

## **Opting Out of Coresidential Unions? Factors Predicting Singlehood in the Fourth Decade**

Xing (Sherry) Zhang, *University of Wisconsin – Madison*, [xzhang2282@wisc.edu](mailto:xzhang2282@wisc.edu)  
Sharon Sassler, *Cornell University*, [sharon.sassler@cornell.edu](mailto:sharon.sassler@cornell.edu)

PAA 2019 Extended Abstract

### **Short Abstract**

Demographers project an increase in the proportion of adults in the United States who never marry. Many young adults believe marriage has become obsolete, but cohabitation has not yet become a marriage alternative, at least in the United States. We explore factors associated with being unmarried into one's 30s. We create a measure of the propensity to believe one will be unmarried by age 25, and include this in analysis of who remains never married at Wave V, which allows us to disentangle the impact of structural factors on the likelihood of marriage. Data are from Waves 1 through 5 of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health. At Wave 5, 26% of respondents were never married. Accounting for negative views regarding marriage in adolescence provides additional information about non-marriage later in life, narrowing the racial gap in nonmarriage among adults in the early 21<sup>st</sup> century.

## Introduction

The proportion of American adults projected to remain unmarried has increased across the last few decades, as the “golden” era of the family recedes into the past and traditional views of the centrality of marriage are challenged by more heterogeneous conceptions of family. In the 1960s, less than ten percent of American adults were unmarried by the age of 25. By 2012, this share had more than doubled, with one in five adults aged 25 and older unmarried (Wang & Parker, 2014). In the 1950s and 1960s, getting married was a normative rite of passage, marking the transition into adulthood. As of 2010, in contrast, nearly four in ten adults (39%) reported that marriage was “obsolete.” Young adults, those 18 to 29, were the most likely to express this view, with 44% agreeing with that statement compared with about a third of adults aged 50 and older (Pew Research Center, 2010).

In an era when marriage was normative, and those who never married were a small minority, views regarding marriage were less heterogeneous. Today’s young adults have a broader array of life options besides marriage, and there is also growing acceptance for remaining unpartnered throughout life. In recent years, views about life-long singlehood have become more heterogeneous. In fact, a growing body of social commentators tout the advantages of life-long singlehood, arguing that the benefits of marriage are exaggerated (Bolick, 2015; DePaulo, 2007).

But certain populations are more likely to remain unmarried, suggesting that factors other than personal choice or attitudes towards marriage are salient. There are substantial racial, ethnic, and class differences in marriage likelihoods. Blacks are far less likely than Whites to be currently married, while other research highlights growing educational variance in marriage odds; as a result, some suggest that marriage has increasingly become a marker of privilege or racial advantage (Banks, 2011; Cherlin, 2004; McLanahan, 2004). Although racial minorities were more likely to marry than Whites (and married earlier) in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, this advantage flipped in the second half of the century (Koball, 1998). Changes in employment opportunities partially contribute to this retreat for marriage, though the associations are stronger for racial minorities than for Whites (Lichter et al., 1993; Sassler & Schoen, 1999; Schneider et al., 2018; Wilson, 1987). Although attitudes towards marriage were more positive for Blacks than Whites in the latter quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Sassler & Schoen, 1999), since then Blacks’ views of marriage seem to have shifted (Banks, 2011). Whether this reflects changes in values or economic opportunities, however, remains an open question.

Alternatives to marriage have become increasingly normative and even accepted. The majority of adult Americans have lived with a partner without being married to them, and others form sexual relationships without living together (often referred to as “Living Apart Together” or LAT relationships) (Manning, 2013; Strohm, Seltzer, Cochran, & Mays, 2009; Sassler, 2010). Still, the majority of young Americans believe that they will marry at some point in their life (Newport & Wilkie, 2013). Furthermore, a sizable body of research demonstrates that those who hold positive views of marriage in young adulthood are more likely to wed (Carlson, 2015;

Sassler & Schoen 1999; Willoughby, 2014). What factors, then, account for the growing proportion of American adults who never marry? This paper explores what factors are associated with remaining never married into one's third decade of life. We explore the factors associated with believing in adolescence that marriage is not likely, to account for those who have a propensity to remain unmarried. We then examine multivariate analyses that examine those who had never married by their 30s, including a variable that captures their propensity to view marriage as unlikely in adolescence. Our analysis enables us to explore the association of negative views towards marriage formed early in life and economic circumstances in childhood and emerging adulthood with delayed or non-marriage among Americans coming of age in the first few decades of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

## **The Current Study**

Despite a broadening in union options available to contemporary Americans, to date explanations for the growing proportion of adults who defer marriage or never marry have focused on economic explanations for non-marriage. Yet opinion research demonstrates that more Americans are questioning the institution of marriage, questioning its value for themselves as individuals as well as for society overall. This paper focuses on better understanding views towards marriage and remaining unmarried, exploring attitudes towards marriage expressed in adolescence and then assessing if attitudes held early in life are predictive of subsequent marital outcomes in adulthood.

To explore our topic, we utilize data from Waves I through V of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health. This is a study of one cohort, adolescents who were initially surveyed in 1994 and 1995, and who were followed until 2016 through 2018, when they were between the ages of 32 to 40 (Wave V preliminary data release). We first explore respondents' attitudes towards marriage, measured in adolescence, when respondents were aged 12 through 20. From this analysis, we create a variable that captures a respondents' propensity to believe they will not marry by age 25, using demographic attributes as well as views regarding risk-taking behaviors and social acceptance to create this measure. We then examine respondents at Wave V, examining the factors that predict respondents' who were never married. We include our predictor of views about marriage measured in adolescence. This enables us to tease out whether non-marriage is a result of negative views of marriage, or whether other factors – a challenging job market, or poor economic prospects that make one a poor partner choice – contribute to marital delay.

## **Data and Methods**

Data are from Waves I-V of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health, a nationally representative school-based sample of adolescents who were in the 7<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> grades from 1994-1995. Respondents were re-interviewed several times (1995-1996; 2002; 2008; 2016-2018), with the most recent interview done when they were between 32 and 40 years of age (Wave V). For our preliminary analyses we rely on the Wave V-pre-sample, which is

nationally representative and has a sample of 3,872 respondents. Our sample size drops to 2,910 after only reporting respondents who have valid Wave V weights, and have no missing data on the primary dependent, independent, and control variables.

### **Measures: Dependent Variables**

To ascertain attitudes towards marriage, measured in adolescence, the first dependent variable is a constructed measure that captures the propensity to believe that one will be unmarried by age 25, utilizing responses from Wave I. Respondents were asked the following question: “What do you think are the chances that . . . you will be married by age 25.” Responses ranged from 1 (Almost no chance), 2 (Some chance), 3 (a 50-50 chance), 4 (A good chance) to 5 (Almost certain). Because we are interested in those who believed they did not have a good chance of being married by age 25, we group those who reported having almost no chance of being married by age 25 and those who reported almost no chance to be equal to 1, indicating that the respondent did not believe marriage was in the cards. The reference group consisted of those who believed they had a 50-50 chance, a good chance, or an almost certain chance of being married by age 25.

Next, we examined respondent behaviors at Wave V. We utilize responses to the question of whether the respondent had ever been married in their lifetime, to construct a measure of first marriage. We utilize data from the following question asked in Wave V: “How many different persons have you ever married? Be sure to include your current spouse if you are married now.” Respondents who reported 0 persons were coded as never married (= 1), while the remaining respondents were coded as 0 if they reported at least one person they had married. This dummy captures the proportion who were never married at Wave 5.

### **Controls**

Our analysis of the factors contributing to negative views regarding the likelihood of marriage in emerging adulthood utilizes measures generally found in studies that explore non-marriage or delayed marriage in the U.S.: race, ethnicity, and several indicators of social class standing in adolescence, as well as indicators of family structure in adolescence. Our measures for the propensity score outcome include: gender, being non-white, family structure while growing up, views regarding the likelihood of attending college, the importance attached to religion in everyday life, views of whether they are not social accepted, and whether they believe they will survive to age 35.

We rely on somewhat different measures in our analysis at Wave V of whether individuals never marry, drawn from the literature on union formation. We run models with and without our indicator of the propensity to view marriage as unlikely at Wave I, to determine if union outcomes by Wave V are determined by a long-standing disinclination to marry, or if other indicators, such as economic attributes, are more salient in union outcomes in adulthood. Controls include basic demographic attributes, such as gender, race, ethnicity, nativity, and age. Next, we include controls measuring family socialization experience, including family structure

during adolescence, whether mothers had low levels of education, and the region where they had grown up in (given regional differences in marital timing). We then control for indicators of respondent's own achievements, such as educational attainment, if educational attainment surpasses that of mothers, and other measures. Finally, we include controls for respondents' own relationship experiences, such as whether they had ever cohabited with a partner (that they did not marry).

## **Measurement**

Our control for gender accounts for whether the respondent identified as male (0) or female (1). We included two race and ethnicity variables: one was a dummy variable indicating whether the respondent was white or non-white, and another included four categories of non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic, and non-Hispanic Asian. The respondent's nativity was captured by a question on place of birth and parent's place of birth, which determined if respondents were first-generation, second-generation (born in the U.S. to foreign-born parents), or third-generation (both respondent and parents born in the U.S.).

We included respondents' attitudes on their likelihood of attending college, how important they found religion, feelings of being socially accepted, and whether they expected to live by age 35, to account for respondents who may want to invest further in their human capital, as well as respondents who had fatalistic views in adolescence. The likelihood of attending college was based on how likely the respondent thought they would go to college and ranged from 1 (low) to 5 (high). The importance of religion to the respondent came from the question, "How important is religion to you?" and ranged from 1 (very important) to 4 (not important), and were reverse-coded. The respondent's feeling of being socially accepted ranged from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree), and was reverse-coded. Whether the respondent thought they would live to age 35 had responses that ranged from 1 (almost no chance) to 5 (almost certain).

Our measures of the socialization experienced by adolescence growing up include the respondents living arrangement at the time of the first interview, and included two biological parents, two parents (including step-parents), single parent, and other. Maternal education was the respondent's mother's highest educational attainment at the time of interview in Wave I, and included less than high school, high school or GED, some college, completed college and more, and don't know.

Our analysis of union status at Wave V includes controls for respondents' characteristics in adulthood. We include the respondent's age in Wave V. The respondent's highest educational attainment in Wave V was divided into the following groups: HS/GED and less (1), some college (2), completed college (3), and more than college (4). We also included the respondent's educational mobility in Wave V – whether they had less than their mother's, the same as their mother's, and more than their mother's education, and responses ranged from 1 to 3. The region of the United States where the respondent lived included the West, Midwest, South, and Northeast.

## Analytic Approach

We used propensity score analysis to account for selection bias for respondents who thought they would never marry by age 25 during adolescence, to see whether they actually never married in adulthood (Rosenbaum & Rubin, 1983). First, we created a propensity score that accounted for selection factors associated with never wanting to marry by age 25, measured at Wave I. These factors included measures ascertained at Wave I: gender, being a racial and ethnic minority, growing up outside of a two-biological parent family structure in adolescence, the respondent's perceived likelihood of attending college in adolescence, the importance of religion, whether they did not feel socially accepted, and their expectations of living to age 35. The treatment variable was 0 for adolescent respondents who thought they would have a 50-50 or higher chance of marrying by age 25, and 1 for adolescent respondents who thought they had almost no chance or some chance of marrying by age 25.

We then included this propensity score in our subsequent logistic regression of whether the respondent actually was never married by ages 32-40 in Wave V using covariate adjustment. We ran two models: the first model included individual covariates such as gender, race and ethnicity, and immigrant generation status. The second model included family structure in adolescence, maternal education in adolescence, region, age of the respondent, the respondent's highest educational attainment in Wave V, and educational mobility in Wave V.

Summary statistics for the analytic sample are presented in Table 1. Slightly over half of the sample was female (52%). A majority of the respondents were White (70%) and born in the United States (95%). Most adolescents thought that they were likely to attend college in Wave I, found religion fairly unimportant, felt socially accepted in adolescence (85%), and expected to live to age 35 (88%). A majority of respondents grew up with two biological parents in adolescence (62%), and had mothers who completed at least a high school degree or GED (84%). Most adolescents thought that they were likely to attend college in Wave I, found religion fairly unimportant, felt socially accepted in adolescence (85%), and expected to live to age 35 (88%). A majority of respondents grew up with two biological parents in adolescence (62%), and had mothers who completed at least a high school degree or GED (84%).

[Insert Table 1 here]

In Wave V, the average age of the respondent was 37 years old, and most had completed more than a high school degree and GED (79%). Slightly less than half of respondents completed more than their mother's level of education (47%), and most respondents lived in the Midwest and South (73%). As can be seen, the attributes of those who were never versus ever married were quite different. Table 2 shows characteristics of respondents who have never married by the time they are 32-40 years old, by gender, race and ethnicity, family structure, maternal education, educational attainment in adulthood, and region. Black adults had the highest proportions of never marrying (46%), followed by Hispanic adults (29%), Asian (28%), and White adults (22%). Of those who were never married, a little over a third (34%) of adolescents who grew up

with single parents, compared with 66% of those who had ever married. Approximately 76% of respondents who grew up with two biological parents had married by the time they reached their early forties, compared to 24% who grew up with two biological parents. Respondents who completed college and more were the least likely to have never married, compared to those who completed a high school degree or GED. Respondents who had more than a college degree were the most likely to have ever married (81%) by their thirties. Relative to living in the West, respondents who lived in the South and Northeast were less likely to have never married.

[Insert Table 2 here]

## **Preliminary Results**

### **What Distinguishes the Propensity to View Marriage as Unlikely?**

At the time of their first interview, over three quarters of respondents expected to be married by age 25. However, nearly a quarter – 23% - thought that they had almost no chance or only some chance of being married by age 25. Results from our logistic regression analysis of the effects of adolescent characteristics on young adults' likelihood of viewing marriage as unlikely are presented in Table 3. These are the variables utilized in calculating our propensity measure of the likelihood of remaining never married. We include both the coefficients and the odds ratios (the exponentiated coefficients, which can be interpreted as the change in the odds of graduating from high school associated with a one unit increase in the independent variable). An odds ratio greater than 1.0 indicates that the specified variable (e.g., being a racial or ethnic minority) is associated with greater odds of viewing marriage as unlikely than the reference category, while an odds ratio less than 1.0 denotes the odds of experiencing the event of interest is lower relative to the odds of the reference group.

[Insert Table 3 here]

The results indicate important characteristics associated with feeling that marriage by age 25 was unlikely. Those who were racial or ethnic minorities were far more likely to view marriage by age 25 as unlikely relative to White adolescents and this difference is highly significant. The odds of viewing marriage by age 25 as unlikely among racial minorities are 34% greater than for White adolescents. Those who grew up in disrupted families were also less likely to view marriage by age 25 as likely; those who grew up with married biological parents have odds of viewing marriage as likely that are 16% greater than adolescents who were living in single parent or step-parent families, or in non-family living arrangements.

In particular, we note that expectations for the future and perceptions of belongingness are associated with expectations of marriage in the future. For example, those with greater expectations of attending college in the future are significantly less likely than those with lower expectations to believe they will be unmarried at age 25, as is assigning greater importance to religion. On the other hand, adolescents who feel less socially accepted, and the small proportion who think it unlikely that they will live to age 35, are significantly less likely to

expect marriage by age 25 than those who feel more accepted and believe they will live into their 30s. In other words, adolescent respondents who do not think they will attend college, do not find religion important, and do not expect to live to age 35 in adolescence are more likely to expect that they will have almost no chance or some chance of never marrying by age 25, relative to respondents who do think they will attend college, find religion important, and expect to live to age 35. It is, in fact, the case that minority youth from less advantaged backgrounds are less likely to marry by mid-life than those from more affluent backgrounds, given the growing social class divergence in marriage (Cherlin, 2004; McLanahan, 2004). Whether such views, held in adolescence, matter in one's thirties, or if they matter above and beyond the attributes that signify marriageability in adulthood, is explored in our next analysis. We include a variable that captures this propensity to believe that marriage is unlikely, and explore how it shapes the likelihood of remaining unmarried into one's thirties.

### **Factors Associated with Never Having Married by the Thirties**

In our second set of analyses, we examine whether accounting for the propensity to view marriage as unlikely is associated with non-marriage among those who are between the ages of 32 to 40. The proportion of adults in the sample of Wave 5 respondents who remained never married is slightly greater than the proportion who in adolescence thought marriage was unlikely. Over a quarter of the Wave 5 respondents, 26%, had never married at the time of their interview. That is not to say that they had not lived with a partner. Over half of Wave 5 respondents, 57%, had cohabited, oftentimes with the person they went on to marry.

Results for our analysis of remaining never married by Wave V are shown in Table 4. We first run reduced models without our propensity measure, and then include it, before repeating with our full models, in our logistic regressions predicting whether the respondent remained unmarried at Wave 5. Model 1 shows individual background factors, while Model 2 shows additional background factors in adulthood.

[Table 4 about here]

Results from our reduced model, which controls for gender, race, ethnicity, and nativity alone, reveals that there are no gender differences among Add Health respondents in the likelihood of remaining never married by Wave 5. We do note racial differences in marriage, consistent with the literature. The odds of remaining unmarried among Black respondents are over three times that of Whites. Although Hispanics and Asians also appear somewhat more likely to be never married by Wave V than their White counterparts, these coefficients never attain conventional levels of significance. Additional analyses show that Hispanics and Asians are not any more or less likely to be never married relative to Blacks. Including the propensity to view marriage as unlikely in adolescence (Model 2) indicates that this group is, in fact, significantly more likely to have never married. Furthermore, the inclusion of this propensity score reduces the magnitude of the race effect for Blacks, though it still remains large and highly



significant. Nonetheless, we find evidence that negative views of the likelihood of marrying held in adolescence are strong predictors of remaining unmarried in one's thirties.

Our full models, which include measures of educational attainment as well as other factors capturing relationship experience and region, further support the literature on union formation. Those with the most education are significantly less likely to have never married, suggesting that while schooling may delay marriage it increases its likelihood down the road. Future analyses will include more indicators of economic standing, as well as incorporate additional measures of family disadvantage.

### **Ongoing Efforts**

Of course, those who have determined to eschew marriage in adolescence may not be opposed to cohabitation, and may view living together as an alternative to marriage. Future steps involve exploring whether respondents ever cohabit, if they cohabit with someone other than their spouse, or if other measures of relationships – number of sexual partners, or age at sexual debut, for example, or if partners were of a different race, influence whether or not they marry, cohabit but do not marry, or remain outside of any kind of coresidential union altogether.

## References

- Banks, R.R. (2011). *Is Marriage for White People? How the African American Marriage Decline Affects Everyone*. Dutton Books.
- Bolick, Kate. 2015. *Spinster: Making a Life of One's Own*. Broadway Books.
- Carlson, Daniel L. 2015. "Do Differences in Expectations and Preferences Explain Racial/Ethnic Variation in Family Formation Outcomes?" *Advances in Life Course Research* 25:1-15.
- Cherlin, Andrew J. (2004). "The Deinstitutionalization of American Marriage." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(4): 848-861.
- DePaulo, Bella. 2007. *Singled Out: How Singles are Stereotyped, Stigmatized, and Ignored, and Still Live Happily Ever After*. St. Martin's Press.
- Goldstein, J.R. & Kenney, C.T. (2001). "Marriage Delayed or Marriage Foregone? New Cohort Forecasts of First Marriage for U.S. Women." *American Sociological Review* 66(4):506-519.
- Koball, H. (1998). "Have African American Men Become Less Committed to Marriage? Explaining the 20<sup>th</sup> Century Racial Cross Over in Men's Marriage Timing." *Demography*, 35(2):251-258.
- Kreider, R., & Ellis, R. (2011). "Number, Timing, and Duration of Marriages and Divorces: 2009." U.S. Census Bureau: Household Economic Studies.  
<https://www.census.gov/prod/2011pubs/p70-125.pdf>
- Lichter, D.T., McLaughlin, D.K., Kephart, G., & Landry, D.J. (1992). "Race and the Retreat from Marriage: A Shortage of Marriageable Men?" *American Sociological Review*, 57: 781-799.
- Manning, W.D. (2013). "Trends in Cohabitation: Over Twenty Years of Change, 1987-2010." Family Profiles, National Center for Family & Marriage Research.
- McLanahan, S. (2004). "Diverging Destinies: How Children Are Faring Under the Second Demographic Transition." *Demography*, 41(4): 607-627.
- Newport, F., and Wilkie, J. 2013. "Most in U.S. Want Marriage, But Its Importance has Dropped." *Gallup*. Accessed Sept. 15, 2018 at <https://news.gallup.com/poll/163802/marriage-importance-dropped.aspx>.
- Pew Research Center. (2010). *The Decline of Marriage and Rise of New Families*. Washington, DC.

- Rosenbaum, P.R. & Rubin, D.B. (1983). "The Central Role of the Propensity Score in Observational Studies for Causal Effects." *Biometrika*, 70(1): 41-55.
- Sassler, S., & Schoen, R. (1999). "The Effect of Attitudes and Economic Activity on Marriage." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 61(1): 147-159.
- Schneider, D., Harknett, K. and Stimpson, Matthew. (2018). "What Explains the Decline in First marriage in the United states? Evidence from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, 1969 to 2013." *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 80(4):791-811.
- Strohm, C., Seltzer, J.A., Cochran, S.D., & Mays, V.M. (2009). "Living Apart Together: Relationships in the United States." *Demographic Research* 21(7), 177-214.
- Wang, Wendy, and Parker, Kim. 2014. "Record Share of Americans Have Never Married." *Pew Research Center*.
- Willoughby, Brian. (2014). "Using Marital Attitudes in Late Adolescence to Predict Later Union Transitions." *Youth & Society* 46(3):425-440.
- Wilson, W.J. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. University of Chicago Press.

**Table 1. Weighted Summary Statistics for Analytic Sample.**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Range</b>
<b>Expectation of being married by age 25 in Wave I</b>	3.26	0.03	1 to 5
<b>Expectation of being married by age 25 in Wave I</b>			
Almost no chance/some chance	0.23	0.01	1 to 3
50-50 chance/A good chance/almost certain	0.77	0.01	
<b>Gender - female</b>	0.52	0.01	1 to 2
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>			1 to 4
NH White	0.70	0.03	
NH Black	0.16	0.02	
Hispanic	0.11	0.02	
NH Asian	0.04	0.01	
<b>Immigrant generation status</b>			1 to 3
1st generation	0.05	0.02	
2nd generation	0.48	0.02	
3rd generation	0.47	0.01	
<b>Educational likelihood of attending college in Wave I</b>	4.16	0.04	1 to 5
<b>Importance of religion in Wave I</b>	2.90	0.04	1 to 4
<b>Feeling socially accepted in Wave I</b>	4.09	0.02	1 to 5
Strongly disagree	0.01	0.00	
Disagree	0.04	0.00	
Neither agree nor disagree	0.11	0.01	
Agree	0.55	0.01	
Strongly agree	0.30	0.01	
<b>Expectation of living to age 35 in Wave I (average)</b>	4.45	0.02	1 to 5
<b>Expectation of living to age 35 in Wave I (distribution)</b>			1 to 5
Almost no chance	0.01	0.01	
Some chance, but probably not	0.02	0.02	
A 50-50 chance	0.10	0.01	
A good chance	0.27	0.01	
Almost certain	0.61	0.02	
<b>Family structure in Wave I</b>			1 to 4
Two biological parents	0.62	0.02	
Two parents (step or bio)	0.14	0.01	
Single parent	0.20	0.01	
Other family arrangement	0.03	0.00	
<i>n</i>		2,910	

**Table 1. Weighted Summary Statistics for Analytic Sample, Continued.**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Range</b>
<b>Maternal education in Wave I</b>			
Less than HS	0.16	0.01	1 to 5
HS or GED	0.34	0.02	
Some college	0.21	0.01	
Completed college+	0.25	0.02	
Don't know	0.04	0.01	
<b>Age of the respondent in Wave V</b>	36.93	0.13	33 to 42
<b>Highest educational attainment in Wave V</b>			1 to 4
High school/GED and less	0.21	0.02	
Some college	0.41	0.01	
Completed college	0.21	0.01	
More than college	0.18	0.01	
<b>Educational mobility</b>			1 to 3
Less than mother	0.11	0.01	
Same as mother's education	0.42	0.01	
More than mother's education	0.47	0.01	
<b>Region</b>			1 to 4
West	0.16	0.02	
Midwest	0.34	0.03	
South	0.39	0.02	
Northeast	0.12	0.01	
<b>Never cohabited by Wave V</b>	0.43	0.01	0 to 1
<b>Never married by Wave V</b>	0.26	0.01	0 to 1
<i>n</i>		2,910	

**Table 2. Characteristics of Never-Married Individuals by Wave V.**

<b>Demographic characteristic</b>	<b>Never married</b>	<b>Ever married</b>	<b>Proportion of full sample</b>
<b>Gender</b>			
Men (ref. group)	0.28	0.72	0.48
Women	0.26	0.74	0.52
<b>Race and ethnicity</b>			
White (ref. group)	0.22	0.78	0.70
Black	0.46*	0.54*	0.16
Hispanic	0.29	0.71	0.11
Asian	0.28	0.71	0.04
<b>Family structure in Wave I</b>			
Two biological parents (ref. group)	0.24	0.76	0.62
Two parents (step or bio)	0.27	0.73	0.14
Single parent	0.34*	0.66*	0.2
Other family arrangement	0.37	0.64	0.03
<b>Maternal education in Wave I</b>			
Less than HS (ref. group)	0.29	0.71	0.16
HS or GED	0.29	0.71	0.34
Some college	0.22	0.78	0.21
Completed college+	0.24	0.76	0.25
Don't know	0.38	0.62	0.04
<b>Highest educational attainment in Wave V</b>			
High school/GED and less (ref. group)	0.34	0.66	0.21
Some college	0.27	0.73	0.41
Completed college	0.24*	0.76*	0.21
More than college	0.19*	0.81*	0.18
<b>Region</b>			
West (ref. group)	0.33	0.67	0.16
Midwest	0.26	0.74	0.34
South	0.26*	0.74	0.39
Northeast	0.24*	0.76	0.12

*n*

2910

\* - indicates significant difference from the reference group at the  $p < 0.05$  level

**Table 3. Factors Predicting the Propensity Score to Never Marry by Age 25.**

Variable	<b>B</b>		<b>OR</b>
<b>Gender</b>	-0.01 (0.05)		0.99
<b>Non-white</b>	0.29 (0.05)	***	1.34
<b>Growing up outside of a two-biological parent family structure in Wave I</b>	0.15 (0.05)	**	1.16
<b>Likelihood of attending college in Wave I</b>	-0.05 (0.02)	*	0.95
<b>Importance of religion in Wave I</b>	-0.08 (0.02)	***	0.92
<b>Not feeling socially accepted in Wave I</b>	0.40 (0.10)	***	1.49
<b>Expecting to live to age 35 in Wave I</b>	-0.12 (0.03)	***	0.89
<b>Constant</b>	0.01 (0.16)		1.01

*n* 3771  
Standard errors in parentheses. † -  $p < 0.10$ ; \* -  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\* -  $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*\* -  $p < 0.001$ .

**Table 4. Weighted propensity score logistic regression predicting the likelihood of never marrying in Wave V using covariate adjustment.**

Variable	Model 1 w/o PS		Model 1 w/ PS		Model 2 w/o PS		Model 2					
	B	OR	B	OR	B	OR	B	OR				
<b>Propensity score</b>	-	-	2.58	**	13.20	-	-	2.32	*	10.18		
	-	-	(0.82)			-	-	(1.05)				
<b>Gender - female</b>	-0.14	0.87	-0.11		0.90	-0.14	0.87	-0.11		0.90		
	(0.12)		(0.12)			(0.12)		(0.12)				
<b>Race/ethnicity (ref. group, NH White) - NH Black</b>	1.12	***	3.06	0.89	***	2.44	1.14	***	3.13	0.97	***	2.64
	(0.17)			(0.18)			(0.16)			(0.18)		
Hispanic	0.35		1.42	0.12		1.13	0.20		1.22	0.01		1.01
	(0.24)			(0.25)			(0.25)			(0.26)		
NH Asian	0.34		1.40	0.17		1.19	0.24		1.27	0.07		1.07
	(0.28)			(0.28)			(0.29)			(0.30)		
<b>Immigrant generation status (ref. group, 3rd gen) - 1st gen.</b>	0.00		1.00	-0.04		0.96	0.14		1.15	0.14		1.15
	(0.35)			(0.36)			(0.34)			(0.15)		
2nd generation	0.18		1.20	0.13		1.14	0.14		1.15	0.14		1.15
	(0.13)			(0.13)			(0.15)			(0.15)		
<b>Family structure in Wave I (ref. group, two bio. parents) - Two parents (step or bio)</b>							0.03		1.03	-0.11		0.90
							(0.18)			(0.19)		
Single parent							0.19		1.21	0.05		1.05
							(0.21)			(0.22)		
Other family arrangement							0.15		1.16	0.08		1.08
							(0.39)			(0.39)		
<b>Maternal education in Wave I (ref. group, &lt;HS) - HS or more</b>							-0.03		0.97	0.01		1.01
							(0.21)			(0.21)		
<b>Age of the respondent in Wave V</b>							-0.14	***	0.87	-0.15	***	0.86
							(0.04)			(0.04)		
<b>Highest educational attainment in Wave V (ref. group, HS/GED and less) - Some college</b>							-0.20		0.82	-0.16		0.85
							(0.21)			(0.21)		
Completed college							-0.22		0.80	-0.15		0.86
							(0.25)			(0.26)		
More than college							-0.62	*	0.54	-0.53	*	0.59
							(0.26)			(0.27)		

*n* 2910  
Standard errors in parentheses. † -  $p < 0.10$ ; \* -  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\* -  $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*\* -  $p < 0.001$ .



**Table 4, Continued. Weighted propensity score logistic regression predicting the likelihood of never marrying in Wave V using covariate adjustment.**

Variable	Model 1 w/o PS		Model 1 w/ PS		Model 2 w/o PS		Model 2						
	B	OR	B	OR	B	OR	B	OR					
<b>Educational mobility (ref. group, less than mother) - Same as mother's education</b>					0.08	1.08	0.08	1.08					
					(0.22)		(0.22)						
More than mother's education					0.06	1.06	0.06	1.06					
					(0.24)		(0.24)						
<b>Ever cohabited by Wave V</b>					0.67	***	1.95	0.66	*	1.93			
					(0.14)			(0.14)					
<b>Region (ref. group, West) - Midwest</b>					-0.33	*	0.72	-0.33	*	0.72			
					(0.16)			(0.16)					
South					-0.60		0.55	-0.58	**	0.56			
					(0.17)			(0.17)					
Northeast					-0.32		0.73	-0.32		0.73			
					(0.21)			(0.21)					
<b>Constant</b>	-1.18	***	0.31		1.36	***	3.90	4.18	***	65.37	3.90	*	49.40
	(0.19)							(1.51)			(1.54)		
F-statistic		9.29			10.24			6.84			6.98		
<i>n</i>							2910						

Standard errors in parentheses. † -  $p < 0.10$ ; \* -  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\* -  $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*\* -  $p < 0.001$ .