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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

During the past ten to fifteen years the American public and researchers alike have shown a growing concern over adolescent pregnancy and childbearing (Hayes, 1987). Public awareness of these issues has been particularly keen during the past few years as popular magazines such as the Boston Globe Magazine (Diamant, 1986), New York Magazine (Klein, 1984), Psychology Today (Robinson and Barret, 1985), Time (Wallis, 1985), and Woman's Day (Cantarone, 1985) featured articles on these topics. A considerable amount of social science research has also been conducted on adolescent fertility during the last fifteen years. This research has focused predominantly on how adolescent pregnancy and parenthood affect young women and to a lesser extent the children born to adolescent mothers. Indeed, research on any aspect of the male's role in adolescent fertility has been scarce and usually based on small, unrepresentative samples. Nationally representative descriptive data have not been published on teenage fathers who are responsible for nonmaritally or maritally conceived first births, prior to this study, and we know virtually nothing about how young males perceive and experience adolescent fatherhood.
My research, based on two complementary surveys, will address this shortcoming in the adolescent fertility literature by focusing on male adolescent fertility, teenage fathers' propensity to live with their nonmaritally conceived first child, and young males' hypothetical intentions to do the same in the event that they and their girlfriend were responsible for an unplanned pregnancy. Throughout my discussion I will explore the association between living arrangement variables and young fathers' educational outcomes, schooling intentions, and their expectations for their partners' schooling.

Although much of my discussion will focus on young males who were responsible for a nonmaritally conceived first birth during their teen years, I will in several instances contrast this group of young fathers with teen fathers who were responsible for maritally conceived first births. These comparisons should illustrate how results can be altered if teenage fathers are grouped together without considering their marital status at conception.

**Problem Definition**

One of the most critical decisions that a young male must make after learning that his partner is pregnant with his child, is whether he should express a formal commitment to his partner and child by living with them and/or getting married. While living arrangement decisions will often be quite complicated, and involve parties other than the male and his partner, e.g., parents, I have chosen to emphasize the male's role in this area. Research has
seldom examined the young male's role in this decision making process nor how young fathers are affected by assuming the fatherhood role in the social sense. If living with a child fathered by a teenager does affect a young male's life it is important to focus on the initial decision as to whether or not the father lives with his partner and child. Even if this living arrangement decision, generally accompanied by marriage, does not have direct consequences for the male partner, the decision is likely to have a profound impact on the lives of the female partner and child and therefore warrants study.

It is generally assumed that for physiological and social reasons the consequences of teenage fertility are more direct and pronounced for young women than they are for young men (Card, 1977). Although males are not immune to the consequences frequently associated with early childbearing, many of these consequences are contingent upon the father's willingness to assume a degree of responsibility in raising his child, particularly since child support obligations for young fathers are seldom enforced (Rivera-Casale et al., 1984, see also Hayes, 1987: 206-208). Biological paternity does not necessarily imply a commitment to fatherhood responsibilities. In contemporary American society, assuming fatherhood responsibilities generally entails some type of commitment to the mother, usually in the form of marriage or a living together arrangement. The social dimension of teenage fatherhood as I operationalize it here thus requires the male to express a commitment to his child by living with him or her, at least initially.
Young males' willingness or tendency to live with their partner and child when the child is born may be considered an indicator of their "commitment" to the social aspects of fatherhood. Admittedly, the living arrangement measure I use does not assess directly a number of dimensions presumed to be relevant to the commitment concept, for example, a father's willingness to make sacrifices on behalf of his child, the intensity with which a father assumes childcare responsibilities, or the time a father devotes to interacting with his child. It is possible that a young father may play an active role in caring for his child even though the two do not live together. His reason for not living with his child may actually have more to do with his relationship with the child's mother than it has to do with his lack of interest in assuming responsibilities for his child. In some cases a young father will be denied an opportunity to live with his child from the outset if the child's mother retains custody of the child and chooses not to live with the child's father. Despite these caveats, this variable serves a useful purpose by identifying a group of young fathers who made an initial commitment to their child and partner. This variable will also enable me to illustrate the association between early fatherhood in its social sense and high school completion patterns. Living together is thus only one type of indicator of fatherhood commitment, but it is an important one: the decision to live with one's child and partner is likely to result in negative and/or positive consequences for the father, mother, and child (see Gabbard and Wolff, 1977; Parke et al., 1980.; Sawin and Parke, 1976; Rothstein, 1978; Vaz et al., 1983).
Some teenage fathers choose to dissociate themselves from their child and the child’s mother, or are forced by others to do so, thereby minimizing their vulnerability to various socioeconomic types of consequences. There are large subcultural variations in the tendency to legitimize unplanned births through marriage. Teenage males socialized within the black subculture, for example, are more likely than youth from other racial/ethnic groups to have children out of wedlock and to live apart from these children after their birth. A recent "Digest" report in Family Planning Perspectives (1984) noted that although out-of-wedlock births among blacks may be declining slightly and similar types of births for whites may be on the rise, black teenagers 15-19 still have about four times as many births out-of-wedlock as do whites, according to 1981 figures from the National Center for Health Statistics.

Previous research on unmarried pregnant women has shown that significant others are very important in decisions at the various stages of the pregnancy resolution process (Cotroneo and Krasner, 1977; Evans et al., 1976; Freeman, 1978; Rosen, 1980; Zimmerman, 1977). Likewise, males are also probably influenced considerably by significant others as they contemplate marriage and living together options.

The importance of normative referents and external factors for young fathers’ living together decisions can be illustrated by considering the racial differences in the acceptance of out-of-wedlock parenthood. Males’ behavior patterns may be influenced by young
mothers' willingness or ability to marry or live with their partner. Even though black adolescent males and females tend to be more pro-natalistic than their white counterparts (Thompson, 1980), and despite the fact that many young black males may be interested in living with their child and the child's mother, their disadvantaged status may discourage their partner (and her parent(s)) from wanting to pursue such an arrangement. Young males may also feel that their partner and child would be better served by not living with them, given their poor economic circumstances. Contrary to popular myth, a number of earlier studies have shown that many low income black males continue to show an interest in their child and the child's mother even if they are not married or living together (Furstenberg, 1976; Ladner, 1971; Liebow, 1967; Sauber, 1970).

The decisions young males make with respect to living together and/or getting married as a response to a teenage pregnancy may sometimes affect their schooling and employment activities. Young males' current educational and employment circumstances and motivations may also influence the likelihood that young couples will either live together and/or marry, as well as their educational attainment. One theoretically relevant causal issue then, particularly since males do not experience the physical side effects associated with pregnancy and childbearing, is whether or not assuming the fatherhood role in the social sense as a teenager curtails young males' educational attainment and influences their employment patterns. Unfortunately, it is quite difficult with the
data currently available to determine in a causal sense if assuming the social responsibilities associated with fatherhood affect teenage fathers' later educational and work behavior, or if current educational expectations affect young fathers' willingness to assume fatherhood responsibilities. The NLSY is probably the most suitable national data set for this purpose; but, the sample's age structure combined with the questionnaire design preclude a thorough assessment of this issue, as will be discussed in more detail in the methodology section.

It is useful at this point to reiterate Haggstrom et al's. (1981) observation:

Rather than causing a reduction in educational aspirations, early parenthood may simply reflect the realization of other plans that were not linked with further education. Early parents, who are not part of the "college-going crowd" in high school and who do not share the aims and criteria for success of many of their classmates, appear to seek other goals in life—goals that are more compatible with early marriage and parenthood. The stereotypical view of teenage parenthood as invariably interfering with educational plans clearly must be qualified.

This quotation highlights the difficulty of doing causal research in this area because it may be inappropriate for researchers to define a priori a given level of education as being desirable. Moreover, if the temporal ordering assumption required to infer causality is to be preserved, it is necessary to measure educational and work expectations prior to a pregnancy, and follow respondents over time to observe whether a decrement in educational attainment occurs.
Likewise, it is useful to identify whether the pregnancy and/or birth occurs while the young father is actively enrolled in high school or perhaps at least before he has received formal certification for completing his secondary schooling.

Some young fathers' educational careers will be affected adversely if they assume fatherhood responsibilities. But from an atheoretical and narrow policy perspective, the causal nature of this relationship may be of secondary importance in terms of teenage male fertility. The critical issue may simply be: Are males who tend to father children when they are teenagers on average more likely to acquire less human capital than males who do not experience early fertility? Males who father children when they are in their teens may tend to be below average students and have little motivation to complete their high school education and/or pursue further education. If males who father children when they are teenagers are predisposed to complete less education and have fewer individual resources than males who do not become teenage fathers, for whatever reason, young fathers will probably exacerbate the adverse consequences of their disadvantaged status for themselves, their child, and the child's mother. The indirect consequences of male teenage fertility and teenage fatherhood may be quite severe for the young father, mother, and child, then, even though early fertility may not be directly responsible for suppressing young males' socioeconomic status. Many young fathers who are not interested in graduating from high school and who are not part of the "college-going crowd" may have had no intention of completing high school or of pursuing post secondary
education; their disadvantaged educational status thus cannot be attributed to the fact that they fathered an unplanned child. Nevertheless, these poorly educated young fathers will probably have a difficult time providing adequate financial support to their child and partner, and they may feel insecure about their inability to assume financial responsibility for their family. If they do decide to marry or live with their child and partner, they may be ineligible for welfare assistance and possibly "doomed" for a life of poverty. This reality by itself will no doubt influence how policy makers address the teenage fertility issue in general, and how they attempt to incorporate young fathers into legislative and program initiatives. If teenage fathers are poorly educated and are either unemployed or underemployed, they will not be in a favorable position to contribute financially to their child and the child's mother, either in the immediate or long term future.

**Research Questions**

Despite the conceptual and methodological problems in assessing the effects of living arrangement decisions on subsequent educational outcomes, other questions can be answered in connection with teenage fathers' living arrangement propensities and intentions. For example, are there sociodemographic and attitudinal factors that are associated with the decision to assume the social responsibilities of fatherhood? If so, which factors are most prominent within a multivariate context? Do males tend to base their intentions on their own
personal beliefs concerning the advantages and disadvantages of assuming fatherhood responsibilities, or do they place more emphasis on what they perceive to be normative expectations from friends and family? Are there differences in the relative importance of particular attitudinal and normative beliefs in predicting this commitment decision, and do these preferences vary by race and socioeconomic class? For instance, are males' beliefs about what they feel their parents would want more important than their beliefs about their best friend's desires and are males from particular racial or socioeconomic backgrounds more likely to be influenced by their parents or friends?

An obvious question central to the teenage fatherhood issue then is: What types of teenage males demonstrate a general form of commitment to their partner and child by living with them around the time of the child's birth or reporting an intention to live with them? I will consider this issue from a sociodemographic as well as a social psychological perspective as I examine young fathers' actual living arrangement patterns and the hypothetical intentions of a separate sample of young males.

In addition to the series of questions related to commitment issues, it is important to determine the patterning of young males' fertility experiences relative to their high school enrollment and completion status. For instance, it would be useful to know the percentage of teenage fathers who are responsible for nonmarital conceptions (and births) while they are enrolled in high school, or
more generally, for those who have not yet received certification for high school. Similarly, it would be of interest to know the percentage of teenage fathers who have already completed their high school education prior to conception or becoming a father. Descriptive statistics of this sort will help us to appreciate an important dimension of the teenage fatherhood issue.

**Research Objectives**

First, I will use data from the 1979-1984 rounds of the National Longitudinal Surveys of Labor Market Experience of Youth (NLSY), a panel of 12,686 male and female youth who were 14-22 during the initial survey year 1979 and have been interviewed annually since then, to provide a sociodemographic profile of a national sample of teenage fathers and their peers who remained childless throughout their teens. I will differentiate the teenage fathers according to whether their child was maritally conceived or not. One of my objectives in using these data is to highlight the resources available to young fathers. I will accomplish this by comparing high school completion outcomes for young fathers who experienced a non-marital pregnancy that led to a birth with outcomes for teenage fathers whose child was maritally conceived and outcomes for males who remained childless through age 19.

It is important to note that accreditation for completing high school may come in the form of a regular diploma or a G.E.D. (General Educational Development). The G.E.D. program, introduced in 1943 and
revised in 1978, tests an individual's competency in mathematics, social studies, science, and reading and writing skills at the high school level and issues high school equivalency diplomas or certificates for satisfactory test scores. Most employers, training programs, and universities accept G.E.D. certificates in the same manner as they do regular diplomas (see Cervero, 1983; Swarm, 1981; Ulin, 1982), although a recent national study of 17-24 year olds found that the wage returns associated with a G.E.D. were considerably smaller than they were for a regular diploma (Morgan, 1984).

G.E.D. recipients are likely to be older than the typical group of students who receive their diplomas in the spring of their senior year. Data gathered by the G.E.D. Testing Service showed that the mean age of individuals taking the G.E.D. test in 1980 was 25.7, with 33 percent taking it before age 20 (Malizio and Whitney, 1981). (The mean age for G.E.D. recipients was 19.5 for the present sample of males 20-27.) Separate statistics are not available by sex or for those who passed the test. Cervero (1983) reported that G.E.D. certificates comprised 14.3 percent of all high school credentials issued in 1981 and projected that, based on current demographic trends, this figure should increase to at least 20 percent by 1990.

If a teenage birth is actually a disruptive life event, some teenage males may elect to drop out of school temporarily and then return for a high school diploma (or study and take a G.E.D.), or perhaps if they are already out of school, they may opt for a G.E.D. since they feel they are unable to return to regular school.
Grouping all high school graduates together would obscure this pattern. I will therefore restrict my analyses using the NLSY to males who were at least 20 years old as of their 1984 survey to provide respondents with adequate time to complete their high school education. Given that about 60 percent of G.E.D. candidates are 24 or younger, the present design accounts for a sizable proportion of the would-be "dropouts" in the NLSY data set; roughly 7 percent of this 20-27 year old sample earned a G.E.D. by 1984. Nevertheless, this figure will underestimate the total number of males who will eventually earn this form of accreditation since many will be in their twenties or thirties when they finally receive it.

By using sociodemographic data (e.g., race, geographical region of the country, parental education, family structure, urban-nonurban residence, religion) and high school completion information, I am able to develop a portrait of young fathers who live with their child shortly after he/she is born. I will use the NLSY data, to the extent they permit, to examine the relationship between the background factors noted above and young males' tendencies to live with their child shortly after their child is born, and the relationship between living with a child and completing high school.

In addition to my descriptive analyses, I will use the NLSY to consider whether teenage fathers who live with their child are any more or less likely to complete high school. I will also discuss a number of methodological issues which minimize the utility of the NLSY data for teenage fatherhood research in the methodology section to follow.
Second, I will supplement these sociodemographic analyses with data from a survey of 325 males who were enrolled in 10th grade Health Science classes in a midwestern metropolitan city. I will use these data to identify young males' preference for resolving an unplanned pregnancy. I will also use these data to examine some of the underlying social psychological factors related to young males' stated willingness to live with their partner and child in the event of an unplanned nonmarital pregnancy. More specifically, I will use a model of reasoned action developed by Fishbein and his colleagues (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980; Fishbein, 1972; and Davidson and Jaccard, 1975, see Figure 1) to explore young males' hypothetical intentions to live with their partner and child in the event of an unplanned nonmarital conception. This model is discussed more fully in subsequent sections.

My analyses using this high school data set will assess the relative importance of the salient beliefs and referents which young males identify as being likely to influence their hypothetical decision to make a commitment to husband and fatherhood responsibilities. I will also attempt to determine if the attitudinal or normative component of this model is significantly stronger than the other while considering the relationship between the various components of this model separately for whites and blacks, and males from different socioeconomic backgrounds.

My study thus considers both young fathers' propensity to live with their child and young males' intentions to assume spousal and
Figure 1: Azjen and Fishbein’s Model of Reasoned Action

The person's beliefs that the behavior leads to certain outcomes (B1)
X
The person's evaluation of these outcomes (E1)

X

Attitude toward the behavior (Aact)

Relative importance of attitude and subjective norm

Intention (BI) → Behavior

Subjective Norm (Sn)

The person's belief that specific individuals or groups think he/she should or should not perform the behavior (NBj)
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fatherhood responsibilities. I devote considerable attention to examining the racial patterns in these areas. Although I will develop an extensive argument regarding the probable connection between assuming fatherhood responsibilities and educational and work-related outcomes, the data I use generally do not permit me to establish a solid causal relationship between these variables. By using these two complementary data sets I will be able to provide a much needed description of a national sample of teenage fathers who were responsible for either a nonmarital or marital conception that resulted in a first birth, assess young fathers' living arrangement propensities, consider some of the social psychological factors related to young males' social fatherhood intentions, and examine how decisions and intentions pertaining to living arrangement considerations are related to schooling outcomes and expectations.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

As noted previously, most of the research that has addressed adolescent fertility issues has focused on the presumed adverse effects of teenage parenthood on young mothers and to a much lesser extent their children. The timing and sequencing of marriage in relation to nonmarital conceptions is an important topic of concern within this literature. A considerable amount of attention has also been devoted to understanding the relationship between teenage childbearing and various aspects of schooling. Research that has considered the varying effects of marriage sequencing on the stability of relationships and schooling outcomes is particularly relevant. More generally, research which has examined the racial, socioeconomic, family structure, and neighborhood factors associated with teenage fertility is of substantive interest here. I will review briefly the salient research on young women in these areas to provide some insights into adolescent parenthood in general before discussing the sparse literature on teenage fathers. While it would be misleading to suggest that the experiences of young mothers will parallel those of their male counterparts, it is possible that research on the former may provide some direction for research on teenage fathers.
Social Environment and Female Teenage Fertility

Several researchers have examined how socioeconomic, family structure, and neighborhood factors affect teenage female fertility (Hogan and Kitagawa, 1985; Moore and Hofferth, 1980; Mott, 1983; Presser 1978; Zelnik, Kantner, and Ford, 1981, see also Marsiglio and Mott, 1986). Using a sample of 13-19 year old unmarried black females, Hogan and Kitawaga (1985) recently examined the direct and indirect effects of social class, parental marital status, number of siblings, neighborhood quality, parental control of dating, whether a sister had been a teenage mother, and career aspirations of young women on the probability of experiencing a pregnancy before age 20. They found that all of these factors except neighborhood quality were significantly related to the likelihood of pregnancy in a multivariate context. The observed effects of these variables were mediated primarily by the timing of initial sexual intercourse. Upper class background was the only factor which affected the probability of pregnancy for teenagers once they became sexually active. The importance of unfavorable social circumstances is illustrated by Hogan and Kitawaga's (1985: 852) observation:

Considered in combination, teenagers who are from high-risk social environments (lower class, resident in a ghetto neighborhood, nonintact family, five or more siblings, a sister who became a teenage mother, and lax parental control of dating) have rates of pregnancy that are 8.3 times higher than girls from low-risk environments (upper class, resident in a good neighborhood, intact family, four or fewer siblings, no sister who became a teenage mother, and strict parental control of dating). These different rates cumulate substantially over the early life span, with
only 9 percent of the low-risk teenagers experiencing a pregnancy before age 18 compared with 57 percent of the high-risk teenagers.

While Moore and Hofferth (1980) reached a similar conclusion by noting that a young woman's family of orientation has a significant impact on the age at which she has her first child, they also noted that there are racial differences in how this family formation process occurs. Farm background and being raised in an intact family were more powerful predictors of age at first birth for blacks than they were for whites. In addition, the effect of family size was reversed, whites from large families tended to have their first child earlier while blacks from large families tended to begin childbearing at an older age.

Marsiglio and Mott (1986) found that living in an urban area at age 14 was not a significant predictor of experiencing a nonmarital pregnancy before age 20 for a national sample of females who were 19-27 in 1984. They did find that parental education, minority status (black or Hispanic), and being an economically disadvantaged white were associated with an above average probability of having a nonmarital pregnancy. Being raised a Fundamentalist Protestant and attending church more frequently were associated with an above average probability of pregnancy, while living in the South at age 14 was negatively related to pregnancy. In an earlier analysis with these data, Mott (1983) found that living with two parents at age 14 was negatively related to the probability of experiencing a pregnancy by age 17 and bearing a child by age 17.
Nonmarital Conceptions Among Young Women: Marriage and Divorce

While the proportion of young women who have experienced an out-of-wedlock pregnancy has stabilized since 1970, the proportion of young women who have married before their child’s birth has declined according to data from the 1980 and 1982 Current Population Surveys (O’Connell and Rogers, 1984). These data indicate that about 72 percent of first births among 15-19 year women in 1980-1981 resulted from conceptions outside of marriage and that about 32 percent of women who had an out of wedlock pregnancy married before their child’s birth. Black teenage mothers were more likely to experience a conception outside of marriage than were white teenage mothers, 97 percent compared to 64 percent (see also Robbins et al., 1985). Research has shown that black women on average wait longer to marry after a nonmarital birth than do whites, while black women with post-secondary education marry much more quickly than blacks with less education, black women from the South and North Central region marry more quickly than blacks from the West and Northeast, and women in the prime marrying years (18-19) for the cohorts of women studied (1950-1979) were more likely to marry quickly than younger or older mothers (O’Connell and Moore, 1980; O’Connell and Rogers, 1984; Teachman and Polonko, 1984).

A number of factors have been purported to be responsible for differential rates among blacks and nonblacks in their propensity to legitimate an unplanned birth (Chilman, 1980). At a structural
level, young low-income black males have a much higher rate of unemployment, and are less able to assume the financial responsibilities associated with fatherhood. Recent data indicate that black males 16-19 have an unemployment rate of about 43 percent, compared to a 17.5 percent rate for their white counterparts (U. S. Department of Labor, 1985). In her summary of literature conducted during the 60s and 70s, Chilman (1980: 220) notes that:

...marriage to legitimize a child is seen by many low-income black people as neither very practical nor moral. All too often the father of the baby is an unemployed or underemployed youth with little chance for financial improvement. Teenagers observe that marriages in poverty are apt to be fragile and conflict-ridden. The community usually holds that marriages should be entered into because they have a good chance of succeeding and because the couple wants to (and can) live together and establish their own home. Otherwise, the young mother and her child can live with relatives (often her own mother) or friends and not be committed to a new life pattern that may prove to be too onerous. Or failing these arrangements, if she cannot find employment and care for her child, she can "go on welfare".

This difference may also partly reflect the general tendency for black females to be more likely to postpone getting married than whites irrespective of childbearing status. Previous research based on the Young Womens cohort of the 1972 National Longitudinal Surveys has shown that among dropouts, black females tend to marry before age 18 about half as often as white dropouts from similar family backgrounds (Carlson, 1980).

There is evidence to suggest that young women who have a child conceived out of marriage may fare better in the long run if they do
not get married and instead live with their parents while they complete high school (Furstenberg and Crawford, 1978; McLaughlin et al., 1986). Furstenberg and Crawford reported that black adolescent mothers who lived with their parents or relatives were more likely to return to school, finish high school, be employed, and be independent of welfare support than young black mothers who made adult transitions which entailed establishing an independent residence.

McLaughlin et al. (1986) used data from the 1982 National Survey of Family Growth III (NSFG) and the 1979-1982 rounds of the NLSY to examine how several schooling outcomes for adolescent mothers were affected by the sequencing of marriage relative to first birth. After restricting the NSFG sample to 15-25 year old respondents, the probability of being enrolled in school six months after the birth of the child was not related to the sequencing of marriage for the total sample although a significant relationship was found among blacks. Whereas 56 percent of the young mothers who had a nonmarital birth were enrolled in school at a point six months after they gave birth, only 15 percent of those who conceived their child before getting married but married before giving birth were enrolled. The authors cautioned that their strategy of using an enrollment variable measured at one point in time (6 months after a child's birth) does not take into account individuals who completed their schooling within the 1-5 month period following a birth or those who returned to school after the 6 month observation point. The NSFG findings were generally confirmed by results from a similar analysis that was
based on data from the NLSY and which used the probability of ever returning to school as the dependent variable. Unlike the NSFG, the effect of sequencing on enrollment was significant for both races although it was stronger among blacks. Other analyses with the NLSY suggested that educational expectations did not affect the relationship between the sequencing of marriage and the probability of ever returning to school after the birth of the first child.

These authors also found, contrary to previous research (O'Connell and Rogers, 1984), that young mothers who married before their child was born, whether the conception was nonmarital or postmarital, were more likely to separate from their husbands than those who delayed marriage. Regardless of the consistency of this finding, it is well established that children born to women who began childbearing during their teen years are likely to spend at least part of their childhood in a one parent household (see Baldwin, 1980; Menken and McCarthy, 1979; Presser, 1980) and that marriages between young partners have a high probability of ending in divorce (Kellam, Adams, Brown and Ensminger, 1982; Moore and Waite, 1981). Research has also shown that teenage marriage rather than teenage childbearing is probably responsible for increasing the probability of marital disruption, at least for whites (Moore and Waite, 1981).

**Female Adolescent Childbearing and Schooling Issues**

The majority of studies that focus on educational issues pertaining to adolescent mothers have examined the association between
mother's age at first birth and completed years of schooling (Eacon, 1974; Furstenberg, 1976; Presser, 1980; Trussell, 1976; Card and Wise, 1978; Moore et al., 1978; Waite and Moore, 1978; Hofferth and Moore, 1979; Koo and Bilsborrow, 1979; Moore and Hofferth, 1980; McCarthy and Radish, 1983; Wertheimer and Moore, 1982; Haggstrom et al., 1981; see also Marini, 1984). Recent commentaries and reviews by Hofferth (1984 and 1986) and Rindfuss et al. (1983) highlight many of the key issues pertinent to the ongoing debate over the relationship between mother's age at first birth and educational attainment. Several other studies have considered issues related to early fertility and the process or probability of leaving, returning to, staying in, or obtaining certification for school (Darabi, 1979; Koo and Bilsborrow, 1979; McLaughlin et al., 1986; Moore et al., 1978; Mott and Maxwell, 1981; Mott and Marsiglio, 1985). The distinction between childbearing and actually assuming motherhood responsibilities is seldom made in this literature (see Moore and Waite, 1981 for an exception) because of the tendency for young mothers to live with their children.

In her recent review of this literature, Hofferth (1986) noted that there are several alternative ways of viewing the relationship between early childbearing and schooling. One line of argument contends that young mothers drop out of school and suffer deficits in educational attainment because of the constraints associated with early motherhood. On the other hand, schooling may be seen as delaying childbearing. Those who are below average in achievement or
motivation may drop out of school and then begin childbearing. It is also possible to argue that the relationship between age at first birth and school leaving is simultaneous. In other words, the first argument will be appropriate in some instances while the second argument will be more relevant in others. A final possibility is that there are independent factors which lead to both early school leaving and adolescent childbearing.

Hofferth (1986) suggested that research on this topic could roughly be divided into two phases. Research constituting the first phase was conducted during the early and mid seventies and was primarily descriptive (Bacon, 1974; Furstenberg, 1976; Presser, 1976; Trussel, 1976). These studies were based on local samples of youth who generally came from lower socioeconomic class backgrounds and the research tended to focus on short term consequences. Although these studies did not control for initial differences between teenage mothers and their peers who did not bear a child while a teen, they indicated a strong positive association between the age at which young women have their first child and the years of schooling completed.

A second phase of research initiated in the late 70's took advantage of data sets with more nationally representative samples than earlier research and used multivariate techniques (Card and Wise, 1978; Haggstrom et al., 1983; Koo and Bilsborrow, 1979; Moore et al., 1978; Hofferth and Moore, 1979; McLaughlin, 1977, 1986; Rindfuss et al., 1980, 1983; Waite and Moore, 1978). The models used
in this research attempted to account for the effects of an early age at first birth on educational consequences while controlling for initial differences among teenage mothers and their childless peers. After controlling for socioeconomic status, living in a single parent home, educational goals, and other factors, Moore and her colleagues found that an early age at first birth was associated with fewer completed years of school, with whites being adversely affected more strongly than blacks (Moore et al., 1978; Moore and Hofferth, 1980; Waite and Moore, 1979).

Some of the studies in this second group also examined the simultaneous relationship between age at first birth and schooling. This research attempted to account for the possibility that some women terminate or reduce their schooling because they have a child while others have a child because they have finished their schooling. Hofferth and Moore (1979) found a simultaneous relationship between age at first childbearing and educational attainment at age 27 while using a sample of 27 year old women from the National Longitudinal Surveys of Young Women. When they distinguished between early (18 and below) and older (19 and above) childbearers, they found no reciprocal effects among younger childbearers but there were simultaneous effects among older mothers. Koo and Bilsborrow (1979) performed a similar analysis with the 1973 National Survey of Family Growth sample of ever-married women 35-44 who had been teenage mothers and found results consistent with Hofferth and Moore for white women; although for black women, they found an effect of
schooling on age at first birth but no simultaneous effect. Hofferth (1986) has suggested that the inconsistency between these two studies for blacks may be due to the fact that the NSFG sample excluded never married women.

According to Hofferth (1986), the most significant area of recent and current research examines the "joint process of school leaving (and completion) and family formation." A few of the studies noted above can be categorized in this manner, for example, McLaughlin et al.'s (1986) work which was discussed in the context of marriage sequencing and early childbearing. Some of this research has attempted to identify young women who have had a baby and then dropped out of school as well as those who dropped out of school prior to conceiving or giving birth to their child. The unique feature of this kind of research is its emphasis on the temporal sequencing of fertility and schooling events.

Moore et al. (1978) made an extensive attempt to examine school leaving and reentry patterns among young childbearers. They estimated models of school exit using data from the 1968-1972 waves of the Young Women's Cohort of the National Longitudinal Surveys (women aged 14-24 in 1968). While they considered school leaving at five distinct levels (e.g., some high school, high school graduate, some college, college graduate, and post-graduate), only their models focusing on the first two levels are discussed here. Respondents eligible for the first model were all women who were enrolled full-time at t-1 and had completed ten or fewer years of schooling, while
the second model was based on those who were enrolled full-time at t-1 and had completed 11 years. Their dependent variable measured whether or not a woman had discontinued full-time school enrollment at the interview following her year at risk. These models can thus best be described as school disruption models given the transitional type of dropout measure used. The major limitation of this research is that it does not take into account subsequent accreditation, either through formal re-enrollment and diploma receipt or acquisition of a G.E.D..

Their basic conclusion for the first exit model was that while a first birth had some direct and indirect effect on inducing women to leave school before graduation, marriage was the single most important factor curtailing school enrollment. Similarly, they argued that marriage had a greater impact than a first birth on school exits in the second model, although neither of these factors seemed to be important for women who remained in school for the first two years after they gave birth. The effects of early childbearing and marriage also appeared to be permanent since higher reentry levels were not observed for those who left school. Unlike the school exit models which were estimated for five levels of educational attainment, only one model of school reentry was reported for women who were not enrolled in school full-time at their 1971 survey.

Caution is warranted when generalizing from Moore et al's. (1978) results given the legislative changes enacted since the late 1960s and early 1970s which have enabled teenage mothers to remain in
school more easily (Goldstein and Wallace, 1978; Hendrixson, 1979), and the apparent shift in societal norms that reflects a greater appreciation for the difficulties teenage mothers encounter. Mott and Maxwell (1981), using data from both the Young Women's cohort and the Youth cohort of the National Longitudinal Surveys, documented this trend by finding that more teenage women (as of 1979) were enrolled in school at a point five months prior to delivery, irrespective of their racial background, than were attending school in 1968. A similar finding was reported for the probability of returning to school at a reference point nine months subsequent to a birth. This study also reported statistics for staying in school at different points in time relative to a first birth for both high school dropouts and graduates. As with the Moore et al. (1978) study, however, no distinction was made between a high school diploma and a G.E.D. and this study did not clearly state whether the last enrollment date was the actual school leaving date or the date a credential was received. It is also important to note that while early childbearers may now be more likely to remain in school or return if they do leave, the relative probability for early childbearers and nonchildbearers to leave or return to high school may not have changed appreciably since the amount of schooling has risen for all women (McCarthy and Radish, 1983).

Mott and Marsiglio (1985) recently differentiated between regular diploma and G.E.D. recipients and assessed the two possible strategies for identifying the date when respondents were last
enrolled in school. They highlighted the importance of the G.E.D. program for young mothers while using the NLSY to document the high school completion patterns for a contemporary cohort of young women according to when they had their first child relative to their schooling status. Among high school completers who had borne a child before the date they received their certification for high school, about 40 percent earned a G.E.D.. These authors also demonstrated that when actual school enrollment is used to determine whether a child was born and/or conceived prior to high school completion, the rate of high school completion and the importance of the G.E.D. is underestimated for young mothers.

**Promoting Adolescent Fatherhood Research: Recent Developments**

While the previous discussion has underscored the voluminous body of literature that addresses adolescent childbearing issues for women, a comparable literature does not currently exist for males. However, during the past several years, researchers, family planning service providers, and funding agencies have demonstrated a growing interest in the male partner's role in teen pregnancies and adolescent childbearing. Three notable examples of this nascent development are Elster and Lamb's (1986) edited volume *Adolescent Fatherhood*, the Teen Father Collaboration project (TFC) which grew out of a Ford Foundation initiative, and the research agenda of the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs (OAPP) of the Department of Health and Human Services during the past several years.
The recent publication *Adolescent Fatherhood* was the first book devoted exclusively to addressing adolescent childbearing issues from the perspective of young fathers. It grew out of a study group of professionals that was supported by two organizations, the Committee on Study Groups and Institutes of the Society for Research in Child Development and the Foundation for Child Development. The book's primary purpose was to "synthesize current knowledge and stimulate further research" (Elster and Lamb, 1986: xi).

The Teen Father Collaboration project was launched in 1983 in eight U.S. communities and was funded primarily by the Ford Foundation with the assistance of a community foundation in each of the eight sites. The Bank Street College of Education was responsible for coordinating and evaluating programs within each of the communities. The project had several important goals:

1) to develop effective methods for reaching out to young fathers;

2) to provide these young men with services that successfully increase their responsibility as fathers;

3) to document with care all aspects of program development and impact; and

4) to focus local and national attention on the importance of including teenage fathers in any future attempts to overcome the many problems associated with adolescent childbearing

(Klinman, Sander, Rosen and Longo, 1986).

In 1984, the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs demonstrated its interest in fathers of nonmaritally conceived
children born to adolescent mothers by requesting proposals on "The Characteristics and Family Involvement of Fathers of Adolescent Premaritally Conceived Births" (U.S. Federal Register, 1984; see also Vinovskis, 1986). The six areas of research listed in this RFP are listed below:

1) What are the demographic, social, ethnic, and economic characteristics of the fathers of babies born to single teenage women? To what extent are they different than fathers of babies born to married teenagers?

2) In what ways and to what extent are the fathers of out-of-wedlock teenage births involved in the lives of the mothers and children, socially and financially? Is their involvement different from that of fathers of babies born to married teenagers?

3) What are the social, economic, health, and developmental consequences of fathers' involvement in the lives of their out-of-wedlock children? Are those consequences different from the consequences of involvement with fathers of babies born to married teenagers?

4) Are the problems of teenage fathers of children born to single adolescent mothers very different from those of older fathers of adolescent mothers?

5) What can be done to alleviate some of the difficulties facing fathers of children born to adolescent women while at the same time increasing their involvement with and responsibility for the young mother and child?

6) What are the advantages and disadvantages of fathers not marrying the pregnant adolescent from the point of view of the young mother, the child, the father, and society as a whole?

These requests are diverse and involve both teenage and nonteenage fathers. As Vinovskis (1986: 187) has noted, the OAPP's focus under
the Reagan Administration is "not only on the interaction of the father with the child or on his own problems and needs, but also on the father's economic responsibility to the mother and child."

Research Issues and Findings on Male Adolescent Fertility and Fatherhood

Our substantive understanding of adolescent fatherhood has not yet been enhanced appreciably given the recency of the developments noted above. The meager research that currently exists on males in the fertility and family planning literature provides little information about young males who father a child out-of-wedlock. Because of the difficulty of sampling teenage fathers, most of the research that has focused on aspects of teenage fatherhood has tended to be exploratory in nature and has been based on small, unrepresentative samples with numerous shortcomings (Barret and Robinson, 1982; Elster and Panzarine, 1980, 1983; Hendricks, 1982; Kahn, 1984; Redmond, 1985; Rothstein, 1978). Hendrick's study was based on 95 respondents but Barret and Robinson, Elster and Panzarine, and Kahn's studies were based on only 26, 16, and 20 respondents, respectively. Rothstein also defined "adolescent" very liberally (under 25) and several studies included adolescent and older fathers.

Barret and Robinson (1982) collected information from 26 young fathers (under 21) by soliciting their participation through their girlfriends who were residents of either a home or public school for unwed mothers, and a social service agency in North Carolina. The sample was 85 percent black. The authors reported that the young
fathers tended to feel that they were accepted by their girlfriend's family, had certain responsibilities toward their girlfriend and child, and continued to see their girlfriend at least daily or weekly.

Hendricks (1982) studied 95 first time unwed black adolescent fathers (under 21) living in Tulsa, Chicago, and Columbus. The fathers were identified by social service workers from teenage parenting agencies. Respondents were asked a series of true/false questions regarding their attitudes toward sex, contraception, and pregnancy. Only eight percent agreed with the statement "If I got a girl pregnant, I would want her to have an abortion."

Redmond solicited the participation of 74 Caucasian males (under 21) from Ontario, Canada through five community agencies. Twenty-eight percent of her sample knew they had caused a pregnancy. Respondents were asked to report on their attitudes toward adolescent fatherhood and willingness to be involved in pregnancy decision-making. Only five percent agreed that causing a pregnancy or actual fatherhood would result in a higher self-image among their peers or demonstrate their manhood. In a situation where a pregnancy was perceived to be the result of a casual dating relationship, 69 percent indicated that they would want their partner to continue the pregnancy, with eight percent indicating that they preferred to get married. Within the context of a serious dating relationship, 86 percent would want their partner to continue her pregnancy and 40 percent said they would prefer to get married. The vast majority of
respondents, 91 percent, reported that they would be willing to provide financial support to their partner regardless of how serious they were about their relationship.

While the small scale studies noted above have attempted to examine young males' attitudes and needs with respect to adolescent fertility events, a recent study by Robbins et al. (1985) estimated models to predict young males' responsibility for nonmarital pregnancies before the age 21. The sample consisted of 994 males from Houston, Texas who were interviewed in 1971 initially and then again during 1981-83. Fifteen percent of these young males experienced a nonmarital pregnancy with one percent occurring when the males were ages 12 to 15, and 4 percent at ages 16 and 17. Only parental socioeconomic status and school stress in the 7th grade (index of ten items indicating low grades, a desire to leave school, disciplinary problems at school, and the perception that teachers do not like the respondent) had significant direct effects on the pregnancy outcome variable. Hispanic and black males were more likely to be involved in nonmarital pregnancies but this relationship was mediated by parental SES. Father absence and number of siblings had no significant direct effects.

Many of the socioeconomic issues salient to teenage fatherhood are similar to those Hofferth and Moore (1979) raised concerning childbearing among young women. As these authors noted, the pervasive notion that early childbearing brings about various social and economic hardships for young women is not well grounded
empirically. Likewise, little has been done to explore similar issues for teenage fathers.

A sample of these types of issues would revolve around the following questions. To what extent, if any, and under what conditions, does fathering a child as a teenager decrease the likelihood that a male will attain a socio-economic status commensurate with his abilities and aspirations which existed prior to fathering a child? In turn, does a young father's inability to pursue his educational goals have a negative effect on his self-esteem and status aspirations? Are the initial socio-economic and academic differences between young fathers and their childless peers solely responsible for differences in educational and employment experiences among these two groups of males, or does fathering a child as a teenager represent an independent factor that curtails young men's opportunities net of other factors? How do teenage fathers respond to fathering a child in terms of their school and work related activities during the months immediately preceding and following the child's birth? For example, do they tend to drop out of high school and college, and if they do leave high school prematurely, do they eventually receive credit for high school through the G.E.D.? Are there long term consequences associated with an early first birth for teenage fathers who live with their child, such as lower educational attainment and unrealized employment opportunities, and how is age at first fatherhood related to these outcomes? In addition to the types of questions listed above, there
are numerous other questions that could be raised in terms of young males' involvement in decision-making, coping strategies, and fathering behaviors.

Haggstrom et al.'s (1981) analysis of males from the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972 represents one of the few studies on teenage fathers which uses national data. It attempted to determine how teenage male fertility affects young males' educational attainment. This study, although insightful in certain ways, is restricted to a sample of high school seniors (thereby excluding dropouts), focuses on teenage parenthood among youth in their late teens, does not distinguish between biological paternity and social fatherhood and deals primarily with young women. This sampling design limits the types of questions that can be addressed. The authors' major conclusion was that teenage fathers in this sample tended to have lower educational aspirations, lower educational attainment, and were less satisfied with their career progress than their childless peers; but, the effects of early parenthood net of marriage were quite small.

McLaughlin et al. (1984) have also used nationally representative data to analyze the consequences of the timing of marriage on educational outcomes for teenage parents. As with the Haggstrom et al. analysis, though, the major focus of their research was on young women. These authors found that adolescent males who married after their child had been conceived but before their child was born were less likely to enroll in school after their child's birth than males
who married after their child was born or who fathered their child after they were married. When they restricted one of their analyses to a sample of white males, they also found no evidence to support the notion that males with high educational expectations prior to conception would be inclined to delay marriage more than males with lower educational expectations.

The recently completed Teen Father Collaboration project which provides a model for organizing services to assist teenage fathers is another data source that has information on teenage fathers' educational and vocational behaviors. Eight different agencies that were previously working with women around the United States made a concerted effort to provide services to a sample of 395 teenage fathers who initially made contact with one of the sites. Of this initial sample, 204 young men returned for additional services. The programs offered young fathers a variety of services that included vocational training, job placement, assistance in completing their education, individual counseling, parenting skills classes, pre-natal classes, group and couples' counseling, and a grandparents' support group. Overall, the programs were influential in encouraging high school dropouts to return to school and/or obtain a G.E.D.. The project was also apparently successful in enabling young fathers to secure a part-time or full-time job (Klinman and Sander, 1986).
CHAPTER 3
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

In conceptualizing issues that deal with a young father's level of commitment to social fatherhood, it is important to realize that the living arrangement decision will usually not be his alone; family members and friends will often play an instrumental role in the decision-making process. Indeed, a young male's preferences may be completely ignored in some instances. My research is narrowly focused in that I do not address the complexity of the decision-making process here nor do I consider Gershenson's (1983) concept of "multiple fatherhood" which suggests that males other than the biological father often fulfill paternal kinds of roles for a child born to a teenage mother. Instead, I focus on the tendency for a young father to live with his nonmaritally conceived child, and I consider a young male's hypothetical intention to live with his partner and child under specified circumstances. Since educational activities are likely to be influenced by an unplanned birth, I discuss some of the possible effects of early fatherhood on educational activities.

I have several specific objectives in this chapter. First, I will explore the key issues relevant to a young father's educational and work-related decisions and the various factors that influence how
a young father will be affected by assuming a fatherhood role in the social sense. Second, I will discuss how normative referents and socioeconomic considerations play an important role in establishing racial differentials in living together propensities in response to unplanned nonmarital pregnancies. Third, I will discuss the essential features of Azjen and Fishbein's (1980) model of reasoned action. As a first step toward understanding young fathers' role in living arrangement decisions, I will use this model to consider young males' hypothetical intentions to live with their partner and child if they were to discover that their girlfriend whom they had dated for a year was pregnant with their child. Finally, I will delineate my major research hypotheses.

Life Course Perspective: Living Together and Schooling Issues

Adverse Consequences and Mediating Factors

From a life course perspective (Elder, 1978), an unplanned teenage birth is likely to be perceived as a disruptive experience, for the individuals directly involved and for the society at large, because it represents a major life event which has usually occurred "out of the normative sequence for which institutions of education, the family, and the labor market are designed" (McLaughlin et al., 1984). Admittedly, young parents may be affected by the earliness of a birth as well as whether the pregnancy occurred within the context of marriage. By emphasizing the "legitimacy" of the pregnancy in my
research, I will restrict myself to the group of youth who would seem most likely to experience difficulties. A teenage birth may prove to be detrimental because it accelerates a youth's transition to a parental and perhaps spousal role, and it may impede a teenager's future role transitions, for example, completion of school, entrance into the labor force, or enrollment in post secondary school (Bacon, 1974). A young male confronted with unexpected fatherhood responsibilities is likely to experience stress as he attempts to adjust himself to his newly acquired status and reconcile the competing role demands of being a father, husband, and student (Elster and Hendricks, 1986).

A young father may attempt to reorganize his priorities because of his own beliefs and values, or he may alter his educational and career plans to accommodate his new obligations as a father and perhaps husband because he feels pressured by others into making these changes. He may leave high school or college before graduating in order to enter the labor market. Or, if he has already left school, he may find that the responsibilities associated with his newly acquired statuses make it exceedingly difficult for him to resume his education. Another scenario involves the young male who is currently attending high school or college and manages to finish his current program, but perceives the arrival of a new baby as a legitimate reason to postpone or at least reassess his plans to enroll in college or graduate school. A teenage father may postpone or never realize his educational and career ambitions if he becomes
entrenched in an everyday work routine, a lifestyle which may enable him to feel comfortable momentarily with how well he is fulfilling his role obligations as a "responsible" father and husband. The tendency to postpone ambitions is of utmost concern if educational opportunities foregone early in a young male's life place him at a disadvantage later in life in acquiring human capital.

A number of diverse factors will determine the extent to which a teenage father perceives his fatherhood experience as problematic. They will also influence how well a particular teenage father adapts to his new situation, both with respect to the immediate future and the long term. Some of the more important factors are likely to be: the young father's view of himself as a student, both in terms of his abilities and how salient his student identity is to him; the seriousness of his relationship with his partner and the extent to which she supports his efforts; parents' and parents' in-law schooling expectations, financial resources, and willingness to assist the father, partner, and child financially, e.g., providing a temporary home and defraying the costs of child care; whether the father assumes direct responsibilities for fathering his child, e.g., financial and living together; the young father's grade level when his child is born; and the availability and quality of extended family and community support systems.

Student Identity. Many young fathers who end up living with their child and the child's mother will need to make decisions about education and employment. The extent to which these decisions will
be problematic to youth will depend on a number of interrelated factors as noted above. If young fathers are attending high school, they will have to decide whether to remain in school in order to earn their diploma, or to leave school to get a job. If they leave school, they need to decide whether to seek a G.E.D. certificate. Many young fathers will probably consider the possibility of remaining in school and working part-time. Some of those who do remain in school and have aspirations for attending college will undoubtedly encounter difficulties in making plans for pursuing post secondary education.

Besides considering their own employment and educational plans, young fathers may also think about their partner's plans and how their partner's desires and behavior will affect their own plans. Some young fathers may want their partner to continue her schooling if they are in high school or college, while others may expect their partner to leave school and take full responsibility for the care of their child. In other cases young males may want their partner to work in addition to taking care of their child.

Some teenage fathers may experience little difficulty attending school and achieving their desired level of education, but many others, presumably those who live with the child's mother, will find it extremely difficult to pursue their educational career in the manner they would have if they had not fathered and assumed responsibility for a child. One factor which may affect a teenage father's schooling decisions and ultimate educational attainment is
his perception of his competency in educational endeavors. If a young father considers himself to be a good student and his significant others have similar feelings about him, he will probably value his role as a student and be more assertive in pursuing his educational goals than the student who is pessimistic about his abilities and disenchanted with his school environment.

The saliency of the "student" identity to a young father's self definition and the relative position of this identity among his other identities will influence his behavior (Stryker, 1980). The extent to which the young father's "student" identity is based on either personal or social characteristics will also affect his behavioral preferences as he attempts to seek activities that provide outcomes relevant to his type of identity (Cheek and Briggs, 1982; Leary, Wheeler, and Jenkins, 1986). An identity related to school performance is more likely to consist of personal types of characteristics such as goals and abilities than it will social characteristics, for example, membership in an organization or friendship with another person. A young male will probably make a greater effort then to continue his education or to receive some type of formal certification for completing high school, even if others discourage his efforts, when he has a lot of psychological investment in advancing his educational career and when his student identity is defined primarily by personal characteristics. Hogan and Cheek (1983) found that individuals whose identities are based extensively on personal characteristics and weakly on social ones are more resistant to influence by others.
Relationship with Partner. A young male may have developed a strong attachment to a "student" identity but it is unlikely that he will have an identity that directly encompasses fatherhood responsibilities prior to the conception of his first child. On the other hand, a young male may have a very salient identity that involves his relationship with a girlfriend. The primary characteristics of his identity in this instance will probably be social in nature. The more important this identity is to him, the more susceptible he will probably be to influence attempts and the more likely he will be to pursue activities (e.g., living together, fathering behavior) that provide outcomes relevant to the social characteristics that define his identity.

Support from Parents and Parents-In-Law. It seems reasonable to expect that a young father who lives with his child will tend to experience more restrictions on uninterrupted schooling than his male counterpart who does not live with his child since the "committed" father will be more likely to assume responsibilities to provide income, and even contribute to child care. A young father may be more likely to experience difficulties in continuing his education if he lives apart from his parents' home or the home of his partner's parents. School completion, especially high school, should be facilitated for the teenage father living with parents or parents-in-law, since a convenient support network may be in place to help him fulfill his familial obligations. The wife or partner of a teenage father in particular may play an instrumental role in assisting a
young father to achieve his educational goals by contributing financially to the household and by extending emotional support to the young father. Similarly, parental expectations and financial resources are likely to be related to a young father's ultimate level of educational attainment.

**Fathers' Grade Level.** The timing of the birth in relation to the youth's current grade level may also influence a young father's decision about whether or not to "stick it out" and complete his schooling. Morgan's (1984) study of high school dropouts showed that youth who were attending the 10th or 11th grade were more likely to drop out than were those in 9th and 12th grade; so too, those who are one or more years behind their normal age-grade were more likely to drop out than were those who are on-time. Morgan also found that even after controlling for a number of nonschool differences, high school completers earned substantially more income than did dropouts, while delayed completion was not associated with any notable disadvantages compared to on-time completion. As noted previously, a regular diploma had considerably more certification value than the G.E.D. in terms of enhancing wage returns. The widespread conviction that school leaving is a more common and permanent phenomenon among minority groups was also well supported. These findings buttress the contention that accreditation is an important vehicle for status attainment in our industrialized society, and is an important outcome measure to consider when discussing male teenage fertility and fatherhood.
Today, a high school diploma or its equivalent is the minimum qualification for most jobs in the U.S. This reality is most salient to a young father who has an interest in, or is coerced into, contributing financially to the support of his child and perhaps the child's mother as well. Young women who have their first child when they are 15 or 16 years old are almost as likely to use the G.E.D. (21 percent) as they are a diploma (26 percent) as a means to receive high school credentials (Mott and Marsiglio, 1985). Data to be presented here suggest that males who father their first child at age 16 or younger also make extensive use of the G.E.D., earning it more than twice as often as older fathers. The G.E.D. thus affords many teenage mothers and fathers who would probably not otherwise graduate a better opportunity to gain entry into the labor market and to make a financial contribution to their families.

Quality of Extended Family and Community Support Systems. The importance of community support systems in assisting young fathers should not be overlooked. Special programs may be needed to assist young fathers in completing high school and acquiring relevant work experiences if they are to assume the fatherhood role actively (even if their involvement is limited to financial support), and pursue a post secondary degree if they desire.

Beneficial Consequences

The discussion to this point has tended to cast active teenage fatherhood in a negative light by emphasizing how accepting the
responsibilities of fatherhood can disrupt and curtail the educational careers of young fathers. However, some young fathers may benefit from assuming direct responsibility for raising their child. They may actually achieve educational outcomes which they might not have otherwise experienced. Young fathers who thoroughly commit themselves to their fatherhood role and also have high educational expectations, will probably find it exceedingly difficult to pursue and accomplish their educational goals. On the other hand, young males who only expect to finish high school or are even ambivalent about doing so, may view the financial responsibilities associated with fatherhood as an additional incentive to complete their high school education. They may therefore be more inclined to complete high school than their peers who come from similar backgrounds and have similar schooling expectations but do not choose to live with their child or are not given the opportunity to do so. This line of reasoning may also apply to older teenage fathers who have completed a few years of college and feel that it is in everyone's best interest if they put forth the extra effort to earn their degree.

In short, while a teenage birth is usually thought of as a destabilizing factor in young parents' lives, the demanding responsibilities associated with raising a child may help young fathers who live with their child develop a more mature life perspective than their counterparts. In turn, this life view may encourage them to take greater advantage of their educational opportunities.
Ajzen and Fishbein along with their colleagues have used their model to study varied forms of behavior including voting behavior, family planning, consumer behavior, occupational choice, and weight reduction. A diagram of this model can be found in Figure 1. Jaccard and Davidson (1972) and Davidson and Jaccard (1975) studied women's childbearing intentions and their intentions to use birth control pills. More recently, Jorgensen and Sonstegard (1984) have used this model to examine the pregnancy risk-taking behavior of adolescent females. The model was developed originally as an attempt to address what was perceived to be a gap in the attitude-behavior literature. Azjen and Fishbein (1980) argue that the best predictor of a particular behavior is the behavioral intention to perform or not to perform the given behavior. This type of intention is presumed to be a more accurate means of predicting a behavior than are global attitudes. This model is specifically designed to predict behaviors which are volitional in nature.

A person's intention to perform a particular behavior is considered to be the immediate determinant of the behavior. In turn, a person's intention is influenced by an attitudinal component and a subjective norm component. An attitude is considered to be a feeling of favorableness or unfavorableness toward performing a given behavior. An attitude is determined by the evaluation of a small set of salient beliefs (5-9). These behavioral beliefs reflect an individual's evaluation of consequences that may be associated with
performing a given behavior. Each of these outcomes is weighted by
the strength of an individual's belief that the behavior will
actually lead to the particular consequence. The products of the
individual beliefs and evaluations are then summed to create an
estimate of the attitude variable. With respect to the present
study, for example, a young male may value the idea of teenagers
spending time with their friends very highly, only somewhat, or not
at all. Meanwhile, he will either believe that assuming fatherhood
responsibilities will or will not deter his own chances of spending
time with his friends. Thus, the extent to which any of these
weighted salient beliefs influence a young male's intention will
depend on how the young male evaluates the particular consequence in
combination with the extent to which he feels that living with his
partner and child will bring about the perceived outcome.

The general subjective norm component refers to an individual's
perception that most people who are important to him or her think
that he or she should or should not perform the behavior. Normative
beliefs are thought to underlie this second component and refer to an
individual's perception of how specific individuals or groups feel he
or she should behave. Note that an individual's perception may not
be an accurate assessment of how others actually feel. The normative
beliefs are weighted by an individual's motivation to comply with
them. The overall strength of a young male's normative belief will
depend on the extent to which he is motivated to comply with a
particular referent in general. As with the attitudinal component,
an estimate of the subjective norm component is created by weighting each of the individual's beliefs about the views of particular normative referents with his or her motivation to comply with them. In making a decision a young male may take into account what he perceives his partner, her parents, his own parents, friends, and church leaders want him to do. A young male's perception of what significant others would want him to do in a given situation may influence his intentions even though he does not directly consult with them. Hudis and Brazzell (1981), for example, found unvalidated perceptions to be important for a sample of female clinic patients.

While an individual may have several referents, it is quite possible that an individual will be inclined to comply with some more than others. Since the vignette used in this study does not identify a specific young woman whom the male has impregnated, it seemed unlikely that males could provide an accurate assessment of what their hypothetical partner and her parents would want them to do or of how motivated they would be to comply with those preferences. These referents, however, may be the most influential parties in the decision-making process for living arrangements and marital decisions. Rosen (1980), for example, found in her study of 432 unmarried pregnant women under 18 years of age, that the mothers of these teenagers assumed a prominent role in the pregnancy resolution process in more than 50 percent of the cases. Consequently, the research design will probably underestimate the overall importance of normative referents with respect to the living together decision.
Research Hypotheses

I initially discussed a series of factors that I presume will mediate how assuming social fatherhood responsibilities will affect teenage fathers' schooling. A thorough assessment of how these variables influence young fathers' educational activities unfortunately must await the collection of data which more readily lend themselves to such analyses. Nevertheless, the NLSY is useful for descriptive purposes and it can also be used to answer a few questions in a multivariate context.

My logit analysis of living together propensities will determine whether particular background factors have an independent effect on the probability that teenage fathers responsible for nonmaritally conceived first births will live with their child. I suspect that being raised a Catholic or Fundamentalist Protestant, attending church more frequently, living with two parents at age 14, living in the South at age 14, living in a rural area at age 14, and an older age at first birth will be associated with an above average probability of living with a child in a bivariate context. Meanwhile, I expect that being black and having parents with more education will be associated with a below average probability of living with a child. Some of these relationships are probably confounded and will be absent in a multivariate model. I will use a subset of NLSY respondents 14-15 years old at their 1984 survey to test my hypothesis that males who have a first child that is
nonmaritally conceived will be retarded in their school progression, have lower educational expectations, and complete fewer years of education in the short term relative to their counterparts who do not experience a nonmarital conception that leads to a birth. I will also test my hypothesis that living with an unplanned child will be associated with a lower probability of completing high school for young fathers who become fathers prior to completing school in a multivariate context.

Most of my hypothesis testing will involve the high school sample of males and will therefore focus on behavioral intentions rather than actual behavior. I predict that the attitudinal component of the Ajzen and Fishbein model will be a stronger predictor of intention than the subjective norm component. This is largely because the present research design could not consider the entire range of probable normative referents that young males may find important in their decision-making. Of the two normative referents considered in this research, parents and best friends, parents will probably be the referent with the stronger impact on shaping males' subjective norm because of the future-oriented and serious nature of the intention under study (Brittain, 1963; Sebald, 1986).

Social exchange theorists (Scanzoni, 1977; Winch and Gordon, 1974) have argued that adolescent males who have parents with more resources will tend to accommodate their parents' wishes more readily than young males whose parents have fewer resources to offer them.
While this study does not assess the sources of parental power young males attribute to their parents or the types of influence attempts parents might be inclined to use (a general measure of a youth's motivation to comply with parental and peer expectations is used here), I assume that adolescents from higher socioeconomic backgrounds will tend to see their parents as being potentially more powerful and as having more sources of potential power than males from lower socioeconomic backgrounds (McDonald, 1977, 1979). I anticipate that males from more affluent backgrounds will tend to do what they believe their parents want them to do more often than will males who are from less advantaged circumstances. Peer influence may therefore be greater among more disadvantaged males as these youth will be more likely to look to a social system other than parents for rewards since parental resources will be scarce.

In view of the greater acceptance of out-of-wedlock parenthood within the black subculture, I anticipate that there will be racial differences among blacks and whites in their willingness to live with their child and partner, with black males being less inclined to report that they would live with their partner than white males.

This study will also examine the extent to which young males' attitudes toward living with their child are associated with their perception that such a decision would inhibit their educational attainment. Contrary to McLaughlin et al's. (1984) finding that educational expectations were not associated with teenage fathers' marital decisions, I hypothesize that males with higher educational
goals will be less likely to state a willingness to live with their child and the child’s mother. I expect that young males who want to pursue their schooling beyond high school are likely to perceive teenage fatherhood responsibilities as being detrimental to their educational goals. Thus, I anticipate that for young males with high educational expectations, the belief that assuming fatherhood responsibilities would inhibit a teenage father’s educational career will be one of the more powerful beliefs underlying males’ attitude toward living with their child.
CHAPTER 4
RESEARCH DESIGN

Data for the present study were drawn from two sources, the National Longitudinal Survey of Labor Market Experience of Youth (NLSY) and the author's survey of youth attending 10th grade health sciences classes in six Columbus public high schools. I will describe the sample and procedures, measures, data quality issues, and research questions relevant to each of these data sets in turn.

The National Longitudinal Survey of Labor Market Experience (Youth)

Sample and Procedures

The NLSY is a nationally representative panel survey that included 12,686 respondents who were 14 to 22 years old during the initial survey year 1979. Responsibility for drawing the sample, conducting the field work, and preparing data tapes was subcontracted by the Center for Human Resource Research to the National Opinion Research Center (NORC). The procedures for selecting the NLSY sample are described in the Center for Human Resource Research (1986) Handbook as follows:
The target population for this survey consists of ten groups between the ages of 14 and 21 on January 1, 1979:

Group 1  Hispanic males (946)
Group 2  Hispanic females (978)
Group 3  Non-Hispanic black males (1,444)
Group 4  Non-Hispanic black females (1,479)
Group 5  Non-Hispanic, nonblack, economically disadvantaged males (744)
Group 6  Non-Hispanic, nonblack, economically disadvantaged females (899)
Group 7  All Non-Hispanic, nonblack males (2,441)
Group 8  All Non-Hispanic, nonblack females (2,475)
Group 9  Male military personnel (823)
Group 10  Female military personnel (457).

For all cohorts, individuals were considered in the population if they were living within the 50 states or if they were on active military duty outside the United States. Excluded from these groups are individuals living in institutions on a permanent basis.

With the exception of individuals on active military duty, all sample selection was accomplished through a multistage stratified area probability sample of dwelling units and group quarter units. A screening interview was administered at approximately 75,000 dwelling and group quarters distributed among 1,818 sample segments in 202 Primary Sampling Units (PSU). A primary sampling unit is composed of either a single county or group of counties (SMSA). In certain special situations, state-defined units are termed "independent cities" or "parishes." In these instances, such units are used in the definition of primary sampling units. Included in this screening interview was information which would allow the identification of persons eligible for sample membership.

Approximately 18,000 of the screening interviews were carried out among 918 sample segments in the 102 Primary Sampling Units constituting the NORC Master Probability Sample of the United States. This sample is designed to maximize the statistical efficiency of samples which are "cross-sectional" with respect to the general population. Specifically, through the several stages of sample selection (counties, enumeration district block groups, sample listing
The remaining 57,000 screening interviews were carried out among 900 sample segments in a 100 PSU sample specifically designed to produce statistically efficient samples of Groups 1-6. All stages of sampling, except the final stage, were carried out with the probabilities proportional to a linear combination of population size for these groups. The effect of this procedure is to produce sample listing segments which vary significantly in terms of total population size but tend toward equality with respect to the target groups.

In the final stage of sample selection (i.e., dwelling units within sample listing segments), a moderate degree of oversampling was employed in order to increase the sample composition with respect to Groups 1-6. Since the use of oversampling tends to decrease sample efficiency, attempts were made to hold required oversampling to a minimum.

At all selected dwellings, attempts were made to obtain appropriate classification information for all persons living in the dwelling. In order to minimize the potential for "interviewer effect," survey interviewers were not informed about specific groups that would be included in the subsequent interviews.

Since certain classes of group members do not usually reside in dwelling units, procedures were also used to establish "linkages" between dwellings and these individuals. As part of the initial screening, household respondents were asked if there were any persons with primary family connections to household members who were away from the household at the present time. Included in this group were college students, persons in the military, persons in prisons and other institutions. Household respondents were also asked to name persons who might occasionally stay at the dwelling who did not have any other "usual place of residence." For each individual identified in this process an attempt was made to determine whether the individual would be "linked" to some other household (e.g., college students living off campus in their own dwelling units). All individuals without other linkages were included in the household composition for purposes of subsampling. The only exception to this linkage occurred in the case of active military personnel who were sampled separately.
Selection of sample respondents for the first interview was based upon the individuals identified at the household screening phase. Base year samples for groups 1-6 were selected from individuals identified in both screening samples (i.e., 102 PSU cross-sectional sample and 100 PSU special purpose sample). To the extent that individuals identified in the screening phase were obtained with different probabilities of selection (because of selective oversampling), the selection of base year samples attempts to minimize these probability differences.

Sample respondents in Groups 7 and 8 were selected from the 102 PSU cross-sectional sample. Restriction of subsampling for these groups to the 102 PSU National Sample is based upon considerations of per element statistical efficiency.

Members on active military duty were sampled from rosters provided by the Department of Defense. Sample selection was accomplished in two stages. In the first stage, a sample of approximately 200 "military units" was selected. These units were selected with probabilities proportional to the number of persons age 14-21 within the unit. Within selected units, persons age 14-21 were subsampled with probabilities inversely proportional to the first-stage selection probability. Separate samples were selected for males and females. A small number of military personnel living in their own households, not on military bases, were included in the household screening, too. This sample was dropped in 1984 when the Department of Defense withdrew funding. However, 150 respondents, representing those who would have been in the main sample even though they were in the military, were retained.

Because all individuals age 14 to 21 residing in a selected household were chosen as respondents, the survey includes interviews with over 2,400 household units in which two or more siblings were part of the sample. Of the initial 10,527 civilian respondents, 5,863 had one or more siblings who were also respondents. There are 3,386 respondents with one other sibling, 1,725 with two, 604 with three, 130 with four, and 18 with five. (In 168 instances a respondent and his/her spouse were interviewed.)
In summary, the sample includes an over-representation of black, Hispanic, and economically disadvantaged white males and females. The overall sample consists of three independently selected probability samples. These samples include 1) a nationally representative cross-section of civilian, non-institutionalized youth who were 14-21 years of age as of January 1, 1979; 2) a supplemental sample designed to oversample civilian Hispanics, blacks, and economically disadvantaged non-Hispanic, non-black youth; and 3) a military sample that represented youth 17-21 as of January 1, 1979 and serving in the military as of September 30, 1978. Among those selected for baseyear interviews, interviews were completed with 89.7 percent and 88.7 percent of the cross-sectional and supplemental samples, respectively. The military sample had a 71.5 percent interview completion rate for those targeted at baseyear. These subgroups can be weighted to represent a national cross-section of American youth aged 14 to 21 as of January 1, 1979. I will report all percentages throughout my discussion as weighted statistics. The sample sizes I report will reflect actual frequency counts.

Respondents have been interviewed during the first five months of each year through 1986 and a 1987 survey round is also planned. Every attempt has been made to interview each respondent at the same time each year. Over 95 percent of the original sample were interviewed in 1984 (6015 females and 6054 males). A more detailed description of the youth sample, panel design, and interview schedule can be found in Frankel et al.'s (1983) technical sampling report and

The NLSY, with the support of the U.S. Department of Labor, has since its inception in 1979 continued to gather a comprehensive battery of annual information about the employment, educational, training, and family-related experiences of all the respondents (e.g., ongoing marriage record), and, to a lesser degree, other members of their family unit (e.g., educational attainment of spouse and parents). A household record that includes information on the relationship to the respondent of other members in the household is also a feature of the NLSY. The surveys originally focused primarily on the labor market activities of youth: employment, unemployment, job training, and wages.

More recently, however, the NLSY has become more diversified, reflecting the interests of other governmental agencies in addition to the Department of Labor. For example, in 1982 the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development funded the collection of a retrospective fertility history for male respondents and an extensive pregnancy history for female respondents. All respondents were asked to report the birth dates for all of their children. These records have been updated in each of the subsequent survey rounds. Unfortunately, the usefulness of the male fertility data is limited because of the post hoc manner in which these fertility data were added to the survey and because there was only a small amount of pertinent information gathered from males. The NLSY age distribution
(14-22 during 1979, 17-25 in 1982) increases the difficulties associated with using these data to do research on male adolescent fatherhood topics. Despite these shortcomings, the NLSY is perhaps the best available nationally representative data source on adolescent male fertility and living arrangements. My research focuses on the group of young males who were 20-27 at their 1984 survey.

**Male Fertility Measures**

**Teenage Fathers.** Males were classified as teenage fathers if they reported by their 1984 survey that they were 19 years of age or younger when their first child was born.

**Sequencing of Marriage, Conception, and Birth Among Teenage Fathers.** I identified three distinct patterns by comparing dates of child's birth and dates of marriage. These patterns are as follows:

1) **Maritally conceived teenage births** included births before age 20 where the conception occurred one or two months prior to marriage or anytime after marriage. All other births were considered to have been nonmaritally conceived. Dates were calculated by using a "century month" indicator which was created by multiplying the year date of the respective event (birth or marriage) by 12 and adding the month, where January=1, February=2, and so on. For instance, the century month for February, 1980 is (80*12)+2=962. I assumed that the vast majority of the young fathers who married during the first or second month following their child's conception would not have
known that their partner was pregnant when they decided to marry and therefore did not purposely marry to legitimate an unplanned pregnancy.

2) Nonmaritally conceived teenage births legitimated by marriage included births before age 20 which were defined as nonmaritally conceived, and where marriage occurred within three months of the birth and at least three months after conception but before the child was four months old. If births were full-term, this definition would exclude those cases where a young father’s partner was one or two months pregnant at the time of marriage, since these cases were defined as maritally conceived births. I used the dating information for births and marriages to calculate the child’s month of conception and identify young fathers who married within 12 months after a date which was three months subsequent to the conception date. The one to three month interval reflects my decision to classify fathers who had married within the first two months following conception as being responsible for maritally conceived births. Thus, I subtracted seven months from the child’s century date of birth and then added 12 to this number to arrive at a date that was approximately one year after a father would have presummably known that a conception had occurred. I classified a father as marrying within this one year period if he married anytime during those 12 months. If the father married during or after the 13th month, or never married, he was classified as not marrying within the one-year period. I chose the 12 month period instead of a more
standard definition that would have identified in-wedlock and out-of-
wedlock births because it would seem that fathers who married their
partner sometime during her pregnancy (but at least three months
after conception), and those who married during the first three
months following the child's birth, would have similar kinds of
commitments and perhaps experiences. The decision to use 12 months
as the upper limit was somewhat arbitrary but it was important to
feel confident that the respondent was marrying the mother of his
child and not someone else (respondents were not directly asked if
they married the mother of their first child).

3) Nonmaritally conceived teenage births not immediately
legitimated by marriage included births before age 20 where the
father was never married or married when the baby was at least three
months old. In other words, if respondents' century month date for
when their child was born was less than seven months earlier than
their century month date of first marriage, or they never married,
they were considered to have fathered a child that was conceived
nonmaritally and which was not immediately legitimated by marriage.

The the marital status and sequencing of births for all 555
teenage fathers could be categorized: 1) married at least seven
months prior to the first birth, 20 percent; 2) married at least
three months after the conception of the first child but before the
child was four months old, 32 percent; 3) married later than three
months after the child's birth or never married, 48 percent.
Subsequent Fertility of Teenage Fathers. I created three other categories which used the birth date information for first born children. I determined if teenage fathers were responsible for an additional birth (in-wedlock or out-of-wedlock) within three specified time intervals after their first child’s birth date (18, 24, and 36 months). Among those who had a nonmaritally conceived first birth during their teen years, 11.7, 22.0, and 34.7 percent had a second child during the 18, 24, and 36 month time period subsequent to the birth of their first child.

Living Arrangement Measures

Father’s Living Arrangement Immediately After Child’s Birth. I used the household record information to create a dichotomous living arrangement variable that differentiated between teenage fathers who lived with their child at the first observation point after their first child’s birth and those who did not. In cases where a respondent was not interviewed in the survey immediately following his first child’s birth, data from the next survey in which the respondent was interviewed were used. This appears to be a reasonable approach in that 93 percent of all teenage fathers in this sample were interviewed in all six years and 98 percent were interviewed in at least five. However, the living arrangement variable is potentially misleading in that data from the 1979 survey had to be used for all respondents who had a birth prior to their 1979 survey date; retrospective data on living arrangements were no:
collected. About 65 percent of the 555 teenage fathers who were 20-27 years old at their 1984 survey were responsible for first births born between 1978-1984 that were nonmaritally conceived. Respondents whose child was born during 1978 were not considered to be problematic cases, since most respondents were surveyed initially in the first five months of 1979. If all of the cases were included in creating the living arrangement variable, then, about 35 percent of the cases would represent teenage fathers whose first child was born sometime before 1978 and would therefore reflect their living situation as it existed at least several years after the child's birth. In an attempt to standardize this variable and insure its validity, I excluded from analyses the 148 cases where the teenage father's first child was born between 1969 and 1977.

**Parental/In-law Living Arrangement.** In addition, I used the household record information to determine whether or not teenage fathers who reported that they lived with their child at the first observation point after their child was born were also living with at least one of their parents or in-laws at the same observation point.

**Living Duration with Child.** I developed a crude indicator of the permanency of the young father's initial living arrangement with his child by differentiating between fathers who reported living with their child on at least two consecutive surveys immediately following the child's birth from those who did not live with their child at the first observation point or only lived with their child at the first observation point. In those instances where respondents reported
fathering a child during 1983, but after their survey, and also reported living with their child on their 1984 survey, I assumed that the situation would be the same in 1985 and thus coded these cases 1. Since the household record data on living arrangements only dealt with the situation at the time of the survey, the two consecutive survey criteria seemed to be the most viable way of assessing the permanency of the living together arrangement given the potential bias due to censored data.

**Educational Measures**

**Highest Grade Completed at 1979 Survey.** At their 1979 survey, respondents were queried about the highest grade they had ever completed. This variable had a range of 0 to 18.

**Highest Completed Grade Expected at 1979 Survey.** At their 1979 survey, respondents were asked to indicate the highest number of years of school they expected to complete in their lifetime. This variable had a range of 3 to 18.

**High School Completion Status as of 1984.** As of the date of their 1984 survey, respondents could have either received their high school diploma, received a G.E.D. certificate, or been defined as a dropout if they had not yet earned their diploma or G.E.D.. Respondents were queried about their high school completion status at each survey. They reported the month and year they received their credential and/or whether they were currently enrolled in school.
Highest Grade Completed by 1984 Survey. A variable was calculated which determined the total number of years of schooling respondents had completed by their 1984 survey. This variable ranged from 0 to 20.

Timing of Fertility Events Relative to High School Attendance and Completion Measures

I created century month dates for last school attendance and the receipt of high school credentials. I compared these data to similar fertility dates for teenage fathers' first child to determine the relative timing of these events. By comparing these dates I was able to create separate variables for diploma and G.E.D. recipients and those who had not yet received certification for high school by their 1984 survey. I distinguished between teenage fathers whose child was born during the same century month or prior to the school leaving/credential receipt date, and those whose child was born after this date. In addition, I estimated a date for knowledge of conception by subtracting seven from the birth date, which I then compared to the schooling date.

Background Characteristics

Other background characteristics were also assessed: race/ethnicity/disadvantaged status, geographical region, urban background, religious socialization, household composition, and parental education. I provide a brief description of these variables below.
1) Race/ethnicity/disadvantaged. The designation "Hispanic" refers to all respondents of Hispanic origin regardless of race, and "black" refers to all nonwhite, non-Hispanic respondents. Economically disadvantaged whites can be distinguished from other whites in the NLSY data as a means to supplement the conventional racial/ethnic breakdown of white, black, and Hispanic. The Office of Management and Budget's criteria for poverty in 1978 when the sample was selected was used to identify this group of poor whites. A similar variable was not available for blacks or Hispanics, so this variable has four possible values, Hispanic, black, nondisadvantaged white, and disadvantaged white. A dummy variable was also created which identified blacks as 1 and all others as 0.

2) Geographical region at age 14. A standard classification for regional residential status at age 14 (Northeast, Northcentral, South, and West) was based on the Federal Information Processing Standards Publication 5-1, June 15, 1970. Two regional variables were created: a) all four categories, and b) South versus all others.

3) Urban/rural residence at age 14. A urban-rural distinction is based on an item that asked respondents where they were living at age 14. Respondents could indicate that they lived in a town or city (urban), or either in the country but not a farm or on a farm or ranch (rural).

4) Religious socialization and church attendance in 1979. The childhood religious affiliation of respondents was determined using the following question, "In what religion were you raised?" For
descriptive purposes I classified respondents according to whether they were raised Catholic, Fundamentalist Protestant, other Protestant, or all others (including those who did not identify a religion). Consistent with Chi and Houseknecht's (1985) strategy, I classified all Baptists as Fundamentalists and I used The National Opinion Research Center's (NORC, 1981) coding scheme to differentiate between all other Fundamentalists and non-Fundamentalist Protestants. Biblical literalism and aspects of religious activities were the major criteria for NORC's designation. All Baptists were labeled as Fundamentalists since Southern Baptists predominate within this group and Stark and Glock (1970) have argued that even non-Southern Baptists are more fundamentalistic in their views than non-Fundamentalistic religions.

Church attendance as of the 1979 interview was assessed with the following question, "In the past year, about how often have you attended religious services--more than once a week, about once a week, two or three times a month, about once a month, several times or less during the year, or not at all?" This information was used to create two dummy variables to distinguish three levels of religious service attendance: once a week or more, 1-3 times a month, and less than once a month.

5) Household composition at age 14. Two categories were distinguished: living with two parents and all other arrangements. Respondents were considered to be living with two parents at age 14 if they indicated that they were living with either their mother and father, father and stepmother, or mother and stepfather at age 14.
6) Parental educational attainment. Respondents were asked the total number of years of completed schooling their natural mother and natural father had obtained as of the 1979 survey.

Data Quality Issues

A noteworthy data issue for the present study involves the quality of males' fertility reporting. The longitudinal nature of the NLSY provides an opportunity to assess the accuracy with which respondents report their birth histories over time. Mott (1983) evaluated the quality of the NLSY fertility data by examining discrepancies in the fertility reporting of males and females. Discrepancies (internal reporting inconsistencies) included "discrepancies in dates of birth (month and year only) between earlier and later records, the appearance of pre-1981 births in the 1982 records which had not previously been reported between 1979 and 1981, and the non-appearance in the 1982 birth history of births which had been reported earlier" (Mott, 1983: 7).

Mott found, not surprisingly, that women report their birth histories much more accurately than do men. Overall, 47 percent of the male respondents who ever reported a live birth as of their 1981 survey had at least one discrepancy, whereas 14 percent of comparable mothers had at least one discrepancy. Misreporting was most pronounced for fathers not living with their child. The most common type of discrepancy among males involved the reporting of a child for the first time in 1982 whom they were not living with at that time.
After resolving as many discrepancies as possible, using a series of internal record checks that utilized other reported fertility evidence in the various surveys and household and interview date information, the male discrepancy rate (28 percent) was still much higher than the female rate (three percent). Mott speculated that the higher discrepancy rate among fathers may be due in part to the fact that a higher proportion of fathers compared to mothers were not living with their children and would therefore be less likely to know specific birth dates. He also noted that men are less accurate reporters than women regardless of the living arrangement of the child in question.

These findings suggest that the overall teenage father subsample may be biased to some extent. Males who were less active in assuming fatherhood responsibilities may have also been less likely to acknowledge their fertility and would therefore have been mistakenly misclassified. Misreporting the child's correct birth date may have also been more common among fathers who were less involved with their children, but dating discrepancy is probably less systematic than is the failure to report a birth altogether. Consequently, the teenage father subsample, particularly when it is restricted to those whose child was conceived nonmaritally, may be biased toward young fathers who are above average in their degree of involvement in fatherhood. Caution is thus warranted when generalizing from these data. At the same time, however, it can be argued that these data are more reliable than cross-sectional data since misreporting was resolved in
about 41 percent of the respondents who had discrepant records. In this study I use the revised male fertility variables after the reporting discrepancies were altered (Mott, 1983).

**The Columbus High School Sample**

**Sample and Procedures**

The second data set is drawn from a sample of 624 youth who were surveyed in 1985 in six desegregated high schools in Columbus, Ohio. Analyses for the present research will focus only on the 325 male respondents. The Columbus public school system, which was under a court-ordered desegregation order between 1979-1985, includes sixteen high schools. The six schools used for the present study were chosen by school administrators. The administrators' major considerations in selecting schools were to identify schools in which resident principals and health teachers would be most likely to be cooperative in having their students participate in survey research, and to choose a combination of schools that would yield a sample large enough for statistical analyses. While this sampling procedure was not random, it is unlikely that the criteria used to select individual schools introduced any notable bias with the exception of underestimating the black student population. Whereas 33 percent of the sample was black, 45.1 percent of the Columbus public school population for grades 9-12 was black in 1985.
Compared to the weighted estimates of the NLSY, the high school sample has slightly over twice the proportion of blacks (33 percent to 14 percent), fewer youth who are living with two parents (58 percent to 83 percent), fewer Catholics (12 percent to 32 percent), fewer fathers who did not complete high school (20 percent to 30 percent), and fewer mothers who were high school dropouts (16 percent to 28 percent).

Several observations are worth noting with respect to the racial comparability of the two samples using the NLSY's weighted estimates. Among blacks, the high school sample has a much lower proportion of respondents who report that their parents are high school dropouts. Whereas 14 percent of blacks in the high school sample report that their father did not complete high school, the comparable figure for NLSY blacks is nearly 49 percent (percentages are based on valid answers since about 26 percent of NLSY blacks had missing data for father's education and ten percent did not report mother's education). Likewise, only 13 percent of the mothers of the black high school sample respondents were high school dropouts, compared to 51 percent of the mothers of NLSY respondents. Meanwhile, a similar comparison between NLSY estimates and frequencies for the high school sample reveals very little difference in parental educational attainment among whites. Twenty-nine and 24 percent of NLSY white respondents' fathers and mothers did not complete high school, whereas similar figures for the high school sample are 26 and 19.
Given the educational differences among blacks in these two samples it is somewhat surprising to note that only 46 percent of blacks in the high school sample were living with two parents when they were surveyed (73 percent were 15-16 years old), while about 60 percent of NLSY blacks lived with two parents at age 14. This difference is probably due to a cohort effect since NLSY respondents were 14-22 years old at their first interview in 1979. This interpretation is buttressed by the fact that 73 percent of white males in the high school sample were living with two parents in 1985 and about 88 percent of NLSY males lived with two parents at age 14.

I surveyed all non-overlapping health classes in the individual schools during the course of a school day. I distributed a 52 item, self-administered survey to students during their regular Health Science class period (see Appendix). The survey was pretested on a group of high school students from two health science classes in one of the participating schools. Respondents' participation was voluntary. They were instructed prior to taking the survey that they were to place their survey in an envelope individually whenever they completed their survey so as to insure the confidentiality of their answers. Respondents were first presented with a vignette about their involvement in an adolescent pregnancy (discussed below) and were then asked a series of attitudinal questions related to this vignette and directly relevant to Ajzen and Fishbein's model. They then answered a series of questions that required them to indicate how likely they would be to choose various employment and schooling
options if they were to decide to live with their child and partner. They were also asked about their own and their parents' preference about aborting a pregnancy or the arrangement for caring for the child if the pregnancy were carried to term. Sociodemographic data including respondents' age, current household structure, present religion, race, number of siblings, and parents' educational attainment were collected at the end of the survey along with respondents' expectation for the level of education they would complete and their perception of what their parents expected them to complete.

The 325 usable surveys completed by males represented 80 percent of the total 407 male students who were officially registered for the respective health classes. Health Science is a required subject ordinarily taken during the 10th grade, but several instructors informed me that some 11th and 12th graders were repeating the class. Respondents reported their age but not their year in school.

**Behavioral Intention Measures**

I created five variables in order to operationalize and test the Ajzen and Fishbein model: a behavioral intention (Bi) variable; two global components which included the attitudinal (Aact) and subjective norm (Sn) components; and two estimates of these global components, ΣBiEi and ENbjMCj.

The behavioral intention (Bi) was operationalized by presenting respondents with the following vignette to assess their behavioral intention to live with their child and the child's mother in the event of an unplanned nonmarital pregnancy:
Please imagine that you have been dating the same girl who is about your age for the past year and that she told you last week that she was two months pregnant with your child. For the purposes of this survey assume that your girlfriend wants you to live with her and your child.

Respondents were then asked to indicate on a seven point bi-polar adjective item how likely they would be to assume fatherhood responsibilities by living with their child and the child's mother.

The attitude component (Aact) was operationalized by summing scores from three evaluative measures that pertained to the question, "How do you think you would feel about living with your child and the child's mother?" These evaluative scales included the following bi-polar adjectives; 1) bad-good; 2) foolish-wise; and 3) harmful to me-helpful to me. Aact was created by summing the responses to these three items. For the small number of cases where information was missing from only one of these items, a value was imputed by substituting the race-specific (black-nonblack) mean value for that item in order to take into account any potential racial differences.

An estimate of the attitude component (ΣBiEi) was also created. Respondents were asked to evaluate on a seven point bipolar adjective scale (bad-good) how they felt about nine individual beliefs that dealt with experiences relevant to adolescence and teenage fatherhood (Ei). They were also asked to indicate on a seven point scale how likely they felt that living with their child under the circumstances described in the vignette would lead to the outcome specified in each of the evaluation items (Bi).
I attempted to develop a diverse set of experiences which were highly salient to adolescence and teenage fatherhood. I was primarily responsible for selecting the nine issues, although pretest subjects provided several useful insights. Generally speaking, these experiences dealt with views of autonomy/control and responsibility as they pertain to personal activities, work, and childrearing.

See the Appendix for a complete listing of the evaluation and belief questions. Note that the evaluation items numbered 3, 4, 8, and 11 in the original survey were reverse coded so that their conceptual meaning would coincide with the meaning of their accompanying belief question. The products of the corresponding evaluation and belief questions were summed to create an estimate of the attitudinal component.

The global subjective norm component \( (S_n) \) was operationalized with the following item using a seven point scale, "How likely is it that most people who are important to you would think that you should live with your child and the child's mother?"

An estimate of the global subjective norm component \( (\Sigma NBjMCj) \) was created in a manner similar to that used to create the estimate of the attitudinal component. The individual beliefs \( (NBj) \) about the views of respondents' referents were assessed by using a 7 point scale. Respondents were asked to indicate separately how likely they felt it was that their parent(s), best friend, and the religious leaders of their church would want them to live with their child, e.g., "How likely is it that your parent(s) would think that you
should live with your child and the child's mother?" Because 30 percent of the respondents indicated that they had no religious preference I did not use the data on church leader in my analyses. The two specific normative beliefs about parents and best friend were then multiplied by a seven point assessment of how motivated respondents felt they were to comply (MCj) with the specific referent in general, e.g., "In general I usually want to do what my parent(s) think I should do." The matched NBj and MCj values were then multiplied and summed to create an estimate of the normative belief component.

**Education Action Measures**

A number of items assessed respondents' perceptions of how likely they would be to choose particular options if they lived with their child and partner. Respondents were asked to indicate how likely they would be to do certain things using a 7 point scale. The statements that were relevant to this research include: 1) leave high school to find a full-time job; 2) leave school and try to earn credit for high school by studying for and passing the G.E.D. test; 3) ask my girlfriend to leave school when our child was born so that she could take care of our child; 4) ask my girlfriend to leave school and find a full-time job; 5) stay in school, earn a regular diploma, and then enroll in college.
Preferred Pregnancy Resolution Measures

Respondents were asked to choose from seven options the one they would most likely select if the decision concerning the pregnancy and possible birth were exclusively theirs:

1) get an abortion;
2) marry the girl and live with your child and your girlfriend;
3) ask your girlfriend to have the baby and then give him/her up for adoption;
4) let your girlfriend do what she wants as long as she does not expect you to get involved;
5) keep the baby, live with your girlfriend, but not marry your girlfriend;
6) Ask your girlfriend to have the baby and offer to pay child support but not live with or marry your girlfriend;
7) keep the baby yourself, and not live with or marry your girlfriend.
8) other (specify)

This question was repeated in order to ascertain what respondents felt their parent(s) would most likely want them to do. Information from these two questions were used to create parallel personal and parental probable first choice measures with four categories each. Abortion (option 1) represented a separate category. The second, fifth, and seventh options were collapsed into a single category since the father would live with his child in each instance. The sixth option which involved child support payments represented the third category because of its substantive interest and racial
differences. The final category "other" included the remaining options (adoption, let the partner keep the child and not get involved, and other).

**Background Variables**

Several background items were also included. Respondents were asked to indicate their age, current household structure, present religion, frequency of church attendance, race, and number of siblings.

**Respondent's age.** Respondent's age was measured in years.

**Household Composition.** A variable was created which differentiated between respondents who were living with two parents (natural or step parents) and all other arrangements.

**Religious Affiliation and Frequency of Church Attendance.** Respondents were asked to identify themselves as either Catholic, Baptist, Other Protestant, Jewish, other, and none. I subsequently used the coding scheme I had used for the NLSY data to identify which "Other Protestant" responses represented Fundamentalist Protestants and recode them accordingly. I combined Baptists with these selected cases to create a Fundamentalist category. The categories were thus distinguished: Catholic, Fundamentalist Protestant, Other Protestant, other, and none. Additional dummy variables were created which identified Fundamentalist Protestants and all others, and Catholics and all others.
Respondents were also asked how often they attended religious services using a six point scale ranging from "not at all" (1) to "more than once a week" (6). I created two dummy variables to identify the same three categories as for the NLSY: once a week or more, 1-3 times a month, less than once a month.

**Race.** A race variable was created which identified blacks, whites, and others. A dummy variable was also used which differentiated blacks from all others.

**Number of Siblings.** Respondents identified the number of siblings they had (including stepbrothers and stepsisters) and the variable was used as a continuous variable.

**Father's and Mother's Education.** The following categories were used to create separate variables to identify the respondent's natural father and mother's levels of educational attainment: left high school before graduating, high school graduate, some college, college graduate, and post college graduate. Two dummy variables were also created which distinguished three levels of parental education: did not complete high school, completed high school but did not complete college, and completed college. Mother's information was used when father's data was missing.

**Level of Education Expected.** Respondents were asked to indicate separately what level of education they expected to complete and what level they thought their parent(s) expected them to complete from the following list: leave high school before graduating, graduate from high school, attend one or two years of college, but not graduate,
graduate from two-year trade school or community college, attend three or four years of college but not graduate, graduate from four-year college, and obtain degree beyond college (lawyer, doctor, college professor). I also created a dummy variable which distinguished respondents who expected to complete college from all others.

**Desired Family Size.** Respondents were asked how many children they would like to have ranging from 0 to 8 or more.

**Data Quality Issues**

The vignette I presented to these males required them to imagine that they were confronted with an unexpected and presumably undesirable situation. Some males may have felt that the situation was far removed from their personal experience, particularly for those who were still virgins; however, recent media attention on teenage pregnancy and parenthood issues, as well as the visibility of teenage pregnancy in U.S. high schools today, is likely to have increased the saliency of this issue for this contemporary group of teenage youth. The decisions teenage males would make about this issue in real life would probably result in immediate and long term consequences. Unfortunately, it was not possible to test the extent to which males were able to appreciate the possible ramifications of their intentions and take them into account when they provided their answers. However, respondents were generally conscientious in completing their surveys and many of their open-ended comments indicated that they understood the seriousness of assuming fatherhood responsibilities.
Since I used a hypothetical situation as the major feature of my research design, I was restricted to a behavioral intention variable as my major dependent variable. As I have discussed previously, I attempted to present a realistic vignette that clearly specified the circumstances surrounding the unplanned pregnancy so as to enable respondents to indicate what their intentions would be in a particular situation. Given the paucity of information on male beliefs and attitudes regarding teenage fatherhood, an approach that focuses on intentions, though less comprehensive than one which also assesses actual behavior, is valuable nonetheless.

**Theoretical Issues**

Even though the research design used for the high school data focuses on behavioral intentions (the behavior is not measured here), it is worth noting some of the issues dealing with the linkage between the measured intention and the unmeasured behavior. In general, two factors influence the strength of the relationship between intention and behavior. The first is the degree of correspondence between the intention and the behavior. Measures of these two concepts should parallel each other with respect to four elements: action, target, context, and time. In this research, I attempt to specify as clearly as possible the conditions under which a young male is asked to indicate what he would do if he were responsible for an unplanned nonmarital pregnancy.
Living together is the action in this vignette while the partner and child represent the target. Several features of the vignette establish the context: dating the same girl who is about the male's age, dating for a year, and the girl being two months pregnant with the male's child. Given the wording of the example and the nature of the question, time is assumed to refer to when the child is born. The measured behavioral intention will be an accurate predictor of behavior to the extent that the measured behavior conforms to the conditions stipulated in the intention. In other words, the intention measured here is not necessarily expected to be an accurate assessment of how likely all young fathers will be to live with their partner and child, particularly for example, if the dating relationship is very casual. The importance of keeping the context in perspective is illustrated rather clearly by two males' comments:

I expect myself to possibly live with my child and the child's mother, but it would most likely depend on who the child's mother is. My girlfriend now would be a choice that is easy to make, I would most definitely live with her and my child.

If I had been going out with this girl for at least a year I would have to love her and therefore would have no regrets in marrying her. It might be tough having a child at that young age but if we love each other we can accomplish anything together.

The model also does not consider the role that the female partner will have in determining living arrangement decisions. A young father's intention to live with his partner may be volitional but his ability to pursue his preference can be thwarted by a partner or
parents who are opposed to the idea of having the young couple live together.

The second factor involves the stability of intentions over time. Aggregate intentions are more stable over time than individual intentions, since circumstances will tend to balance out. However, an exception to this pattern will result if there is an external event that changes intentions for a large proportion of the population in the same way. In this study, maturation may affect the strength of the relationship between intention and behavior. If the condition outlined in the vignette were not to occur for another year or so, respondents might have a different perspective on the possible negative and positive consequences of living with their partner and child because they might have a more realistic understanding of the situation and a better sense of their future plans.
CHAPTER 5
RESULTS

I will use data from the NLSY and the Columbus high school sample to address various issues pertaining to teenage fatherhood; the most important research objectives and questions are delineated below. Since a basic description of teenage fathers in the United States does not currently exist, I will use data from the NLSY to construct a separate sociodemographic profile of teenage fathers who were either responsible for a nonmaritally conceived first child or were married at the time of conception. I will also document teenage male fertility rates for this national sample of males while controlling for race/ethnicity, marital status at conception, and father's age at the child's birth.

One important question I will consider with the NLSY data is whether teenage fathers with particular background characteristics are more or less likely to live with their nonmaritally conceived first child shortly after the child's birth. I will examine whether particular background characteristics are related to teenage fathers' propensity to live with their child in a bivariate and multivariate context.

Another important issue I will address, to the extent the NLSY data permit, involves the relationship between teenage fatherhood and
high school education. This relationship can be considered by describing the accreditation patterns of teenage fathers and/or attempting to determine in a causal sense whether fathering and living with a child at a young age affects school completion outcomes. As was noted earlier, specifying the timing of early fertility events relative to the date students leave or complete high school has been an important issue in recent research on young mothers. While I will control for the temporal ordering of events to the extent the NLSY data permit, I will also consider the relationship between teenage fatherhood and high school completion outcomes in a noncasual context. I will determine whether there are differences in the completion patterns of teenage fathers whose first child was conceived nonmaritally within two age categories (11-17 and 18-19 year olds), teenage fathers whose child was conceived within a marriage but irrespective of the father's age, and males who were not responsible for fathering a child when they were teenagers. Since it is inappropriate to assume that biological paternity will necessarily result in social fatherhood which will in turn lead to attenuated schooling, I will use the subsample of males responsible for nonmaritally conceived first births to determine whether males who make a formal type of commitment to their unplanned child by living with him/her (and presumably to their partner as well), tend to exhibit different high school completion patterns than their counterparts who do not live with their child.
The analyses described above will provide timely and useful information about a national sample of young fathers. However, they are not ideal for establishing a causal relationship between early fertility events and high school completion patterns. To control for the temporal ordering of events, I will use a group of young fathers whose child was born before they left high school for the last time or received their diploma or G.E.D. I will focus on these fathers in order to consider whether those who lived with their child were any more or less likely to graduate from high school by 1984 than those who did not while controlling for selected background factors.

I will also supplement these analyses by focusing on a subsample of the NLSY youth who were 14-15 years of age in 1979 and who had not fathered a child prior to their 1979 interview. I will use this subsample to examine whether teenage males who had a nonmaritally conceived first child after their 1979 survey were already retarded in their age-normal grade level at the 1979 interview, had lower educational expectations (as measured in 1979), and were less likely to complete as many years of schooling by 1984, compared to their peers who did not experience this event. I will also compare the percentages of youth from these two groups who earn certification for high school through a G.E.D. or diploma.

An important point that should not be overlooked is that some young fathers have already stopped attending school prior to the birth of their child. It is possible to get a sense of the proportion of young fathers whose first child was conceived and/or born
prior to the date a teenage father received a high school credential or left school by using the small number of teenage fathers in this subsample of 14-15 year olds. This approach will identify the percentage of males and young fathers who are probably most at risk of experiencing adverse consequences from an early fertility event. Unfortunately, the small number of males who fathered a child prior to school leaving precludes using multivariate analyses to examine the relationship between living with a child and the likelihood of receiving a diploma or G.E.D. by respondents' 1984 survey date.

Research Questions and the Respective Teenage Father Samples: NLSY

Given the numerous sample permutations that are possible with the NLSY data, it is useful to summarize the key sampling decisions and describe the various subsamples before presenting the results (note that reported frequencies are unweighted but percentages are weighted). Of the original 6,400 males interviewed in 1979 and 1984, 582 had their first child before they turned 20, and 459 had a first child that was conceived nonmaritally. As of their 1984 survey date, 5,550 male respondents were 20-27 years of age, 555 had their first child before age 20, and 446 of these teenage fathers had a first child that was nonmaritally conceived. Nearly 78 percent of the teenage fathers whose first child was nonmaritally conceived and who were 20-27 years old in 1984 had therefore fathered their first child nonmaritally (37 percent married within the 12 month postconception period), and 21 percent were already married prior to or around the
time of their first child's conception. Of these 446 teenage fathers, 298 had their child sometime between 1978-1984. The rest (148) reported that their child was born in 1977 or earlier. The young fathers who reported that their child was born prior to 1978 were disproportionately younger than the group of fathers whose child was born in 1978 or later. Fifty-one percent of the young fathers whose child was born in 1977 or earlier had become a father when they were 17 years of age or younger, whereas only 20 percent of the sample whose child was born in 1978 or later were 17 years of age or younger when they first became a father. Consequently, my analyses using the living arrangement variable are based on a somewhat older than average sample of teenage fathers responsible for nonmaritally conceived first births. This sample of teenage fathers also has about six percent fewer blacks than the omitted group of teenage fathers whose first child was born before 1978. Just over half (50.3 percent) of this sample of males lived with their child shortly after the child's birth, and 22 percent of those living with their child were also living with either one or both of their parents or parents in-law at the first observation point.

With these sample permutations in mind, it is important to make explicit the nature of the sample that is being used to address each respective question. When I present tabular data on the high school completion patterns of young fathers, I will restrict the sample to those who were 20-27 years of age at their 1984 survey and whose child had been conceived nonmaritally (n=446). When I illustrate the
completion patterns for those who lived with their child and those
who did not, I will include only those teenage fathers whose first
child was born after 1977 (n=298) because the living arrangement
variable reflects the living situation shortly after the child's
birth most accurately for this group. I will also use this
restricted sample for my logit analysis of the propensity to live
with a child conceived nonmaritally. In addition, I will use a
sample of 1,253 males who were 14 or 15 years of age in 1979 to
address, to the extent possible, several issues that require the
temporal ordering of variables (e.g., educational expectations and
number of years of school completed measured prior to the pregnancy).
Sixty-one of these males were teenagers when they fathered a child
that was conceived nonmaritally after the date of their 1979 survey.

A summary of the background characteristics for the NLSY sample
is presented in Table 1 for the total sample of males 20-27 years of
age at their 1984 survey; for a comparison group of males whose first
child was born when they were at least 20 years of age or who had not
yet fathered a child by 1984; all teenage fathers; teenage fathers
whose first child was nonmaritally conceived; and teenage fathers
whose first child was maritally conceived.

Table 1 illustrates the racial, regional, religious, and socio-
economic heterogeneity of the present sample of American youth who
are currently in their early and middle 20s. It also highlights a
few of the sociodemographic differences among males who experience an
unplanned nonmarital conception resulting in a first birth during
Table 1: Distribution of Background Characteristics for Total Sample and Relevant Subsamples of Males 20-27 at Their 1984 Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Males Who Did Not Have a Child as a Teenager</th>
<th>All Teenage Fathers</th>
<th>Teenage Fathers with Maritally Conceived Child</th>
<th>Teenage Fathers With Maritally Conceived Child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent’s age as of the 1984 survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity/ disadvantaged status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>1188</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, not poor</td>
<td>2475</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>2338</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged White</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region of residence at age 14</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North central</td>
<td>1436</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence at age 14</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (City/Town)</td>
<td>4351</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>3902</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1181</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion as child</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>1671</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund. Protestant</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Protestant</td>
<td>1249</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No religion</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lived with two parents or stepparents at age 14</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4241</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>3872</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father’s education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 12 years</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>1486</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 15 years</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years or more</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother’s education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 12 years</td>
<td>2113</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>2143</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 15 years</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years or more</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age at fatherhood</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-16</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Frequencies are unweighted and percentages are weighted and do not add to 100% in all cases due to rounding.
their teen years and those who do not experience this event. Relatively speaking, it is quite clear that blacks are much more likely to experience an unplanned nonmarital pregnancy that results in a first birth than males from other racial backgrounds. Whereas only 13.6 percent of the overall sample of males are black, 35.3 percent of the subsample of young fathers experiencing a nonmarital conception are black. Likewise, compared to the overall sample, males who did not live with two parents at age 14 are overrepresented in the teenage father subsample, as are those who were raised in a Fundamentalist Protestant background. Young fathers with a nonmaritally conceived first child are more likely to have parents who have not completed high school and less likely to have college educated parents. It appears then that these differences are related largely to racial differentials in the tendency for teenage fathers to live with their child.

Table 2 presents a more detailed description of teenage fathers with nonmaritally conceived first births. Note that these fathers had not yet made a commitment to the adult roles associated with family formation prior to living with their child, whereas the opposite is presumably true for those married teenage males whose first child was conceived after marriage. The table highlights the socioeconomic background characteristics of young fathers who lived with their child and those who did not (a residual category which includes cases where the birth occurred before the 1978 survey, and for which the living arrangement variable could not be determined
Table 2: Distribution of Background Characteristics for Subsamples of Teenage Fathers with Nonmaritally Conceived Births Between 1978-1984 by Living Arrangement Status and Cases Where Living Arrangement Could Not be Determined: Males 20-27 Years of Age at Their 1984 Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Living With Child in First Year After Birth</th>
<th>Not Living With Child in First Year After Birth</th>
<th>Living Arrangement Not Known (Birth Prior to 1978)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent's age as of 1984 survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 28 18.1</td>
<td>27 19.9</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 20 15.7</td>
<td>49 24.1</td>
<td>1 0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 22 20.8</td>
<td>44 24.3</td>
<td>2 0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 16 12.9</td>
<td>36 16.6</td>
<td>10 5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 26 26.2</td>
<td>14 10.8</td>
<td>33 22.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 7 6.3</td>
<td>9 4.3</td>
<td>40 28.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>52 36.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>10 4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic 23 8.0</td>
<td>26 9.3</td>
<td>18 6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black 20 9.5</td>
<td>114 58.7</td>
<td>69 39.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White 43 71.1</td>
<td>13 23.1</td>
<td>40 42.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged White 33 11.4</td>
<td>26 8.9</td>
<td>21 11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of residence at age 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast 25 22.6</td>
<td>33 18.9</td>
<td>21 12.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North central 27 34.5</td>
<td>45 27.8</td>
<td>44 34.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South 36 38.6</td>
<td>69 38.5</td>
<td>53 35.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West 28 23.5</td>
<td>28 11.9</td>
<td>25 15.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA 3 0.8</td>
<td>4 2.9</td>
<td>4 1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence at age 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (City/Town) 89 70.1</td>
<td>151 83.6</td>
<td>124 78.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural 28 28.2</td>
<td>26 13.9</td>
<td>23 20.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA 2 1.7</td>
<td>2 1.0</td>
<td>1 0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion as child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic 38 34.6</td>
<td>37 17.0</td>
<td>32 24.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund. Protestant 45 35.0</td>
<td>95 51.3</td>
<td>80 49.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Protestant 17 16.1</td>
<td>27 19.8</td>
<td>19 12.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other 18 14.0</td>
<td>19 11.2</td>
<td>7 4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA 1 0.3</td>
<td>1 0.3</td>
<td>5 7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived with two parents or stepparents at age 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes 79 79.3</td>
<td>165 63.1</td>
<td>100 65.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No 40 20.7</td>
<td>74 36.9</td>
<td>46 31.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA 0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>2 3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 12 years 57 36.5</td>
<td>76 43.9</td>
<td>64 39.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 years 29 29.2</td>
<td>46 29.4</td>
<td>33 29.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 or more years 14 20.1</td>
<td>11 6.1</td>
<td>13 11.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA 19 14.4</td>
<td>46 20.6</td>
<td>38 19.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 12 years 61 40.4</td>
<td>98 51.6</td>
<td>63 36.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 years 40 43.0</td>
<td>48 30.4</td>
<td>52 44.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 or more years 7 8.1</td>
<td>17 8.6</td>
<td>13 7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA 11 8.5</td>
<td>16 9.3</td>
<td>20 10.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at fatherhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-16 5 3.9</td>
<td>21 12.9</td>
<td>40 21.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 16 12.4</td>
<td>23 12.1</td>
<td>37 29.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 37 29.9</td>
<td>73 40.4</td>
<td>48 28.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 61 53.8</td>
<td>62 34.6</td>
<td>23 20.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Frequencies are unweighted and percentages are weighted and may not add to 100% in all cases due to rounding.
precisely, is also incorporated into this table). Recall that this
table is based on a sample of teenage fathers who were older than
average when their first child was born and it has a smaller per­
centage of black teenage fathers than actually exists because the
living arrangement variable could only be created for males whose
first child was born after 1977 (this eliminated a disproportionate
number of younger fathers given the age distribution of the NLSY
sample). The sociodemographic profiles for these two subsamples of
teenage fathers should therefore be interpreted with caution.

**Male Teenage Fertility by Race, Father’s Age, and Marital Status at
Conception**

Table 3 illustrates the percentage of males 20-27 years of age
from the NLSY who experienced teenage nonmarital and marital fertili­
ity events while controlling for race/ethnicity/disadvantaged status.
As this table indicates, 6.8 percent of young males had a child while
they were a teenager and 5.5 percent had a nonmaritally conceived
first child. If we assume that nonmarital conceptions were
unplanned, these percentages suggest that at least 80 percent of the
first-born children to teenage fathers were unplanned. About 25
percent of teenage births were due to males who were age 17 or
younger and were nonmaritally conceived. Another 56 percent of these
teenage births were nonmaritally conceived to males 18 or 19 years of
age. Thus, about 19 percent were to adolescent males who were
married at the time of conception. The most obvious racial differ­
ence is that blacks were three times more likely than nonpoor whites


Table 3 Percent Distribution of Males Experiencing Selected Types of Fertility Events by Race/Ethnicity/Disadvantaged Status: Males 20-27 Years of Age at Their 1984 Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Hispanics</th>
<th>Blacks (not poor)</th>
<th>Disadvantaged Whites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any Teenage Birth</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Birth at Age 11-17, Nonmaritally Conceived</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Birth at Age 18-19, Nonmaritally Conceived</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritally Conceived First Birth</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>5550</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>2475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Frequencies are unweighted and percentages are weighted. All racial comparisons for teenage births are significant (p < .01). Racial comparisons for 11-17 nonmarital conception category are as follows: black-Hispanic (p < .05), black-nonpoor white (p < .01), and black-disadvantaged white (n. s.); 18-19 nonmarital conception category, black-Hispanic (p < .05), black-nonpoor white (p < .01), and black-disadvantaged white (n. s.); and maritally conceived category, black-Hispanic (p < .01), black-nonpoor white (n. s.), and black-disadvantaged white (p < .01).
to father a child as a teenager, 14.8 percent to 4.6 percent, but only slightly more likely than poor whites, 11.9 percent, and Hispanics, 10.9 percent (all racial comparisons significant at $p < .01$). The difference between blacks and other groups is even more pronounced when nonmarital conceptions leading to first births are considered. Whereas 14.2 percent of black males had a nonmaritally conceived first child when they were teenagers, only 3.4 percent of their nonpoor white, 9.1 percent of their poor white, and 7.0 percent of their Hispanic counterparts had such an experience. This general pattern can also be observed when attention is focused on the youngest (11-17) group of teenage fathers of nonmaritally conceived first births; the group which presumably is the most likely to be experiencing a socially off-time event. While 5.8 percent of black males experienced this event, the comparable figures for the other groups were 0.7 (nonpoor white, $p < .01$), 3.4 (poor white, n. s.), and 2.6 (Hispanic, $p < .05$). In addition, black males were the least likely group to marry during their teen years and then have a child (0.6 percent), whereas Hispanic males were the most likely to follow this pattern (3.9 percent, $p < .01$).

It is also noteworthy that of the 6.8 percent of males who were teenage fathers, nearly three-quarters were 18 or 19 at the time their first child was born (see Table 1). Thus, less than two percent of the entire sample had a nonmaritally or maritally conceived child before age 18. The data indicate that not only were blacks more likely to experience teenage fertility than other racial groups,
they were also more likely to do so at younger ages. Nearly 23 percent of black teenage fathers in this sample were 11-16 years old when their nonmaritally conceived first child was born, whereas the comparable figures are 6.2, 11.1, and 9.1 percent for nonpoor whites, disadvantaged whites, and Hispanic teenage fathers, respectively (data not presented here).

Background Factors and Living Arrangement Tendencies

In addition to documenting the fertility rates of teenage males, it is instructive to consider what factors are related to young fathers' propensities to live with their nonmaritally conceived first child. I hypothesized in Chapter 3 that living together propensities would be related to respondent background characteristics, particularly race. As suggested earlier, previous research with young mothers has shown that blacks are less likely to marry to legitimate an unplanned pregnancy than other racial/ethnic groups. Thus, I examined the bivariate associations between initial living arrangements and a race/ethnicity/disadvantaged status variable as well as other background factors, some of which are typically associated with race—for example, parental education, being raised in a two parent family, and urban residence.

Before turning to this analysis, I should note that I considered performing supplemental analyses on living together tendencies by attempting to focus directly on the group of young fathers who committed themselves initially to living with their child. I reasoned
that while the initial living together decision is obviously very important and perhaps traumatic for many males (and females), young fathers' desires and decisions whether to remain with their partner and child may be equally significant. The transitory nature of marriages entered into in response to an unplanned pregnancy is well documented. I was thus interested in describing the young fathers who not only lived with their child initially but who also lived with them for at least a couple of years. Since the NLSY data were not specifically designed to consider issues pertinent to these kinds of arrangements, I was limited in my ability to characterize or examine this group of young fathers. I found that 87.8 percent of young fathers who lived with their child at the initial observation point after their child's birth were also living with their child at the next observation date. Given the small unweighted sample size, n=97, and the fact that there were so few young fathers who were not living with their child, I was unable to compare these two groups of teenage fathers in any detail. My analyses of living together arrangements are therefore limited to the first observation point after the child's birth.

The bivariate associations are presented in Table 4 for teenage fathers with nonmaritally conceived first children born between 1978-1984. A number of sociodemographic characteristics were associated with living together. This table highlights once again the tendency for black male youth not to live with their nonmaritally conceived first child. About 15 percent of teenage black males lived with their first child compared to 48, 77, and 58 percent for Hispanic,
Table 4 Percent Distribution of Teenage Fathers With Selected Characteristics Living with Their Nonmaritally Conceived Child at the First Observation Point After the Child's Birth: Males 20-27 Years of Age at Their 1984 Survey (Births Occurred Between 1978-1984)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent Living</th>
<th>N</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>298 50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>49 47.9&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>134 14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>56 76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disadvantaged White</td>
<td>59 58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at age 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>58 56.1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northcentral</td>
<td>72 57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>105 34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>56 68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence at age 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban (City/Town)</td>
<td>240 47.4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>54 68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>75 68.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fund. Protestant</td>
<td>140 42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Protestant</td>
<td>44 46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>37 56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived with two parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at age 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>184 57.4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>114 37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 12 years</td>
<td>133 47.1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>75 51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 or more years</td>
<td>25 77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 12 years</td>
<td>159 45.7&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>88 60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 or more years</td>
<td>24 50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at fatherhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-16</td>
<td>26 24.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39 52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>110 44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>123 62.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> = p < .01, <sup>b</sup> = p < .05, <sup>c</sup> = p < .10

NOTE: Frequencies are unweighted and the percentages are weighted. Forty-three percent of the respondents who had missing data for their father's highest level of education (n=66) lived with their child and, 50 percent of the respondents who had missing data for their mother's highest level of education (n=27) lived with their child.
non-disadvantaged whites, and disadvantaged whites, respectively ($x^2=90.72$, df=1, $p < .01$). Contrary to expectations, Southern youth were significantly less likely to live with their child compared to youth in other parts of the country, while youth living in the West were the most likely to live with their child ($x^2=17.67$, df=3, $p < .01$). Teenage fathers who lived in a rural area at age 14 were more likely than their urban counterparts to live with their first child ($x^2=8.90$, df=1, $p < .01$), and Catholic teenage fathers were also more likely to live with their child than were Protestants (Fundamentalists and non-Fundamentalists) ($x^2=17.6$, df=5, $p < .01$). Teenage fathers who lived with two parents when they were 14 years old were more likely to live with their child than were youth who did not live with two parents ($x^2=9.6$, df=1, $p < .01$). The oldest teenage fathers were the most likely to live with their child, while very young fathers (11-16) were the least likely ($x^2=15.73$, df=3, $p < .01$). Youth with mothers who had less than a high school education were less likely to live with their child ($x^2=5.23$, df=2, $p < .01$). A similar but stronger relationship was observed for father's education ($x^2=11.46$, df=2, $p < .01$). The interpretation of parental education is complicated, though, because of the small number of males with a college educated mother or father.

While Table 4 indicates that a number of characteristics are related to living together in a bivariate context, these relationships may be largely a function of racial/ethnic background. I therefore performed a multivariate logit analysis using the same
sample of fathers who were responsible for nonmaritally conceived first births. I considered the importance of these background factors net of other factors in predicting the probability that young fathers would live with their child shortly after their child was born (see Table 5). I used a logit model instead of ordinary least squares regression in this analysis to minimize the statistical problems associated with having a dichotomous dependent variable. The dependent variable in a logit model, represented by the formula \[ \log\left( \frac{P_i}{1-P_i} \right) = a + BX_i \], is the logarithm of the odds that a particular choice will be made. An advantage of the logit model is that it addresses the problem of predicting probabilities within a (0,1) interval by estimating instead the odds of an event occurring within the range of the entire real line.

I created a series of dummy variables, based on the results from the bivariate analyses, which I then used as the independent variables for the logit analysis. Since there were considerable differences among fathers from different racial/ethnic/disadvantaged status backgrounds in their initial likelihood of living with their child, I elected to create separate dummy variables for black, Hispanic, and poor white teenage fathers while using nondisadvantaged whites as the reference group. I used multiple dummy variables to account for religious attendance in 1979 (one dummy identified those who had attended religious services several times a year or not at all, another identified those who had attended 1-3 times a month, and the reference group consisted of those who had attended once a week.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Logit Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ethnicity/disadvantaged status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-1.655&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-2.621&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged white</td>
<td>-0.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lived in South at age 14</strong></td>
<td>0.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lived in urban area at age 14</strong></td>
<td>-0.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Raised Catholic</strong></td>
<td>0.786&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of religious attendance in past year 1979</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) several times a year/ not at all</td>
<td>0.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 1 month/2-3 times a month</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 1 a week or more (reference category)</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parental education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) less than 12 years</td>
<td>-0.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 12 years (reference category)</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 13 or more years</td>
<td>0.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living with two parents at age 14</strong></td>
<td>0.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fathered child between ages 11-16</strong></td>
<td>-0.168&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baby after graduation</strong></td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercept</strong></td>
<td>0.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likelihood ratio</strong></td>
<td>149.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample size</strong></td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> = significant at .01, <sup>b</sup> = significant at .05, <sup>c</sup> = significant at .10
or more). I chose these categories to represent a low, medium, and high level of religious commitment. Paternal education was the third variable I operationalized by using a series of dummy variables. I used a paternal education variable instead of separate variables for fathers and mothers to minimize the problem of missing data. One dummy variable identified fathers—mothers in the absence of the father—who had not completed 12 years of school, and the other identified fathers who had completed at least 13 years. The reference group was fathers who had completed exactly 12 years of school. I considered residence status and family structure at age 14 as I did in the bivariate analyses (urban/non urban, lived with two parents/other arrangement). I chose to examine religious upbringing by comparing Catholics to all others since they were most likely to live with their child and Fundamentalist Protestants did not appear to be different from their non-Fundamentalist counterparts. In terms of regional status at age 14, I focused on Southern youth because they were the least likely to live with their child and because this variable has been used in previous research. The bivariate results indicated that very young (11-16) teenage fathers were much less likely to live with their child than were older teenage fathers, so I used a dummy variable to identify this group of fathers.

In contrast to the bivariate relationships noted above, only a few of these variables were significantly related to the initial living arrangement of young fathers in a multivariate context. Being black, Hispanic, or fathering a child at age 16 or younger were
associated with a lower probability of living with a first child ($p < .01$). Being raised Catholic was related to a higher probability of living together ($p < .10$).

Since teenage fathers' propensity to live with their first child might be affected by their high school completion status at the time of their birth, I estimated another model which took this into account (see also Table 5). I included a variable which identified whether the birth occurred before the date respondents graduated from high school with a diploma or a G.E.D., or before they left high school for the last time if they were a drop out. A surprising finding was that this variable was not significantly related to respondents' living arrangement propensities. Teenage fathers whose child was born after they graduated or left school were no more or less likely to live with their child than fathers whose child was born before they graduated or dropped out of school. This finding should be interpreted cautiously, however, because the dating information was not ideal for many respondents, particularly for dropouts and G.E.D. recipients.

Logit analysis does not provide a convenient means to assess the relative and overall strength of the independent variables. I therefore performed a separate stepwise regression analysis (results not show here) in order to get a better sense of the importance of the relevant variables. The total set of independent variables accounted for 27 percent of the variance in the living arrangement variable with the black variable explaining 20 percent by itself. In the
context of the measured variables in this research then, being black is clearly the most significant predictor of initial living arrangement tendencies for young fathers while the remaining variables are of limited predictive value.

Since race apparently is an important variable in predicting initial living arrangement patterns for young fathers, I estimated separate logit models for whites and blacks to assess possible interaction effects associated with race (there were too few Hispanics and poor whites to examine these groups individually). The models presented in Table 6 are identical to the previous model (including the additional variable that accounts for the sequencing of the birth event and school attendance), with the exception that the race dummy variables were eliminated. The model was more powerful for whites than for blacks. For white teenage fathers, being raised Catholic, and living with two parents was associated with a greater likelihood of living with their child (p < .05), and living in an urban area and having a child at age 16 or younger was associated with a reduced likelihood of experiencing this living arrangement (p < .01). Surprisingly, none of the variables were significant for blacks, which would suggest that unmeasured factors are responsible for the strength of the black variable in the earlier analyses.

**High School Completion by Fertility Experiences, Race, and Living Arrangement Status**

Having considered the relationship between sociodemographic variables and initial living together arrangements of young fathers,
Table 6 Likelihood of White and Black Teenage Father Living with His Nonmaritally Conceived Child at the First Observation Point After the Child's Birth: Males 20-27 Years of Age at Their 1984 Survey (Births Occurred Between 1978-1984)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Logit Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived in south at age 14</td>
<td>.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived in urban area at age 14</td>
<td>-1.474&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised Catholic</td>
<td>1.263&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of religious attendance in past year 1979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) several times a year/ not at all</td>
<td>.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 1 month/2-3 times a month</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 1 a week or more (reference category)</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) less than 12 years</td>
<td>.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 12 years (reference category)</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 13 or more years</td>
<td>.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with two parents at age 14</td>
<td>1.712&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathered child between ages 11-16</td>
<td>-2.542&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby after graduation</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood ratio</td>
<td>72.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> = significant at .01, <sup>b</sup> = significant at .05, <sup>c</sup> * = significant at .10
it is useful to describe the high school completion patterns of teenage fathers. The following two tables utilize the NLSY data to describe the educational patterns of teenage fathers (both for those who were responsible for nonmarital and marital conceptions) and their counterparts who remained childless throughout their teens.

Table 7 presents a comparison of high school completion outcomes for teenage fathers who fathered their first child nonmaritally at ages 11-17 and 18-19, teenage fathers whose first child was maritally conceived, and a comparison group of males who had not fathered a child during their teenage years prior to their 1984 survey. This table reveals several notable patterns. The percentage of teenage fathers who were high school dropouts, irrespective of their marital status or age at conception, was significantly higher than the comparable figure for the group of males who had fathered a child when they were 20 or older or who were still childless as of their 1984 survey. Teenage fathers with marital conceptions had a particularly high dropout rate. Whereas 41 and 35 percent of the teenage fathers responsible for nonmaritally conceived births were high school dropouts, 61 percent of the married group had not completed high school by the 1984 survey. Taken separately or together, these figures stand in stark contrast to the 14 percent dropout rate for the comparison group. This discrepancy in the proportion of youth completing high school can also be illustrated by pointing out that whereas 86.0 percent of males who had not been teenage fathers had received certification for high school, only 59,
Table 7 Percent Distribution for Type of High School Completion Outcome for Males According to Their Different Fertility Experiences: Males 20-27 Years of Age at Their 1984 Survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fertility Experiences</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Dropout</th>
<th>G.E.D.</th>
<th>Diploma</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Birth at Age 11-17,</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmaritally Conceived</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Birth at Age 18-19,</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmaritally Conceived</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenage First Birth,</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritally Conceived</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Teenage Birth or No Birth</td>
<td>4880</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5416</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages are weighted and frequencies are unweighted: The graduation status for 2% of the sample could not be determined and were omitted from the table. The omitted cases are similar to the overall sample in terms of background characteristics.
66, and 39 percent of the teenage father groups had either earned a diploma or G.E.D. Teenage fathers, particularly young fathers' responsible for nonmarital conceptions and teenage males responsible for marital conceptions, were also more likely to gain certification for high school by obtaining a G.E.D. than males who had not been teenage fathers. While almost 14 percent of all teenage fathers earned a G.E.D., only 6.5 percent of all other males received this form of certification.

Additional analyses showed that males who fathered a child when they were 11-16 years old were in relative terms the most likely to earn a G.E.D. (32.6 percent), a finding consistent with previous research on young mothers (Mott and Marsiglio, 1985). This group of young fathers were about as likely to graduate as either 17 or 18 year old fathers. Fatherhood was clearly "off time" for this younger group. This may have enabled them to complete high school since they were probably not encouraged to assume new family responsibilities. Indeed, males who fathered children at very young ages (11-16) were much less likely to marry within the 12 month period immediately following the estimated date of conception than older teenage fathers. Only 5.5 percent of the youngest group of teenage fathers aged 11-16 married within this time period, compared to 42 percent of the 17-19 year old fathers.

As I noted earlier, whether or not teenage fathers live with their nonmaritally conceived first child may affect their progression through school and their ultimate high school completion status. It
is important to take into account the temporal ordering of the birth and schooling events in order to infer a causal relationship between living arrangement and high school outcomes since many fathers will have previously completed high school or dropped out before their child was born. Thus, in Table 8 I only focused on teenage fathers who reported a date for their first child’s birth which was prior to the date they either received their diploma or G.E.D., or left high school for the last time. I considered the relationship between initial living arrangement status and high school completion outcomes as of the 1984 survey within racial/ethnic/disadvantaged status groups because there are large differences in high school completion outcomes for these groups (Morgan, 1984). I also presented percentages for a comparison group of young males who did not experience a teenage birth.

Table 8 indicates that 72 percent of the teenage fathers who were responsible for nonmaritally conceived first births and lived with their partner shortly after the child’s birth had not completed high school by their 1984 survey, whereas 53 percent of those who did not live with their child were dropouts ($p < .05$). Those who did not live with their child were more likely to receive either a diploma (22 percent) or a G.E.D. (25 percent) than their counterparts who lived with their child, 11 and 17 percent, respectively. Thus, those who did not live with their child initially were significantly more likely to receive some form of certification for high school than their counterparts who did live with their child ($p < .05$). While
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Dropout</th>
<th>G.E.D.</th>
<th>Diploma</th>
<th>Total Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>2288</td>
<td>2288</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4880</td>
<td>4880</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages are weighted and frequencies are unweighted. Teenage fathers living with their child at the initial observation point were significantly more likely to be high school dropouts (p < .05), less likely to have graduated with either a diploma or a G.E.D. (p < .05) than were fathers who had not lived with their child initially. These two groups of fathers did not significantly differ in their propensity to earn a G.E.D. Respondents in these two groups were more likely to be dropouts (p < .01) and G.E.D. recipients (p < .01), and less likely to have graduated from high school (p < .01) than the comparison group of males who were childless through age 19.
the sample sizes are quite small, the data suggest that living with a child is associated with a substantially lower rate of high school graduation among blacks and, to a lesser extent, Hispanics. Whereas 38 percent of blacks who lived with their child completed high school by either receiving a diploma (23 percent) or a G.E.D. (15 percent), 67 percent of those who did not live with their child went on to complete high school, 35 percent by receiving a diploma and 32 by earning a G.E.D.. A similar though less pronounced pattern was found for Hispanics in that 25 percent of those who lived with their child completed high school, while 38 percent of those who did not live with their child graduated. This pattern was reversed for poor whites. Thirty-nine percent of the living together group graduated and 27 percent of the not living together group completed high school. Although none of the subgroup graduation differences between teenage fathers who lived with their child and those who did were statistically significant, this may be due to the small samples. These results should therefore be interpreted carefully and merely considered suggestive and in need of replication.

I then examined the relationship between the initial living together decision and the probability of graduating from high school in a multivariate context. I used a dummy variable which categorized diploma and G.E.D. recipients as 1 and dropouts as 0 for my dependent variable. With the exception of the religion variables, I used the series of variables from my earlier logit model as controls (see Table 9) in the present analysis. After controlling for these
Table 9 Likelihood of Teenage Father Earning a Diploma or a G.E.D. by Their 1984 Survey: Males 20-27 Years of Age at Their 1984 Survey (Births Occurred Between 1978-1984 and Before Last School Leaving Date or Certification Date)

Weighted Multivariate Logit Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Logit Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity/disadvantaged status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>1.602&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged white</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived in South at age 14</td>
<td>-.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived in urban area at age 14</td>
<td>-.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) less than 12 years</td>
<td>-.121&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 12 years (reference category)</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 13 or more years</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived with two parents at age 14</td>
<td>.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathered child between ages 11-16</td>
<td>.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived with child first survey after child's birth</td>
<td>-.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood ratio</td>
<td>86.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> = significant at .01, <sup>b</sup> = significant at .05, <sup>c</sup> = significant at .10
background factors, this analysis revealed that living with a child shortly after the child was born was not related to the probability of completing high school. Being black was positively associated with a higher probability of graduating, while having a father with less than 12 years of education was negatively related to the probability of graduating. Having a child at age 16 or younger was not related to graduation status.

One interpretation of the racial finding could be that norms and/or social/familial supports are more influential in minimizing the deleterious effects of teenage fertility for blacks males' schooling than for the education of white males. However, the fact that there are so few black males who lived with their child impedes my ability to assess whether actually living with a child is somehow less detrimental to black males than whites. It is possible that the blacks who chose to live with their child may be different from whites who lived with their child in ways which the background control variables did not take into account. For example, a self-selection bias may have existed whereby mostly industrious, highly competent black males had the opportunity to live with their child. As was noted earlier, parents of women impregnated by young blacks are apparently likely to dissuade their daughter from marrying or living with young black fathers.
Sample of 14-15 Year of Males in 1979

By using a subsample of males who were 14 or 15 years of age at their 1979 survey and who had not yet fathered a child as of their survey, I was able to address a few additional questions on male teenage fertility. I was able to document the proportion of young fathers who were responsible for a nonmaritally conceived first child before or after respective schooling outcomes. This subsample, which identifies a group of young males who had not yet fathered a child, enabled me to compare the educational expectations (measured prior to birth) and outcomes for those who went on to father a child while they were teenagers with those who did not.

Table 10 displays the percentages of conceptions and births which actually occurred before the three school-related events, diploma receipt, G.E.D. receipt, and last enrollment date for dropouts. Among young fathers who received a diploma, 76 percent had not yet received their degree when their child was conceived, but only 32 percent had still not received it by the time their child was born. Not surprisingly, 95 percent of the teenage fathers of nonmaritally conceived first births who earned a G.E.D. obtained their certificate after their child was conceived and born. Perhaps the most important piece of information provided by this table is that only 40 percent of the young fathers who had not yet received a diploma or G.E.D. as of their 1984 survey, when they were 19 or 20 years of age, had had their first child conceived before they left school. Thus, 60 percent of the high school dropouts who were
Table 10 Percentage of Fertility Events (Conceptions and Births) Relative to the Timing of High School Outcome for Sample of Teenage Fathers Responsible for Nonmaritally Conceived Births After 1979 Survey Date (14-15 Years Old in 1979)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Diploma</th>
<th>GED</th>
<th>Last Enrolled in School Date (Had Not Completed H.S. by 1984 Survey)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conception Before</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Estimated)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Before</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages are weighted and frequencies are unweighted.
responsible for a nonmaritally conceived first child were no longer attending school. In cases such as these, then, which comprised 33 percent of all nonmaritally conceived births to teenage fathers (see Table 11), the child may have inhibited young fathers' ability to return to school but could have in no way directly led to the young males' departure from school.

With this caveat in mind, the percentages for the various high school completion outcomes can be observed for the group of males who went on to have a nonmaritally conceived first child after their 1979 survey and the group of males who remained childless (at least through their teenage years). Seventy-four percent of childless males received a diploma, whereas only 43 percent of teenage fathers of nonmaritally conceived first births earned one (p < .01). Teenage fathers were more likely to utilize the G.E.D. option than their childless counterparts, 25 percent compared to six percent (p < .01). While teenage fathers' greater use of the G.E.D. helped to make their overall graduation rate more comparable to childless males, the later group was still significantly more likely to have graduated from high school (p < .05).

It is possible that young males who go on to become fathers as well as high school dropouts could be retarded in their school progression prior to fathering a child and therefore be at a greater disadvantage to complete school than their peers who remain childless. However, there were no significant difference between the mean attained grade level as of the 1979 survey date between those
Table 11  Comparison of High School Completion Outcomes for Sample of 14-15 Year Olds in 1979: Teenage Fathers With Nonmaritally Conceived Child After 1979 Survey and Males Childless Through 1984 Survey (19-20 Years of Age)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Dropout</th>
<th>G.E.D.</th>
<th>Diploma</th>
<th>Total Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teenage Fathers, Nonmaritally Conceived First Child</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childless Males</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages are weighted and frequencies are unweighted. Significant differences between teenage fathers and childless males for all high school outcomes, dropout (p < .05), G.E.D. (p < .000), diploma (p < .000), and total graduates (p < .05).
who eventually experienced a nonmaritally conceived first birth, \( x = 8.04 \), and those who did not, \( x = 8.00 \). There was a significant difference, though, between the number of years of schooling respondents from these two groups expected ultimately to complete. Prior to any fertility events, the teenage father group anticipated completing fewer years of school, \( x = 12.61 \), than their peers who did not father an unplanned child as a teenager, \( x = 14.00 \) (\( t = 3.79, p < .01 \)). Consistent with this finding, the teenage father group had completed fewer years of school as of their 1984 survey, 11.14, than the comparison group, 11.72 (\( t = 2.81, p < .01 \)).

**Research Questions and High School Data**

While I can provide a sociodemographic profile of teenage fathers and document their educational patterns and initial living arrangements with the NLSY data, these data do not address the social psychological factors related to these behaviors. The high school sample, while focused on a hypothetical situation, permits some explanation of young males' beliefs, attitudes, subjective norms, and intentions regarding pregnancy resolution, living arrangements, schooling options and expectations.

I will use the high school sample to describe young males' personal preferences and their perception of how their parents would want them to resolve an unplanned nonmarital pregnancy. For the purpose of this research, I am specifically interested in how males would respond to a hypothetical situation which would involve a woman
they had been dating for a year. One of my primary objectives will be to analyze young males' hypothetical living together intentions and test Ajzen and Fishbein's model for the total sample and for various racial and socioeconomic subgroups. These analyses will enable me to determine whether personal beliefs are any more or less important in predicting living together intentions than individuals' perceptions of what significant others would prefer, and whether there are racial and socioeconomic differences in the relative importance of these two components. I will also be able to determine if particular individual beliefs underlying the attitudinal and subjective norm components are more important than others. And finally, I will be able to determine whether higher educational expectations are related to a lower willingness to live with a nonmaritally conceived child.

Table 12 presents a descriptive summary of the high school sample. About 87 percent of the sample were between 15-17 years of age and 33 percent were black. Somewhat surprisingly, 42 percent of the sample had at least four siblings (in part this may have been because they were asked to count stepsiblings).

Pregnancy Resolution Options: Personal and Parental Preferences

Young couples have a variety of pregnancy resolution options from which to choose when they learn that they are expecting a child. From a young male's perspective he has at least seven possible alternatives to consider: 1) he may marry his girlfriend and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18+</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current household structure</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural mother and natural father</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural mother but no father</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural mother and stepfather</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present religion</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentalist Protestant</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Protestant</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of siblings</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's level of education</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left high school before graduating</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post college degree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother's level of education</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left high school before graduating</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post college degree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Includes two respondents age 14, ++ includes one 19 year old.
live with her and the child; 2) keep his baby and live with but not marry his girlfriend; 3) keep the baby himself and not live with or marry his girlfriend; 4) ask his girlfriend to have the baby and then give him/her up for adoption; 5) let his girlfriend do what she wants as long as she does not expect him to get involved; 6) ask his partner to keep the baby and pay child support; or 7) have an abortion. Note that some of these options frequently may be beyond his control. I ascertained young males' preferences for resolving an unplanned nonmarital pregnancy by asking them to indicate which option they would most likely choose if the pregnancy resolution decision were exclusively theirs. I also asked respondents to indicate what they believed their parents would want them to do. Because race was an important predictor of male adolescent fertility and living together propensities, I presented the results for the hypothetical pregnancy resolution choices separately for whites and blacks in Table 13 (there were no self-reported Hispanics in this sample). In addition, I used a crude indicator for socioeconomic status, educational status of the respondent's father, to examine males' choices more closely.

A number of insights can be gleaned from this table. Nearly 45 percent of all respondents felt that they would choose to live with their child in some kind of arrangement given the circumstances outlined in the vignette. Whites and blacks were about equally likely to select an option that involved living with their child, 45 percent to 43 percent. The same percentage of respondents, both white
Table 13 Percent Distribution for Males' Personal First Choice and Perception of Parents' First Choice For Pregnancy Resolution for Vignette: Restricted to White and Black Males Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal First Choice</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Abortion</th>
<th>Live With Child</th>
<th>Pay Child Support</th>
<th>Ask Partner to Keep</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Total</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father College Graduate</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Not College Graduate</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father College Graduate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Not College Graduate</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents' Probable First Choice</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Abortion</th>
<th>Live With Child</th>
<th>Pay Child Support</th>
<th>Ask Partner to Keep</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Total</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father College Graduate</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Not College Graduate</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father College Graduate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Not College Graduate</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The category labeled "Live With Child" includes respondents who chose one of the following options: "marry the girl and live with your child and your girlfriend," "keep the baby, live with your girlfriend, but not marry your girlfriend," and "keep the baby yourself, and not live with or marry your girlfriend." The category labeled "Other" includes respondents who chose one of the following options: "ask your girlfriend to have the baby and then give him/her up for adoption," "let your girlfriend do what she wants as long as she does not expect you to get involved," and "Other." Significant differences for total white-black comparisons were found for personal choice options, abortion, pay child support, and other (p < .01). Significant within white subgroup differences were found for abortion and live with child options (p < .01). Significant differences were also found for total white-black comparisons on parental item preferences of abortion and other (p < .05), and child support (p < .01).
and black, also felt that their parents would want them to live with their child.

Seventeen percent of the sample thought that abortion would be the most viable option for resolving an unplanned pregnancy. Whites were more than twice as likely as blacks to choose this option, 21.8 percent to 9.1 percent ($p < .01$). The other notable racial difference involved the option in which the partner was encouraged to keep the child and the male was to provide child support. Only three percent of whites reported this as their first choice, whereas 31 percent of blacks selected this as their number one preference ($p < .01$). Conversely, whites were more likely to think that their girlfriend should not expect financial help or should give their baby up for adoption, 30 percent to 16 percent, ($p < .01$). Socioeconomic status, as indicated by father's education, does not appear to account for these racial differences in opting for abortion or having the partner retain custody while providing child support. Among whites, however, young males who have a college educated father were much more likely to indicate abortion as their first preference than were males with a father who did not complete college, 37 percent compared to 17 percent ($p < .01$). Not surprisingly then, males with a college educated father were less likely to choose an option that involved living with their child than males with a father who was not a college graduate, 28 to 51 percent, ($p < .01$). The racial and socioeconomic differences in respondents' personal preferences were generally similar to those found among respondents' perceptions of their parents' choices.
**Living Arrangement Intention**

The distribution for the dependent variable of primary interest here, males' behavioral intention to live with their partner and child in the event of an unplanned pregnancy, is presented in Table 14 for the total sample and for whites and blacks separately. Almost 69 percent of the respondents reported that they would be at least 'slightly likely' to live with their child and the child's mother given the conditions outlined in the vignette, and 18 percent responded by saying that they would be 'extremely likely' to live with their partner and child. At the other extreme, seven percent of these youth indicated that they would be "extremely unlikely" to make this kind of commitment. Somewhat surprisingly, blacks and whites responded quite similarly to this question (no significant differences). Roughly 71 percent of blacks and 68 percent of whites reported that they would be at least "slightly" likely to live with their partner and child (the 27 respondents who reported their race/ethnicity as other than black or white and those who did not provide an answer were excluded from this comparison). This racial similarity in behavioral intention is inconsistent with current behavior patterns that indicate that blacks are less likely than whites to marry or live with their partner when teenage childbearing occurs (Chilman, 1980; Hayes, 1987).
### Table 14 Percent Distribution for Males' Willingness to Assume Fatherhood Responsibilities by Living with Their Child and the Child's Mother by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely Unlikely</th>
<th>Quite Unlikely</th>
<th>Slightly Unlikely</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Slightly Likely</th>
<th>Quite Likely</th>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blacks</strong></td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whites</strong></td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total includes all respondents regardless of whether or not they reported their race. Black-white differences were not statistically significant.
Salient Beliefs

I will examine the salient beliefs and normative referents that underlie the attitudinal and subjective norm components before examining the relationship between these components and young males' hypothetical intentions to live with their partner and child. Means for the individual belief evaluations, the strength of respondents' beliefs, and the products of these two measures are displayed in Table 15 for the total sample, and separately for whites and blacks.

Respondents were asked to evaluate particular ideas and outcomes associated with teenage fatherhood or the teen years in general. Respondents were only slightly likely (x=.90) to suggest that, "The idea that a child generally can be raised best by teenage parents if the natural father is present in the home is," good. Meanwhile, respondents were relatively favorable to the idea that teenage fathers would have a chance to watch their child develop week by week (x=1.93). The two outcomes which respondents were on average most likely to perceive negatively dealt with teenage males' inability to date different girls and spend time with their friends during their teen years (x=-2.00, and x=-2.09).

While high school males responded to the outcome evaluation items in the abstract, i.e., for teenage males in general, they were required to provide more personal responses to the items which measured the strength of their beliefs. These items referred to their beliefs regarding the probability of particular outcomes occurring if they lived with their partner and child. Not surprisingly,
### Table 15: Means for Outcome Evaluation, Belief Strength, and Weighted Salient Beliefs for White and Blacks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Evaluation</th>
<th>Belief Strength</th>
<th>Weighted Salient Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>My Living with My Child and the Child’s Mother</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Whites</strong></td>
<td><strong>Blacks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Would prevent dating other girls</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>-2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Would lessen chances of obtaining desired level of education</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>-1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Would give chance to care for the daily physical needs of child</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Enable watching of child develop week by week</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Require a steady job</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Enable assumption of financial responsibility for situation</td>
<td>-.84</td>
<td>-.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Enable child to have the best possible chance for being raised well</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Enable changes in social status</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Limit chances to spend time with friends</td>
<td>-2.07</td>
<td>-2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Attitude</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means are based on 7 point scale ranging from -3 to 3 where a larger value represents a more favorable evaluation or stronger belief. The evaluation item represents respondents' assessment of the desirability of selected outcomes relevant to either teenage fatherhood or the teen years in general (questions 3-11 on the original survey, see appendix for the exact wording of items). The belief items represent males' perception of the probability of these outcomes occurring for them if they were to live with their partner and child (questions 12-20 on the original survey, see appendix for the exact wording of items). The weighted salient belief means are based on the summed products of evaluation and belief scores for individual respondents. For those cases where information was missing on only 1 item, the group mean (calculated separately for whites and blacks) for that item was substituted. Sample sizes reflect the number of cases in which valid data existed for at least 8 of the items (total=322, whites=190, blacks=106). Estimated attitude is the proxy measure for the attitudinal component.

Two-tailed T-tests between white-black means: a=p < .01, b=p < .05.
the two outcomes which respondents felt were most likely to occur were that they would be required to find a steady job and that they would be prevented from dating other girls (x=2.25, and x=1.86). Perhaps the most notable finding, though, was that the outcome males perceived to be the least probable was that their chances of obtaining their desired level of education would be lessened (x=.32).

Issues of freedom, in particular respondents' views regarding restrictions on their dating other women and of spending time with their friends, were the two most negatively rated items when the weighted salient beliefs (product of the evaluation and belief items), were considered. On the other hand, being required to take a steady job and being able to watch their child develop week by week were the two most positively rated items. Relatively speaking, male youth did not seem to feel that it was essential that they live with their child in order for their child to have the best possible chance of being raised well, nor did they feel that living with their child would inhibit them from obtaining their desired level of education.

Whites and blacks tended to evaluate several outcomes differently. For example, whites assessed possible restrictions on spending time with friends more negatively than blacks (t=3.21 p < .01) and whites were less favorable in their evaluations regarding teenagers having a steady job (t=4.36, p < .01). Blacks indicated more favorable evaluations of a teenage father having an opportunity to care for the daily physical needs of his child (t=4.17, p < .01) and to have a chance to watch his child develop week by week (t=3.02,
Whites and blacks did not differ, however, on their perception of whether a child born to teenage parents would necessarily have the best possible chance of being raised well if both parents lived with the child.

Blacks and whites also differed in the strength with which they held several personal beliefs regarding the possible consequences associated with living with their partner and child. Perhaps the most notable difference was that blacks were significantly less likely to believe that living with their partner and child would limit their chances of obtaining their desired level of education ($t = -3.57, p < .01$) or of spending time with their friends ($t = -3.23, p < .01$). Blacks also held stronger beliefs than whites that their own child would have the best possible chance of being raised well if they lived with their partner and child ($t = 2.31, p < .05$). Similarly, blacks had stronger beliefs that living with their partner and child would enable them to care for their child's daily physical needs ($t = 2.80, p < .01$).

When I weighted the evaluation measures by multiplying them by the corresponding belief strength item, I found statistical differences between four of these created measures. Whites had a more negative attitude on all four of these consequences which were perceived to be associated with living with their partner and child: being inhibited in their ability to obtain their desired level of education ($t = 2.31, p < .05$), having a chance to care for their child's daily needs ($t = 4.25, p < .01$), being required to have a
steady job to support their new family ($t=3.20$, $p < .01$), and having more limited opportunities to spend time with their friends.

**Relative Strength of Individual Beliefs**

I then explored the possibility that particular attitudinal beliefs might have a distinctive and powerful relationship with the attitudinal component or behavioral intention. In a related analysis, I also examined whether any beliefs were important in differentiating between groups of males who intended to live with their child and those who did not.

Collinearity was not a problem with either the evaluation items, belief measures, or the weighted salient beliefs. In fact, the separate inter-item correlations within these three groups of items were quite modest. Among the evaluation items which assessed the desirability of particular kinds of events for male youth or teenage fathers, the indicators which focused on a teenage father spending time taking care of his child, a child being raised best if both teenage parents were present, and a teenage male being responsible for his own actions were the only items to have at least a $r=.20$ correlation with the direct measure of attitude. Similarly, only the first two items had a $r=.20$ correlation with behavioral intention.

Only a handful of the individual belief items, which assessed the likelihood that living with a nonmaritally conceived child would result in the respective consequences outlined in the evaluation questions, were correlated $r=.20$ or better with the attitudinal or
behavioral intention measures. A male's belief that living with his child would lessen his chances of obtaining his desired level of education was negatively related to his attitude ($r=-.35$) and a similar but weaker association was found between a male's belief that making this kind of commitment would limit his chances to spend time with his friends and his attitude toward living with his child ($r=-.21$). Having a chance to care for the daily physical needs of a child was positively related to attitude ($r=.33$). Only the belief about educational restrictions was related to males' intention to live with their child.

When I regressed the nine individual evaluation items on the direct measure of attitude, they explained 17 percent of the variance (see Table 1b). Three items were particularly important and each was positively related to having a more favorable attitude toward living with a nonmaritally conceived child. They dealt with a teenage father spending time taking care of a child's physical needs, a child having the best possible chance of being raised well if both teenage parents are present, and the idea that a teenage father should be responsible for his own actions.

The nine evaluation items accounted for only five percent of the variance when the behavioral intention variable was used as the dependent variable (see also Table 16). Two of the items which were related to attitude, a child having the best possible chance of being raised well if both teenage parents are present and the idea that a teenage father should be responsible financially for his own actions,
Table 16 Results for Multiple Regression Equations with Outcome Evaluations for Males' Attitude Toward Living with Partner and Child and Males' Intention to Live with Partner and Child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Evaluations</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Behavioral Intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would prevent dating other girls</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would lessen chances of obtaining desired level of education</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would give chance to care for the daily physical needs of child</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable watching of child develop week by week</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require a steady job</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit ability to make plans for life without worrying about others</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>-.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable child to have the best possible chance for being raised well</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable assumption of financial responsibility for situation</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit chances to spend time with friends</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>4.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>2.614</td>
<td>2.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items based on a 7 point scale ranging from -3 to 3 where a larger value represents a more favorable evaluation. Items represent respondents' assessment of the desirability of selected outcomes relevant to either teenage fatherhood or the teen years in general (questions 3-11 on the original survey, see appendix for the exact wording of items).

a = p < .01, b = p < .05
were also positively related to young males' willingness to live with their partner and child (p < .05).

The nine separate belief items explained 22 percent of the variance in males' attitude toward living with their child (see Table 17). The beliefs about assuming financial responsibility for the situation (p < .05) and caring for the child's daily physical needs were positively related to a more favorable attitude (p < .05), while the beliefs that living with a child would lessen educational opportunities (p < .01) and limit a male's opportunities to spend time with his friends (p < .05) were negatively related to attitude.

As with the evaluation items, the beliefs items were only of minor importance in explaining males' willingness to live with their child (see also Table 17). The belief items accounted for seven percent of the variance in this model. Caring for the child's physical needs and assuming financial responsibility were positively associated with the behavioral intention variable (p < .05), while the perceived restrictions on educational attainment was negatively related to living together intentions (p < .05).

In order to determine if individual variables were responsible for young males' intentions, I compared the mean values of the individual evaluation and belief items for the two groups of males who indicated that they were at least "quite likely" or "quite unlikely" to live with their partner and child (see Table 18). I also compared the "likely" group with males who were categorized as "unclear". The "likely" and "unlikely" groups of males were chosen
Table 17 Results for Multiple Regression Equations with Belief Items for Males' Attitude Toward Living with Partner and Child and Males' Intention to Live with Partner and Child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief Strength</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Behavioral Intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would prevent dating other girls</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>-.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.143)</td>
<td>(.060)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would lessen chances of obtaining desired level of education</td>
<td>-.556a</td>
<td>-.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.119)</td>
<td>(.050)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would give chance to care for the daily physical needs of child</td>
<td>1.085a</td>
<td>.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.200)</td>
<td>(.084)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable watching of child develop week by week</td>
<td>-.226</td>
<td>-.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.147)</td>
<td>(.062)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require a steady job</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.187)</td>
<td>(.077)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit ability to make plans for life without worrying about others</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>-.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.128)</td>
<td>(.053)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable child to have the best possible chance for being raised well</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.143)</td>
<td>(.059)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable assumption of financial responsibility for situation</td>
<td>.304b</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.151)</td>
<td>(.063)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit chances to spend time with friends</td>
<td>-.319b</td>
<td>-.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.153)</td>
<td>(.063)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R</td>
<td>.22a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>10.322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items based on a 7 point scale ranging from -3 to 3 where a larger value represents a stronger belief. The belief items represent respondents' perception of the probability of these outcomes occurring for them if they were to live with their partner and child (questions 12-20 on the original survey, see appendix for the exact wording of items).

a = p < .01, b = p < .05
### Table 1B: Means For Outcome Evaluation, Belief Strength, and Weighted Salient Beliefs for Males According to Whether They Are Unlikely, Unclear, or Likely to Live with Their Child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My Living with My Child and the Child's Mother</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Would prevent dating other girls</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
<td>-2.30</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>-4.43</td>
<td>-4.07</td>
<td>-3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Would lessen chances of obtaining desired level of education</td>
<td>-1.74</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.02(b)</td>
<td>-2.98</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>-.05(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Would give chance to care for the daily physical needs of child</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1.31(b)</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.01(a)</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>3.00(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Enable watching of child develop week by week</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.11(b)</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.63(b)</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>3.00(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Require a steady job</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Limit ability to make plans for life without worrying about others</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>-.84</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
<td>-.77</td>
<td>-.29(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Enable child to have the best possible chance for being raised well</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1.12(a)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1.16(a)</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>2.34(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Enable assumption of financial responsibility for situation</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.78(a)</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.24(a)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.27(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Limit chances to spend time with friends</td>
<td>-2.31</td>
<td>-2.04</td>
<td>-2.05</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-4.65</td>
<td>-2.30</td>
<td>-3.10(b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weighted Salient Beliefs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Attitude</td>
<td>-4.94</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>9.01(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means are based on 7 point scale ranging from -3 to 3 where a larger value represents a more favorable evaluation or stronger belief. The evaluation items represent respondents' assessment of the desirability of selected outcomes relevant to either teenage fatherhood or the teen years in general (questions 3-11 on the original survey, see appendix for exact wording of items). The belief items represent males' perception of the probability of these outcomes occurring for them if they were to live with their partner and child (questions 12-20 on the original survey, see appendix for the exact wording of items). The weighted salient belief means are based on the summed products of evaluation and belief scores for individual respondents. For those cases where information was missing on only 1 item, the group mean (calculated separately for whites and blacks) for that item was substituted and figured into the overall mean. Sample sizes reflect the number of cases in which valid data existed for at least 8 of the items (Unlikely: N=51, Unclear: N=114, Likely: N=154). The estimated attitude is the proxy measure for the attitudinal component.

Respondents who indicated that would be "extremely" or "quite" unlikely to live with their child were included in the "unlikely" category, those who stated that they would be either "slightly" unlikely, "slightly" likely, or "neither" were classified as "unclear," while those who reported that they would be "quite" or "extremely" likely were labeled as "likely".

Two-tailed T-tests between "likely" and "unclear" groups are reported (a)*p < .01, (b)*p < .05, and between "likely" and "unlikely" groups they are reported (a)*p < .01, (b)*p < .05.
because they apparently had a clear idea of whether or not they were going to live with their child. The most notable finding was that those who planned to live with their child were quite similar to youth who did not intend to live with their child in the way they assessed individual consequences and the probability that they would occur if they were to live with their child. There were only significant means differences for three items when comparing the two extreme groups. Males in the "likely" category tended to evaluate the chance to assume financial responsibility for their situation more favorably than those in the "unlikely" category (t=-2.87, p < .01). Likewise, the former group was more favorably predisposed, compared to those who did not intend to live with their child, to the ideas that a child born to teenage parents would have the best possible chance of being raised well if both parents were present (t=-3.15, p < .01), a teenage father spending a lot of time caring for the physical needs of his child (t=-3.02, p < .01), and a teenage father being able to watch his child develop on a weekly basis (t=-2.21, p < .05). Males in the "likely" category had stronger beliefs that living with their child would result in their child having the best chance of being raised well (t=-2.67, p < .01), their having more of an opportunity to care for their child's daily needs (t=-3.09, p < .01), and improve their ability to assume financial responsibility for their situation (t=-2.85, p < .01). They were also less likely to think that living with their child would lessen their ability to obtain their desired level of education (t=2.44, p < .05).
The similarities between these two groups of males were more prominent than their differences. Although there were some minor differences between them, these differences are more apparent when the means for the weighted salient beliefs are examined. All of the significant differences between these two groups on the weighted salient belief measures were in the expected direction. Youth who indicated that they would probably live with their child had less negative beliefs about how their decision would adversely affect their educational attainment ($t=-3.37, p < .01$), limit their ability to make plans without worrying about others ($t=-2.18, p < .05$), and limit their chances for spending time with their friends ($t=-2.14, p < .05$). Meanwhile, they were likely to have more positive beliefs about having a chance to take care of the daily needs of their child ($t=-2.31, p < .05$), being able to provide their child with the best possible chance of being raised well ($t=-2.38, p < .05$), and assuming financial responsibility for their situation ($t=-3.37, p < .01$).

**Normative Referents**

The means for the normative belief and motivation to comply with referent items (parents and best friend) are displayed in Table 19 separately by race. Several interesting findings can be observed in this table. First, whites perceived their parents as being more likely to favor the idea that they should live with their partner and child compared to blacks' perceptions of their parents' feelings ($t=-2.30, p < .05$). It should be noted, though, that in Table 13
Table 19: Means for Normative Beliefs, Motivation to Comply, and Weighted Normative Beliefs for Whites and Blacks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Normative Beliefs</th>
<th>Motivation to Comply</th>
<th>Weighted Normative Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>Blacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Friend</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated Subjective Norm 1.27 1.51 .66

Note: Means are based on a 7-point scale ranging from -3 to 3 where a larger value represents a more favorable belief toward a living together arrangement or stronger motivation to comply to referents. The belief items (questions 22 and 23 in original survey, see appendix for the exact wording of items) represent respondents' perception of the probability that their parents or best friend would want them to live with their partner and child if they were to become a teenage father. Note that the normative belief items are specific to the vignette used in this study while the motivation to comply items (questions 25 and 26 in original survey, see appendix for the exact wording of items) assess males' perception of how well what they generally want to do corresponds with their parents' expectations for their behavior in general. The weighted normative belief means are based on the summed products of the belief and motivation to comply scores for individual respondents.

Two-tailed T-tests between "likely" and "unclear" groups are reported a*p < .01, b*p < .05, and between "likely" and "unlikely" groups (a) p < .01, (b) p < .05.
whites and blacks were shown to be equally likely to report that their parents' first choice for pregnancy resolution would involve the father living with his child. A similar racial pattern also exists when the perceptions of a 'best friend's attitude is considered. Whites tended to feel that their best friend's advice would be more favorable toward making a commitment to live together (t = -2.04, p < .05).

Contrary to expectations, blacks and whites were almost identical in the extent to which they reported complying with their parents' wishes in most situations. I expected that blacks would be less inclined to be influenced by their parents than whites, since their parents would have fewer tangible rewards to offer them compared to what white parents would be able to offer their sons. A notable racial difference did exist, however, in youths' motivation to comply with their best friend. Blacks were generally more negatively predisposed toward their best friend's advice than were whites (t = -3.79, p < .01). Overall, parents were considered to be the more important referent for both racial groups. When salient normative beliefs were compared controlling for race, the parental referent was significantly more important for blacks than whites (t = -1.96, p < .05) and there was no difference in the perceived importance of the best friend referent for blacks and whites.

In an analysis similar to the previous regression model where I used the attitudinal variable as the dependent variable and regressed the beliefs items on it, I regressed both the parental normative
The referent item and the peer item on the global measure of subjective norm. The former was significantly related to the subjective norm measure (p < .01), while the peer item was not.

In Table 20 the means for the normative beliefs, motivation to comply, and weighted normative beliefs are compared for respondents categorized according to their willingness to live with their partner and child. Respondents who indicated that they were "quite" or "extremely" likely to live with partner and child perceived that both their parents (t=-4.41, p < .01) and peers (t=-4.00, p < .01) would be more favorable to their decision than was the case for those who felt that they were at least "quite" unlikely to make this kind of commitment to their partner and child. No differences were found for the motivation to comply items while the parental item but not the peer item was significantly different when comparing weighted normative beliefs (t=-3.78, p < .01).

**Attitudinal and Subjective Norm Components**

Having examined the individual beliefs and norms, I will now examine the relationships between the relevant components of Azjen and Fishbein's model. The statistical relationships between the various components of this model are displayed in diagrammatical form in Figure 2. Recall that the major assumption of this model is that behavioral intention is a function of an attitudinal and subjective norm component. The global or direct measures of attitude and subjective norm can in turn be estimated by the weighted salient beliefs.
Table 20 Means for Normative Beliefs, Motivation to Comply, and Weighted Normative Beliefs for Males According to Whether They are Unlikely, Unclear, or Likely to Live with Their Child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents</strong></td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.84(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Best Friend</strong></td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.90(^a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means are based on 7 point scale ranging from -3 to 3 where a larger value represents a more favorable belief or stronger motivation to comply to referents. The belief items (questions 22 and 23 on the original survey, see appendix for the exact wording of items) represent respondents perception of the probability that their parents and best friend would want them to live with their partner and child if they were to become a teenage father. Note that the normative belief items are specific to the vignette used in this study while the motivation to comply items assess males' perception of how their behavior corresponds with their parents' and friends' expectations in general. The weighted normative belief means are based on the summed products of belief and motivation to comply scores for individual respondents.

\(^a\) Respondents who indicated that they would be "extremely" or "quite" unlikely to live with their child were included in the "Unlikely" category, those who stated that they would be either "slightly unlikely," "slightly likely," or "neither" were classified as "Unclear," and those who reported that they would be "quite" or "extremely" likely were labeled as "Likely".

Two-tailed T-tests between "likely" and "unclear" groups are reported \(a\)\(p < .01\), \(b\)\(p < .05\), and between "likely" and "unlikely" groups \(a\)\(p < .01\), \(b\)\(p < .05\).
Figure 2: Relations Between Beliefs, Attitude, Subjective Norm, and Intention: All Males
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and weighted normative beliefs. These weighted beliefs are thus interpreted as the underlying factors which contribute to a person's attitude and subjective norm.

The direct measures of these two components combined to explain 32 percent of the variance in young males' intentions to live with their child in the event of an unplanned nonmarital pregnancy. As can be seen by the Pearsonian correlations and the standardized regression coefficients, males' personal attitudes were more important than their beliefs about what they thought their parents and best friend would want them to do. The correlation between the attitudinal component and behavioral intention was \( r = 0.52 \), while the subjective norm component was correlated \( r = 0.32 \) with behavioral intention. The standardized weights for these two variables indicated that the attitude component (\( B = 0.48 \)) was slightly more than twice as strong as the subjective norm component (\( B = 0.20 \)). The correlation between these two major components was \( r = -0.28 \). This latter finding would seem to suggest that parental and peer influence generally tends to be of unequal importance and in opposite directions.

The estimated measure (\( \Sigma BiEi \)) of the attitudinal component, which was based on the nine evaluation items weighted by the corresponding belief strength items, was correlated \( r = 0.35 \) with the direct measure of attitude. The estimated measure (\( \Sigma NBjMCj \)) of the subjective norm component based on the parental and peer normative referent items was correlated \( r = 0.34 \) with the direct measure of subjective norm. Davidson and Jaccard (1975) found correlations
between the direct measure of attitude and $\sum BiEi$ that were at least twice as strong as those found in this study when they examined attitudes toward having a child during the next two years ($r=0.81$), using birth control pills ($r=0.75$), and having two (and only two) children in the completed family ($r=0.71$). They did not report the association between the estimated and direct measure of subjective norm.

**Models for Whites and Blacks Separately**

Because there are marked differences in the tendency for whites and blacks to live with children they father as teenagers, I examined separate models for these racial groups. The model of whites displayed in Figure 3 is essentially the same as the overall model. The attitudinal and subjective norm components explained 35 percent of the variance in males' willingness to live with their partner and child. Both components had a statistically significant relationship with $B1$ with the attitudinal component being slightly less than twice as strong as the subjective norm. The correlation between these two components was $r=-0.31$. The estimated measure ($\sum BiEi$) was correlated $r=0.36$ with the direct measure of attitude and the estimated measure ($\sum NBjMCj$) was correlated $r=0.34$ with the direct measure of subjective norm.

A slightly different pattern of relationships among the model components emerged when the analysis was restricted to blacks (see Figure 4). The attitudinal component continues to have a strong relationship to $B1$ ($r=0.59$), but the subjective norm component is not
Figure 3: Relations Between Beliefs, Attitude, Subjective Norm, and Intention: White Males
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Figure 4: Relations Between Beliefs, Attitude, Subjective Norm, and Intention: Black Males
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The diagram shows the following relationships:

- Attitude toward the behavior (Aact) was correlated with Bi (r=.28, p<.01, n=94).
- Subjective Norm (Sn) was correlated with Bi (r=.29, p<.01, n=105).
- Relative importance of attitude and subjective norm (Beta=.56, R^2=.32, n=91).
- Intention (Bi) was correlated with Sn (r=.16, n.s., n=104).
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significantly related to BI (r=.16). The two components were correlated (r=-.29) with one another. The estimated measures of attitude and subjective norm in the model restricted to blacks are less strongly associated with the global measures than they are in the model for whites. The correlations between these components and the global measures were r=.28 and r=.29 respectively in the model for blacks.

Models for SES Groups Separately

In order to examine my hypotheses about the relative importance of the model components for males from different socioeconomic backgrounds, I performed analyses identical to those for blacks and whites but compared respondents whose father had at least a college education with both those who did not and a more restricted sample of youth whose father was a high school dropout. Since the high school sample had a higher percentage of respondents whose father was a college graduate compared to the NLSY, I was able to focus specifically on this more educated group, rather than limiting myself to a paternal variable that combined 13 or more years of education together. Figure 5 displays the model for youth who had a college educated father. The two components combined to explain 47 percent of the variance in young males' willingness to live with their child. Aact was correlated r=.67 with BI while Sn was correlated .3b with BI. In a multivariate context, the standardized coefficient for the
Figure 5: Relations Between Beliefs, Attitude, Subjective Norm, and Intention: Males with College Educated Father
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Aact component was three times as large as it was for the Sn component. Thus, the Aact component is quite powerful by itself and is considerably more important than the subjective norm dimension for this subsample of youth with a college educated father. The correlation between the attitudinal component and the subjective norm component was $r = -0.31$.

The models for youth who do not have a college-educated father and the subsample of youth whose father is a high school dropout are presented in Figures 6 and 7. The Aact and Sn components for both of these samples explain much less of the variance in the BI variable than was found in the model for youth with college educated fathers and the individual correlations between the components and BI were also smaller. Contrary to expectations, the attitudinal component was appreciably more important than the subjective norm in these models. These findings suggest that while the attitudinal and subjective norm variables have a greater influence on youths' intentions from high socioeconomic backgrounds than on males from less advantaged backgrounds, the importance of the Aact component relative to the Sn component is comparable regardless of class. The attitudinal and subjective norm components were correlated $r = -0.25$ for the entire group of youth whose father did not have a college degree and $r = -0.32$ for the subset of youth with a father who had not completed high school.

As an extension of the previous analysis I tested the hypotheses that parents from higher socioeconomic backgrounds would have a
Figure 6: Relations Between Beliefs, Attitude, Subjective Norm, and Intention: Males with Fathers Who had not Completed College
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greater influence on their sons than parents will who are less advantaged, and that peers would be a more important referent than parents for males from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. I used the global measure of attitude and the normative referent variables for parents and best friend (I had used the normative referent variables earlier to create the subjective norm component) as independent variables and regressed them on males' behavioral intention to live with their partner and child. I estimated these models for males who had a college educated father and the residual subsample of males whose father had not completed college. Neither of the normative referent variables were significant in the model for respondents with a college-educated father. However, the parental variable was positively and significantly related to males' willingness to live with their child and partner for the group of males whose father had not completed college (p < .01). Contrary to expectations, then, I found that parents appeared to more influential among males from a lower socioeconomic background than they were in higher status families, and that parents rather than peers were the more important referent source among males with fathers who were not college graduates.

**Background Factors as Predictors of Intention**

Consistent with Ajzen and Fishbein's model, the previous analyses have shown that young males' intentions can be predicted from their attitudes about the consequences of their behavior and to
a lesser extent, their perceptions of what their parents and best friend would expect them to do. An additional issue that can be raised deals with whether particular kinds of males might be more likely to have a favorable personal attitude toward living with their child and the child's mother, or report that their parents or peers would expect them to live with their child. I addressed this issue by creating eight independent background factors from the descriptive information which I had gathered on respondents. I used these variables in regression analyses for each of the estimated and global measures for the attitudinal and subjective norm components. This enabled me to assess the extent to which particular types of males may have different attitudes and perceptions of what is expected of them.

Since my earlier analyses with the NLSY showed obvious differences in the initial living arrangements of racial/ethnic groups, I included a dummy variable (black/non black) for my analysis which focused on a hypothetical situation. I expected that young males residing in two-parent families or who were from more traditional religious backgrounds, e.g., Fundamentalist Protestant or Catholic, would be more likely to state a willingness to live with their partner and child. I therefore created religion dummy variables for Fundamentalists and Catholics while using everyone else as the reference group. I also operationalized paternal education by using a series of dummy variables and employed it as a proxy for socio-economic status. One variable identified fathers who were high
school dropouts and the other identified fathers who had completed college (fathers who had completed high school but not college were the reference group and mother's level of education was used when data on the father were missing). I treated respondents' age and number of siblings as continuous variables.

The model with the estimated attitudinal component as the dependent variable is presented in Table 21. As the low $R^2$ indicates (.09), these background variables were of limited value in predicting young males' attitudes about living with their partner and child. Blacks had a more favorable attitude toward living with their child ($p < .01$), as did older teenagers ($p < .01$), while males living with two parents had a less favorable attitude toward living with their child. Despite the presumed pro-family orientation of Fundamentalist Protestant religious organizations, belonging to a Fundamentalist Protestant church did not have a significant influence on youths' intentions to live with their child and the child's mother. In an additional model, I included a dummy variable that differentiated between respondents who expected to complete college and those who did not, and found that the college expectation variable was not a significant predictor of attitude. The model predicting the measures of subjective norm was not significant.

As a direct test of the relationship between young males' educational expectations and their living arrangement intentions, I regressed the eight background factors detailed in the previous analysis and a dummy variable which identified respondents who expected
Table 21 Relationship Between Background Factors and the Estimated Measure for Attitude: Multiple Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Factor</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black coded 1, else 0</td>
<td>8.34^a</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.699)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with two parents coded 1, else 0</td>
<td>-5.59^b</td>
<td>-.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.382)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Fundamental Protestant</td>
<td>-3.25</td>
<td>-.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.642)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Catholic code</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.638)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Other or none</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) High school dropout</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.771)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) High school graduate, but not college graduate</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) College graduate</td>
<td>-3.40</td>
<td>-.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.819)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents age, collapsed to 15-18</td>
<td>3.81^a</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.264)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of siblings</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.540)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-54.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20.17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R^2</td>
<td>.09^a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4.373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a p < .01, ^b p < .05
to complete college on males' behavioral intention to live with their child. Neither the model nor the college expectation variable were statistically significant.

**Schooling Intentions and Expectations for Partner**

Although the primary focus of my analysis with the high school data has been on young fathers' living arrangement intentions, I estimated several additional models to assess the importance of selected background factors on young males' schooling intentions and their expectations for their partner in the event of an unplanned pregnancy. I included the same background variables that I used in the earlier models and also included the dummy variable that identified whether a respondent expected to complete college in a series of regression analyses (see Table 22).

I first examined young males' willingness to leave high school and find a full-time job in the event they were responsible for a nonmaritally conceived child. The independent variables accounted for only a small percentage of the variance in young males' willingness to pursue this option ($R^2 = .05$). Blacks were less likely to view this option favorably than nonblacks. An anomalous finding emerged from this analysis in that both the dummy variable that identified respondents who had a father who was a high school dropout ($p < .10$) and the variable that identified males with a father who had a college education ($p < .05$) were more likely to view this option favorably than the reference group of youth whose father had completed high
Table 22  Relationship Between Background Factors and Schooling Intentions and Expectations for Partner Variables: Multiple Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Leave School and Find Full-time Job</th>
<th>Leave School and Earn a G.E.D.</th>
<th>Ask Partner to Leave School to Take Care of the Child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black coded 1, else 0</td>
<td>-.80(a)</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>-.91(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.297)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.299)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with two parents</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>-.71(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coded 1, else 0</td>
<td>(.263)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.265)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Fundamentalist Protestant</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.87(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.290)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.292)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Catholic</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.396)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Other or none</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) High school dropout</td>
<td>.58(c)</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.304)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.306)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) High school graduate, but not college graduate</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) College graduate</td>
<td>.61(b)</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.58(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.314)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.317)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents age, collapsed to to 15-18</td>
<td>- .01</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.147)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of siblings</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.059)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree expected, coded 1, else 0</td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-.52(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.269)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.271)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.695</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R(^2)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.542(^a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.281(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a=p<.01, \ b=p<.05, \ c=p<.10\)
school but not college. Although having expectations for college was negatively associated with the willingness to leave school and find a full-time job, the relationship was not significant (p < .11).

In addition to leaving school and finding a full-time job, young males also have an opportunity to leave school and work toward earning a G.E.D. certificate as a means of receiving credit for high school. As with the previous model, only a small amount of the variance was explained by this group of independent variables ($R^2 = .07$). Blacks were again less inclined to pursue this option than other youth (p < .01) as were youth who lived with two parents (p < .01) and those who expected to complete college (p < .05). Fundamentalist Protestants (p < .01) and youth who had a father with a college education (p < .10) were more likely to view this option positively.

In the final two models I estimated the relationship between the selected background factors and teenage males' expectations for earning a college degree and young males' expectations for their partner. Respondents were asked to indicate how likely they would be to ask their partner to leave high school so that she could help take care of their child. The nine independent variables accounted for 12 percent of the variance in this model. Blacks were less likely to expect their partner to quit school than nonblacks (p < .01), while Fundamentalist Protestants (p < .05) and respondents with a father who was a high school dropout (p < .10) were more likely to want their partner to leave school and take care of their child. Although
the relationship was not statistically significant, respondents who expected to obtain a college education tended to be less inclined to think that their partner should drop out of school \( (p < .14) \). The final model that examined males' expectations for their partner to leave school and find a job was not significant and is therefore not reported here.
CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

My research, based on two complementary surveys, has focused primarily on teenage fathers' propensity to live with their non-maritally conceived first child, and young males' hypothetical intentions to do the same in the event that they and their girlfriend were responsible for an unplanned pregnancy. This kind of research is timely in that the adolescent pregnancy and childbearing literature has neglected to examine systematically how teenage males respond to their unplanned fertility and how their lives are affected by assuming the fatherhood role in the social sense.

I used data from the Youth Cohort of the National Longitudinal Survey of Labor Market Experience to develop a sociodemographic portrait of teenage fathers in the United States. While I focused primarily on males who had fathered their first child nonmaritally, I also considered teenage fathers whose first child was maritally conceived. Since nonmaritally conceived births to older teenage males (18-19) are probably conceptually different than similar births to younger males, I employed a categorization scheme that took this into account.
In a multivariate context, I determined whether selective background factors were related to young fathers' commitment to fatherhood which I operationalized by focusing on initial living arrangements. I also used these data to describe the educational patterns of young fathers while focusing on the association between living arrangements and schooling outcomes and expectations. Most of my analyses highlighted the racial variations in fertility, fatherhood commitment, and high school completion patterns.

My analyses based on the metropolitan high school sample augmented the NLSY's sociodemographic information by assessing social psychological aspects of young males' hypothetical living together intentions. I considered young males' willingness to live with their child and partner in the event of a nonmarital pregnancy by operationalizing and testing Ajzen and Fishbein's model of reasoned action. This approach enabled me to determine the relative importance of the attitudinal and subjective norm components in determining young males' behavioral intentions. Moreover, I was able to explore racial and socioeconomic differences for this model and consider whether particular beliefs or normative referents accounted for the differences between males' intentions to live with their child and partner.

In this chapter 1 will discuss the major findings from my analyses and assess research design and data quality issues that may affect the interpretation of my results. I will generally discuss my findings from the two surveys separately beginning with the NLSY.
Finally, I will note the policy implications of my results where appropriate and suggest directions for future research.

**Findings From the NLSY**

NLSY data indicate that 5.5 percent of males 20-27 years of age in 1984 were teenagers when they fathered a nonmaritally conceived child, that almost 80 percent of teenage fathers had their child when they were 18 or 19 years old, and that black teens were more likely to father children, and to do so outside of marriage and at younger ages, than white or Hispanic teenage males.

Young males who are responsible for an unplanned pregnancy, if given the opportunity, will need to decide whether to make a formal commitment to their child and partner by living with them (with or without getting married). In one way or another, they will experience and demonstrate their degree of acceptance or rejection of their adolescent father identity. While one of my objectives was to identify and examine factors associated with young fathers' tendencies to commit themselves to their adolescent father identity, the only information on the NLSY data set relevant to this issue deals with the living arrangement status of the child and father and the male's marital status (note that the marital status item does not explicitly link the young male's marriage to his child's mother). My indicator of fatherhood commitment is therefore restricted to a measure of household structure and does not deal with the multidimensional nature of fatherhood commitment or important
features of fathering behavior. This measure of household structure may also be confounded because of the father's relationship with the child's mother and his desire to live with her. Despite its shortcomings, the living arrangement variable does measure a significant gesture on a young father's part.

The bivariate analyses I presented indicated that a number of respondent characteristics were associated with living together. However, in multivariate analysis, only a few variables were useful in predicting the living arrangement propensities of teenage fathers whose first child was nonmaritally conceived. Not surprisingly, being black or Hispanic was associated with a lower probability of living together as was fathers' younger age at their child's birth.

When I estimated separate models for whites and blacks, I found that none of the variables were significant predictors of initial living arrangements for blacks. But, several variables were significant in the model restricted to whites. Living in a rural area, being older at their child's birth, being raised Catholic, and living with two parents at age 14 were associated with an above average probability of living with a child initially. These results suggest, given that being black was associated with a lower probability of living with the child (with nondisadvantaged whites as the reference group), that different factors affect the patterns for living with a child for whites and blacks.

While many aspects of a young father's psychological and social world need to be explored in connection with living together
decisions and fatherhood commitment, I have emphasized educational issues here because they are central to the lives of teenage fathers (and mothers) and because the NLSY, despite its shortcomings, is best suited to address these kinds of questions. The importance of a high school education as it relates to teenage fatherhood was captured in the comments of two high school youth:

If it came down to my being a teenage parent I would expect to assume responsibility for my actions. But I would finish school, get a job and become financially set for the upbringing of my child.

I think that if teenage pregnancy should occur I would be willing to take the responsibility of my girlfriend and my baby. ...I would want her (partner) to continue her education and I would also continue my education. I would find a steady job and with me continuing my education I probably could get a higher paying job.

The NLSY data documents quite clearly that teenage males, both those who were responsible for marital conceptions and those who fathered children who were nonmaritally conceived (whether or not they lived with them) were less likely to receive a regular diploma, more likely to receive a G.E.D., and more likely not to receive certification for high school by age 20, at least two years after their age-normal date of graduation, than their peers who avoided teenage fertility.

Teenage fathers whose first child was maritally conceived had the poorest high school completion patterns, even more undesirable than those who had unplanned births at younger ages. The fact that only 39 percent of males who elected to get married and then have a child graduated from high school by age 20 is an alarming statistic.
I suspect that this pattern partly reflects the fact that young males who tend to be unsuccessful in an academic environment may drop out of school and look to other kinds of social roles, husband and father, in search of their personal fulfillment.

It is also quite clear that a sizable proportion of teenage males (20-27 at their 1984 survey) who have had a nonmaritally conceived child, and whether or not they lived with their child initially, are at a distinct disadvantage in the labor market because they have poor educational credentials; only about 64 percent of these young men have earned certification for high school whereas roughly 84 percent of their peers who did not experience this kind of fertility event have completed high school. While young fathers of nonmaritally conceived first births are about twice as likely as males in the comparison group to earn accreditation for high school via a G.E.D., the G.E.D. is particularly important for very young fathers. This pattern exists for all racial/ethnic/disadvantaged groups, but it is least pronounced for blacks, a finding that is consistent with the notion that subcultural norms associated with blacks may minimize the disruptive aspects of unplanned teenage fertility, at least for males.

An important consequence of these school completion rates is that young fathers are hampered in their ability to contribute financially to the support of their partner and child. It is interesting to note in this context that 32 percent of young black males in the Columbus sample indicated that they would prefer to pay
child support and ask their partner to assume custody of their child in the event of an unplanned pregnancy. Their eagerness and presumed ability to provide financial assistance, however, is surprising and perhaps unrealistic given current employment patterns among young black males and the economic status of black families in general (Betsy et al., 1985; Freeman and Holzer, 1985; Wilson and Neckerman, 1985). Ironically, only three percent of young white males (the racial group most likely to be in a favorable position to provide financial assistance) indicated that their first choice for resolving an unplanned pregnancy would be to grant child custody to their partner and provide child support. About equal percentages of whites and blacks (45 and 43 percent) opted for an arrangement that would enable them to live with their child and presumably contribute to the financial support of their household.

While the NLSY data indicate that young fathers are much more likely than their peers who do not experience early fertility to have less education, it is not clear whether living with a child nonmaritally conceived (or even conceived within a marriage) affects the school progression and educational attainment of young males. As noted previously, research has shown that young males who legitimate an unplanned pregnancy by marrying before their child is born are less likely to enroll in school after the birth than males who wait until after the child is born to marry or who are already married when their child is conceived (McLaughlin, 1984). Although the structure of the NLSY poses serious obstacles to conducting causal
research which would clarify the association between fatherhood commitment and educational outcomes, I was able to construct a model that tested the hypothesis that teenage male fertility accompanied by a living together commitment leads to a lower probability of completing high school. I was unable though to consider the long term effects of social fatherhood on educational attainment since the teenage fathers I used for this analysis were only 20-27 years of age at their last observation date.

Among young males who fathered a child before their last school leaving date or date of certification for high school, fathers who lived with their child initially were significantly less likely to receive a diploma or be a high school graduate than those who did not live with their child immediately. There was no difference between these two groups in their propensity to earn a G.E.D.. In a multivariate analysis, however, living with a child initially was not related to the probability of completing high school by earning a G.E.D. or diploma. Being black was associated with a greater probability of completing school while having a father who had not completed high school had the opposite effect. While the NLSY data are not ideal for determining how living with a nonmaritally conceived child affects young males' schooling behavior, these data do not suggest, (as might be expected), that living with a child is directly related to adverse educational consequences.
Findings From the Columbus Sample

Since it is not possible to use the NLSY to focus on social psychological dimensions of the decision-making process relevant to living together decisions, I used a separate survey of high school males' hypothetical intentions given a specified set of circumstances. My focus using this second sample of males was narrow in scope considering the dynamic and often quite complicated situation that reflects these types of decisions.

Almost 48 percent of young males 15-18 years of age, the majority of the sample (73 percent) being either 15 or 16, indicated that they would be "quite likely" or "extremely likely" to live with their child and partner if they were confronted with an unplanned nonmarital pregnancy in which they had been dating the same girl for a year. Whites and blacks surprisingly were very similar in their stated willingness to live with their partner and child. Youths' responses to a related question which asked them to indicate their personal preference and their parents' probable first choice for resolving their unplanned pregnancy were generally consistent with their answers to the specific question noted above. Overall, about 45 percent of males chose a pregnancy resolution option that would enable them to live with their child, while 17 percent indicated that they would opt for an abortion. Whites and blacks were equally likely to provide one of the three living together responses, but blacks were significantly less likely to choose abortion.
The findings for preferences to live with a child nonmaritally conceived are clearly inconsistent with current racial differentials in actual living arrangement patterns among teenage parents. As Table 4 indicated, about 77 percent of nondisadvantaged whites, 58 percent of disadvantaged whites, 48 percent of Hispanics, and 15 percent of blacks were living with their nonmaritally conceived first child at the first observation point after birth. A number of factors might account for the difference between my results and current patterns. For example, young black mothers may be more reluctant to live with or marry their partner than are white females, and parents of black youth may be less likely than parents of white youth to endorse marriage as a response to an unplanned pregnancy. Recall that compared to whites, blacks in the Columbus sample indicated that their parents would have a more negative attitude toward the idea that they should live with their child or get an abortion. Black males could therefore have intentions similar to those of white males but they may encounter more obstacles in trying to actualize their preferences. If a higher percentage of black males than white males father children within the context of less committed kinds of relationships this could also serve as a contributing factor to the discrepancy between living together intentions and actual patterns for whites and blacks. The specific features of the vignette in this study, especially the idea that the respondent had been dating the same girl for a year, may therefore be partly responsible for the larger percentage of blacks indicating a
willingess to live with their partner and child compared to the percentage of black teenage fathers who actually lived with their child. A reporting bias might also be a factor if black males are more inclined than whites males to provide socially acceptable answers. The difference in patterns could, of course, be explained to some extent if the white and black subgroups in my Columbus sample are distinctly different in some meaningful way from these racial subgroups as they exit in a nationally representative cross-section of youth. As I noted in Chapter 3, black respondents in the high school sample tended to have better educated parents compared to the national estimates for blacks which were based on the weighted NLSY figures. On the other hand, parental education among whites was similar across samples.

In order to examine males' intentions systematically, I considered them within the context of Azjen and Fishbein's social psychological model of reasoned action. Based on this model, I argued that males' intentions would be a function of their personal attitudes and the perception of how they feel significant others would expect them to behave.

Before discussing the results from my analyses with the high school data, it is appropriate to comment on the selection of the paired evaluation and belief strength items I used to operationalize this model, and to discuss the wording in one particular case. Even though the saliency and breadth of the nine experiences I asked respondents to consider seems reasonable, it is possible that I may
have overlooked a few experiences which would have been relevant to respondents. It is also important to note that the wording on the evaluation and belief strength items which dealt with educational attainment did not ensure conceptual correspondence between one another. The evaluation item dealt with the desirability of teenage males obtaining schooling beyond high school in their late teens and early twenties. The belief strength item, on the other hand, asked respondents to indicate how likely it would be that their chances of obtaining their desired level of education would be lessened if they were to live with their child and the child's mother. The belief strength item, or weighting factor, represents an individual's belief about how their living with their child and partner would affect their desired level of education but it is combined with their evaluation of a level of education that is not necessarily the same. All respondents obviously would have had to desire post secondary schooling for these two items to correspond directly. Since this was not the case, the weighted salient belief which combines these two items is not ideal and may even be misleading for respondents who had educational expectations which did not exceed high school. This discrepancy in correspondence may account for why the evaluation item on education was not significantly related to attitude or behavioral intention in the multiple regression analyses while the belief item was negatively related to each of these variables.

I was surprised that only a few of the belief items were significantly related to attitude and behavioral intention. Three of
the items dealing with freedom issues, dating girls, making plans without worrying about others, and spending time with friends, were not related to young males' willingness to live with their child and partner, and only the latter item was negatively related to attitude. I had anticipated that teenage males would value their autonomy and be leery of jeopardizing it by assuming responsibilities associated with fatherhood and living with their partner. It is quite probable that these areas would become problematic for some teenage fathers once they committed themselves in this manner and experienced restrictions on their social activities.

The item which dealt with an intact family and childrearing also produced unexpected results. While teenage males' evaluations about the likelihood that a child born to teenage parents could be raised best if both parents were present was a significant predictor of their attitude and intention, their beliefs about how they would affect their own child's well-being if they lived together was not. One interpretation of this finding would be that these youth on average felt that they were less capable of being a good parent or creating a healthy environment for their child compared to teenage fathers in general.

An expected finding was that teenagers who were more likely to believe that living with their child and partner would lessen their chances for obtaining their desired level of education, were also less likely to have a favorable attitude toward living together and were less inclined to do so. An equally important factor in
predicting males' attitude and intention was the belief that living together would enable them to care for the daily physical needs of their child. Whether or not young males would participate in any meaningful sense in the daily care of their child is of course an entirely different question.

There were also unexpected results in terms of the individual normative referents. These data did not support my hypothesis that peers would be a more important factor than parents for males from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. My hypothesis that parents would be more important to males from higher class backgrounds than they would be to less advantaged males was also not supported although the results were in the expected direction. It would be premature, however, to conclude that these hypotheses are without merit given the small sample sizes on which these findings are based; they are in need of further testing with a larger and more nationally representative sample.

In assessing the overall model, I found that the attitudinal and subjective norm components combined to explain a considerable amount of the variance in the behavioral intention variable. The strength of the correlations that resulted from regressing the attitudinal and subjective norm components on the dependent variables of interest were generally stronger in this study than Jorgenson and Sonstegard (1984) found in their study of adolescent sexual and contraceptive behavior, but they were considerably weaker than Davidson and Jaccard's (1975) findings based on a sample of married women 18-38
years of age. Jorgenson and Sonstegard (1984: 52) speculated that one of the reasons why their correlations were weaker than those found in Davidson and Jaccard's study might be because of the "greater inconsistency and unpredictability of adolescent attitudes and behaviors." This thesis could also be applicable to my findings but it is impossible to test its validity here. Jorgenson and Sonstegard's relatively weak findings may also be due in part to the fact that they performed a secondary analysis of data that were not collected explicitly for testing Azjen and Fishbein's model. They also used actual behavior rather than behavioral intention as their dependent variable, and the measures they used to operationalize the major components of the model were considerably different in form than the kinds of measures generally used to test this model.

The data supported my hypothesis that the attitudinal component of the model would be more important than the subjective norm component. However, it is useful to recall that the nature of my research question and design precluded a thorough assessment of the normative component since my study could not examine how males would be affected by individuals other than their parents and best friend. Caution is therefore warranted when interpreting the relative importance of the attitudinal and subjective norm components for determining males' intentions to live with their child and partner. The exclusion of normative referents other than parents and best friends might be partly responsible for the relative weakness of the overall model when compared to previous research.
My study also simplified respondents' assessment of their parents' expectations by not providing respondents with an opportunity to differentiate between their mothers' and fathers' perceptions. In some instances, an individual's parents will disagree as to what they feel is the proper course of action. These kinds of differences will probably be even more dramatic between the maternal and paternal parents of the expectant couple.

The attitudinal component was a powerful predictor of behavioral intention for blacks and whites alike, but the subjective norm component was only a significant predictor of intention for whites. When I tested this model using subsamples of youth who were categorized according to their father's educational status, I found that both the attitudinal and subjective norm components were more powerful predictors of intentions for youth who had a college educated father compared to those whose father had not completed college (especially when the comparison group only included youth with a father who was a high school dropout). The relative importance of these two components, however, was largely the same regardless of the educational status of the father. The attitudinal component was at least three times more powerful than the subjective norm component irrespective of which subsample was examined.

When I examined the possibility that males from particular types of backgrounds might be more inclined to have a favorable personal attitude toward living with their child and partner or perceive that their parents and best friend would expect them to live with their
child, I found that background variables were only weakly associated to these two estimated measures. An unexpected finding was that being a Fundamental Protestant or Catholic was not related to a young male's living together attitudes even though these two religious groups have very dogmatic views concerning marriage and out-of-wedlock childbearing. It was also surprising that being black was positively related to a more favorable attitude toward living with one's partner and child given current patterns of out-of-wedlock adolescent childbearing among blacks.

Background factors were also poor predictors of several other dependent variables I examined, for example, males' willingness to either leave school and find a full-time job or leave school and earn a G.E.D., as well as males' expectation that their partner should leave school and take care of their child or leave school to find a full-time job. Somewhat surprisingly, males' expectation that they would complete college was not related to their willingness to leave school and find a full-time job. I anticipated that males who expected to complete college would tend to not want to leave school and earn a G.E.D.

While it is impossible to determine from these data how supportive young males would be of their partner finishing her high school education and/or continuing her education beyond high school, only a small percentage of males indicated that they would expect their partner to stay home and take care of their child. Another interesting finding was that males' expectation that they would
complete college was not related to their willingness to live with their partner. This finding suggests that under certain circumstances, a sizable percentage of males would be willing to live with their partner and child even though they recognized that doing so would inhibit their ability to pursue their education. The seriousness of their relationship with their child's mother is one of the factors which is likely to be important in this context.

**Theoretical Implications**

My research has some theoretical implications for the life course perspective and Ajzen and Fishbein's model of reasoned action as they relate to adolescent social fatherhood. Data from the NLSY provide further evidence that a life course perspective on adolescent childbearing must be sensitive to the complexity of the antecedents and consequences of adult role transitions. Just as it is inappropriate to accept the commonly assumed notion that adolescent births uniformly have deleterious effects on adolescent mothers' educational careers, it would be misleading to suggest that social fatherhood always leads to grave consequences for young fathers' schooling outcomes. These data do indicate a relationship between early social fatherhood and lower rates of high school completion, for both maritaly, and to a lesser extent, nonmaritally conceived first births. However, these correlations should not be interpreted as evidence of a causal relationship in all cases.
At the outset I argued that young fathers who responded to an "off-time" birth with a living together commitment would tend to experience negative educational consequences. My analyses with the NLSY data do not clearly support this contention. For example, youth who had maritally conceived births had a considerably higher dropout rate than youth who had nonmaritally conceived births. Since most of these youth did not get married while in high school, it can safely be assumed that their decision to marry and have a child did not directly affect their decision to leave school. These youth apparently were either discouraged with their school performance and/or disenchanted with their student role before getting married and having a child. It would therefore be misleading to argue that marriage or social fatherhood were responsible for attenuating their educational career. These data also indicated that living with a child conceived nonmaritally and before high school leaving or graduating was not associated with the probability of completing high school. Consistent with the notion that the black subculture has a more viable network to assist adolescent fathers, young black fathers, controlling for a number of factors including age at fatherhood and living arrangement status, were more likely to complete high school than their white counterparts.

These findings suggest that individuals' life goals and expectations, as well as the resources available to them, should be taken into account when a life course perspective is used to conceptualize the relationship between social fatherhood and aspects of schooling.
behavior. The extent to which an event is perceived to be "off-time" by the various individuals and subcultural groups affected by the event should therefore be considered explicitly. In addition, and as is discussed more fully below, it is important to consider the exact nature of the support structure that is available to youth when they are making adult transitions. The success of adolescents' transitions undoubtedly will be affected by the availability of these social and financial supports in many cases. The utility of this theoretical approach will be enhanced then to the extent that it can incorporate these concerns into its overall framework.

While Azjen and Fishbein's model does not specify a relationship between the attitudinal and subjective norm components, I found significant negative correlations between these components for every model I examined. This suggests that the theoretical relationship between these two components should be given more attention in the future. Since the living together decision will not be completely volitional in many cases, the model should also be modified so that it takes into consideration some of the various kinds of resources and constraints that young males will encounter in actualizing their preference. Identifying the kinds of resources or inhibiting factors that may be indirectly or directly related to young males' ability to realize his choice should also be an important topic of future concern.
Directions for Future Research

The paucity of research on male teenage fertility and fatherhood to date represents a major gap in the adolescent pregnancy and child-bearing literature. Little is known about young fathers' attitudes and behaviors with respect to living with their partner and child, the experience of fathering and nurturing a child, and schooling and work force activities. The two projects that I noted previously, the edited volume, Adolescent Fatherhood (Elster and Lamb, 1986), and the Teen Father Collaboration project, reflect social scientists' and social service providers' recent commitment to understand various aspects of the fatherhood experience for young males and to assist them in dealing with their unexpected and in many cases demanding responsibilities. These initiatives may serve as an impetus for additional research on young fathers as will the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs' recent efforts to solicit research proposals on young fathers.

One of the primary hurdles in conducting research on teenage fathers has been to identify and gain access to this elusive group of males. In this respect, the sample of teenage fathers involved in the eight clinics for the TFC project will provide researchers with a rich source of information on teenage fathers. This pilot project will also serve a useful purpose if other communities use it to develop their own programs and further expand the number of clinic samples. Over two hundred inquiries have already been made to the TFC project staff for information on how to build programs for young
fathers (Klinman and Sander, 1985). While these types of samples will have the same self selection biases that characterize female clinic samples, they should prove to be useful in developing a better understanding of the teenage fatherhood experience and in generating concepts and testable hypotheses. Perhaps if there is a growth in the number of clinic sites that have services for males and a concomitant expansion in the academic and popular literature on teenage fatherhood issues, additional support will evolve to fund national data collection efforts that focus directly on multiple aspects of teenage fatherhood.

In terms of verification research, we need to specify more fully and in a causal context the possible consequences of assuming fatherhood responsibilities in the social sense and the mediating factors that either exacerbate or minimize problems associated with living together or marriage. In particular, research should attempt to specify more fully the conditions under which assuming the fatherhood role as a teenager retards or enhances a young male's chances of completing high school and fulfilling his educational plans. This type of research will help to clarify the issue as to whether or not the consequences thought to accompany social teenage fatherhood may be exaggerated since youth who are predisposed to father children at young ages may initially have fundamentally different kinds of life goals than their peers who do not father a child. As the NLSY data has shown, among 14-15 year old males in 1979, those who would ultimately become adolescent fathers of nonmaritally conceived children
had lower educational expectations than their peers who did not experience an unplanned pregnancy which resulted in a first birth.

A direct test of the possible consequences of assuming fatherhood responsibilities on educational attainment would require a longitudinal design. One possibility would be to initiate a panel survey of 13- or 14-year-old males and then concentrate on respondents whose first child was either born or conceived while the young father was enrolled in high school or college. Those who did not experience early fatherhood would represent the control group. This type of design could isolate more readily the causal effects of unplanned births and living arrangement decisions among teenage fathers for a sample of males attending school, although it would fail to consider how teenage fatherhood responsibilities could affect the educational experience of males who dropped out of high school prior to the birth or conception of their first child. It would be important to know the young males' educational expectations, academic performance level, and motivation for performing well in school prior to a conception in order to assess the extent to which young males fulfilled or altered their personal expectations for schooling. Data would also need to be collected to assess what Belsky and Miller (1986) have referred to as "relationship dimensions" (e.g., duration, stability, and exclusivity of sexual relationships) and other possible intervening factors that might affect a young male's decisions regarding his educational pursuits (e.g., parental attitudes, community programs, and partner support).
While I have used a proxy variable for the commitment concept in this research, whether or not a father's first child was living with him shortly after the child's birth, future research should consider the nature of commitment more directly and in greater depth. It is clear that the commitment concept in its most general sense is multidimensional with a variety of possible indicators. Stryker (1966, 1980) has proposed an insightful social psychological approach which goes beyond the NLSY sociodemographic data and warrants future attention. As a major proponent of the structural school of symbolic interactionism within sociology, Stryker emphasizes the importance of social structure for human interaction and relates commitment to identity salience. A person's self is assumed to have a variety of identities, some of which are more salient or central to the person's overall conception of self and are consequently more likely to be invoked in social situations. These identities are developed through a process of social interaction and are embedded in a person's positions and roles. A teenage father, for example, will be faced with an opportunity to develop new identities based on his premature parental and in many cases spousal roles. Future research should determine the extent to which a young father commits himself to these identities, identify the factors which lead him to develop a given level of commitment, and consider how the process of developing new identities and commitment to these identities influence other major life goals, such as the pursuit of certification for high school and further education.
The commitment concept should also take into account the father's level of interest in his child as well as his partner. Understanding how the consequences of early fatherhood are mediated will be enhanced by focusing attention on the teenage father's partner and on aspects of his relationship with her. Is his partner supportive of his educational goals, and if so, how is this support manifested, e.g., does she assume primary responsibility for financially supporting the family? What are her personal educational and career goals and how inclined is she to lower her expectations or postpone her plans in order to facilitate her partner's education? What is the young male's role in helping or hindering his partner fulfill her educational goals? What kinds of decision-making assumptions and patterns characterize their relationship? For example, is it explicitly or tacitly assumed that the male's educational plans should take precedence? What is their level of emotional involvement with each other and to what extent are their expectations for one another realistic?

In addition to the commitment concept, attention needs to be focused on young males' motivation for living with their child and partner. As the following comments from Columbus teenagers suggest, young males may be inclined to make an initial commitment to live with their partner and child for a number of different reasons.

I feel that the boy and girl should both share the responsibility because they both agree to have sex so they should pay for it!
I wouldn't want to marry my girlfriend but since it was my fault I couldn't leave her in the cold. I'd have her live at my parent's house.

I'd be pretty scared at what my parents would say. I would probably ask the girl to leave with me and we could go to another school somewhere else. I would get a job while taking high school. I don't think I would let my parents know until the baby was at least in school.

If my girlfriend for a year told me she was pregnant I would be happy and sad, not only would I be a father but a lot of freedom would be taken away. I think the right thing to do is marry her and raise the child but there isn't anyway she could take my child away from me.

These comments, as well as others not presented here, suggest that some young males may want to relieve their feelings of guilt or live up to their responsibilities; others may feel an intrinsic desire to participate in the fathering of their child; some may want to remain with the partner out of a sense of loyalty and a strong emotional bond; and others may simply want to please their parents and perhaps even their friends. It would be worthwhile to sort out how these varied reasons for making a formal commitment affect the success of such arrangements entered into because of an unplanned nonmarital pregnancy.

Given the seriousness of these kinds of decisions, it would be desirable to concentrate more directly on the decision-making process and on how parents and teenagers arrive at the decision whether the young mother and father should live together. In this context, the sources of power parents are perceived to have and the kinds of compliance (internalized or externalized) teenagers exhibit in
response to their parents' requests could be considered. I suspect that males from higher class backgrounds will evidence conformity with respect to their parents' desires that is more internalized in nature than the conformity found among lower class males (Peterson et al., 1985). With an appropriate design the link between intention and behavior in Ajzen and Fishbein's model could be tested directly and the actual partner and her parents might also be incorporated into the research design.

Another important area for future research involves the role parents play in the educational careers of their sons who are teenage fathers. One 15 year old observed the connection between parental support and educational/career options by noting that:

I would want to live with the girl and our child at either my parents' house or her parents' house. If this were impossible and neither parents would help us financially I would probably not go to college and instead get a job.

Not surprisingly, parental education has been found to be an important predictor of educational attainment among NLSY teenage fathers in previous research (Marsiglio, 1986). This was particularly true with regard to the group of young males who lived with their child. However, research has not specified how parental education enhances a young father's educational attainment. Is a teenage father's educational career enhanced because he has developed high educational expectations, or are the financial resources that generally accompany higher parental education levels responsible for
providing the young male with key resources? This issue could be clarified if future research included measures of parental assistance and transfer payments so that researchers could assess the extent to which resources are available to a young father, and determine to what extent they improve his opportunities to pursue further education. This type of financial assistance would probably be associated with a greater likelihood of completing high school and completing more years of schooling for the group of fathers living with their child. Fathers who received only minimal or no outside financial assistance, but lived with their child, would be more likely to become permanent dropouts, or G.E.D. recipients if they did graduate, and complete fewer years of education overall. Educational aspirations and expectations measured for both young males and their parents, before as well as after the young male has fathered a child, would also need to be incorporated into these models in order to determine the relative effects of the variable noted above.

Program evaluation research will be another important area of study that will probably emerge if the interest in clinic projects designed for teenage fathers grows. Researchers should begin to consider how they can best identify control groups and establish quasi-experimental designs to test the effectiveness of clinic services in helping young fathers continue their education and find meaningful employment (in addition to other goals pertaining to fathering). It may be possible either to augment existing national data sets or prepare new national data collection efforts so that
they would have the appropriate data elements to establish a large scale control group. Various studies could use this control group to assess the progress of young males who receive clinic services.

**Teenage Fatherhood: Policies and Programs**

After two years of extensive study and deliberation, The Panel on Adolescent Pregnancy and Childbearing recently presented its recommendations for policies and programs. One of the Panel's six general conclusions is particularly relevant to the current discussion:

Society must avoid treating adolescent pregnancy as a problem peculiar to teenage girls. Our concept of the high-risk population must include boys. Their attitudes, motivations, and behaviors are as central to the problems as those of their female partners, and they must also be central to the solutions (Hayes, 1987: 262-263)

While the Panel provided a series of recommendations for curtailing adolescent pregnancies and for choosing alternatives to childbearing, a few of its recommendations on improving outcomes for adolescent parents are most relevant within the context of my discussion.

The Panel emphasized the importance of economic well-being for teenage families, particularly those in which the parents have not yet completed high school, by proposing that, "Ensuring the economic security of teenage families until they are able to become self-sufficient is an essential strategy to achieving the larger goal of promoting positive outcomes for these young parents and their
children and should involve partners, families, and the community" (Hayes, 1987: 286). One of the Panel's objectives in this regard is to enhance young fathers' ability to provide child support. This might be accomplished, for example, by introducing public jobs programs which would enable young fathers to contribute financially to their child's support. The implicit gender role assumptions about childrearing and breadwinner responsibilities underlying this approach are obvious. While this policy is not without merit, it may be perceived as indicative of the larger dilemma facing some young fathers. On the one hand, more vigorous efforts may be made to encourage or force young fathers to contribute to the financial support of their child. Yet, efforts may also be made to dissuade young mothers from living with their child's father (the Panel does not necessarily endorse this position). Recent research and current societal wisdom suggests that young mothers who remain in their parent's home, rather than moving away on their own or with their partner, may experience more positive outcomes because they can more readily draw upon their familial network for support and can thus more easily pursue their schooling. Meanwhile, NLSY data indicated that about half of the teenage fathers responsible for nonmaritally conceived first births lived with their child initially, and data from my sample of high school males indicated that a comparable percentage of males would want to live with their partner and child in the event that they were responsible for a nonmarital conception. It is conceivable then that a goodly proportion of
teenage fathers would want to express a serious commitment to their child and/or partner by living together. Many would find it stressful and unfair if they were expected to provide financial support to their child but prevented or discouraged from assuming a central role in the lives of their partner and child. Questions concerning whether or not living with a child negatively affects young fathers' educational career, and if so under what conditions, are clearly central to this issue as well.

The Panel also recommended that teenage parents, both female and male, be provided with special education and employment programs, as well as related services, e.g., transportation, counseling, and child care, which would enable youth to take full advantage of their opportunities. Young males, particularly those from minority backgrounds, were singled out as being most in need of such initiatives due to their work inexperience and educational deficits. It would appear that the fundamental importance of completing a high school education, whether by conventional or unconventional means, can not be overemphasized for adolescent parents.

**Conclusion**

The preceding discussion underscores the diversity of issues relevant to teenage fatherhood. The heightened sense of interest among the research and health service communities portends a growing commitment to develop a research agenda and services which focus more directly on young fathers. Not only will teenage fathers receive
more attention but young fathers in their early 20s will too since children born to adolescent mothers are often fathered by non-teenage fathers (Sonenstein, 1986). Research on teenage fathers as well as older fathers whose partners are teenage mothers will contribute to a better understanding of adolescent pregnancy and parenthood issues in general. By incorporating young males more fully into our conceptualization of adolescent fertility we will enhance our ability to develop viable policies which will reduce the number of unplanned adolescent pregnancies and assist teenage mothers and fathers in leading productive lives.
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APPENDIX
Survey of Teenage Males' Attitudes Concerning Teenage Fatherhood

The purpose of this survey is to collect information on how young males would behave if they found out that they were going to be a father. Please do not place your name on this survey; I am only interested in how young males as a group feel about these questions. I do not want to identify a particular person with his answers. If you feel uncomfortable answering a question, leave it blank and move on to the next one. Please answer the questions as honestly as you can. Your participation in this study is voluntary.

The first group of questions deal with your attitudes and beliefs about becoming a teenage parent. Please imagine that you have been dating the same girl who is about your age for the past year and that she told you last week that she was 2 months pregnant with your child. For the purpose of this survey assume that your girlfriend wants you to live with her and your child.

1) How likely is it that you would try to assume fatherhood responsibilities by living with your child and the child's mother? (Circle only one answer).
   unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 likely
e xtremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

2) How do you think you would feel about living with your child and the child's mother? Circle one answer each for (a), (b), and (c).
   a) bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
e xtremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely
   b) foolish 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 wise
e xtremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely
   c) harmful to me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 helpful
to me extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

The next nine questions ask you to judge to what extent you feel certain behaviors are good or bad ideas.

3) In general, the freedom to date different girls as a teenager is
   bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
e xtremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

4) Obtaining schooling beyond high school while a young male is in his late teens and early 20s is
   bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
e xtremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

5) A teenage father spending a lot of time taking care of the everyday needs of his young child, for example, bathing, feeding, and toilet training is
   bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
e xtremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

6) A teenage father having a chance to watch his child develop week by week is
   bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
e xtremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

7) Having a steady job while a young male is a teenager is
   bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
e xtremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

8) A young male's freedom and ability to plan his life without having to worry too much about how his plans will affect others is
   bad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 good
e xtremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely
9) The idea that a child generally can be raised best by teenage parents if the natural father is present in the home is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>bad</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10) The idea that a teenage male should be financially responsible for his own actions is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>bad</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11) Being able to spend a lot of time doing things with friends as a teenager is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>bad</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next nine questions ask you about how your life might be affected if you decided to live with your child and the child's mother when the child is born.

12) My living with my child and the child's mother would prevent me from dating other girls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unlikely</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13) My living with my child and the child's mother would lessen my chances of obtaining my desired level of education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unlikely</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14) My living with my child and the child's mother would give me a chance to care for the daily physical needs of my child.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unlikely</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15) My living with my child and the child's mother would enable me to watch my child develop week by week.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unlikely</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16) My living with my child and the child's mother would require me to have a steady job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unlikely</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17) My living with my child and the child's mother would limit my ability to make plans for my life without worrying about others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unlikely</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18) My living with my child and the child's mother would enable my child to have the best possible chance for being raised well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unlikely</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19) My living with my child and the child's mother would enable me to assume financial responsibility for my situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unlikely</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>quite</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21) My living with my child and the child's mother would limit my chances to spend time doing things with my friends.

unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 likely
extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

How I would like to know what you think other people would want you to do if you became a teenage father.

21) How likely is it that most people who are important to you would think that you should live with your child and the child's mother?

unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 likely
extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

22) How likely is it that your parent(s) would think that you should live with your child and the child's mother?

unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 likely
extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

23) How likely is it that your best friend (other than your parents) would think that you should live with your child and the child's mother?

unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 likely
extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

24) How likely is it that religious leaders in your church would think that you should live with your child and the child's mother? (skip if you are not a member of a church)

unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 likely
extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

25) In general I usually want to do what my parent(s) think I should do.

unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 likely
extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

26) In general I usually want to do what my close friends think I should do.

unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 likely
extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

27) In general I usually want to do what religious leaders of my church think I should do. (skip if you are not a member of a church)

unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 likely
extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

The next set of questions ask you for more specific information on how you would handle a situation in which you became a teenage father.

For the first seven questions assume again that your girlfriend who is about your age and whom you have dated for the past year is two months pregnant and decides to have your child. Circle how likely you would be to do the things listed in each of the next seven sentences if you decided to live with your girlfriend and your baby.

28) I would leave high school to find a full-time job.

unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 likely
extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

29) I would leave school and try to earn credit for high school by studying for and passing the GED test. (Persons who pass a GED test are given an official certificate that most employers and colleges view as being equal to a regular high school diploma).

unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 likely
extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely
30) I would ask my girlfriend to leave school when our child was born so that she could take care of our child.

likely unlikely extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

31) I would ask my girlfriend to leave school and find a full-time job.

likely unlikely extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

32) I would stay in school, earn a regular diploma, and then enroll in college.

likely unlikely extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

33) I would ask my parent(s) or grandparent(s) to watch my child while I went to school.

likely unlikely extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

34) I would apply for government financial aid to help me take care of my child.

likely unlikely extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

35) If your girlfriend whom you had dated for the past year decided against living with you and she wanted to keep your child and receive child support payments from you, how likely is it that you would pay child support even if to do so meant that you had to get a job?

likely unlikely extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

36) If your girlfriend whom you had dated for the past year decided against living with you and she wanted to keep your child, how likely is it that you would try to gain custody of your child by going to court?

likely unlikely extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely

37) Imagine again that you were dating the same girl who was about your age for the past year and she told you that she was 2 months pregnant with your child. From the options listed below, circle the one which you would most likely choose if it were only up to you.

(Please circle only one answer)

My First Choice Would Be To

a.) Get an abortion ...................................................... 1
b.) Marry the girl and live with your child and your girlfriend ...... 2
c.) Ask your girlfriend to have the baby and then give him/her up for adoption ...................................................... 3
d.) Let your girlfriend do what she wants as long as she does not expect you to get involved ............................... 4
e.) Keep the baby, live with your girlfriend, but not marry your girlfriend ............................................................. 5
f.) Ask you girlfriend to have the baby and offer to pay child support but not live with or marry your girlfriend ......... 6
g.) Keep the baby yourself, and not live with or marry your girlfriend ............................................................. 7
h.) Other (specify) ............................................. 8

38) How sure are you of your personal choice in question # 37

sure unsure extremely quite slightly neither slightly quite extremely
Once again imagine that you were dating the same girl who was about your age for the past year and she told you that she was 2 months pregnant with your child. From the options listed below, circle the one which you think your parent(s) would most likely want you to choose.

(Please circle only one answer)

My Parent(s)' Would Want Me To

a.) Get an abortion .......................................   1
b.) Marry the girl and live with your child and your girlfriend ...... 2
c.) Ask your girlfriend to have the baby and then give him/her up for adoption ........................................ 3
d.) Let your girlfriend do what she wants as long as she does not expect you to get involved ......................... 4
e.) Keep the baby, live with your girlfriend, but not marry your girlfriend ...................................................... 5
f.) Ask your girlfriend to have the baby and offer to pay child support but not live with or marry your girlfriend ......................... 6
g.) Keep the baby yourself, and not live with or marry your girlfriend ............................................................ 7
h.) Other (specify) ..................................   8

40) How sure are you of your parent(s)' choice in question # 39?

unsure 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 sure

The last set of questions ask for general information.

41) How old are you? ..........................................

42) With what parents are you living now? (Read the list and circle only one answer)
a. Natural mother and natural father ......................... 1
b. Natural mother and stepfather ................................ 2
c. Natural father and stepmother .................................. 3
d. Natural mother but no father ................................. 4
e. Natural father but no mother ............................... 5
f. Stepfather and stepmother ..................................... 6
g. Other (specify) ............................................ 7

43) What is your present religion, if any?
a. Catholic ......................................... 1
b. Baptist .......................................... 2
c. Other Protestant (specify) __________________..... 3
d. Jewish ........................................... 4
e. Other (specify) ................................. 5
f. None, no religion ...................................... 6

44) In the past year, about how often have you attended religious services?
a. Not at all ...................................... 1
b. Several times a year or less ......................... 2
c. About once a month .................................. 3
d. Two or three times a month ............................... 4
e. About once a week ........................................ 5
f. More than once a week .................................. 6

45) Circle your race or ethnic group.
a. Asian ........................................... 1
b. Black ........................................... 2
c. Hispanic ........................................... 3
d. White ............................................... 4
e. Other (specify) ________________________________ 5

46) Altogether, how many brothers and sisters do you have? Please count stepbrothers and stepsisters. (Circle only one answer)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 or more

47) How many children would you like to have? (Circle only one answer)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 or more
48) Circle the number that goes with the category for how much schooling you expect to complete.

(Please circle only one answer).
I Expect To

a) Leave high school before graduating ................................ 1
b) Graduate from high school ........................................... 2
c) Attend 1 or 2 years of college, but not graduate ................. 3
d) Graduate from two year trade school or community college .......... 4
e) Attend 3 or 4 years of college, but not graduate ................... 5
f) Graduate from 4 year college ....................................... 6
g) Obtain degree beyond college, for example, lawyer, doctor, college professor .. 7

49) Now circle the number that goes with the category for how much schooling you think your parent(s) expect you to complete.

(Please circle only one answer).

My Parent(s) Expect Me To

a) Leave high school before graduating ................................ 1
b) Graduate from high school ........................................... 2
c) Attend 1 or 2 years of college, but not graduate ................. 3
d) Graduate from two year trade school or community college .......... 4
e) Attend 3 or 4 years of college, but not graduate ................... 5
f) Graduate from 4 year college ....................................... 6
g) Obtain degree beyond college, for example, lawyer, doctor, college professor .. 7

50) Circle the category which best reflects your natural father's level of education? If you have been legally adopted, please circle the category that describes your adoptive father.

(Please circle only one answer).

Natural Father

a) Left high school before graduating ................................ 1
b) Graduated from high school ........................................... 2
c) Attended 1 or 2 years of college, but did not graduate ............... 3
d) Graduated from two year trade school or community college .......... 4
e) Attended 3 or 4 years of college, but did not graduate ................... 5
f) Graduated from 4 year college ....................................... 6
g) Obtained degree beyond college, for example, lawyer, doctor, college professor .. 7
h) Don't know ............................................ 8
i) Does not apply ....................................... 9

51) Circle the category which best reflects your natural mother's level of education? If you have been legally adopted, please circle the category that describes your adoptive mother.

(Please circle only one answer).

Natural Mother

a) Left high school before graduating ................................ 1
b) Graduated from high school ........................................... 2
c) Attended 1 or 2 years of college, but did not graduate ............... 3
d) Graduated from two year trade school or community college .......... 4
e) Attended 3 or 4 years of college, but did not graduate ................... 5
f) Graduated from 4 year college ....................................... 6
g) Obtained degree beyond college, for example, lawyer, doctor, college professor .. 7
h) Don't know ............................................ 8
i) Does not apply ....................................... 9

52) Do you have any other thoughts about teenage fatherhood that would help me to understand your answers? Use the backside of this page to write your comments. (Please print).