"Unintended Childbearing and Marital Instability: An Emphasis on Couples' Intentions"

Objective: We consider variation in couples' fertility intentions among first, marital births and examine the subsequent linkages between unintended childbearing and marital instability.

Background: Little is known about unintended fertility within marriage, including whether parents agree on birth intentionality. Understanding couples' joint characterization of the intentionality of marital births may help illuminate the process by which unintended fertility raises the risk of union instability.

Method: Using the 2006-2015 cycles of the National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG), we create a couple-level indicator of unintended childbearing using women's reports of their own and their partners' intentions, focusing on women who had a first birth within marriage (N = 3,963). We predict "intention scenarios": both intended, only mother intended, only father intended, neither intended from fertility characteristics, relationship experiences, and sociodemographic characteristics. Then, we use discrete-time event history models to consider the association between couples' intentions and marital instability.

Results: Nearly one-third of first, marital births were categorized as unintended by one (15%) or both parents (15%). Fertility characteristics and relationship experiences were associated with "intention scenarios". In unconditional models, the odds of dissolution were higher if either or both parents considered the birth unintended relative to when both parents intended the birth. After controlling for covariates, though, only births that were unintended by the father have an elevated risk of dissolution, by about 30%.

Conclusion: Married mothers who intend their first birth but perceive that their husband did not may face relationship challenges that elevate the risk of dissolution.

Unintended and nonmarital childbearing in the United States is disproportionately concentrated among younger, less-educated, and non-white parents (Finer & Henshaw, 2006; Finer & Zolna, 2011; Musick, England, Edginton, & Kangas, 2009). Unintended fertility is associated with poorer outcomes and lower well-being for both parents and children (Barber, Axinn, & Thornton, 1999; Lindberg, Maddow-Zimet, Kost, & Lincoln, 2015; Miller, Sable, & Beckmeyer, 2009), although the causal linkage is sometimes debated (e.g., Lindberg, Maddow-Zimet, Kost, & Lincoln, 2015; Su, 2012). In response, family scholars have identified unintended and nonmarital childbearing as contemporary social problems, with the potential to both reproduce and exacerbate existing structural inequalities in the United States.

A wealth of recent scholarship has addressed this social problem. Yet, most discourse in the field assumes that unintended and nonmarital childbearing are more or less synonymous. As a result, unintended childbearing is typically discussed in the context of single mothers or among those in less stable contexts, such as cohabitation, with married mothers treated as the comparison group. Descriptively speaking, compelling evidence justifies such an approach. Guzzo's (2017) analyses of the most recent rounds of the NSFG reported that over three-fourths of births to married women are intended compared to just over half of cohabiting births and one-third of single births. Scholarship that considers unintended childbearing as a social problem, in the context of nonmarital births, has made noteworthy contributions to our understanding of the decoupling of marriage and childbearing, the reproduction of structural inequalities, and its linkages with health and well-being. Yet, we caution the field's targeted approach that emphasizes unintended childbearing among unwed mothers has somewhat hampered our understanding of unintended childbearing among married parents. Existing work on unintended childbearing and union instability has either (1) focused on unintended childbearing and

transitions among cohabiting parents (Guzzo & Hayford, 2014; Manlove, Wildsmith, Ikramullah, Ryan, Holcombe, Scott, & Peterson, 2012) or (2) focused on birth intentions and union trajectories broadly without a specific focus on marital instability (Guzzo & Hayford, 2012; Lichter, Michelmore, Turner, & Sassler, 2016; Maddow-Zimet, Lindberg, Kost, & Lincoln, 2016). Arguably, this narrow focus, and the lack of attention to unintended childbearing among married couples, is a notable shortcoming as existing research suggested unintended childbearing was a particularly salient predictor of marital instability – having a stronger, negative association with married parents compared to their cohabiting counterparts (Guzzo & Hayford, 2012).

Our analyses examine what factors (i.e., birth characteristics, relationship and fertility histories, or sociodemographic characteristics) explain how unintended childbearing differs among marital births and then consider subsequent linkages with marital instability among a nationally representative sample of first-time mothers. We assert a quasi-couple-level approach to unintended marital fertility provides a meaningful lens to guide this endeavor, and in so doing, our findings make noteworthy contributions to existing research. First and foremost, our findings demonstrate that first marital births should not be treated as a homogenous birth context, as variation exists in couples' intentions, relationship and fertility histories, and sociodemographic characteristics. Second, multivariate findings suggest that different "intention scenarios" (i.e., both intended, only the mother intended, only the father intended, and neither intended the birth) reflect substantial differences in fertility and relationship histories rather than sociodemographic characteristics. Third, consideration of couples' intentions within a multivariate framework indicates that when the mother perceives her partner did not intend the birth, there is an elevated risk of instability regardless of whether she did, or did not, intend the birth.

BACKGROUND

Unintended childbearing is disproportionately concentrated among mothers who report lower levels of social, economic, and demographic privilege. Specifically, those who reported being non-white, less educated, impoverished, and younger at the time of birth are more likely to categorize a birth as unintended (Finer & Henshaw, 2006; Finer & Zolna, 2011; Musick et al. 2009). Moreover, scholarship has demonstrated that births to single and cohabiting mothers are highly likely to be unintended (Finer & Zolna, 2011; Guzman, Wildsmith, Manlove, and Franzetta, 2010; Guzzo, 2017). Although unintended childbearing is more common among unmarried individuals, recent estimates suggested that almost one-in-five marital births is unintended (Guzzo, 2017). Apart from sociodemographic characteristics, Hayford and colleagues' (2014) consideration of trends in first, marital births also underscore the importance of considering the timing of conception relative to marriage as a growing share of first, marital births were preceded by premarital conception, with this increase reflecting a stark class gradient (see Gibson-Davis & Rackin, 2014). In short, not all marital births are intended and consideration of couples' experiences will likely reveal even higher estimates of unintended childbearing among married couples. Based on existing research, we expect that married couples who are older, better educated, are white, and did not report pre-marital conceptions are more likely to both intend the birth that their counterparts with less sociodemographic privilege and more complex relationship and fertility histories.

Insights form a couple-level perspective

In spite of increased attention to unintended childbearing, most existing work has conceptualized unintended childbearing as an individual-level construct (Stykes, 2018). Notable exceptions have pointed to the unique insights that a couple-level approach provided to discussions of unintended childbearing (Hohmann-Marriott, 2009; Martin, McNamara, & Milot, 2007; Moore, Ryan,

Manlove, Mincieli, & Schelar, 2009; Korenman, Kaestner, & Joyce, 2002; Saleem & Surkan, 2014). However, by-in-large current knowledge of unintended childbearing reflects a bias toward individual mothers' experiences. In the context of marital childbearing, we assert that consideration of couples' intentions are especially salient given the weakening, but still normative expectation that married couples should have children and that having a child as a married couple is a way to create a new family unit (Axin and Thornton, 2000; Townsend, 2002). Married couples, more so than other groups, are more likely to have shared interests and expectations and, as such, to be agree on major family decisions, like childbearing (Hohmann-Marriott, 2009). Marriage is a long-term commitment, and childbearing within marriage is a signal and an investment in the longevity of the union. Married couples who experience an unintended marital birth or disagree on the intendedness of that birth are flouting norms and expectations that married couples make joint decisions, are experiencing problems that signal underlying relationship troubles, or both.

Couples' fertility intentions and marital instability

Research has consistently linked unintended childbearing with less stable relationships (Guzzo & Hayford, 2012; Lichter et al., 2016; Maddow-Zimmet et al., 2016). Our analyses are not the first to consider the association between couple-level indicators of unintended childbearing and relationship stability. Yet, we are able to leverage recent methodological developments that concern couples' unintended childbearing and focus on how couples' intentions might be linked with relationship stability, making important and targeted contributions to prior research. Guzzo and Hayford (2012) demonstrated that couples' fertility intentions were associated with marital instability insofar as marriages where both parents reported not intending the birth and those were couples experienced disagreement in intentions

were less stable than their counterparts where both parents intended the birth. Both causal and selection mechanisms are plausible in understanding couples' fertility intentions and their association with marital instability. A causal perspective suggests that experiencing an unintended, marital birth, or spousal disagreement in intentions could lead to more frequent conflict, which in turn might increase the risk of divorce. When examining couples where spouses report disagreement in intentions, it is also important to consider which parent did not intend the birth, as the linkages between couples' intentions and marital stability may be gendered. Since mothers spend considerably more time in childrearing tasks (Milkie, Raley, & Bianchi, 2009) couples might experience a greater risk of dissolution if the mother did not intend the birth as the unequal division of household labor might become increasingly burdensome in the context of unintended childbearing. On the other hand, Townsend's (2002) interviews suggested that men often see marriage and fatherhood as linked. Accordingly, this suggests that a married mother who intended the birth when her husband did not might receive less support from the father in childrearing, which could in turn foster a sense of resentment.

Alternatively, a selection perspective suggests that unintended, marital fertility or spousal disagreement in intentions could appear as a symptom of a strained relationship or economic insecurity – which are also associated with marital instability. Under a selection explanation, we might not expect to observe significant associations between couples' intentions and marital instability net of sociodemographic characteristics, fertility histories, and relationship histories.

Data quality: Intentions and the viability of mothers' proxy reports

In addition to traditional challenges for measuring unintended childbearing, this project also relies on mothers' proxy reports of fathers' intentions. One of the challenges to research on couple-level fertility intentions concerns data availability and quality, but recent scholarship

provides a better understanding of the quality of mothers' proxy reports. Truly couple-level approaches (drawing on information from both mothers and fathers) are quite limited and result in a privileged sample in terms of sociodemographic characteristics, which is not ideal for analyses of unintended childbearing (see Stykes 2018). Yet, mothers' proxy reports of the birth father's intentions show promise as married mothers' proxy reports of fathers' intentions matched men's own reports for 75% of couples, and multivariate analyses suggested that a mother's own intentions were the most salient predictor of the accuracy of her proxy report, as mothers tend to assume that the father shares their own intentions (Stykes 2018). Taken together, this suggests that a reasonable majority of married mothers' proxy reports provide accurate representations of fathers' intentions, and when proxy reports are inaccurate, the bias should produce in downwardly biased estimates of disagreement in intentions and conservative estimates for the association between couples' intentions and martial instability based on prior work. We also assert that even if a mother's perceptions of a father's intentionality differ from his own reports, her perceiving that he did not intend the birth could be associated with a greater risk of marital dissolution, regardless of the proxy report's accuracy per se.

CURRENT STUDY

A wealth of scholarship has contributed to the field's understanding of unintended childbearing, relationship dynamics (e.g., union formation and stability), and well-being. Yet, we assert that prior work in this area has, at times, treated unintended childbearing as synonymous with nonmarital childbearing through methodological decisions and guiding research questions. As a result, we know much less about unintended childbearing among married couples, which is a notable shortcoming as unintended childbearing was most strongly associated with dissolution among married couples (see Guzzo & Hayford, 2012). Further, we suggest that in the context of

married couples, consideration of *couple-level* rather than individual mothers' intentions provides additional insight. In response to these limitations, we analyze the socioeconomic and demographic factors that predict couples' fertility intentions (as reported by mothers) among first, marital births. Then, we consider the association between couples' intentions and divorce. Analyses contribute to existing research by, illustrating the substantial variation in couples' intentions among first, marital births, which are often treated as a homogenous group. We then, showcase the implications of this variation by examining the association between couples' intentions and marital instability.

DATA AND METHOD

The NSFG is a nationally representative sample of men and women aged 15-44 funded by the National Center for Health Statistics and initiated in 1973. Starting in 2006, the NSFG began a continuous interviewing cycle as opposed to previous cycles of data (e.g., 1988, 1992, 2002, etc.). Data include a wealth of information including but not limited to coresidential unions, fertility, and demographic characteristics. In particular, detailed cohabitation, marriage, and fertility histories make these data well-suited for analyses of fertility and union outcomes. The female data files include mothers' proxy reports of fathers' intentions. Accordingly, these data are the only public-use data set that can readily consider couples' intentions and its association with marital instability over a longer duration (via exhaustive marital histories with specific dates of transitions). Unfortunately, since men's fertility data do not include a full history of intendedness, we cannot conduct a parallel analysis for men.

Sample Selection

Drawing on all continuous cycles from 2006-2015 of the pregnancy file, we identify 39,393 pregnancies. Three sample restrictions were applied when identifying the analytic

sample. First, analyses were limited to live, first births (n = 10,157). Then, only couples having clean data (i.e., nonmissing and excluding "didn't care/indifferent" and "don't know" responses) on both mothers' and fathers' fertility intentions were included (n = 9,264). Lastly, analyses were limited to mothers who were married at the time of their first birth (n = 3,963). For analyses of marital instability, 3,963 married, first-time mothers were transformed into 351,890 person-months, which began at the date of first birth and continued until being censored by: (1) interview, (2) month of marital dissolution, or (3) the oldest child's (i.e., which corresponds to the focal birth) 18th birthday.

Measures

One of our focal variables is couples' fertility intentions. The NSFG asks women a series of questions to assess fertility intentions. First, respondents were asked, "Right before you became pregnant, did you yourself want to have a(nother) baby at any time in the future?" Respondents who reply 'yes' are then asked a follow-up question to assess the timing of the pregnancy, "So would you say you became pregnant too soon, at about the right time, or later than you wanted?" A similar series of questions were asked for female respondents' perceptions of the child's father. Based on these questions, both mothers' and fathers' intentions were treated as a categorical indicator having two responses: intended (births that were wanted and on time or later than intended) and unintended (either unwanted or too soon). Mothers' intentions were then cross-referenced to her perception of the father's intentions creating a couple-level indicator of *couples' intentions*: both parents intended the birth (reference), only the mother intended the birth, only the father intended the birth, and neither parent intended the birth.

Fertility and relationship histories. Analyses include an indicator of *timing of contraception* via a series of dummy variables: contraception after the first year of marriage

(reference), at least six months prior to marriage, one to six months prior to marriage, within the first six months of marriage, and within the first seven to 12 months of marriage. We also include binary indicators that flag female respondents who *cohabited with the spouse prior to marriage* or *experienced a prior residential union* with a different partner as "1" and all other female respondents as "0." A continuous variable identified mothers' *age at first birth* and ranged from 9 to 44 (mean = 25.9). *Number of additional children* was another continuous variable that noted the number of higher-order births the respondent reported. Lastly, a binary indicator illustrated if the female respondents' *husband reported prior children.*

Sociodemographic characteristics: *Racial and ethnic status* was operationalized as a categorical variable with four responses: white (reference), black, Hispanic, and "other" (including multiracial/ethnic). *Educational attainment* was also coded as a categorical indicator of the female respondent's highest level of education (at the time of interview): at least a bachelor's degree (reference), some college experience, high school diploma/GED, and no degree. Somewhat crude indicators of family of origin identified *mothers' education* (using the same coding scheme as the female respondent's education and a binary indicator that flagged respondents who lived with married biological/adoptive parents during adolescence as "1" and all other scenarios are "0." Lastly, all models control for five-year birth cohorts and analyses of marital dissolution model duration dependence as a simple linear term (i.e., months since birth) and the presence of additional children (as a time-varying, binary indicator).

Analytic Strategy

Analyses proceed in two distinct stages. The first documents variation in couples' intentions among women married at their first birth. After presenting descriptive statistics, multinomial logistic regression analyses are used to predict couples' intentions. The second set

of analyses links couples' intentions to marital instability using discrete-time event history logistic regression analyses. Data are converted to a person-month file where marriages can be observed from the time of birth to divorce or censorship by interview/child's 18th birthday. Life table estimates are computed to descriptively illustrate how marital instability varies by couples' intentions. Then, marital instability is assessed via a series of discrete-time event history regression models. The first is limited to couples' intentions, the second introduces indicators reflecting detailed relationship and fertility histories, whereas the third (full model) introduces sociodemographic characteristics.

RESULTS

Table 1 reports the characteristics of women experiencing a first, marital birth overall and according to couples' intentions. First and foremost, substantial variation existed in couples' intentions, such that approximately three-in-ten first, marital births were not intended by at least one of the birth parents, with 15% of first, marital births not intended by either parent. A somewhat comparable share of couples were characterized by only the mother or only the father intending the birth (i.e., 7% and 9%, respectively). At face value, these descriptive findings demonstrate that marital births should not be treated as homogenous and intended.

[Table 1 about here]

Given page requirements, we do not elaborate on our samples' overall characteristics but note that our sample appears to align with previously published estimates of first, marital births. Namely, that it reflects a somewhat privileged sample in terms of racial/ethnic status and level of education. It is also worth noting, that the share of marital births that were conceived prior to marriage in our sample (i.e., 20%), aligns with recently published estimates. Of note, bivariate analyses suggested that premarital conception was more common among couples where neither

parent intended the birth. A number of other characteristics differ according to couples' intentions. Notably, couples' where both parents intended the birth are on average older than all other intention scenarios, but mothers reported similar ages at first birth in couples where only the father or neither parent intended the birth. On average, couples where the mother did not intend the birth report more additional children than those where both intended the birth (1.4 versus 1.1 additional children). White mothers are notably underrepresented (i.e., 48% versus 66%) among couples where only the father intended the birth, which are disproportionately Hispanic (i.e., 36% versus 20%). Couples where the mother intended the birth (i.e., both intended or only mother intended) reported higher levels of education than their counterparts where the mother did not intend the birth. Lastly, consideration of family of origin characteristics suggested that mothers who belonged to couples where both parents intended the birth had better educated mothers, on average, and reported a larger share that were reared by married biological (incl. adoptive) parents.

[Table 2 about here]

Regression analyses presented in Table 2 largely reflect the bivariate patterns discussed above. Notably, in a multivariate framework, indicators tied to relationship and fertility histories are more robust predictors of couples' intentions than sociodemographic characteristics and indicators of family background. Specifically, Model 2 (in Table 2) demonstrates that, on average, couples where both parents intended the birth are less likely to experience a pre-marital conception than their counterparts where at least one parent did not intend the birth. Premarital cohabitation with the child's birth father is less common among couples where only the mother or neither parent intended the birth, but mothers who did not intend the birth reported a greater risk of having reported prior unions with a different partner. On average, younger first-time

mothers, reported a greater risk of belonging to a couple where only the father or neither parent (rather than both parents) intended the birth. Lastly, female respondent's in couples where only the father intended the birth (rather than both parents), reported a greater risk of having a husband with children from prior relationships. Consideration of significant differences in Table 2 suggests that on average, greater differences occur when contrasting couples where the mother intended the birth (i.e., both intended the birth and only mother intended the birth) with those where the mother did not intend the birth (i.e., either only father or neither parent intended the birth). However, mothers who intended the birth when their partner did not were more likely to have had a pre-conception birth and less likely to have cohabited prior to marriage compared to their counterparts where both parents intended the birth.

[Figure 1 about here]

Figure 1 clearly illustrates that variation exists in martial stability according to couples' fertility intentions. Approximately one-in-four women, who were married at the time of their first, birth, experienced a marital dissolution within 10 years of having the birth. Moreover, couples where both parents intended the birth report the highest levels of martial stability (with 80% enduring a decade after the birth) whereas couples where either the mother did not intend the birth or neither parent intended the birth reported the greatest instability (with approximately 60% enduring a decade after the birth).

[Table 3 about here]

Logistic, discrete time event-history analyses presented in Table 3 demonstrate what factors were associated with a mothers' risk of divorce after experiencing a first marital birth. Consistent with Figure 1, belonging to a couple where only the mother or neither parent intended the birth (rather than both parents) intended the birth, was associated with an increased odds of

divorce – net of fertility and relationship histories and sociodemographic characteristics. Model 1 in Table 3 suggested that couples where only the father intended the birth reported a greater odds of divorce (compared to couples where both parents intended the birth). However, the inclusion of relationship and fertility indicators (in Model 2) fully explained the association between unintended childbearing and marital instability for this comparison group. Indicators tied to fertility and relationship histories appeared to have more robust associations with marital dissolution much like they did in analyses predicted couples' fertility intentions.

DISCUSSION

We engage with recent scholarship on unintended childbearing and relationship instability. Specifically, our chief contributions to existing work seek to highlight substantial heterogeneity in married parents' fertility intentions and examine the subsequent implications for unintended childbearing and marital stability. In addition, we leverage a couple-level approach to unintended childbearing making separate contributions and assert that a couple-level approach provides an informative lens to view the context in which parents experience and respond to a first birth.

A wealth of recent scholarship in family demography has examined unintended childbearing as a social problem, with the potential to reproduce structural inequalities and widen disparities in health and well-being (Barber et al., 1999; Lindberg et al., 2015; Musick et al. 2009). Separately, researchers have consistently linked unintended childbearing with less stable relationships (Guzzo & Hayford, 2012; Licther et al. 2016; Maddow-Zimet et al., 2016). Congruent with the decoupling of marriage and childbearing, much of what we know about unintended childbearing has *focused* on unintended childbearing among unmarried parents. As a result, the field has often treated marital births as the intended, reference group for the purposes of comparison. Although such an approach may well be justified from a descriptive point of view

(i.e., that most marital births are indeed intended), assuming that all marital births are intended is problematic, particularly when striving to understand unintended childbearing and its association with relationship stability (see Guzzo & Hayford, 2012). Our consideration of the association between couples' fertility intentions and marital instability among first, marital births stands well-poised to make noteworthy contributions to existing research by addressing this blind spot in our current understanding. Ultimately, analyses demonstrate that substantial variation exists in married couples' fertility intentions. As many as three-in-ten marital, first births were unintended by at least one partner. Variation in couples' fertility intentions reflect differences in relationship and fertility histories as well as mothers' sociodemographic characteristics. Moreover, consideration of couples' intentions provides an informative perspective to understand the manner in which fertility intentions are linked with marital stability. Notably, and consistent with prior research on couples' intentions (Guzzo & Hayford, 2012; Korenmann et al., 2002), couples with at least one parent not intending the birth (including only the mother intended the birth), report a greater risk of divorce, on average. However, fertility and relationship factors appear to drive the elevated risk of divorce for couples where only the father (rather than both parents) intended the birth.

Our analyses make important contributions to existing research. However, they are certainly not without limitations. The reliance of mothers' proxy reports of fathers' intentions is not ideal. However, we are unaware of any data that can facilitate a truly couple-level approach to a nationally representative sample of unintended childbearing and marital instability over a longer period of time. Prior work on couples' intentions has taken a similar approach to mothers' proxy reports (see Guzzo & Hayford, 2012; Korenmann et al., 2002; Manlove et al., 2012), and Stykes' (2018) reports that in most cases (i.e., 75% of couples), mothers' proxy reports of

fathers' intentions align with the father's own reports, and that use of mothers' proxy reports produce downwardly biased estimates of couple-disagreement in intentions. In addition, many have articulated that binary, retrospective reports of whether or not birth was intended are not ideal and fall short in tapping into both positive and negative feelings parents may hold about a particular birth (Augustin et al. 2009, Edin & Kefalas, 2005; Joyce et al., 2002). However, consideration of a more nuanced constructs (e.g., ambivalence) are beyond the scope of our study and its contributions. In spite of these concerns over appropriately measuring unintended childbearing, Santelli and colleagues' (2009) recent analyses suggested that binary, retrospective reports of unintended childbearing are a reasonable indicator of fertility intentions. However, consideration of ambivalence in fertility intentions is not readily available in the NSFG, and the couple-approach to intentions cannot provide sufficient power for groups when unwanted and mistimed births are disaggregated. Lastly, the cross-sectional approach and reliance on birth and relationship histories in the NSFG cannot establish a temporal order on some important characteristics (like education, which is taken at time of survey, not birth) and are subject to potential recall biases.

Despite these limitations, our findings raise important questions for future research and have implications for programs. Notably, our analyses suggested that relationship and fertility histories were both distinctive across couple's fertility intentions and strongly associated with marital instability. To that end, consideration of interaction terms between relationship and fertility histories and couples' intentions might provide a better understanding of how couples respond to various birth characteristics as well as the potential implications for marital stability. However, consideration of such terms was beyond the scope of our study. Herein, we chose to focus on intentions of first, martial births and included somewhat crude indicators for the

presence of additional. However, an explicit focus on the couples' intentions of higher-order births is reasonable based on prior work (see Moore et al., 2009) and could provide a more comprehensive understanding of how intention scenarios may have impact on higher-order births and, in turn, raise implications for marital instability. In terms of programs, our analyses suggest that consideration of both parents' fertility intentions could provide help practitioners identify potential challenges that married parents face in relationships and in effect, promote healthier, happier marriages through therapy and communication skills.

REFERENCES

Amato, P.R. (2010). Research on divorce: Continuing trends and new developments. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72(3): 650-666.

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

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.

Brown, S.L., Sanchez, L.A., Nock, S.L., & Wright, J.D. (2006). Links between premarital cohabitation and subsequent marital quality, stability, and divorce: A comparison of covenant versus standard marriages. *Social Science Research* 35(2): 454-470.

Cohan, C.L. & Kleinbaum, S. (2002). Toward a greater understanding of the cohabitation effect: Premarital cohabitation and marital communication. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 64(1): 180-192.

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.

Gibson-Davis, C., Ananat, E.O., & Gassman-Pines, A. (2016). Midpregnancy marriage and divorce: why the death of shotgun marriage has been greatly exaggerated. *Demography* 53(6): 1693-1715.

Gibson-Davis, C., Edin, K., & McLanahan, S. (2005). High hopes but even higher expectations: The retreat from marriage among low-income couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67(5):1301-1312.

Gibson-Davis, C., Gassman-Pines, A., & Lehrman, R. (2018). His and hers: Meeting the economic bar to marriage." *Demography* 55(6):2321-2343.

Gibson-Davis, C. & Rackin, H. (2014). Marriage or carriage? Trends in union context and birth type by education. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 76(3): 506-519.

Guzman, L., Wildsmith, E., Manlove, J., & Franzetta, K. (2010). Unintended births: Patterns by race and ethnicity and relationship type. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health* 42(3):176-184.

Guzzo, K.B. (2017). Unintended births: Variation across social and demographic characteristics. *Family Profiles*, FP-17-09. Bowling Green, OH: National Center for Family & Marriage Research. https://www.bgsu.edu/ncfmr/resources/data/family-profiles/guzzo-unintended-births-variation-social-dem-char-fp-17-09.html

Guzzo, K.B. & Hayford, S.R. (2012). Unintended fertility and the stability of coresidential relationships. *Social Science Research* 41:1138-1151.

Hayford, S.R., Guzzo, K.B., & Smock, P.J. (2014). The decoupling of marriage and parenthood? Trends in the timing of marital first births, 1945-2002. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 76(3): 520-538.

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

Kamp Dush, C.M., Cohan, C.L., & Amato, P.R. (2003). The relationship between cohabitation and marital quality and stability: Change across cohorts? *Journal of Marriage and Family* 65(3): 539-549.

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.

Licther, D.T., Michelmore, K., Turner, R.N., & Sassler, S. (2016). Pathways to a stable union? Pregnancy and childbearing among cohabiting and married couples. *Population Research and Policy Review* 35(3): 377-399.

Lindberg, L.D., Kost, K., & Maddow-Zimet, I. (2017). The role of men's childbearing intentions in father involvement. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 79(1): 44-59.

Lindberg, L.D., Maddow-Zimet, I., Kost, K., & Lincoln, A. (2015). Pregnancy intentions and maternal and child health: an analysis of longitudinal data in Oklahoma. *Maternal and Child Health Journal* 19(5): 1087-1096.

Maddow-Zimet, I., Lindberg, L.D., Kost, K., & Lincoln, A. (2016). Are pregnancy intentions associated with transitions into and out of marriage? *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health* 48(1): 35-43.

Manlove, J., Wildsmith, E., Ikramullah, E., Ryan, S., Holcombe, E., Scott, M., & Peterson, K. (2012). Union transitions following the birth of a child to cohabiting parents. *Population Research and Policy Review* 31(3): 361-386.

Manning, W.D. & Cohen, J.A. (2012). Premarital cohabitation and marital dissolution: An examination of recent marriages. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 74(2): 377-387.

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.

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.

Musick, K., England, P., Edginton, S., & Kangas, N. (2009). Education differences in intended and unintended fertility. *Social Forces* 88(2):543-572.

Saleem, H.T. & Surkan, P.J. (2014). 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.G., 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.

Stykes, J.B. (2018). Methodological considerations in couples' fertility intentions: Missing men and the viability of women's proxy reports. *Maternal and Child Health Journal* 22(8):1-8.

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

Teachman, J. (2003). Premarital sex, premarital cohabitation, and the risk of subsequent marital dissolution among women. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 65(2): 444-455.

Table 1. Weighted Descriptive Characteristics by Couple-Level Indicator of First Birth Fertility Intentions

	Total		Both Intended		Only Mother Intended		Only Father Intended		Neither Intended	
	μ	% (σ)	μ	% (σ)	μ	% (σ)	μ	% (σ)	μ	% (σ)
Fertility and Relationship Histories										
Conception timing										
+6 months prior to marriage		2.6		1.1[d]		3.0		2.9		9.2[a]
1-6 months prior to marriage		17.3		9.3[cd]		11.7		39.2[a]		43.6[a]
Within the first 6 months of marriage		19.4		17.5[c]		18.8		27.3[a]		24.0
First 7-12 months of marriage		12.9		12.6		20.0		13.2		10.9
After first year of marriage		47.8		59.5[bcd]		46.5[acd]		17.4[ab]		12.3[ab]
Premarital cohabitation with spouse		45.0		46.4		36.4		37.5		47.1
Prior union with different partner		14.9		13.5[d]		10.6		17.4		21.7[a]
Age at first birth	25.5	(0.1)	26.7[bcd]	(0.1)	25.2[acd]	(0.4)	22.1[ab]	(0.3)	22.1[ab]	(0.2)
Number of additional children	1.2	(0.0)	1.1[cd]	(0.0)	1.1	(0.1)	1.4[a]	(0.0)	1.4[a]	(0.0)
Husband had prior children		7.9		6.9[c]		8.4		13.7[a]		8.7
Sociodemographic Characteristics										
Race-ethnicity										
White		66.2		69.1[c]		74.0[c]		47.7[ab]		60.8
Black		5.0		4.5		4.3		8.3		5.8
Hispanic		20.0		17.5[c]		12.2		35.5[a]		25.4
Other		8.8		8.9		9.5		8.5		8.0
Wife's education										
BA/BS degree or higher		42.1		48.7[cd]		42.3[c]		19.6[ab]		25.2[a]
Some college, no BA/BS		25.1		23.3[d]		25.9		26.3		32.4[a]
High school degree/GED		22.1		18.5[cd]		25.3		36.3[a]		28.6[a]
No degree		10.7		9.5		6.5[c]		17.8[b]		13.8
Mother's education										
BA/BS degree or higher		19.6		22.2[cd]		18.8		10.8[a]		12.8[a]
Some college, no BA/BS		21.8		21.2		29.5		15.1		25.0
High school degree/GED		33.2		33.3		31.2		30.2		35.8
No degree		25.4		23.3[c]		20.5[c]		43.9[abd]		26.4[c]
Reared by married bio/adoptive parents		72.6		75.3[c]		69.1		64.3[a]		66.7
N	3,963		2,682	69.2	271	6.7	363	9.2	647	14.9

"a" denotes a significant difference from both parents intending the birth, "b" denotes a significant difference from only the mother intending the birth, "c" denotes a significant difference from only the father intending the birth, and "d" denotes a significant difference from neither parent intending the birth.

Table 2. Relative Risk Ratios (RRRs) from Multinomial Logistic Regression Predicting Couples' Birth Intentions among Women Having a Marital First Birth (N = 3,963)

	Model 1 (Both Intended)			Model 2 (Both Intended)		
	Only Mother Intended	Only Father Intended	Neither Intended	Only Mother Intended	Only Father Intended	Neither Intended
Fertility and Relationship Histories						
Conception timing (omitted = After first year of marriage)						
+6 months prior to marriage	3.15*	3.82*	17.70***	3.16*	3.40	19.30***
1-6 months prior to marriage	1.28	6.42***	10.22***	1.28	6.09***	9.27***
Within the first 6 months of marriage	1.17	2.86***	3.85***	1.28	2.63***	3.69***
First 7-12 months of marriage	1.80	2.26*	2.83**	1.93	2.19*	2.84**
Premarital cohabitation with spouse	0.67	0.57*	0.80	0.61*	0.60*	0.86
Prior union with different partner	0.84	1.66	1.85*	0.81	1.92*	1.94*
Age at first birth	0.95	0.84***	0.87***	0.94	0.84***	0.83***
Number of additional children	0.79*	0.92	0.83	0.82	0.93	0.86
Husband had prior children	1.24	2.29**	1.20	1.26	2.18**	1.22
Sociodemographic Characteristics						
Race-ethnicity (omitted = White)						
Black				0.72	2.14*	1.32
Hispanic				0.59	1.51	1.33
Other				1.02	1.75	1.41
Wife's education (omitted = BA/BS degree or higher)						
Some college, no BA/BS				0.96	0.90	0.77
High school degree/GED				1.06	1.04	0.53*
No degree				0.62	0.57	0.35**
Mother's education (omitted = HS degree/GED)						
BA/BA degree or higher				0.99	0.74	0.85
Some college, no BA/BS				1.69	0.89	1.44
No degree				0.96	1.31	0.81
Reared by married bio/adoptive parents				0.70	0.81	0.95
Constant	0.34	3.04	1.29	0.53	3.33	4.39*
Log-Likelihood		-3,248.17			-3,204.72	

Note. * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001. All analyses controlled for five-year birth cohorts since the 2006-2015 NSFG data were appended.

Table 3. Odds Ratios (ORs) from Logistic Regression Event History Models Predicting the Odds of Marital Dissolution Following a Marital First Birth

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Couples' intentions (omitted = both intended)			
Only mother intended	1.37**	1.31*	1.33*
Only father intended	1.80***	1.24	1.22
Neither intended	1.68***	1.28**	1.30**
Fertility and Relationship Histories			
Conception timing (omitted = After first year of marriage)			
+6 months prior to marriage		1.20	1.19
1-6 months prior to marriage		1.01	1.00
Within the first 6 months of marriage		0.95	0.95
First 7-12 months of marriage		0.90	0.87
Premarital cohabitation with spouse		1.14	1.14
Prior union with different partner		1.40**	1.40***
Age at first birth		0.92***	0.93***
Number of additional children		0.95	0.95
Husband had prior children		1.32*	1.31*
Sociodemographic Characteristics			
Race-ethnicity (omitted = White)			
Black			1.25
Hispanic			1.11
Other			1.05
Wife's education (omitted = BA/BS degree or higher)			
Some college, no BA/BS			1.21*
High school degree/GED			1.12
No degree			1.05
Mother's education (omitted = HS degree/GED)			
BA/BS degree or higher			1.13
Some college, no BA/BS			0.90
No degree			1.01
Reared by married bio/adoptive parents			0.87†
Constant	0.00***	0.03***	0.03***
Months since first marital birth	0.96***	0.97***	0.97***
Log Likelihood	-6,350.47	-6,290.21	-6,278.41
N	351,890	351,890	351,890

Note. * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001. All analyses controlled for five-year birth cohorts since the 2006-2015 NSFG data were appended.

Figure 1. Proportion of Marriages Intact a Decade after a First Marital Birth, by Couples' Intentions