantaged, minority populations suggests these behaviors disproportionately affect "at-risk" groups and may exacerbate differences in health and social behaviors (Finer & Zolna, 2011; Maxson & Miranda, 2011; Musick 2002).

BACKGROUND

Most research on the correlates, causes, and consequences of unintended fertility has focused on mothers' and children's experiences, largely excluding fathers – with some notable exceptions (see Augustine et al., 2009; Bronte-Tinkew et al., 2007, 2009; Lindberg & Kost, 2013; Su, 2012). The exclusion of fathers, in turn, means that few studies have considered *couples*. Childbearing is by default a couple experience, but very little is known about fathers' perspectives on unintended fertility and how they affect mothers', fathers', and children's experiences. The limited work that has considered couples' intentions has treated them as a predictor rather than an outcome variable (Hohmann-Marriott 2009; Martin et al., 2007; Moore et al., 2009; Saleem & Surkan, 2013) or relied on mother's reports of the father's intentions (Korenmann, Kaestner, & Joyce, 2002; Williams 1994). Thus, theoretical explanations of couple

disagreement in intentions among recent cohorts of parents are lacking. I contribute to research on unintended fertility by addressing measurement concerns over couples' intentions, developing a theoretical framework to assess gender and disagreement in couples' intentions, and predicting couples' fertility intentions.

Given the dramatic increase in nonmarital fertility, the increasing prevalence of multipartnered fertility, and high levels of unintended fertility in the contemporary U.S., a wealth of research considers which sociodemographic characteristics are associated with these "problematic" fertility behaviors (see Cancian, Meyer, & Cook 2011; Carlson & Furstenberg, 2006; Carlson et al., 2013; Guzzo & Furstenberg 2007). Unintended fertility raises concerns, as it is linked it to risky behaviors during pregnancy (Hohmann-Marriott, 2009; Moore et al., 2009) and increased maternal stress, which in turn lowers child well-being (e.g., Barber et al., 1999; Miller, Sable, & Beckmeyer, 2009). Prior research consistently found younger, unmarried, less educated, minority women, and those living in or near poverty were at a greater risk of experiencing an unintended birth compared to their relatively advantaged counterparts (see Finer & Henshaw, 2006; Finer & Zolna, 2011; Musick, 2002; Musick et al., 2009). Most research considered mothers', rather than fathers', perspectives, but the limited research on fathers suggests the same set of sociodemographic characteristics increased a man's risk of experiencing nonmarital, unintended, or multipartnered fertility (see Carlson et al., 2013; Guzzo & Furstenberg 2007; Lindberg & Kost, 2013).

Conceptualizing fertility intentions as a couple-level construct

Despite the emphasis in recent years on a fairly simple way of measuring unintended fertility with individual-level, retrospective reports from mothers, family and demographic scholars have

often advocated a different approach. In particular, prior work on childbearing desires and fertility outcomes asserted couples were a more appropriate unit of analysis than individuals (see Beckman et al., 1983; Fried & Udry, 1979; Thomson, 1997). Drawing on a family systems framework, I return to this viewpoint and posit a more holistic conceptualization of unintended fertility should model joint, couple-level fertility intentions. The family systems framework regards families as an interconnected collection of persons and relationships seeking to maintain a state of family equilibrium. As such, this framework asserts families must be viewed as a web of persons and relationships rather than a mere collection of individuals and is often concerned with understanding family functioning, dynamics, processes, and cohesion (White & Klein, 2008). Key tenets of this framework have been applied to better understand topics including but not limited to family boundary ambiguity in diverse family forms (see Stewart, 2005); widespread variation in child well-being following divorce (see Hetherington, 1979); and the association between economic crisis, family processes, and well-being (see Conger et al., 2010).

Based on a family systems perspective, I assert unintended childbearing cannot merely be viewed as a social problem involving and affecting mothers and children. Although mothers' and fathers' intentions are certainly important in their own right, the family systems approach suggests researchers should consider joint, couple-level fertility intentions rather than viewing mothers' and fathers' intentions as independent constructs. Conceptualizing intentions as a couple-level phenomenon provides a nuanced framework to better understand both the factors that influence fertility intentions and the "effects" intentions have on parents and children. Specifically, viewing couples' intentions brings disagreement in mothers' and fathers' reports of intentions to the forefront. Examining mothers' or fathers' fertility intentions in and of themselves assumes either parents share similar intentions or the omitted parents' intentions are

not consequential to parent and child well-being, and both assumptions are problematic. For instance, Hohmann-Marriott (2009) found that approximately one-third of couples reported disagreement in intentions, and the limited work examining couple-level fertility intentions has consistently found that both mothers' and fathers' intentions are consequential for maternal and child well-being (Martin et al., 2007; Moore et al. 2009; Saleem & Surkan, 2013). Thus, conceptualizing fertility intentions as a couple-level construct provides a better framework to understand the context of unintended fertility, its correlates and linkages with well-being.

There is relatively little research examining fertility intentions at the couple-level due in part to data constraints. One of the major data limitations is the availability and quality of male fertility data. Recently, Joyner and colleagues (2012) found men were less likely to provide accurate information regarding fertility than women. In a separate vein, Martin (2007) noted household surveys often omit economically disenfranchised men who have weak ties to households, making certain male target populations – like nonresident fathers – particularly difficult to identify (see also Sorenson, 1997; Stykes, Manning, & Brown, 2013). These concerns over the quality of men's data cannot be ignored; however, others have asserted scholars should make efforts to include men in discussions of families as they play integral roles in reproductive health and family processes (see Greene & Biddlecom, 2000; Lindberg & Kost, 2013). In addition, the scarcity of couple-level data has likely hampered research on couples' fertility intentions. The Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Birth Cohort (ECLS-B) provide the only data that can directly assess couple's fertility intentions among a recent, diverse sample. The National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 (NLSY79) and National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG) provide indirect reports of fathers' fertility intentions by asking mothers to report on fathers' intentions, and these data could be used to create couple-level indicators of intentions.

Indeed, early work relied on these indirect reports to model couples' fertility intentions. Williams' (1994) analyses with the 1988 NSFG found that disadvantaged, minority women (i.e. younger, minority racial/ethnic groups, less educated, and never married) experienced higher levels of disagreement in couples' intentions. Korenmann and colleagues (2002) considered the effect of couples' fertility intentions on child well-being and found fathers' intentions mattered as children intended by both parents fared better than those intended by the mother, but not the father, but results indicated no differences existed when one versus neither parent did not intend the birth.

These early pieces were the first to consider couples' reports of unintended fertility. However, their reliance on mothers' proxy reports of fathers' intentions raises concerns. Retrospective reports of fertility intentions are subject to both recall and social desirability biases in their own right, but it is also reasonable to expect mothers might be unaware of fathers' intentions. Prior work found wives' reports of husbands' childbearing desires were largely consistent (see Morgan, 1985; Williams & Thomson, 1985), but these conclusions were based on dated data that considered prospective reports of childbearing desires rather than retrospective reports of unintended fertility and only considered married parents' perspectives. More recent work has used mothers' and fathers' reports of their own fertility intentions available in the ECLS-B data to model fertility intentions as a couple-level construct, but this research has modeled couple's intentions as a focal predictor variable for maternal and child well-being (e.g. Hohmann-Marriott, 2009; Martin et al., 2007; Moore et al., 2009; Saleem & Surkan, 2013). Thus, it is unclear what factors are associated with couples' intentions, and the theoretical explanations for how gender and sociodemographic characteristics play in to couples' intentions is lacking.

Disagreement in intentions: The intersection of gender, disadvantage, and parenthood

Drawing on a family systems perspective, I asserted fertility intentions should be a modeled as a couple construct in order to consider disagreement in mothers' and fathers' intentions. For instance, Williams (1994) found disagreement in couples' intentions was most common among disadvantaged, minority women, and Hohmann-Marriott (2009) noted that disagreement in intentions was more common among cohabiting parents than their married counterparts. Taken together, the limited research predicting couples' fertility intentions suggests couple disagreement is more prevalent among relatively disadvantaged, minority mothers. Although the family systems perspective provides an ideal framework for conceptualizing unintended fertility as a couple-level construct, it falls short in explaining differences *between* mothers and fathers experiences in families. Next, I discuss differences in gendered identities and parenthood, which could contribute to disagreement in couples' intentions.

The social construction of gender and differences in masculinity and femininity could foster disagreement in mothers' and fathers' intentions, as parenthood is gendered. Prior work by feminists and developmental psychologists alike suggested gender socialization and daily interactions with family, friends, peers, and society from birth to death led to differences in what was deemed masculine and feminine (see Chodorow, 1978; Maccoby, 1998; West & Zimmerman, 1987). Arguably, young girls – and women – are socialized (and expected) to invest more in relationships and parenthood than men (see Maccoby, 1998). In a separate vein, others have asserted men must strive to maintain and assert their masculine identity on a regular basis whereas women are often assumed to be feminine (see Nock 1998), and becoming a father has been identified as a key marker of successful masculinity (Marsiglio, 1998; Nock, 1998; Townsend, 2002). Anderson's (1999) classic *Code of the Street* suggested that in the context of

sociodemographic disadvantage, men turned to violence, aggression, and sexual prowess in order to assert their masculinity in the face of limited economic prospects or threats of a premature death. Similarly, one might expect fatherhood to provide disadvantaged men an opportunity to reaffirm their masculine identity. Thus, different approaches to examining gender identities in parenthood lead to competing hypotheses regarding gender differences in fertility intentions. The social construction of gender suggests that parenthood is more consequential for women's identities than men's and thus women are more likely to intend a birth. In contrast, research that underscores pressures for men to secure and defend their masculinity suggests that fathers are more likely to intend a birth than mothers. It is reasonable to expect the latter might be more pronounced among the economically disadvantaged, as fatherhood might allow men to compensate for other challenges to their masculinity, whereas the social construction of gender in parenthood applies to parents more broadly.

Relationship factors and intentions

Of course, there are other factors related to intentions and likely related to agreement, with relationship dynamics being particularly salient. Prior work suggested that single and cohabiting parents had a greater risk of both unintended childbearing and couple disagreement in childbearing (see Finer & Zolna, 2011; Musick, 2002; Hohmann-Marriott, 2009; Williams, 1994), but I expect relationship dynamics might also influence couples' fertility intentions as these factors have been linked to contraceptive use. Research demonstrated poor relationship quality resulted in less consistent contraceptive use which increased the risk of unintended childbearing (see Manlove, Welti, Barry, Peterson, Schelar, & Wildsmith, 2011; Manning, Flanigan, Giordano, & Longmore, 2009). Although disentangling the temporal ordering between current relationship dynamics and retrospective reports of fertility intentions is problematic, it is

reasonable to expect that poorer relationship quality is positively correlated with both unintended childbearing and couple disagreement in intentions whereas longer relationship duration and positive relationship quality likely reduce the risk of unintended childbearing and disagreement.

CURRENT STUDY AND HYPOTHESES

To expand on the limited research examining couple-level intentions and the larger body of work on individuals' intentions, my primary focus is to predict agreement in intentions. However, I first consider measurement issues by assessing the "accuracy" of mothers' proxy reports of fathers' intentions differentiating between 1) "accurate" proxy reports (i.e., mothers' reports of fathers' intentions match the fathers' own reports), 2) mother "inaccurately" reported the father intended the birth, and 3) mother "inaccurately" reported he did not intend.[1] Due to higher levels of agreement in married couples intentions (see Hohmann-Marriott, 2009; Williams, 1994), I expect that mothers who are married to the biological father provide more "accurate" proxy reports than their unwed counterparts. In addition, I expect relatively disadvantaged mothers are more likely to provide "inaccurate" proxy reports than their relatively advantaged counterparts given the recurring theme of ambivalence in disadvantaged parents' intentions (see Augustine et al., 2009; Edin & Kefalas, 2005; Hayford & Guzzo, 2013). I expect mothers who intended the birth are more likely to provide "accurate" proxy reports as they may have had discussions about parenthood with the child's father. Lastly, it is plausible that when mothers' proxy reports are "inaccurate," they are more likely to report the father shared their own intentions.

The second set of analyses predict couple-level fertility intentions: intended by both; intended by mother, *not father*; intended by father, *not mother*; intended by *neither mother nor*

[1] Unfortunately, I cannot consider consistencies between mothers' and fathers' reports of mothers' intentions as these items were not included in the father survey instruments.

father. I begin presenting hypotheses that address both agreement and intentions and are gender neutral. Then, I present competing hypotheses concerning gender and disagreement in couples' intentions. Given the concentration of unintended fertility among disadvantaged and minority populations, I expect couples who are older, better educated, or white are more likely to both agree on intentions *and* intend to have the birth. I also expect married couples are more likely to both agree and intend the birth rather than their unmarried counterparts. A final set of models, limited to couples living together at the child's birth, considers relationship dynamics. For these couples, I expect that longer relationship duration and higher relationship quality increase the likelihood of couples' both agreeing and intending to have the child whereas poorer relationship quality likely increases the odds of both disagreement and unintended fertility. Exploratory analyses will also assess if relationship quality and duration operate similarly for married and cohabiting couples, though I do not present hypotheses for these interactions.

Hypotheses emphasizing gender and disagreement in intentions become more complex as different perspectives inform competing hypotheses. Based on gender socialization and the social construction of gender, I expect when disagreement occurs it is more common for mothers, rather than fathers, to intend the birth. Conversely, Anderson's "Code of the Street" and research on men's negotiation of masculinity, suggest that when disagreement occurs, it is more common for fathers to intend the birth than mothers.

DATA AND METHOD

The ECLS-B is a recent, nationally representative survey of children born in the United States that follows approximately 10,700 of an eligible 14,000 children who were born in 2001 (NCES, 2004). Moreover, data were collected from both mothers and fathers, which allows for analyses

on families, couples, individual parents, and children. Although, these are panel data, the present analyses only draws on information from the baseline interviews (approximately nine months after the child's birth). Data include information on both mother's and fathers' sociodemographic characteristics as well as a number of indicators regarding intentions, involvement, and child well-being. Taken together, these features make the ECLS-B well-suited for analyses focusing on couple-level fertility intentions and measurement implications for using indirect reports of fathers' intentions. However, the ECLS-B struggled to recruit fathers, as 25% of eligible resident fathers and 50% of eligible nonresident fathers were not included in the 9-month, baseline data (NCES, 2004). In addition, nonresident fathers were only eligible to be included in the survey if 1) they had contact with the child or mother in the last month, and 2) if the mother agreed to allow the nonresident father to be interviewed. Accordingly, results from this sample may not be readily generalized to the broader population (see discussion).

Sample Selection

The ECLS-B includes data from 10,700 parents who provided information on themselves and children. Initially, I limited the sample to children who were the biological child of at least one parent in the household (n = 10,600). Next, I limited the sample to firstborn children. Approximately, 3,350 mothers reported having one biological child at the baseline interview. However, a substantial number of these mothers' matching biological fathers had more than one biological child at the baseline interview as well. After limiting the children who were both their mother's and father's eldest child, the analytic sample included approximately 2,950 children. Unfortunately, a substantial share of fathers failed to complete surveys. Among the 2,950 eligible firstborn children, approximately 1,150 children did not have valid survey data from their biological fathers at the baseline interview, which yielded an eligible sample of 1,850 children.

These 1,850 children correspond to 1,850 couples with data on new biological mothers and fathers. Couples must have valid data on mothers' and fathers' intentions alongside mothers' reports of fathers' intentions – further reducing the sample to approximately 1,800 couples. Lastly, I excluded 150 couples where the mother was of an "other" or multi-racial status as their omission did not alter my results and interpreting odds ratios for these groups is problematic.

Measures

Fertility intentions. The ECLS-B include indicators of fertility intentions that correspond to other data sources, such as the NSFG, by asking both mothers and fathers to report on the wantedness and timing the focal pregnancy. Specifically, respondents were asked, "At the time [you/your partner] became pregnant with your baby, did you yourself actually want to have a(nother) baby at some time?" Respondents who replied "yes" were then asked, "Did [you/your partner] become pregnant sooner than you wanted, later than you wanted, or at about the right time?" Responses were coded into intended (wanted and on-time or late) and unintended (unwanted or mistimed – too soon). Both mothers' and fathers' reports were then combined to create four mutually exclusive, exhaustive categories: both mother and father intended (reference); mother intended, father did not; father intended, mother did not; and neither parent intended. An additional indicator assesses "accuracy" of mothers' proxy reports of fathers' intentions by cross-referencing mothers' perceptions of fathers' intentions and fathers' own reports of intentions[2]. Responses were coded into three mutually exclusive, exhaustive categories: "accurate" proxy reports (reference); mother "inaccurately" reported father intended, and mother "inaccurately" reported father did not intend.

[2] Questions used to assess mothers' perceptions of fathers' intentions were identical to those identifying their own intentions.

Mothers' sociodemographic characteristics[3]. Analyses of all couples consider key correlates of mothers' fertility intentions: race/ethnicity, nativity, age, education, and relationship status. *Mothers' race/ethnicity* was coded as: white (reference), black, Hispanic, and Asian. *Nativity status* flagged mothers who were foreign-born as "1". *Mothers' age* in years was a continuous indicator ranging from 15 to 50. *Mother's education* was coded into four mutually exclusive and exhaustive categories: at least a bachelor's degree (reference), some college experience, a high school diploma or GED, and no degree. *Relationship status* corresponds to the mothers' relationship with the biological father at birth and was coded as married (reference), cohabiting, or not living together (herein referred to as "single").

Relationship dynamics. Analyses limited to partnered couples (as described in the analytic strategy below) also included a continuous indicator for *relationship duration prior to birth* (in years) and two indicators that reflect relationship quality. The first is a dummy indicator based on a single-item question about overall relationship quality and flagged *very happy relationships* (very happy = 1; fairly happy or not too happy = 0). In addition, a *relationship conflict* scale (alpha = 0.79) was constructed based on responses to four-level Likert items assessing how often couples have arguments about (1) chores/responsibilities, (2) children, (3) money, (4) not showing love/affection, (5) sex, (6) religion, (7) leisure time, (8) drinking, (9) other men/women, and (10) in-laws. I created a mean scale based on the average of mother and father reports for each item. The alpha coefficient for this scale was 0.79 which suggested this scale of relationship conflict was quite reliable.

[3] Preliminary models suggested racial/ethnic, educational, and age heterogamy were 1) uncommon, 2) not associated with couples' intentions, and 3) did not improve the model fit.

Analytic strategy

I conducted two sets of analyses. The first considered the "accuracy" of mothers' proxy reports of fathers' intentions via multinomial logistic regression techniques. Since these measurement analyses are not concerned with mediating effects, multivariate analyses consider all covariates in a single, full model after discussing univariate and bivariate statistics. The second set of analyses also makes use of multinomial logistic regression techniques to predict couples' fertility intentions. Initially, all couples were considered and three models were estimated. The first included mothers' racial/ethnic status, nativity, age, and education. Model 2 only included relationship status at birth, and finally Model 3 entered all covariates. A second set of models was limited to couples living together at the time of birth (n = 1,450) and assessed the role of relationship dynamics on couples' intentions. The first model replicated the full model from analyses of all couples whereas the second model considered the additional impact of relationship dynamics. I considered interaction terms for relationship status at birth (i.e. married versus not) and indicators of duration and quality, but none of the cross-product terms proved significant so interaction models were neither presented nor discussed in the results.

RESULTS

Given low response rates among fathers and concerns of sample selection biases, I conducted supplemental sensitivity analyses, which are available on request, to better assess both the generalizability of findings and better grapple with problems stemming from sample selection bias. Results from these analyses suggested my analytic sample omitted relatively disadvantaged, minority mothers given missing data from fathers. However, mothers' age and couples' intentions are not significantly associated with fathers' participation in the survey net of mothers' race, nativity, education, and relationship ties. The fact that couples' intentions are not linked to

fathers' participation in the survey is reassuring as it suggests my dependent variable is not directly influenced by sample selection biases.

Measurement analyses: Assessing mothers' proxy reports of fathers' intentions

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 provides a descriptive portrait of mothers' sociodemographic characteristics in my overall sample and according to "accuracy" of mothers' proxy reports of fathers' intentions. Almost two-thirds (63%) of mothers in my sample intended their first birth. In terms of racial/ethnic status, the majority of mothers (two-thirds) are white, whereas approximately one-fifth of mothers are Hispanic, with one-in-ten being black and a mere four percent being Asian. Consistent with sensitivity analyses, white mothers are overrepresented in my sample, which is offset by black mothers being underrepresented. Almost one-in-five (19%) mothers is foreign-born. On average, mothers are 25.4 years old at their first birth. One-third (32%) of mothers are college educated whereas three-in-ten (29%) has some college experience but no degree, a quarter (24%) has a high school diploma or GED, and 14% reported no degree. Lastly, the majority (70%) of mothers in my sample are married to the child's biological father at the time of birth, with 18% of mothers cohabiting with the child's father and 13% not living with the child's father at the time of birth. Married mothers are also overrepresented in my sample whereas both cohabiting and "single" mothers are underrepresented.

[Table 1 about here]

Three-fourths of mothers provided "accurate" reports of fathers' intentions. Although the majority of mothers' proxy reports of fathers' intentions were "accurate," a sizeable minority of couples were characterized by "inaccurate" proxy reports. It was more common for mothers to "inaccurately" report the father intended the birth as a mere 8% of mothers "inaccurately"

reported the father did not intend the birth. Bivariate analyses confirmed that mothers' characteristics varied according to "accuracy" of mothers' proxy reports. Approximately 60% of mothers who provided "accurate" proxy reports intended their birth whereas almost 80% of mothers who "inaccurately" reported the father intended the birth characterized the birth as intended themselves. In contrast 30% of mothers who "inaccurately" reported the father did not intend the birth labeled the birth as intended themselves. These stark differences are statistically significant and provide preliminary evidence that when mothers' proxy reports are "inaccurate," mothers tend to report that fathers share their intentions.

Variation also existed in the distributions of mothers' sociodemographic characteristics across "accuracy" of mothers' proxy reports of fathers' intentions. White mothers made up a significantly larger share of couples where mothers' proxy reports were "accurate" (70%) compared to both couples where mothers "inaccurately" reported fathers intended the birth (55%) *and* couples where the mother "inaccurately" reported fathers did not intend the birth (59%). Although significant variation existed according to racial/ethnic status, all mothers were more likely to provide "accurate" proxy reports (rather than "inaccurate" proxy reports) regardless of racial/ethnic status. Foreign-born mothers were significantly overrepresented among couples where mothers provided "inaccurate" proxy reports, but in spite of these differences, foreign-born mothers remained more likely to provide "accurate" rather than "inaccurate" proxy reports of fathers' intentions. Younger mothers were more likely to belong to couples where the mother "inaccurately" reported the father did not intend the birth. However, mothers who provided "accurate" reports of fathers' intentions and those who "inaccurately" reported he intended the birth were not significantly different in terms of age. Interestingly, there

were no significant differences in the distributions of mothers' educational attainment or relationship status at birth by "accuracy" of mothers' proxy reports.

[Table 2 about here]

Multivariate Results

Net of a mother's sociodemographic characteristics, her own intentions emerge as the most consequential factor influencing "accuracy" of mothers' proxy reports. Consistent with bivariate analyses, mothers who intended the birth are both 1) more likely to "inaccurately" report the father intended the birth and 2) less likely to "inaccurately" report the father did not intend rather than providing consistent reports with fathers. Specifically, a mother's intending the birth increases her odds of "inaccurately" reporting the father intended the birth by approximately 250% whereas her intending the birth reduces her odds of "inaccurately" reporting the father did not intend the birth by 73%. Mothers' own intentions are also significantly related to the type of inconsistency as shown in the last column, a mother's intending the birth greatly reduces her odds of "inaccurately" reporting he did not intend the birth versus "inaccurately" reporting that he did intend the birth (by 93%).

Net of a mother's own intentions, her racial/ethnic status, nativity status, age, and education have no strong significant associations with the "accuracy" of mothers' proxy reports. However, each of these factors is correlated with mothers' intentions making it difficult to discern which factors are most salient. Although relationship status does not have strong, consistently significant linkages with the "accuracy" of mothers' proxy reports of fathers' intentions, there are significant associations. Mothers who did not live with the child's father at birth are less likely than their married counterparts to "inaccurately" report that a father did not intend the birth (rather than provide consistent reports). Similarly, mothers who did not live with

the child's fathers are less likely than their married counterparts to "inaccurately" report he did not intend rather than "inaccurately" report he intended the birth. These associations appear counterintuitive, but sensitivity analyses suggested single mothers in my sample might be a very select group (see discussion).

Predicting couples' intentions

Descriptive Statistics

Next, I turn to analyses that explicitly considered what factors were associated with couple' fertility intentions. Table 3 suggests both that there is variation in couples' fertility intentions and that mothers' sociodemographic characteristics and relationship dynamics vary according to couple-level fertility intentions. Consideration of both parents' perspectives demonstrate less than half (45%) of first births, were intended by both parents. Over one-fourth (27%) of couples experienced disagreement in intentions with 17% of couples having the mother, but not the father intend the birth and 10% of couples having the father, but not the mother intend the birth. Lastly, 28% of firstborn children were not intended by either parent.

[Table 3 about here]

Couples where both parents intended the birth are disproportionately white (75% versus 67%) and black (4% versus 10%). Non-white mothers are overrepresented among couples where only the mother intended the birth. White, Hispanic, and Asian women, mothers were more likely to belong to couples where both parents intended the birth rather than any other "intention scenario" whereas black mothers were more likely to belong to couples where neither parent intended the birth. Foreign-born mothers were disproportionately underrepresented among couples where neither parent intended the birth. Mothers who belonged to couples where the mother intended the birth were older, on average, than couples where the mother did not intend

the birth. College-educated mothers were disproportionately represented among couples where both parents (or at least the mother) intended the birth. In contrast, less-educated mothers were overrepresented among all couples where at least one parent did not intend the birth.

The vast majority of mothers in couples where both parents intended the birth were married to the child's biological father at the time of birth (91%), whereas only 8% and 2% of women in these couples were cohabiting or not living with the child's father, respectively. Among couples where only the father intended the birth, cohabiting mothers are overrepresented whereas both married and "single" mothers are underrepresented among this group. Lastly, couples where neither parent intended the birth are relatively evenly distributed among married (36%), cohabiting (33%), and "single" (31%) mothers, suggesting that both cohabiting and "single" mothers are overrepresented among this group given the overall sample distribution. The majority of married mothers belong to couples where both intended the birth whereas the majority of cohabiting and "single" mothers belong to couples where neither parent intended the birth.

Consideration of couples who were in a coresidential union at the time of the birth suggested very happy relationships were overrepresented among couples where both parents intended the birth and underrepresented among couples where neither parent intended the birth. Conversely, relationship conflict was highest among couples where neither parent intended the birth (18.8), followed by those experiencing disagreement in intentions (17.8), and lowest among those where both parents intended the birth (17.0). Couples where both parents intended the birth reported the longest relationship duration prior to birth, 3.5 years, followed by couples where only the mother intended the birth (2.9 years), those where only the father intended the birth (1.7 years), and finally those where neither parent intended the birth (1.2 years).

Multivariate Results

Table 4 presents relative risk ratios from multivariate, multinomial regression models that predicted couples' intentions. Model 1 included mothers' sociodemographic characteristics whereas Model 2 included only relationship status to the biological father at birth, and Model 3 included all covariates. I adopted this modeling strategy given the pronounced effects of relationship ties that were reported in Table 3. Given small sample sizes, marginally significant findings are both reported in the table and discussed in the text.

[Table 4 about here]

Table 4 demonstrates different characteristics emerge as significant predictors according to which comparisons are being made. When comparing couples where only the mother intended the birth with those where both parents intended the birth, mothers' racial/ethnic status emerges as the only significant predictor in Model 1 such that all minority mothers are more likely than their white counterparts to belong to couples where only the mother (rather than both parents) intended the birth. This effect is most pronounced for black mothers who are 3.71 times as likely as whites to have the only the mother (rather than both parents) intend the birth. Model 2 provides strong evidence that unmarried mothers are more likely than their married counterparts to belong to couples where only the mother intended the birth (OR = 2.78 for cohabiting and OR = 7.75 for "single"). Model 3, confirms that relationship status is the most influential predictor in differentiating couples where only the mother intended the birth from those where both parents intended the birth. Indeed, the previously significant odds ratios for mothers' racial/ethnic status were reduced to nonsignificance, though the odds ratios for black and Asian mothers' remained marginally significant. In contrast, the odds ratios of relationship status remained largely unchanged once mothers' other sociodemographic characteristics were included in the model.

In comparing couples where only the father (rather than both parents) intended the birth, mothers' age and relationship status emerge as the most influential predictors. Model 1 suggests older mothers are less likely to belong to couples where only the father, rather than both parents, intended the birth (OR = 0.83). There are no significant associations with mothers' racial/ethnic status, nativity, or education. Model 2 provides strong evidence that unwed childbearing increases the odds of only the father intending the birth versus both parents intending the birth. In contrast to the previous set of comparisons, fathers who were cohabiting and not living with the child's mother at birth have comparable odds ratios (5.35 and 6.01, respectively). Lastly, Model 3 suggested the association between mothers' age and couples' intentions was more robust than the linkage between relationship status and intentions – at least in differentiating couples where only the father, rather than both parents, intended the birth. There is also marginal evidence that very low maternal education reduces the odds (OR = 0.50) of only the father, rather than both parents intended the birth.

When comparing couples where neither parent intended the birth with those where both parents did, all sociodemographic characteristics are significant predictors in at least one model. In Model 1, black and Asian mothers are more likely than their white counterparts to belong to couples where neither parent intended the birth (OR = 3.54 and 2.59, respectively). In contrast, foreign-born and older mothers are less likely to belong to couples where neither parent (rather than both parents) intended the birth (respective OR = 0.58 and 0.78). Mothers with some college experience but no degree are twice as likely as their college-educated counterparts to belong to couples where neither parent (rather than both parents) intended the birth. A similar association exists in comparing mothers who were high school graduates with those having a bachelor's degree, but this effect only approaches statistical significance (OR = 1.72). Model 2 indicates

that unwed childbearing greatly increases a couples' odds of neither parent intended the birth rather than both parents, and this linkage is most pronounced when comparing parents who were not living with the child's father at birth to their married counterparts.

Model 3 demonstrates the relationship context at birth greatly reduces the odds ratios of mothers' race, nativity, and educational attainment. Mothers' age at birth remains a significant predictor net of relationship status such that each additional year in mothers' age corresponds to an 18% decrease in the odds of neither parent intending the birth rather than both parents. The odds ratios of mothers' education are no longer significant once relationship ties to birth fathers are considered, though weak evidence suggests mothers with some college experience are more likely than their college-educated counterparts to belong to couples where neither parent (rather than both parents) intended the birth (OR = 1.76). Although the linkages between relationship status and couples' intentions are greatly reduced, both remain strong predictors and are associated with an increase in the odds of neither parent (rather than both parents) intending the birth compared to their married counterparts.

Relationship Dynamics

The last set of analyses is limited to couples who were in a coresidential relationship at the birth. Results from Model 1 are consistent with the full model from Table 4. Therefore, the discussion of these results is limited to the associations between relationship dynamics and couples' intentions.

[Table 5 about here]

Relationship conflict is the only relationship dynamic that remains statistically significant across all comparison groups. However, relationship duration significantly differentiates couples where both parents intended the birth from those where the mother did not intend the birth.

Positive relationship quality appears to be the least salient relationship dynamic as it is only marginally significant for one of three comparison groups. Net of mothers' sociodemographic characteristics and relationship status at birth, higher levels of conflict are associated with a higher odds that 1) *only* the mother (OR = 1.05), 2) *only* the father (OR = 1.08), or 3) neither parent (OR = 1.11) intended the birth rather than both parents. In contrast, net of all covariates, longer relationship durations (prior to the birth) are associated with a lower odds that *only* the father (OR = 0.74) or neither parent (OR = 0.61) intended the birth rather than both parents. Relationship duration is not a significant factor differentiating couples where *only* the mother (rather than both parents) intended the birth.

DISCUSSION

Drawing on a family systems perspective and prior research on couples' fertility desires and outcomes (e.g., Beckman et al., 1983; Fried & Udry, 1979; Thomson, 1997), I suggested that both mothers' and fathers' reports of fertility intentions should be considered jointly to model couple's disagreement in fertility intentions in addition to intention status. Although I am not the first to make this argument, my analyses make notable contributions to the limited work on couples' unintended childbearing (see Korenmamn et al, 2002; Hohmann-Marriott, 2009; Martin et al., 2007; Moore et al., 2009; Saleem & Surkan, 2013; Williams, 1994). I focused on first-time mothers and fathers since the transition to parenthood is an important life course event (Rindfuss, 1991) and some have cautioned that births should not be treated as isolated, independent events (Guzzo & Hayford, 2011).

Arguably, two factors have hampered research on couples' childbearing intentions. The scarcity of couple-level data asking both mothers and fathers about fertility intentions is key. To the best of my knowledge, the ECLS-B are the only large-scale data that can be used to measure

couples' unintended childbearing directly, in the U.S. context. In addition, research has voiced concerns over the quality of male fertility data (see Joyner et al., 2012). These concerns are further compounded by difficulty in successfully recruiting disadvantaged, nonresident fathers in data collection efforts. By considering the sample-selection biases that arise from excluding mothers who cannot be matched with corresponding data from the biological father and considering the "accuracy" of mothers' proxy reports of fathers' intentions, I weigh the costs and benefits of incorporating fathers' perspectives into discussions of couples' unintended childbearing and assess the quality of mothers' proxy reports. Prior to these analyses, I am unware of any research that explicitly considered the both the "accuracy" of mothers' proxy, retrospective reports of fathers' intentions and the factors that are associated with the "accuracy" of these proxy reports.

By limiting the sample to mothers with corresponding data for the child's biological father, analyses were less likely to include black (rather than white) mothers, those who were foreign-born, mothers with a high school diploma or less (rather than those who had at least a bachelor's degree), and those who were cohabiting or not living with (rather than married to) the child's biological father at the time of birth. The exclusion of these mothers in discussions of unintended childbearing is problematic as, with the exception of foreign-born mothers; all are more likely to experience an unintended birth (Finer & Henshaw, 2006; Finer & Zolna, 2011; Musick, 2202; Musick et al., 2009). Although Williams' (1994) analyses found disadvantaged women were more likely to report couple disagreement in intentions compared to their relatively advantaged counterparts, sensitivity analyses suggested fathers' participation in the survey was not associated with indirect measures of couples' intentions net of mothers' sociodemographic characteristics.

Should mothers' proxy reports of fathers' intentions be "accurate," the use of mothers' proxy reports could reduce the problems stemming from the "missing men bias." Yet, among a relatively privileged sample, one-in-four mothers' provided "inaccurate" reports of fathers' intentions. Support for my hypotheses regarding the "accuracy" of mothers' proxy reports was mixed. I expected that married mothers provided more "accurate" proxy reports than their unwed counterparts, but I found that either 1) no differences existed between the "accuracy" of married and unmarried mothers' proxy reports or 2) mothers who were not living with the child's father at the time of birth were less likely to "inaccurately" report the father did not intend the birth (rather than provide "accurate" proxy reports) compared to their married counterparts. This finding is counterintuitive, but results from sensitivity analyses suggested that mothers who were not living with the child's father at the time of birth but have corresponding data for the child's biological father might be comprised of a very select group. Separately, I hypothesized that relatively disadvantaged mothers were less likely to provide "accurate" reports with fathers due to high levels of ambivalence among disadvantaged and minority parents, but analyses did not provide support for this hypotheses. Rather, I found weak evidence that black and Hispanic mothers (rather than white mothers) were more likely to "inaccurately" report the father intended the birth. Although mothers' intentions were not associated with "accuracy" per se, I found strong, consistent evidence that when mothers' proxy reports were "inaccurate," mothers are more likely to report fathers shared their own intentions.

In sum, measurement analyses suggested the majority of mothers' proxy reports were accurate, but a sizeable minority of couples provided inconsistent reports. Mothers' sociodemographic characteristics were not strongly associated with "accuracy" of their proxy reports net of their own intentions. Taken together, these results suggest that if researchers

emphasizing couples' fertility intentions chose to retain a more representative sample of mothers (at the expense of incorporating fathers' own perspectives), doing so will likely underestimate disagreement in couples' intentions. Consequently, if researchers prefer to have a more precise measure of couples' intentions, doing so results in a relatively privileged sample of mothers and likely underestimates unintended childbearing. Ultimately, there are considerable advantages and disadvantages associated with using fathers' direct versus mothers' proxy reports of fathers' intentions, and researchers should weigh the costs and benefits given their research questions while being mindful of the limitations of each approach in interpreting results.

A second set of analyses considered what sociodemographic characteristics and relationship dynamics were associated with couples' fertility intentions. Prior work examining couple-level unintended childbearing considered the association between couple's intentions and multiple indicators of maternal and child well-being, without first examining what factors predict or are associated with couples' fertility intentions (see Hohmann-Marriott, 2009; Korenman et al., 2002; Martin et al., 2007; Saleem & Surkan, 2013). Williams (1994) provided a notable exception in that she explicitly predicted couples' intentions, but her analyses relied on mothers' proxy reports of fathers' intentions and used data from the 1980s. Results indicated that the relationship context of the birth appeared most consequential, but a number of other factors (e.g., racial/ethnic status, age at birth, education, relationship conflict, and duration prior to birth) were associated with couples' intentions as well.

Research documenting the prevalence on unintended childbearing notes that more than one-in-three births is unintended by mothers (see Mosher et al., 2012). This statistic is frequently cited to justify that unintended childbearing in the contemporary U.S. is an important social problem. Consideration of couples' fertility intentions suggests focusing on one parent's

perspective underestimates the impact of unintended childbearing on children's well-being as over half of firstborn children were characterized as either unwanted or mistimed by at least one parent. Over a quarter of firstborn children were intended by neither parent. Further, mothers' sociodemographic characteristics, relationship context, and relationship dynamics were associated with couples' intentions.

Drawing on a variety of work concerning the intersection of gender, socioeconomic disadvantage, and parenthood (e.g., Anderson, 1999; Edin & Kefalas, 2005; Maccoby, 1998; Townsend, 2002), I developed competing hypotheses that suggested why a mother or father might be more likely to intend a birth. Consistent with gender socialization and doing gender perspectives, I found that among couples experiencing disagreement in intentions; it was more common for the mother to intend the birth. The linkages between sociodemographic characteristics and couples' intentions also varied depending on which "intention scenarios" (i.e., only mother intended, only father intended, or neither parent intended) were compared. Specifically, relationship ties to the birth father were the most salient factor associated with the mother, but not the father, intending the birth. In contrast, mothers' age was the most salient factor related to the father's, but not the mother's intending a birth. Mothers' racial/ethnic status, age, education, relationship status at birth are all associated with a couple's risk of neither parent (rather than both parents) intending the birth. These findings suggest that "intention scenarios" are distinctive and differentiating which parent intended the birth provides a nuanced understanding of the birth context, which is likely linked with both parental and child well-being.

Relationship status was the most robust correlate of couples' intentions. Indeed, at least one form of nonmarital childbearing was significantly linked with couples' intentions net of mothers' other sociodemographic characteristics across all comparisons, whereas couples who

were married at the time of the birth were more likely to both intend the birth compared to their unwed counterparts, which was consistent with my hypotheses. This association was pronounced and remained largely unchanged once mothers' other sociodemographic characteristics were considered. I also found evidence that mothers who belonged to racial/ethnic minorities, were younger, and less educated were more likely to belong to couples where at least one parent did not intend the birth rather than both parents intending the birth, which was consistent with hypotheses. Although many of these associations were reduced to either marginal or nonsignificance once relationship status was considered, prior research found that mothers' age, education, and racial/ethnic status are all associated with the relationship status at birth (see Carlson & Furstenberg, 2006; Guzzo & Furstenberg, 2007). This suggests parsing out the effects of sociodemographic characteristics versus relationship status at birth is challenging and not necessarily theoretically meaningful. Of note, older mothers were less likely to belong to couples where neither parent – or only the father – intended the birth (rather than at least the mother intended the birth). Asian mothers were more likely than their white counterparts to have neither (rather than both) parent(s) intend the birth; although this seems counterintuitive other work with the ECLS-B found similar results (Guzman et al, 2010), which might be influenced by heterogeneity among Asians. For couples who lived together at the time of birth, relationship conflict was positively correlated with at least one or both parent(s) not intending the birth whereas relationship duration was protective in comparing couples where both parent intended the birth versus those where only the father or neither parent intended the birth. These findings were largely consistent with my hypotheses.

This study advances research on unintended fertility by developing a framework to understand the intersection of gender, fertility intentions, and parenthood, assessing the costs and

benefits associated with using fathers' own perspectives to construct couple-level intentions, and examining the association between mothers' sociodemographic characteristics and relationship dynamics with couples' intentions. However, analyses are not without limitations. Most notably, analyses that predicted couples' fertility intentions were conducted on a select sample that omitted mothers who were at the greatest risk of experiencing an unintended birth. Therefore, these results are not generalizable to the larger population in spite of the ECLS-B being a nationally representative data set. The lack of generalizability of findings raises concerns, but the present study provides a noteworthy compliment work that has already documented the prevalence of unintended childbearing (see Finer & Zolna, 2011). Indeed, prevalence of estimates of fathers' unintended fertility might be ill-advised given challenges with including disadvantaged, men, who are more likely to experience an unintended birth (see Lindberg & Kost, 2013), in samples (see Martin, 2007; Sorenson, 1997; Stykes et al., 2013).

My operationalization of unintended fertility mirrors the limited work on couples' intentions (see Hohmann-Marriott, 2009; Martin et al., 2007; Moore et al., 2009; Korenmann et al., 2002; Saleem & Surkan, 2013; Williams, 1994), which has been found to retain face validity and reliability (see Santelli et., 2009), but retrospective, binary measures of unintended fertility are certainly not ideal (see Augustine et al., 2009; Edin & Kefalas, 2005). Consideration of more nuanced constructs, such as ambivalence, was beyond the scope of this study but would provide key insights into discussion of couples' fertility intentions. Lastly, as these analyses are cross-sectional, it becomes difficult to parse out temporal ordering or discuss potential causal mechanisms such as relationship quality. Therefore, my analyses predicting couples' intentions are limited in that I can only speak to the associations between sociodemographic characteristics, relationship dynamics, and couples' fertility intentions.

In spite of these limitations, this study provides a foundation that could inform future work and answer a host of other research questions related to couples' fertility intentions. Conclusions based on the measurement analyses allow researchers to assess the viability of using mothers' reports of fathers' intentions available in alternative data sources, such as the NSFG and NLSY79. Collectively, the ECLS-B, NSFG, and NLSY79 could be used to address a wide variety of research questions, which would greatly expand the possibilities for research on couples' unintended childbearing, family dynamics, transitions, and processes and their linkages with individual well-being. In other ongoing projects, I build off of this conceptual framework to link couples' unintended childbearing to numerous indicators of parent and child well-being. Finally, these results raise important policy implications. Unintended childbearing has emerged as an important social problem given its relatively high prevalence in the contemporary U.S., and these results indicate that prior work focusing solely on mothers' perspectives underestimates the share of children who are potentially influenced by a parent's not intending their birth. Future programs can strive to encourage parents to be more communicative in terms of their childbearing desires and contraceptive use and help parents effectively co-parent in spite of differences in intentions could be useful as over a quarter of all first-time parents report disagreement in terms of their intentions.

REFERENCES

Anderson, E. (1999). *Code of the street: Decency, violence, and the moral life of the inner city*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc.

Augustine, J.M., Nelson, T., Edin, K. (2009). Why do poor men have children? Fertility intentions among low-income unmarried U.S. fathers. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* 624(1), 99-117.

Axinn, W.G., Barber, J.S. & Thornton, A. (1998). The Long-term Impact of Parent's Childbearing Decisions on Children's Self-Esteem. *Demography,* 35(4), 435-443.

Barber, J.S., Axinn, W.G., & Thornton, A. (1999). Unwanted childbearing, health, and mother-child relationships. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior,* 40(3), 231-257.

Beckman, L.J., Aizenberg, R., Forsythe, A.B., Day, T. (1983). A theoretical analysis of antecedent's of young couples' fertility decisions and outcomes. *Demography*, 20(4), 519-533.

Bronte-Tinkew, J., Ryan, S., Carrano, J., & Moore, K.A. (2007). Resident Fathers' Pregnancy Intentions, Prenatal Behaviors, and Links to Involvement with Infants. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69(4), 977-990.

Bronte-Tinkew, J., Scott, M.E., Horowitz, A., & Johnson, D. (2009). Male Pregnancy Intendedness and Children's Mental Proficiency and Attachment Security during Toddlerhood. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71(4), 1001-1025.

Cancian, M., Meyer, D.R., & Cook, S.T. (2011). The evolution of family complexity from the perspective of nonmarital children. *Demography,* 48(3), 957-982.

Carlson, M.J. & Furstenberg, F.F. (2006). The prevalence and correlates of multipartnered fertility among US parents. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(3), 718-732.

Carlson, M.J., VanOrman, A.G., & Pilskauskas, N.V. (2013). Examining the antecedents of U.S. nonmarital fatherhood. *Demography*, 50(4), 1421-1447.

Chodorow, N.J. (1978). *The reproduction of mothering.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Conger, R.D., Conger, K.J, Martin, M.J. (2010). Socioeconomic status, family processes, and individual development. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(3), 685-704.

Crissey, S.R. (2005). The effect of pregnancy intention on child well-being and development: Combining retrospective reports of attitude and contraceptive use. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 24(6), 593-615.

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

Finer, L.B. & Henshaw, S.K. (2006). Disparities in rates of unintended pregnancy in the United States, 1994 and 2001. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 38(2), 90-96.

Finer, L.B. & Zolna, M.R. (2011). Unintended pregnancy in the United States: Incidence and disparities, 2006. *Contraception*, 84(5), 478-485.

Fried, E.S. & Udry, J.R. (1979). Wives' and husbands' expected costs and benefits of childbearing as predictors of pregnancy. *Biodemography and Social Biology*, 26(4), 265-274.

Greene, M.E. & Biddlecom, A.E. (2000). Absent and problematic men: Demographic accounts of male reproductive roles. *Population and Development Review*, 26(1), 81-115.

Guzzo, K.B. & Furstenberg, F.F. (2007). Multipartnered fertility among American men. *Demography*, 44(3), 583-601.

Guzzo, K.B. & Hayford, S. (2011). Fertility Following an Unintended First Birth. *Demography*, 48(4), 1493-1516.

Hayford, S. & Guzzo, K.B. (2013). Racial and ethnic variation in unmarried young adults' motivation to avoid pregnancy. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 45(1), 41-51.

Hetherington, E.M. (1979). Divorce: A child's perspective. *American Psychologist,* 34(10), 851-858.

Hohmann-Marriott, B. (2009). The couple context of pregnancy and its effects on prenatal care and birth outcomes. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, 13(6), 745-754.

Joyce, T.J., Kaestner, R., & Korenmann, S. (2000). The stability of pregnancy intentions and pregnancy-related maternal behaviors. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, 4(3), 171-178.

Joyce, T.J., Kaestner, R., & Korenmann, S. (2002). On the validity of retrospective assessments of pregnancy intention. *Demography,* 39(1), 199-213.

Joyner, K., Peters, H.E., Hynes, K., Sikora, A., Taber, J.R., Rendall, M.S. (2012). The quality of male fertility data in major U.S. surveys. *Demography*, 49(1), 101-124.

Korenmann, S., Kaestner, R., & Joyce, T. (2002). Consequences for Infants of Parental Disagreement in Pregnancy Intention. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 34(3), 198-205.

Lindberg, L.D. & Kost, K. (2013). Exploring U.S. Men's Birth Intentions. *Maternal and Child Health Journal,* 18(3), 625-633.

Maccoby, E.E. (1998). *The two sexes: Growing up apart, coming together.* Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

Manlove, J., Welti, K., Barry, M., Peterson, K., Schelar, E., & Wildsmith, E. (2011). Relationship characteristics and contraceptive use among young adults. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 43(2), 119-128.

Manning, W.D., Flanigan, C.M., Giordanno, P.C., Longmore, M.A. (2009). Relationship dynamics and consistency of condom use among adolescents. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 41(3), 181-190.

Marsiglio, W. (1998). *Procreative man*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Martin, E. (2007). Strength of attachment: Survey coverage of people with tenuous ties to residences. *Demography*, 44(2), 427-440.

Martin, L.T., McNamara, M.J., Milot, A.S., Halle, T., & Hair, E.C. (2007). The effects of father involvement during pregnancy on receipt of prenatal care and maternal smoking. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, 11(6), 595-602.

Maxson, P. & Miranda, M.L. (2011). Pregnancy intention, demographic differences, and psychosocial health. *Journal of Women's Health*, 20(8), 1215-1223.

Miller, W.B., Sable, M.R., & Beckmeyer, J.J. (2009). Preconception motivation and pregnancy wantedness: Pathways to toddler attachment security. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71(5), 1174-1192.

Moore, K.A., Ryan, S., Manlove, J., Mincieli, L., & Schelar, E. (2009). High-risk subsequent births among co-residential couples: The role of fathers, mothers, and couples. *Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research, & Practice about Men as Fathers*, 7(1), 91-102.

Morgan, S.P. (1985). Individual and couple intentions for more children: A research note. *Demography*, 22(1), 125-132.

Mosher, W.D., Jones, J., & Abma, J.C. (2012). Intended and Unintended births in the United States: 1982-2010. National Health Statistics Report, 55.

Musick, K. (2002). Planned and Unplanned Childbearing among Unmarried Women. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64(4), 915-929.

Musick, K., England, P., Edginton, S., & Kangas, N. (2009). Education Differences in Intended and Unintended Fertility. *Social Forces*, 88(2), 543-572.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2004). *User's manual for the ECLS-B nine-month restricted-use data file and electronic codebook.* Washington, DC.

Nock, S.L. (1998). *Marriage in men's lives.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Rindfuss, R.R. (1991). The young adult years: Diversity, structural change, and fertility. *Demography*, 28(4), 493-512.

Saleem, H.T. & Surkan, P.J. (2013). Parental pregnancy wantedness and child social-emotional development. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, 18(4), 930-938.

Santelli, J.S., Lindberg, L.D., Orr, M., Finer, L.B., & Speizer, I. (2009). Toward a multidimensional measure of pregnancy intentions: Evidence from the United States. *Studies in Family Planning*, 40(2), 87-100.

Sorenson, E. (1997). A national profile of nonresident fathers and their ability to pay child support. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 59(4), 785-797.

Stewart, S.D. (2005). Boundary ambiguity in stepfamilies. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26(7), 1002-1029.

Stykes, J.B., Manning, W.D., & Brown, S.L. (2013). Nonresident fathers and formal child support: Evidence from the CPS, NSFG, and SIPP. *Demographic Research*, 29(46), 1299-1330.

Su, J.H. (2012). Pregnancy intentions and parents' psychological well-being. *Journal of Marriage and Family,* 74(5), 1182-1196.

Thomson, E. (1997). Couple childbearing, desires, intentions, and births. *Demography*, 34(3), 343-354.

Townsend, N.W. (2002). *Package deal: Marriage, work, and fatherhood in men's lives.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

West, C. & Zimmerman, D.H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society,* 1(2), 125-151.

White, J.M. & Klein, D.M. (2008). *Family Theories*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Williams, L.B. (1994). Determinants of couple agreement in U.S. fertility intentions. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 26(4), 169-174.

Williams, R. & Thomson, E. (1985). Can spouses be trusted? A look at husband/wife proxy reports. *Demography*, 22(1), 115-123.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics, by "Accuracy" of Mothers' Proxy Reports (weighted)

	Total	*"Accurate" Proxy Report*	*Mother "Inaccurately" Reported He Intended*	*Mother "Inaccurately" Reported He Did Not Intend*
	% or μ	% or μ	% or μ	% or μ
Mother intended birth*	62.5	61.4[bc]	81.8[ac]	31.2[ab]
(row %)	--	73.1[bc]	23.0[ac]	3.9[ab]
*Mother's Racial/ethnic Status**				
White	66.8	70.4[b]	55.2[a]	58.8
(row %)	--	78.5[bc]	14.5[ac]	6.9[ab]
Black	9.8	8.9	13.1	10.9
(row %)	--	67.7[bc]	23.5[ac]	8.8[ab]
Hispanic	19.4	17.0[b]	26.3	26.4
(row %)	--	65.4[bc]	23.8[ac]	10.8[ab]
Asian	4.0	3.7[b]	5.4	3.9
(row %)	--	68.5[bc]	23.7[ac]	7.8[ab]
Mother foreign-born*	19.2	16.5[bc]	26.8[a]	27.8[a]
(row %)	--	64.1[bc]	24.5[ac]	11.4[ab]
Mother's Age*	25.4	25.4[c]	26.2[c]	23.4[ac]
Standard deviation	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.5
Mother's Educational Attainment				
At least a Bachelor's	32.4	33.5	31.1	25.1
(row %)	--	77.0[bc]	16.9[ac]	6.1[ab]
Some college	29.0	28.4	30.7	30.5
(row %)	--	73.1[bc]	18.6[ac]	8.3[ab]
HS/GED	24.6	24.7	24.0	24.6
(row %)	--	75.0[bc]	17.2[ac]	7.8[ab]
Less than HS/GED	14.0	13.4	14.2	19.8
(row %)	--	71.1[bc]	17.8[a]	11.1[a]
Relationship to Bio. Father at Birth				
Married	69.5	70.4	70.0	60.2
(row %)	--	75.5[bc]	17.7[ac]	6.8[ab]
Cohabiting	18.0	16.7[c]	17.5[c]	30.9[ab]
(row %)	--	69.3[bc]	17.2[a]	13.5[a]
Not in a co-residential union	12.5	12.9	12.5	8.9
(row %)	--	76.9[bc]	17.5[ac]	5.6[ab]
Total	100.0	74.5	17.6	7.9

Please note * suggests there is significant variation according to the couple's consistency in mother's and father's reports of father's intentions. "a" denotes a significant ($p<0.05$) difference from couples with consistent reports, "b" denotes a significant difference from couples where the father did not intend, but the mother said he did, and "c" denotes a significant difference from couples where the father intended the birth, but the mother said he did not.

Table 2. Assessing "Accuracy" of Mothers' Proxy Reports of Fathers' Intentions (relative risk ratios)

	("Accurate" Proxy Reports)		(Mother "inaccurately" reported he intended)
	Mother "inaccurately" Reported He Intended	Mother "inaccurately" Reported He Did Not Intend	Mother "inaccurately" reported he did not intend
Mother intended birth	3.47***	0.27**	0.07***
(White)			
Black	2.19†	1.29	0.59
Hispanic	1.65†	1.31	0.79
Asian	1.60	0.78	0.48†
Mother foreign-born	1.26	1.95	1.54
Mother's age (years)	1.01	0.96	0.95
(At least a Bachelor's)			
Some college	1.27	0.89	0.70
High school (or GED)	1.19	0.68	0.57
Less than high school	1.17	0.85	0.73
(Married)			
Cohabiting	1.48	1.14	0.76
Not living together	1.43	0.37*	0.26*
Intercept	0.04***	0.42	10.34*
Global F Statistic		5.04***	
N		1,650	

Please note † ($p<0.10$), * ($p<0.05$), ** ($p<0.01$), *** ($p<0.001$).

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics, by Couple's Intentions (weighted)

	Total	*Both Intended*	*Mother Intended, Father did Not*	*Father Intended, Mother did Not*	*Neither Intended*
	% or μ	% or μ	% or μ	% or μ	% or μ
Mother's Racial/ethnic Status[*]					
White	66.8	74.5[bd]	58.1[a]	63.8	60.8[a]
(row %)	--	50.5[bcd]	15.0[acd]	9.4[abd]	25.1[abc]
Black	9.8	3.7[bd]	11.4[ad]	9.1[d]	19.1[abc]
(row %)	--	17.1[d]	20.1[cd]	9.1[bd]	53.7[abc]
Hispanic	19.4	17.8	24.6	23.0	17.3
(row %)	--	41.7[bcd]	21.9[ac]	11.8[abd]	24.6[ac]
Asian	4.0	4.0[b]	5.9[ad]	4.1	2.8[b]
(row %)	--	45.2[bcd]	25.5[ac]	10.3[abd]	19.0[ac]
Mother foreign-born[*]	19.2	20.3[d]	26.4[d]	20.1	12.7[ab]
(row %)	--	47.8[bcd]	23.8[ac]	10.3[abd]	18.1[ac]
Mother's Age[*]	25.4	27.9[cd]	27.0[cd]	23.2[abd]	21.2[abc]
Standard deviation	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.5	0.2
Mother's Educational Attainment[*]					
At least a Bachelor's	32.4	45.7[bcd]	34.5[ad]	27.8[ad]	10.9[abc]
(row %)	--	63.9[bcd]	18.4[acd]	8.5[ab]	9.2[ab]
Some college	29.0	27.1	31.3	26.6	31.6
(row %)	--	42.3[bcd]	18.6[ac]	9.1[abd]	30.0[abc]
HS/GED	24.6	18.4[d]	21.5[d]	26.9	35.8[ab]
(row %)	--	33.9[bc]	15.1[ad]	10.9[ad]	40.1[bc]
Less than HS/GED	14.0	8.8[cd]	12.7[d]	18.7[a]	21.7[ab]
(row %)	--	28.5[bcd]	15.6[ad]	13.2[ad]	42.7[abc]
Relationship to Bio. Father at Birth[*]					
Married	69.5	90.5[bcd]	71.1[ad]	63.3[ad]	36.3[abc]
(row %)	--	58.9[bcd]	17.7[ac]	9.0[abd]	14.4[ac]
Cohabiting	18.0	7.5[bcd]	16.4[ac]	28.1[ab]	32.6[ab]
(row %)	--	18.8[d]	15.8[d]	15.4[d]	50.0[abc]
Not in a co-residential union	12.5	2.0[bcd]	12.5[ad]	8.6[ad]	31.1[abc]
(row%)	--	7.4[d]	17.2[cd]	6.8[bd]	68.6[abc]

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics by Couples' Intentions, continued

	Total	*Both Intended*	*Mother Intended, Father did Not*	*Father Intended, Mother did Not*	*Neither Intended*
	% or μ	% or μ	% or μ	% or μ	% or μ
Very happy relationship[1*]	75.9	83.4[bd]	74.2[ad]	76.9[d]	59.1[abc]
(row %)		56.4[bcd]	16.7[ac]	9.9[abd]	17.0[ac]
Relationship conflict[1*]	17.6	17.0[bd]	17.8[ac]	17.8[d]	18.8[abc]
Standard deviation	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.2
Relationship duration prior to birth (yrs)[1*]	2.8	3.5[bcd]	2.9[acd]	1.7[abd]	1.2[abc]
Standard deviation	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.0
Total	100.0	45.3	17.3	9.9	27.5

Please note * suggests there is significant variation according to the couple's consistency in mother's and father's reports of father's intentions. "a" denotes a significant ($p<0.05$) difference from couples where both intended, "b" denotes a significant difference from couples the mother intended, but the father did not, "c" denotes a significant difference from couples where the father intended the birth, but the mother did not, and "d" denotes a significant difference from couples where neither parent intended the birth.

1. Limited to 1,450 couples in a coresidential relationship at the birth.

Table 4. Multinomial Models Predicting Couples' Fertility Intentions, all couples (relative risk ratios)

	(Both intended)			(Both intended)			(Both Intended)		
	Mother intended, father did not			Father intended, mother did not			Neither intended		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Mother's Race/ethnicity									
(White)									
Black	3.71**		2.23†	1.99		1.75	3.54**		1.71
Hispanic	1.57†		1.32	1.06		0.97	0.78		0.57†
Asian	2.13*		1.88†	1.89		1.89	2.59**		2.16*
Mother foreign-born	0.96		1.19	0.85		0.89	0.58*		0.86
Mother's age (years)	0.99		1.01	0.83***		0.84***	0.78***		0.82***
Mother's Education									
(College degree)									
Some college	1.43		1.33	0.87		0.82	2.04**		1.76†
HS/GED	1.32		1.06	0.78		0.67	1.72†		1.18
Less than HS/GED	1.47		0.99	0.69		0.50†	1.19		0.64
(Married)									
Cohabiting		2.78***	2.82***		5.35***	3.00**		10.87***	5.39***
Not living together		7.75***	7.07**		6.01**	2.15		37.99***	11.43***
Intercept	0.31†	0.30***	0.15**	21.71***	0.15***	14.26**	152.08***	0.24***	32.73***
Global F Statistic	8.16***	21.83***	8.01***	8.16***	21.83***	8.01***	8.16***	21.83***	8.01***
N					1,650				

Please note † (p<0.10), * (p<0.05), ** (p<0.01), *** (p<0.001).

Table 5. Predicting Couples' Fertility Intentions, limited to couples in a coresidential union (relative risk ratios)

	(Both intended)					
	Mother intend, father did not		Father intend, mother did not		Neither intended	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Very happy relationship	--	0.81	--	1.08	--	0.61†
Relationship conflict	--	1.05*	--	1.08**	--	1.11***
Duration of relationship prior to birth (years)	--	0.92	--	0.74**	--	0.61***
Mother's Race/ethnicity						
(White)						
Black	3.88**	3.78**	2.03	1.88	3.68*	2.60
Hispanic	1.45	1.54	1.18	1.28	0.59	0.55†
Asian	2.17*	2.11*	1.90	1.72	2.21*	1.85
Mother foreign-born	1.08	1.08	0.92	0.92	0.82	0.89
Mother's age at birth	1.01	1.02	0.86***	0.90**	0.82***	0.88***
Mother's Education						
(College)						
Some College	1.53	1.45	0.79	0.69	1.83†	1.54
HS/GED	1.04	1.09	0.58	0.54	1.31	1.28
Less than HS/GED	1.13	1.17	0.41†	0.39†	0.61	0.64
Married at birth	0.33**	0.36**	0.28**	0.30**	0.19***	0.21***
Intercept	0.44	0.14*	33.36***	3.76	180.08***	15.31*
Global F-statistic	8.09***	6.47***	8.09***	6.47***	8.09***	6.47***
Unweighted N	1,450					

Please note † (p<0.10), * (p<0.05), ** (p<0.01), *** (p<0.001).