CRIMINAL INVOLVEMENT, RISKY SEXUAL BEHAVIOR, RELATIONSHIP FORMATION, AND FERTILITY OUTCOMES

Brittany Ganser

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate College of Bowling Green
State University in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August 2023

Committee:

Danielle C. Kuhl, Committee Chair

Lee Nickoson,
Graduate Faculty Representative

Stephen Demuth

Karen Benjamin Guzzo

Thomas J. Mowen

ABSTRACT

Danielle C. Kuhl, Committee Chair

While the field of criminology has focused on turning points that could shift individuals away from crime, little research has examined how criminal offending shapes sexual behaviors, adult relationships, and achieved fertility. Those involved in criminal activity arguably could face worse outcomes in these behaviors, largely due to considerations of labeling theory, where stigma could result in difficulty finding relationship partners. Certain types of crime may also be more stigmatizing than others, making one less desirable as a partner. This effect may be gendered in nature, such that certain types of crime may be more damaging for women as opposed to men. My project draws on criminology literature on labeling theory, the age-graded theory of social control, and social homogamy to predict numerous sexual, relationship, and fertility outcomes. Using Waves I, III, and IV of the National Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health), the following studies examine the impact of criminal activity on a variety of risky sexual behaviors, relationship type, and fertility outcomes. I find that both types of crime predict a younger age at first sex and more opposite-sex partners, though gender differences exist in how well the mechanisms included explain these relationships. While property crime initially decreases early union risk for women, this type of criminal behavior increases early union risk for men. Violent crime decreased early union risk for both gender groups, but the relationship only remained significant for women. Violent crime decreased the odds of Multiple-Partner Fertility (MPF), but only in reference to Single-Partner Fertility (SPF). Overall, linkages existed between the outcomes of all three studies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you to my advisor and chair, Dr. Danielle Kuhl, for her excellent feedback throughout the process. Her guidance was pivotal in guiding this dissertation through multiple rewrites. I also appreciate the help of my committee members: Drs. Thomas Mowen, Stephen Demuth, Karen Benjamin Guzzo, and Lee Nickoson. These individuals answered questions, provided advice, and offered additional theoretical perspectives to enhance my project.

I am grateful to all of my family members for their love and support over these last six years, especially mom, dad, Marcus, and Amanda. Thank you to everyone for encouraging me through the hard times and being there for me whenever I needed it. To my husband, Dane, who let me travel hundreds of miles away and commit years of our lives to this wild journey called graduate school. Not everyone would be supportive of my decision, but you have helped me financially, emotionally, and mentally throughout these years.

To all of my wonderful friends I have in my life, many of whom I met through graduate school. I owe the most thanks to my close friend David, who took me on road trips and introduced me to so many new cities: Detroit, Ann Arbor, Pittsburgh, and Cleveland. Because of you I am addicted to coffee and buying books, and both of which are positive to me. Through every challenge that presented itself, you were a constant source of support and encouragement.

Finally, thank you to all of the fur babies that were by my side through my schooling: Aslan (or Nugget baby), Ruby, Brielle, Nibbler, and Cookie. I love all of you so much, even though you prefer your dad.

This research uses data from Add Health, funded by grant P01 HD31921 (Harris) from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), with cooperative funding from 23 other federal agencies and foundations. Add Health

is currently directed by Robert A. Hummer and funded by the National Institute on Aging cooperative agreements U01 AG071448 (Hummer) and U01AG071450 (Aiello and Hummer) at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Add Health was designed by J. Richard Udry, Peter S. Bearman, and Kathleen Mullan Harris at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Criminology has linked parenthood and adult relationships such as marriage to desistance (Abell 2018; Giordano et al. 2011; Kreager et al. 2010; Pyrooz et al. 2017; Ziegler et al. 2017) and has linked victimization to relationship formation in adulthood (Kuhl et al. 2012; Kuhl et al. 2015; Warner et al. 2017). However, little research has focused on how criminal offending is associated with later adult relationships, and no scholarship has taken this a step further to link offending, sexual behavior, and relationships to subsequent fertility patterns. This likely complex association between offending, sexual behavior, adult unions, and fertility outcomes is important because it spans the rarely linked fields of criminology, family sociology, and demography. An interdisciplinary focus can offer greater insight into these behavioral patterns than a strict focus on criminology or family demography alone. Risk behaviors in general are often the result of a confluence of factors from multiple contexts. Offending itself is a risky behavior that is associated with numerous negative life course consequences, and sexual behavior, union formation, and fertility can occur in non-traditional or potentially "risky" ways. As such, this study seeks to join these bodies of work in the hope of uncovering meaningful associations that can inform theory.

Labeling theory predicts that a criminal record is associated with negative social consequences and stigma (Bernburg 2019). This could impact the way others view those with a criminal record, limiting future opportunities. Research finds that those with a criminal record fare worse in the employment sphere, in terms of college acceptance, and in obtaining housing, supporting the idea that the label signifies character flaws to others (Evans et al. 2019; Evans and Porter 2015; Leasure et al. 2022; Pager 2003; Pager et al. 2009; Stzewart and Uggen 2020). This effect may vary by type of crime: the public perceives recidivism risk to be greater for those

convicted of violent crimes and that employers are justified in not considering hiring these individuals (Denver et al. 2017). Crime may be particularly stigmatizing for women due to it being more rare, especially violent crime (Jones 2007; Lauritsen et al. 2009). However, some research suggests that women with a criminal record are viewed similarly to men with records, and female violent offenders may even fare better than men due to neutralization techniques that are often invoked to justify their engagement in crime (Adshead 2011). Labeling stigma would mean that individuals with a criminal record would fare worse in terms of relationship formation, as these negative perceptions of offenders would decrease their desirability to potential partners. Because violent crime may be particularly stigmatizing for all offenders and especially for women, I examine multiple types of crime and separate my analyses by gender.

Criminal offending has the potential to impact the sexual behaviors of an individual, the timing of unions individuals experience, and the number of partners with whom an individual has children. In turn, these behaviors, partnerships, and births could impact the ability of offenders to desist from offending. In these studies, I seek to explore the likely complex associations between offending, sexual behaviors, union formation, and fertility for a national sample of respondents in the U.S. Findings should have implications for criminological and family theory and policies related to adult unions and childbearing. I undertake three related studies. In Study 1, I explore the association between criminal offending and risky sexual behaviors. Study 2 focuses on the link between criminal offending and first relationship timing. My third study examines how criminal offending impacts fertility outcomes, specifically multiple-partner fertility (MPF). In the next section I briefly summarize the theoretical perspectives that motivate my analyses and then break the project into three distinct studies using these perspectives.

CHAPTER I. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The current study relies on a life course orientation. This theoretical lens comes from the work of Elder (1994) and includes several key themes. Timing is a key idea in life course theory, specifically the idea that when events occur matters. Events that occur at nonnormative times (either early or late) could have negative consequences. This dissertation examines the outcomes of early sex and early union formation, both of which are associated with worse well-being. Linked lives indicates that people are linked together, such that events have an impact through multiple generations. This idea extends to the implications of this research. Having experienced multiple-partner fertility could realistically lead to more disadvantage for the children of these relationships. In general, this framework stresses the importance of the timing of life events for reproducing inequalities or for potentially breaking the cycle of disadvantage to open avenues for improved well-being.

Relatedly, Sampson and Laub's age-graded theory of social control may have important implications for the present research (1993). This theory emphasizes the importance of events, or transitions, in altering long-term patterns of behavior, or trajectories. As individuals age and enter into relationships, these relationships may serve as important catalysts for knifing off prior criminal pasts. Bonds to prosocial individuals and institutions increase the costs that could result from offending, so these events could lead an individual from criminal offending to desistance (a turning point). However, those with a history of offending may fail to obtain these bonds or may have bonds to deviant others, thus decreasing the odds of desistance. I extend this theory to posit that those engaged in crime may still have these bonds, but that they occur in risky ways. In contrast, Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory of crime states that all deviant behavior can be explained by the trait of low self-control (1990). According to Hirschi and Gottfredson, those

with low self-control tend to engage in risky behaviors more frequently and focus on immediate gratification rather than long-term goals.

Additionally, scholars generally believe that relationship partners are chosen based on an interaction of preferences and opportunities (Kalmijn 1998). Though individuals have expectations for who they would like to form a union with, this collides with the opportunities they have to interact with those who are different from them. Resources are generally a major component of preferences, and criminal knowledge and skills could be perceived as an advantage (van Schellen et al. 2012). People also tend to select partners that are similar to them, especially in terms of attitudes (Kalmijn 2005). The tendency of individuals to form relationships with those who are similar to them is referred to as social homogamy (van Leeuwen and Maas 2019). This would mean that those involved in crime are not any less likely to form unions, but they are more likely to form relationships with others who are involved in crime. This would have implications for future criminal activity based on differential association theory, which states that we learn criminal behavior from individuals we are close to (Sutherland 1939). This can entail learning the attitudes that are accepting of criminal behavior as well as the actual techniques used to commit a crime. It seems logical to conclude that if those involved in crime are more likely to form relationships with those also involved in crime, these relationships could serve to amplify offending rather than decrease it.

Another relevant theoretical perspective is labeling theory. Labeling theory emphasizes the importance of the criminal offender label in perpetuating further criminal behavior (Bernburg 2019). This is largely because being labeled a “criminal” is accompanied by a host of negative stereotypes and associated stigma (Becker 1963; Lemert 1967). The criminal offender, according to Bernburg, is portrayed as “immoral, devious, and fundamentally different from other people”

(2019: 180). One way through which stigma operates is to change the individual's sense of self; they may now embrace the label and view shifting it as inevitable. Of particular relevance to the current study, the impact of stigma changes public perceptions of the individual, limiting future opportunities (Link 1982). Those who become aware of the criminal record may avoid the individual in social settings, resulting in difficulties with issues such as employment and housing. Though criminal records in general have negative societal implications, the most stigmatizing types of crimes, such as sex offenses or violent crime, may have even stronger labeling effects associated with them (Travis 2002). However, not all criminal behavior leads to sanctions from the criminal justice system (Becker 1963). It may be that only those with this formal label face the negative societal consequences of a criminal record. For instance, Sugie et al. find that those with an arrest or conviction face worse reactions from potential employers than those who just signal deviant behavior through their social media (2020). This criminal label would potentially make these individuals less likely to form relationships, as the stigma associated with the label may deter others from forming partnerships with them.

Crime Type

There is reason to believe that type of crime may be important for relationship outcomes. Offending type may make someone less desirable as a partner, and there may be gender differences. For example, violent offending may be particularly undesirable regardless of gender, but engaging in violence is likely even more stigmatizing for women due to violation of gender norms and the rarity of this type of crime for women (Jones 2007). Michel finds that violent street crimes such as rape and murder are perceived as more serious than white-collar crime in a vignette study (2016). Individuals also wanted harsher punishments for violent street crime offenders when compared to white collar offenders (ibid). This may mean fewer interested

partners in terms of sexual behavior. It likely would be even more influential in terms of union formation. Sexual encounters may be relatively brief, but relationships are usually entered into with an expectation of permanence. As such, individuals place time and effort into finding the ideal partner. Crime type also may represent differing developmental patterns that could have implications for family patterns in the future. Though not directly examining risky sexual behaviors, Larson et al. find a link between low self-control and violent behavior, though they also examine narcissism (2015). This type of stigma would predict fewer partners in general, resulting in less sexual risk-taking, less early union formation, and less multiple-partner fertility (MPF).

Gender Differences in Crime Type

There is an intersection in crime rates by type of crime and gender. In terms of property offending, males generally offend more, though this difference has decreased over time (Jones 2007). This is largely due to a drop in property offending by males more so than an increase in property offending by females. Trends are similar for violent offending (Lauritsen et al. 2009). Women are still less likely to engage in both violent and property offending than men, though property crime rates have increased for women (Bennett et al. 2005; Federal Bureau of Investigation 2013; Steffensmeier et al. 2006). However, Steffensmeier et al. note that increases in violent arrests for girls are traceable to the inclusion of more minor violent acts rather than the emergence of a violent female offender (2005). This finding is supported by other work finding gender differences in official data on assaults, but not for more serious offenses (Steffensmeier et al. 2006). Overall, we can conclude that even for different types of crime, men still seem to offend at higher rates than women. These differences are especially notable for violent crime. Social expectations of femininity also emphasize the importance of being gentle and considering

the feelings of others, which may mean that female violent offenders face more stigma than violent male offenders due to norm violation. Chiricos et al. find evidence that women face a stronger labeling reaction than men when convicted of a felony (2007). However, other evidence suggests that women may face the same or even fewer consequences as a result of criminal behavior. When examining questionnaire responses, individuals tend to stigmatize female offenders less than male offenders (Steffensmeier and Kramer 1980). Blais and Forth find that other characteristics of the offender, such as psychopathy, matter more for jurors considering sentencing than gender (2014). Similarly, Evans et al. find no differences in the effect of a criminal record on the reactions of potential landlords by gender (2019). An audit study in the Chicago area finds little difference in callback rates for women with a criminal record and those without (Galgano 2009). Adshead theorizes that the response to violent female offenders would be characterized by more neutralization techniques, leading to the perception that they are less accountable for their actions (2011). Though women may be stigmatized less than men involved in crime, some evidence suggests that they are more susceptible to the effects of stigma than men, with labeling playing a negative role in their own self-concept (McGrath 2014). There also is the potential for an interaction between crime type and gender; Evans and Porter find that sex offenses are particularly damaging for men attempting to find housing (2015).

CHAPTER II. STUDY 1: OFFENDING AND RISKY SEX OUTCOMES

Introduction

Little research investigates the link between criminal offending and sexual behaviors, but the life course perspective suggests that the timing of events matters. In terms of risky sexual behaviors, those who engage in sex at earlier ages may be prone to more early adult transitions, such as early union formation or early pregnancy. Experiencing multiple risky transitions will likely lead to disadvantage that passes down to the next generation, as these early transitions are linked to negative outcomes for both parents and their children. Increasingly the United States is already experiencing different demographic behaviors by socioeconomic status, with riskier types of unions and childbearing being experienced by those of low socioeconomic status (McLanahan 2004). Criminal behavior could be an effort to make money for those who cannot compete effectively in the job market. It also reduces job prospects in the future, meaning that there is likely overlap between criminal offending and risky demographic behaviors due to disadvantage (Pager 2003). Risky sexual behaviors could be part of the equation that explains why outcomes such as early union formation and multiple-partner fertility (MPF) occur.

Similarly, Sampson and Laub's age-graded theory of social control suggests that transitions matter for future desistance, but if individuals engaged in crime are more likely to have risky transitions, this would also have implications for desistance (1993). Risky sexual behaviors could potentially influence later union formation and fertility, both of which could impact desistance if they occur in risky ways. Early partnering, either through union formation or parenthood, could be more conflict laden and less stable, resulting in dissolution and subsequent repartnering. This connection would mean that those who engage in risky sexual behaviors early could experience early, unintended pregnancy and then have a larger window for repartnering

and future fertility with different partners. Both of these perspectives suggest that non-normatively timed experiences decrease the odds of healthy transitions later on, thereby amplifying offending behaviors and increasing disadvantage. Conversely, a self-control perspective would suggest that those who offend will also take risks in their sexual lives, resulting in a spurious rather than causal relationship. Perhaps those who engage in risky sexual behavior will be more likely to experience an early relationship formation or an unintended pregnancy as these transitions signify risk-taking in other areas of life.

The tendency for individuals to form relationships with those that are similar to them could also be important (Kalmijn 2005). This idea is generally referred to in the sociological literature as social homogamy (van Leeuwen and Maas 2019). Unions are also based on preferences, of which resources are a crucial component (Kalmijn 1998). Criminal knowledge could be perceived as a resource for someone looking to learn more about criminal techniques. The fact that we learn the most from those we are close to is a key part of Sutherland's differential association theory (1939). Sutherland stated that individuals learn both attitudes friendly to crime as well as actual criminal techniques from those they have good relationships with. If this is the case, then those involved in crime would not be any less likely to form relationships. Instead, they would form relationships with those who are similar to them in terms of offending and could potentially see an increase in their criminal behavior based on learning theory.

Labeling theory notes that a criminal record serves as a negative symbol to others in society, leading to stigma and reduced opportunities (Bernburg 2019). If those engaged in crime are negatively evaluated by potential partners, they would be expected to have an older age at first sex and fewer opposite-sex partners. In general, the expectation would be that those who

participate in crime, especially those with a formal label from the criminal justice system, would be less likely to form serious romantic partnerships. There is also potential for impacts by type of crime, with violent crime often being viewed as more dangerous and stigmatizing (Michel 2016). Crime is relatively rare for women and may result in more social stigma (Chiricos et al. 2007). However, it is also possible for crime to be equally stigmatizing for both men and women, or for women to even be treated more leniently.

Victimization has also been linked to a variety of early adult transitions, such as running away and parenthood (Haynie et al. 2009). Given that many involved in crime could also be victimized, there is the possibility that early sexual behavior could be another example of an early exit to adulthood. Kuhl et al. find that those who are victimized begin dating earlier, which could also entail sexual activity (2015). I include several types of victimization to examine this relationship.

Literature Review

Criminal Offending and Risky Sexual Behaviors

Studies usually rely on a variety of measures to assess risky sex. Unprotected sex is usually considered risky, as it may increase the chance of pregnancy or sexually transmitted infections (Fleming et al. 2019). Contraceptive use and contraceptive consistency also can be considered aspects of healthy sexual encounters (Field 2020). Condom use and sexual frequency have been considered part of sexual risk-taking (Beadnell et al. 2005). Some view casual sex outside of a relationship as risky (DeGenna and Cornelius 2015). Abortion, unintended pregnancy, and STI transmission have been examined as risky sexual behaviors (Chawla and Sarkar 2019).

Number of sexual partners and age at first intercourse have also been used as indicators of risky sex (Merrill and Liang 2019). Having more than two partners in the past 12 months is considered risky (Fleming et al. 2019). I therefore examine these two dimensions of risky sex in the following study: age at first intercourse and number of opposite-sex partners. Part of the reason I chose these two measures is that research suggests a linkage between the two: more opposite-sex partners is associated with a lower age at first sex (Haderxhanaj et al. 2014). However, future research could examine the relationship between crime and other types of risky sexual behavior to see if the relationships uncovered here apply to other outcomes.

Some past research has examined the linkage between criminal offending and risky sex. Genetic factors may explain both of these behaviors (Beaver et al. 2008). Late childhood delinquency has been indirectly related to risky sexual behaviors through the mechanism of adolescent delinquency (Mason et al. 2010). Lansford et al. (2014) find a relationship between delinquency in childhood and adolescence and risky sexual behaviors into adulthood. A study examining a variety of risk factors finds that early antisocial behavior and engaging with antisocial peers are both strongly associated with risky sex (Fleming et al. 2019). Lohman and Billings find that parental monitoring and academic achievement can prevent risky sexual behaviors for boys (2008). These factors are protective because they reduce delinquent behaviors (ibid). There is also a relationship that can be observed between puberty timing, sexual behavior, and adolescence (Negriff 2011). Early puberty is associated with increased sexual behavior, which then predicts later delinquency (ibid). There is also evidence to suggest that both crime and sexual behaviors follow similar developmental patterns. For instance, stressful life events (SLEs) have been linked to both risky sexual behaviors and delinquency (Dariotis and Chen 2022). Hair et al. find a high-risk group of adolescents that engage in substance use, delinquency,

and unsafe sex, indicating that a variety of risky behaviors co-occur (2009). Low self-control has been linked to both risky sexual behaviors and crime (Birthrong and Latzman 2014; Rubens et al. 2019; Wright et al. 1999). This suggests that a variety of problem behaviors may share similar developmental pathways.

Sexual debut in adolescence has been linked to delinquency one year later (Armour and Haynie 2007). However, Harden et al. use a twin sample and find that age at first sex is actually associated with less delinquency, which they trace to the use of a sample that shares genetics (2008). I examine the opposite direction of the relationship in that I examine the impact of criminal behavior on risky sexual behaviors. The number of delinquent acts committed is associated with age at first sex (Caputo 2007). Those engaged in delinquency are more likely to have had sex and tend to have more sexual partners (Savioja et al. 2017). These studies rely on a variety of variables to measure risky sex: age at first intercourse, STI diagnosis, unprotected sex, number of opposite-sex partners in the past 12 months, and number of partners over the lifetime. However, they largely rely on general delinquency measures or use just a certain type of offending (serious delinquency or drug use). Therefore, I examine multiple dimensions of offending behavior in my study, specifically examining property and violent crime. I also include low self-control, a predictor that was not used in the previous studies.

Predictors of Risky Sexual Behaviors

A variety of experiences can be used to predict risky sexual behaviors. Gender, race, family structure, religion, and socioeconomic status have been linked to early age at first sex (Caputo 2007). Specifically, those who reside in two-parent families have later age at first intercourse than those in other family types (ibid). Aspects of disadvantage have been associated with sexual behavior, with those experiencing poverty more likely to engage in risky sexual

activity. Community disadvantage, such as poverty rates and the proportion of single-parent families, have been linked to STIs (Wickrama et al. 2012). Women who experience poverty tend to have lower contraceptive use and higher contraceptive inconsistency (Field 2020). While I do not examine contraceptive use or STI transmission here, there is the possibility that disadvantage could be linked to other aspects of sexual risk-taking. Several findings indicate the importance of religion in predicting sexual behavior. Those involved in Christianity in Norway tend to be older at first sex and to have fewer sexual partners (Pedersen 2014). Those who attend church services frequently tend to have fewer sexual partners and delay sexual initiation (Haglund and Fering 2010). Religiosity among college athletes was associated with fewer sexual partners (Jahanfar and Pashaei 2022; Moore et al. 2013). Discrimination is also associated with age at first sex and number of sexual partners, with those who have experienced discrimination reporting a younger at first sex and multiple sexual partners compared to those who have not (Grollman 2017). This may suggest that racial minorities are at greater risk of these behaviors due to increased exposure to prejudice.

There are also linkages between different types of sexual risk-taking. For junior high students, those with an early sexual debut (before 13 years old) had more sexual partners than those with a later sexual debut (Durbin et al. 1993). Adolescents who used contraceptives inconsistently tend to have more sexual partners over their lifetime (Davies et al. 2006). Reproductive knowledge and attitudes towards contraceptives influence the type and consistency of contraceptive use (Guzzo and Hayford 2018). Self-control, one of the theoretical perspectives outlined in this study, also predicts participation in risky sexual behaviors (Magnusson et al. 2019).

A variety of research findings link substance use to sexual behaviors. Past drug use is associated with more sexual partners (Longshore and Anglin 1995). In general, substance use in various forms, such as alcohol and drug use, may predict sexual behavior due to the risks individuals tend to take when they engage in intoxicated sex (Caldeira et al. 2009). Contraceptive non-use, for instance, becomes more likely if sexual activity occurs in a state of intoxication (ibid). For college students, going to parties and bars is associated with increased risk of engaging in risky sexual behaviors (Jahanfar and Pashaei 2022). Binge drinking in late adolescence is associated with more sexual partners in early adulthood (Guo et al. 2002). Alcohol and drug use is associated with risky sexual behaviors for both young women and men (Turchik et al. 2010). Among low-income youth, substance use increases sexual risk-taking fourfold (Sly et al. 1997). As many involved in crime may be disadvantaged, substance use may be particularly influential for this sample as well.

There is also reason to suspect gender differences in the occurrence of risky sexual behaviors. Dir et al. (2014) examine numerous studies and find a linkage between impulsivity and risky sexual behaviors. Though the effect was small, it was far greater for females than for males. Therefore, gender served as a moderator in the relationship between impulsivity and risky sexual behavior. However, there is also the potential for a lack of gender differences. Mayeux et al. find that popularity in adolescence is linked to increased sexual activity regardless of gender (2008). Others find a similar linkage between substance use and risky sexual behaviors, with gender being unimportant in this relationship (Biswas and Vaughn 2011; Dembo et al. 2010). Sexual activity is also generally less accepted for female adolescents compared to males, so it may be that girls are less likely to participate in sexual risk-taking regardless of criminal offending (Kreager et al. 2016). Like criminal offending, sexual behavior is considered a

violation of social norms for girls more than for boys (Zaikman et al. 2016). Female adolescents who participate in criminal activity may already face social sanctions, so there is also the possibility that there will be less to lose in terms of sexual risk-taking. Those who already face stigma may be hardened and less concerned about sexual stigma.

Consequences of Risky Sexual Behaviors

Younger age at sexual debut and more sexual partners is generally associated with negative life course outcomes. Health consequences are often discussed in reference to sexual risk-taking. Having multiple current sexual partners increases sexually transmitted disease risk for adolescents (Rosenberg et al. 1999). Number of sexual partners and inconsistent contraceptive use are associated with increased risk of STIs in adulthood (Manhart et al. 2016). In particular, lifetime number of sexual partners is associated with HPV infection for men (Lu et al. 2009). Risky sexual behaviors in general are linked to STIs and unintended pregnancy, both of which have large negative tolls on the individual and society (Manhart et al. 2016). Some evidence suggests a link between the two outcomes: early sexual initiation is associated with more sexual partners (Kugler et al. 2017). Sexual behaviors also could yield negative consequences for mental health. Sexual risk-taking can lead to depressive symptoms in adulthood (Hallfors et al. 2005). Early sexual debut (before the age of 14) is associated with poor self-esteem and mental health for adolescent boys (Kastbom et al. 2015). More sexual partners are also associated with substance abuse disorders for New Zealand women throughout the life course (Ramrakha et al. 2013). Sexual debut that occurs before age 14 is also connected with substance use among Swedish teens (Kastbom et al. 2015).

Sexual risk-taking tends to result in poor future outcomes. Sabia and Rees (2012) find that more sexual partners leads to lower educational attainment. Early sexual debut also reduces

the chance of individuals attending college in Scotland, even if pregnancy did not result from the sexual encounter (Parkes et al. 2010). A similar relationship is found in the U.S., especially for females (Spriggs and Halpern 2008). Sexual debut before the age of 16 is associated with later marital dissolution (Paik 2011). All of these outcomes indicate increased disadvantage, which will potentially be even greater for those involved in criminal activity. Early sexual debut also increases the likelihood of later delinquency and violence (Armour and Haynie 2007; Kastbom et al. 2015). If the individual is already participating in delinquent behavior, perhaps risky sexual behaviors could serve to amplify offending among adolescents.

There is also reason to believe that these risky sexual behaviors could be linked with other outcomes examined in the remaining studies. Raley et al. (2007) find that relationships that are sexual in nature rather than romantic are associated with early cohabiting unions. Multiple premarital sexual relationships are also associated with increased risk of dissolution, which could lead to repartnering and subsequent multiple-partner fertility (Teachman 2003). Sex at a young age increases the chances of a man experiencing multiple-partner fertility (Logan et al. 2006; Manlove et al. 2008). These studies may indicate a pathway from risky sexual behaviors to at-risk unions to early, unintended pregnancy to multiple-partner fertility.

Mechanisms Connecting Criminal Involvement and Risky Sexual Behaviors

My analyses are partly motivated by the perspective of the life course, especially the concept of timing (Elder 1994). This idea is the most important when considering age at first sex. Sexual initiation is part of the transition to adulthood, so if it occurs at earlier ages this could indicate other early adult transitions, such as early union formation or early pregnancy. Early transitions are generally associated with worse outcomes for parents and their children, which has implications for the replication of inequality throughout multiple generations. This relates to

another life course concept of linked lives, or the idea that one individual's life impacts others who are close to them (Elder 1994). Part of the value of the present study is to determine how early risky behavior shapes family outcomes and contributes to intergenerational inequality. An individual engaged in both crime and risky sexual behavior may experience disadvantage, which can be felt by children in the family unit and may lead to them embarking on similar behavioral patterns once they are of age.

This idea also relates to Sampson and Laub's age-graded theory of social control (1993). According to this theory, events can be pivotal in helping individuals desist from crime, but the quality and timing of bonds likely matters. Sexual initiation is a normative behavior, but if it occurs in a risky way it could bear consequences such as unintended pregnancy or early union formation. Both early age at first sex and numerous sexual partners are risky aspects of sexual initiation that could lead to other early and negative transitions. Therefore, while attachment to others is important in desisting from crime, sexual risk-taking with numerous partners is unlikely to have much impact as a deterrent. Perhaps sexual activity is occurring with partners that take similar risks in terms of criminal and sexual behavior. Similarly, while sexual initiation could be linked to the beginning of a serious romantic relationship, relationships that begin early in the life course tend to fare worse in terms of quality and longevity.

The age-graded theory of social control notes that individuals have the potential to adapt and change over the life course, especially with crucial life events. Sampson and Laub refer to pivotal life events as "transitions" that can dramatically alter long-term patterns of behavior, called "trajectories" (1993). Events such as marriage, parenthood, and military service could all help individuals leave a life of crime, as they increase the stakes in conformity (Abell 2018; King et al. 2007; Sampson and Laub 1993). This is in contrast to the general theory of crime, which

states that self-control would be the main determinant of any risky behaviors (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990). Those who have low self-control tend to be sensation-seeking and impulsive when making decisions. These individuals focus on the immediate future and are unable to consider the long-term impacts of behavior. This idea would posit that those involved in crime would take risks across their lives, such as sexual behaviors.

Individuals use a great deal of effort to discover the best possible partner. Part of these evaluations may involve the use of labels in making conclusions about a potential partner's character. According to labeling theory, criminal behavior may be associated with negative stereotypes, which would deter partnership formation with these individuals (Bernburg 2019). Individuals with a criminal record would be expected to be older at first sex and to have fewer lifetime sexual partners than those without a record. Crime type and gender may be significant in these relationships. Violent crime tends to be rarer and evokes more fear than other types of crimes, meaning that those engaged in violent offenses may be particularly unlikely to form serious relationships (Michel 2016). Crime, particularly violent crime, is rare and potentially more stigmatizing for women (Jones 2007; Steffensmeier and Kramer 1980). There is also the potential for women to face less consequences from crime, perhaps because they tend to face less severe sentencing (Doerner and Demuth 2014; Rodriguez et al. 2006). Society may use neutralizations to lessen the responsibility of female offenders (Adshead 2011).

In contrast, criminal behavior may not serve as a deterrent to forming relationships. People select partners based on preferences, with those who have the most resources generally being the most desirable (Kalmijn 1998). Criminal behavior could entail a knowledge base that is desirable to others involved in crime. Individuals also form relationships with those they are similar with (social homogamy), and openness to criminal behavior could be a desirable

similarity in attitudes (Kalmijn 2005; van Leeuwen and Maas 2019). Based on learning theory, in particular differential association theory, people learn the most from those they have a close relationship with. This means that relationships could actually serve to increase rather than decrease offending if the union is with someone who has knowledge of criminal techniques and attitudes. According to this perspective, crime would not decrease odds of relationships, but would increase the odds of forming relationships with others involved in crime.

Another potential mechanism linking criminal offending and sexual behaviors is a purely mechanical one: those incarcerated due to crime may have less opportunity to be in the general population and to form relationships. Those engaged in serious violent crime likely face long stints of incarceration. Given the isolation of imprisonment, these individuals would be unlikely to be able to meet individuals in social settings, and therefore would have fewer opposite-sex partners and possibly an older age at first intercourse. Certain types of offending are likely more stigmatizing, potentially reducing the ability to find partners. Violent offending is likely particularly frightening to the public, meaning that those who engage in violence may have a difficult time finding sexual partners. Incarceration is also more likely with serious violent offending, meaning that these individuals would be removed from the relationship pool for potentially long periods of time. Conversely, sexual activity may be viewed as a relatively short-term interaction, meaning that type of offending may not matter. There may also be gender differences in the consequences of crime. Women may face especially harsh consequences for violent offending, as so few women engage in those behaviors (Jones 2007). However, there is also the possibility for violent crime to be equally stigmatizing regardless of gender, as this type of crime is viewed with particular punitiveness (Chiricos et al. 2007). Those who experience

more stigma will be more likely to recidivate due to reduced opportunities and because the negative evaluations of others will eventually be internalized.

Current Study

Study 1 Hypotheses

Study 1 examines the following research questions: Does participation in crime impact age at first sex? Is offending potentially more harmful for women? Or is criminal behavior a resource that will make sexual risk-taking just as likely even if the individual engaged in crime? Will these relationships exist for another risky sexual behavior: number of opposite-sex partners?

Hypothesis 1a: Property offending will be associated with a later age at first sex for women, but few differences will exist between men involved in this type of crime and those not involved.

Hypothesis 1b: Property offending will not deter partnership formation for men and women if they form partnerships with those involved in crime. Therefore, age at first sex will not significantly differ based on engagement in property crime.

Hypothesis 2a: Men engaged in violent offending will experience a similar age at first intercourse compared to those not involved, while women engaged in violent offending will be highly stigmatized and will be older at first sex.

Hypothesis 2b: Violent offending will be associated with similar patterns for both men and women, with age at first intercourse being relatively unaffected by engagement in violent crime.

Hypothesis 3a: Property offending will be more stigmatizing for female offenders, resulting in fewer opposite-sex partners. There will be little impact of violent crime on number of partners for men due to partnerships being formed with others involved in crime.

Hypothesis 3b: Property offending will not significantly alter the number of opposite-sex partners for men or women in the sample, as relationships can be formed with others engaged in criminal behavior.

Hypothesis 4a: Violent offending will be stigmatizing for women due to its rarity, with women experiencing a lower number of opposite-sex partners if they have engaged in violent crime. Little effect will be observed for men in the sample.

Hypothesis 4b: Violent offending will not impact number of partners for men or women in the sample.

Data

This study uses data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health). Add Health is a nationally representative school-based sample of individuals in grades 7-12 in 1994-1995. The in-home interview at Wave I occurred in 1995; some key groups were oversampled. Wave II interviewed those who were still in school in 1996. Waves III, IV, and V were interviews of the original Wave I respondents and occurred in 2001-2002 (ages 18-24), 2008 (ages 26-31), and 2016-2018 (35-40). [1] In this study, I use Waves I, III, and IV. Out of the full sample of 20,774, 13,034 have participated in Waves I, III, and IV. I also eliminate those without valid sampling weights (746) for a sample size of 12,288. My final sample size is 10,437 after eliminating those missing on either of the dependent variables (1,851 respondents). I use MICE to impute missing data. Those missing on the dependent variable were included in MICE, but dropped after the imputations were conducted. This is following the lead of von Hippel (2007). Missing data patterns and comparisons between observed and imputed data can be found in Appendix B.

[1] The full age range at Wave IV is 24-34, but the majority of the sample fall between the ages of 26 and 31.

Study 1 Dependent Variables

I examine two dependent variables: age at first sex and number of opposite-sex partners. *Age at first sex* is a continuous variable taken from a question asking about the respondent's age at first vaginal intercourse. I only include those who reported an age at first sex in the range of 10 to 25 years old, following the lead of other authors who have examined this outcome (Le et al. 2019; Winter et al. 2022). This results in 1,086 individuals being missing: 864 who were missing on the question initially, 77 who reported being under the age of 10 at first intercourse, and 145 respondents who were above the age of 25 at first sex. *Number of opposite-sex partners* is also a continuous variable with 653 respondents missing on this question. Both of these measures are taken at Wave IV. Overall, 1,739 individuals were missing on either of these measures (14.15% of the original sample of 12,288).

Study 1 Independent Variables

My key independent variables include several measures of criminal involvement, taken at Waves I and III. Respondents were asked about their involvement in a variety of criminal activities: 1) deliberately damage property that didn't belong to you, 2) steal something worth more than $50, 3) hurt someone badly enough to need bandages or care from a doctor or nurse, 4) go into a house or building to steal something, 5) steal something worth less than $50, 6) take part in a fight where a group of your friends was against another group, and 7) use or threaten to use a weapon to get something from someone. I separate these measures into two binary measures: violent offending and property offending, coded as one if the respondent reported engaging in any of the behaviors in these categories at either Wave I or Wave III. *Violent offending* uses questions three, six, and seven listed above. *Property offending* uses questions one, two, four, and five.

Study 1 Control Variables

I include the demographic controls of age, race/ethnicity, education, income, family structure, religiosity, and household socioeconomic status in adolescence. All of these variables are from Wave I with the exception of age, income, and education, which are from Wave IV. *Age* is a continuous measure coded from subtracting the interview date from the date of birth. This variable is only included in the analyses for number of opposite-sex partners. *Race/ethnicity* has the categories of non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic, and Asian/other. *Education* assesses the level of education reached by Wave IV: less than a high school degree, a high school degree or GED, some college, an AA or vocational college degree, and a graduate degree. *Income* is a categorical variable with 12 possible categories, which are listed in Appendix A. *Family structure* includes the following categories: two-parent, single parent, stepparent, and other. *Religiosity* asks respondents about the importance of religion: 1) not at all important, 2) somewhat important, 3) very important, and 4) more important than anything else. *Household socioeconomic status* uses Bearman and Moody's conceptualization, examining occupation and education of both parents (2004).

I also include number of times incarcerated, victimization, neighborhood disadvantage, substance use, and low self-control. *Number of times incarcerated* asks about the number of times the individual spent time in a correctional facility, with the options: 1) never, 2) once, and 3) more than once. *Victimization* is a measure from Wave IV that asks how many times in the last 12 months: 1) someone pulled a knife or gun on them, 2) someone cut or stabbed them, 3) someone shot them, or 4) they were jumped. These variables are created into dummy variables and victimization is coded as 1 if they have experienced any of the types of victimization (alpha=0.9242). I use a series of questions to gauge *neighborhood disadvantage* at Wave III: the

proportion Black, the proportion of female-headed households, the unemployment rate, the male unemployment rate, the median family income, the proportion of families below the poverty line, and the proportion of those 25 and over without a bachelor's degree. These are turned into a standardized alpha (alpha=0.8610). I create a measure of *substance use* at Wave I regarding use of cigarettes, chewing tobacco, alcohol, marijuana, cocaine, and other illegal substances (LSD, PCP, ecstasy, mushrooms, speed, ice, heroin, or pills). The categories are 1) no substance use, 2) alcohol or tobacco use, 3) marijuana use, and 4) other substance use. Finally, *low self-control* consists of 23 questions which are combined into a sum scale, with higher scores reflecting lower self-control (alpha=0.7596). This is the same measure used by Beaver et al. (2009). Details on the questions included and the coding used can be found in Appendix A.

Study 1 Analytical Strategy

All analyses are weighted using longitudinal survey weights for Wave IV. Descriptive statistics are shown in Table 1.1 and are separated by gender. Bivariate relationships between outcome variables and offending type are shown in Tables 1.2 and 1.3. I then use ordinary least squares regression (OLS) to examine the relationship between offending and age at first sex. I first present pooled models (Table 1.4), then models that separate males and females in the sample to determine if relationships differ for these two groups (Tables 1.6 and 1.7). Model 1 includes controls for basic demographic information such as age, education, income, and race. Model 2 includes incarceration experiences, victimization, neighborhood disadvantage, substance use, and self-control measures. These models are first run with property crime and then with violent crime as the independent variable. I then repeat these same sequential models in Tables 1.5 (pooled), 1.8, and 1.9 using Poisson regression to predict the number of opposite-sex partners.

Study 1 Results

I first discuss descriptive statistics in Table 1.1. The majority of women (over 70%) are not engaged in property or violent crime. Slightly under half of men report ever engaging in property or violent crime (47.79% for property crime and 45.89% for violent crime). Women in the sample tend to be slightly younger than men (28.191 compared to 28.364 years old). Patterns by race are similar regardless of gender, with the majority of individuals identifying as non-Hispanic white, followed by non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic, and Asian/Other. Most included in this sample have some college (65.36% of women and 62.15% of men), with those having a high school degree or GED being the second largest group. Most men and women were raised in a two-parent family, with smaller shares in single parent, stepparent, and other family structures. Around 90% of the sample reports religion being either "very important" or "more important than anything else". About 93% of women and 76% of men have never been incarcerated. A larger share of men reports incarceration experiences compared to women. Most in the sample do not report experiencing victimization, with only about 20% having been victimized. At Wave I, substance use patterns are relatively similar regardless of gender: most respondents have used alcohol or tobacco, but a sizeable portion (28% and 26%, respectively) report no substance use in adolescence. Age at first sex is also similar for men and women in the sample, with women being just slightly younger with a mean of 16.615 compared to 16.730 for men. Men, however, report more sexual partners than women (15.277 compared to 9.503).

I now discuss bivariate results for the first outcome of age at first intercourse, shown in Table 1.2. Both men and women engaged in property crime are significantly younger at first sex than those who are not engaged, with the difference being particularly striking for women. An even more dramatic difference can be observed when examining violent crime, where both men

and women are a full year younger, on average, at first sex when engaged in violent crime versus not engaged. Similar patterns emerge when examining the other dependent variable of number of opposite-sex partners, observed in Table 1.3. Men and women engaged in property crime have significantly more sexual partners than those who do not engage (16.348 versus 13.670 for men, 12.248 versus 8.272 for women). Similar differences can be observed for those engaged in violent crime for both men and women, with those who report engaging in violent acts reporting more partners than those without that involvement.

I first present pooled models, first without and then with an interaction term, to assess whether these outcomes differ on the basis of gender and criminal involvement (Table 1.4). While property crime is initially negative and significant in both of the first models, it only remains significant in model 2 when the interaction term is included. As the interaction between gender and property crime involvement is significant in both models, I present gender separated results below (b=-0.439 and b=-0.419). I first present a summary of other significant results seen in the table. Women are significantly younger at first sex across all models. Non-Hispanic Black individuals are younger when compared to non-Hispanic white individuals (b=-0.972 in Model 2 without the interaction term), while the other racial ethnic groups (Hispanic and Asian/other) tend to be older (b=0.272 and b=0.269 in the final model). All educational categories except for graduate degree result in a younger age at first intercourse when compared to those with a college degree. These relationships persist across both models (b=-1.633 for less than a high school degree, b=-1.065 for a high school degree or GED, b=-0.779 for some college, and b=-0.401 for an AA/vocational degree). When compared to those who grew up in two-parent families, all other family structures tend to result in a younger age at first sex. Those in the sample that report being the most religious are significantly older when first intercourse occurs

(b=0.427), as are those who have higher socioeconomic status in adulthood (0.066). Regardless of whether the interaction term is included in Model 2, those who are incarcerated are younger at first sex (b=-0.596 for incarcerated once and b=-0.768 for more than once). Victimization experiences reduce age at first intercourse. All forms of substance use decrease the age at which first sex occurs.

When turning the focus to violent crime in Table 1.5, it is highly significant across all models and reduces age at first sex (b=-0.990 in Model 1 and b=-0.639 in Model 2). Gender on its own exerts a similar effect, again across both models (b=-0.349 and b=-0.399). As with the property crime models, the interaction term is significant in both models. This suggests that this outcome likely varies based on gender. Effects of other variables are similar to the previous findings discussed in Table 1.4. Non-Hispanic Black respondents are younger at first sex, while Hispanic and Asian/other individuals are older. Those with an AA/vocational degree or less are younger when compared to those with a college degree (b=-1.521 for less than high school, b=-0.994 for high school degree or GED, b=-0.731 for some college, and b=-0.391 for an AA/vocational degree). Again, family structures other than two-parent in adolescence result in a younger age at first sex. Those who say religion is “more important than anything else” are older at first sex (0.446), as are those with a higher socioeconomic status in adolescence (b=0.063). Incarceration exerts a significant effect on the age of sexual initiation for both categories of incarcerated once (b=-0.525) and incarcerated more than once (b=-0.652). Substance use also decreases age at first sex. Due to the significance of both gender and the interaction between crime and gender, I proceed to present gender separated results below, first focusing on property crime and then on violent crime.

I show the impact of property crime on sexual initiation for both gender categories in Table 1.6. In Model 1, property crime exerts a significant and negative effect on age at first sex for men and women (b=-0.660 for women and b=-0.263 for men). However, by Model 2 property crime only significantly reduces age at first sex for women (b=-0.183). Racial/ethnic effects for women are similar to the pooled models: Non-Hispanic Black women are younger at first sex (b=-0.791 in Model 2), while Hispanic and Asian/other women are older (b=0.535 and b=0.274). For men, only non-Hispanic Black and Asian/other individuals are significantly different than non-Hispanic whites, though in the same direction as for women (b=-1.194 and b=0.288). Regardless of gender and across both models, those with less education (less than a high school degree, a high school degree or GED, and some college) are younger at first sex when compared to those with a college degree (b=-1.526, b=-0.986, and b=-0.706 for women and b=-1.713, b=-1.125, and b=-0.867 for men in Model 2). Similarly, the effect of family structure in adolescence operates in the same direction for men and women: those in family structures other than two-parent tend to be younger at first intercourse across both models. For both women and men, the most religious are older at first sex in Model 1. This category only remains significantly different for women in Model 2 (b=0.429). The controls added in Model 2 operate similarly regardless of the gender category examined. Incarceration experiences decrease age at first sex (women: b=-0.487 for once and b=-0.751 for more than once, and men: b=-0.671 and b=-0.842). Victimization also decreases age at first intercourse, as do all types of substance use. Low self-control predicts a younger age at sexual initiation for women (b=-0.010) but is insignificant for men in the sample.

I examine the impact of violent crime on age at first sex in Table 1.7. Violent crime is highly significant for men and women in both models. In Model 1, engaging in violent crime

reduces age at first sex by 0.784 years for women and 1.189 years for men. By Model 2, the coefficients are slightly reduced but still highly significant (b=-0.412 and b=-0.883). Racial/ethnic effects are similar to the property crime models. Non-Hispanic Black individuals are younger at first sex regardless of gender (b=-0.747 for women and b=-1.118 for men), while Asian/other respondents are younger (b=0.283 for women and b=0.341 for men). Hispanic women are also significantly older, but this effect is not observed for Hispanic men. As with the property crime models, those in the less educated categories are younger at first sex. However, for women the categories of less than a high school degree, a high school degree or GED, some college, and an AA/vocational degree are significantly younger, while only the first three categories have an impact on age at first sex for men. As with the property crime models, all family structures other than two-parent in adolescence lead to a younger age at first sex for women and men in the sample. The most religious individuals are older at first sex in Model 1 (b=0.912 for women and b=0.724 for men). In Model 2, significance is reduced but the most religious category still is older at first sex (b=0.431 and b=0.432). An increase up the socioeconomic scale in adolescence increases age at first intercourse (b=0.064 for women and b=0.061 for men). When examining the controls introduced in Model 2, incarceration, victimization, and all types of substance use decrease age at first sex for both groups. Low self-control significantly reduces age at sexual initiation, but only for women (b=-0.009).

I now conduct similar analyses for the other outcome of number of opposite-sex partners, first starting with the pooled models (Table 1.8). Property crime increases the number of partners in both models without interaction terms (b=0.265 and b=0.072). While property crime is no longer significant in the Model 2 with the interaction term included, the interaction term between gender and crime is highly significant in both Model 1 and Model 2. Women have significantly

fewer partners than men in both models (b=-0.399 and b=-0.313). These findings combined indicate that the relationship between property crime and number of opposite-sex partners differs based on gender. Each year of age increases the total number of partners, but only in Model 1. The lack of significance in Model 2 is likely explained by the additional controls included. As with the previous dependent variable, non-Hispanic Black individuals have more partners across models (b=0.266 in Model 2), while those in the Hispanic and Asian/other categories have fewer (b=-0.036 and b=-0.197). Initially a clear educational gradient can be observed in the number of opposite-sex partners: those with less than a high school degree, a high school degree, or some college have more partners than those with a college degree, while those with an AA/vocational degree or a graduate degree have fewer. The relationship between the lower educational categories and number of partners is reversed, however, in Model 2 with the addition of other controls. Income in adulthood at first reduces the number of partners, but then increases the number of partners in Model 2. Family structure is highly significant, with those having family structures in adolescence other than two-parent increasing the number of partners reported across models (b=0.125 for single parent, b=0.176 for stepparent, and b=0.321 for other family structures when compared to two-parent families). The most religious respondents (those who reported religion was either “very important” or “more important than anything else) reported significantly fewer partners (b=-0.188 and b=-0.272 in Model 1). These relationships persist in Model 2. Though adulthood income at first decreased number of partners, socioeconomic status in adolescence increases the number of partners across both models (b=0.039 and b=0.040). Incarceration and victimization increase the number of opposite-sex partners (b=0.473 for incarcerated once, b=0.621 for incarcerated more than once, and b=0.231 for victimization experiences). All forms of substance use predict higher numbers of reported partners, which

could indicate that sexual encounters are occurring in a state of intoxication. Low self-control is significant and predicts more partners, but whether this effect persists in gender-separated models remains to be seen.

Engaging in violent crime also leads to more reported sexual partners, as seen in Table 1.9 (b=0.362 in Model 1 and b=0.167 in Model 2). As in the descriptive statistics and bivariate analyses, women have significantly fewer partners than men in the sample. The interaction term between gender and violent crime is highly significant in both models. Due to these results, I present gender-separated analyses below. Many of the relationships of other predictors are similar to the property crime models. Age predicts more partners in Model 1 but is insignificant in Model 2. Non-Hispanic Black respondents report more partners (b=0.244), while Hispanic and Asian/other individuals report fewer (b=-0.043 and b=-0.207). Educational patterns are the same as with property crime: while initially the three less educated categories predict more partners, in Model 2 all educational categories have significantly fewer partners than those with a college degree. Household income at Wave IV is also the same as with the property crime models, as the negative, significant association in Model 1 becomes positive in Model 2 (b=-0.008 in Model 1 and b=0.007 in Model 2). The two most religious categories have fewer opposite sex-partners across models. Socioeconomic status in adolescence predicts more partners (b=0.042), as does incarceration (b=0.460 and b=0.601), victimization, (b=0.222), substance use (b=0.228 for alcohol or tobacco, b=0.498 for marijuana, and b=0.575 for other substances), and low self-control (b=0.006). As with the property crime models, the significance of crime, gender, and the interaction term between the two indicates gender differences and justifies gender-separated models (presented below).

The relationships between number of opposite-sex partners and property crime for men and women is presented in Table 1.10. For women, property crime engagement is highly significant and positive across both models (b=0.366 and b=0.147). Though it becomes less significant from Model 1 to Model 2, property crime also predicts more partners for men in the sample (b=0.201 and b=0.032). For women, age at first predicts more partners but predicts significantly fewer in the second model. This could be explained by the controls that were significant in the pooled models, mainly incarceration, victimization, and substance use. For men each year of age increases number of partners. Hispanic and Asian/other women report significantly fewer partners in Model 1 (b=-0.087 and b=-0.144). While these relationships persist in Model 2, now non-Hispanic Black women have significantly more partners. Similarly, only non-Hispanic Black men report more partners and Asian/other men report fewer partners in Model 1, but by Model 2 all racial/ethnic comparisons are significant (b=0.405 for non-Hispanic Black men, b=-0.031 for Hispanic men, and b=-0.269 for Asian/other men). The effect of education differs by gender: while all educational categories reduce number of partners for women, for men all categories except those with a graduate degree increase number of partners. These patterns are observed in both models. All family structures other than two-parent lead to more opposite-sex partners in both models (women: b=0.164 for single parent, b=0.137 for stepparent, and b=0.420 for other family structures in Model 2; men: b=0.094 for single parent, b=0.197 for stepparent, and b=0.215 for other family structures). The two most religious categories of women report significantly fewer partners in Model 1, while all three categories report significantly fewer in Model 2 compared to those who are not religious (b=-0.162, b=-0.277, and b=-0.268). For men, the most religious category is associated with fewer opposite-sex partners, but only in Model 1. Adolescent family socioeconomic status predicts more sexual

partners for men and women across both models (b=0.043 for women in Model 2, b=0.036 for men). A variety of additional control variables are introduced in Model 2, which may explain the changes in relationships seen across models. Incarceration, victimization, and substance use explain more partners for women and men. Neighborhood disadvantage (b=0.035) and low self-control (b=0.014) also lead to more opposite-sex partners, but only for women.

Table 1.11 shows the gender-separated models regressing violent crime on number of opposite-sex partners. Violent crime is associated with significantly more partners for women and men in Model 1 (b=0.251 and b=0.437). This significance only remains for the male sample in Model 2 (b=0.259). Each additional year of age leads to more partners in Model 1, but this relationship is reversed for women in Model 2. Before additional controls are introduced in Model 2, Hispanic and Asian/other women report fewer partners. In the next model, these effects are still observed (b=-0.061 for Hispanic women and b=-0.120 for Asian/other women), but now non-Hispanic Black women report significantly more partners (b=0.058). The same effects are observed for men, but across both models (b=0.379 for non-Hispanic Black men, b=-0.049 for Hispanic men, and b=-0.286 for Asian/other men). Gender divergence occurs in the educational effects on number of opposite-sex partners. For women, all educational categories report significantly fewer partners when compared to those with a college degree. The reverse relationship exists for men, where all educational categories except a graduate degree are associated with more partners compared to men with a college degree. A similar dynamic is seen in the effect of adulthood income, where for men it is associated with more partners (b=0.029) and for women with fewer partners (b=-0.019 in Model 2). Family structures other than two-parent in adolescence lead to more partners for men and women across both models. The most religious women have significantly fewer partners in Models 1 and 2 (b=-0.282 for those who

say religion is “very important” and b=-0.274 for those who say religion is “more important than anything else”). The most religious men also report fewer partners, but only in Model 1. Adolescent family socioeconomic status leads to more partners regardless of gender (b=0.044 and b=0.037). As in the other models, incarceration, victimization, and substance use are associated with more partners for women and men. As in the property crime models, both neighborhood disadvantage and low self-control predict more partners for women in the sample (b=0.035 for neighborhood disadvantage and b=0.016 for low self-control).

Study 1 Discussion

This study explored the possible connection between two types of crime, property and violent crime, and risky sexual behaviors. I also posited the possibility that gender could play a moderating role in this relationship. The first set of hypotheses addressed the first outcome of age at sexual initiation and posed two possible theoretical explanations for how this dependent variable would be related to property crime. Labeling theory might suggest that property crime would be more stigmatizing for women and would thus predict a later age at first sex (Hypothesis 1a). Men would follow a perspective in line with social homogamy and differential association theory, where those involved in crime would be just as likely to form relationships as long as their potential partners would also be engaged in crime. Hypothesis 1b posited that social homogamy and learning theory would persist regardless of gender, with those involved in crime just as likely to engage in sexual risk-taking as those not involved. Pooled models revealed that there was some gender divergence in these outcomes, which initially seemed in line with Hypothesis 1a. As the interaction term between female and property crime was significant, I presented gender-separated analyses. The gender-separated analyses indicated that for both men and women, engagement in property crime was associated with a younger age at first sex.

However, this relationship was explained by incarceration, victimization, and substance use for men, while for women it remained significant in both models. Though in Model 1 a low self-control perspective seems supported in that multiple types of risk-taking are linked to each other, low self-control only attains significance for women in the model. Social homogamy and differential association theory could be supported for men in the sample, as over the models they were not different from those not involved in crime in terms of age at first sex. Therefore, though the relationship between property crime and age at first intercourse is in the same direction for men and women, for men the mechanisms included account for this relationship. For women, though self-control seems supported theoretically, some of the relationship is still unaccounted for.

Hypotheses 2a and 2b were largely the same as the first set, except they now applied to violent crime rather than property crime. Hypothesis 2a predicted divergence, specifically that women engaged in violent crime would be especially stigmatized and would experience a later age at first sex. In contrast, Hypothesis 2b suggests that violent crime may not be a deterrent to sexual activity if it occurs with others also engaged in crime and that this relationship would be the same for men and women in the sample. As with property crime, pooled models revealed a significant interaction effect between violent crime and gender. However, separated models showed that violent crime operated very similarly for both men and women in the sample: those engaged in violent crime tend to be significantly younger at first sex. This relationship was largely the same across models, though as in the previous models only women saw a significant reduction in age at first sex based on low self-control. Therefore, though the effects of violent crime on sexual initiation were significant for men and women, my measure of low self-control was only significant for women. Overall, the age at first sex models revealed much similarity

between men and women in the effect of crime on this outcome, but the mechanisms at play seemed to vary.

I examined another outcome, number of opposite-sex partners, in the next sets of hypotheses. Hypothesis 3a again predicted gender divergence when examining the impact of property crime engagement, as crime is rarer and perhaps more stigmatizing for women. That would predict fewer sex partners for women, but little difference for men. The second hypothesis, 3b, posited that property crime would exert little influence on the number of opposite-sex partners regardless of gender. As with the first outcome examined, pooled models revealed a significant interaction between gender and property crime, so I examined gender-separated models. However, the effect of property crime on number of opposite-sex partners seemed relatively similar for women and men in the sample. Though the significance of the coefficient was reduced for men, property crime still predicted significantly more partners across both models. Again, it appears that the mechanisms included explained more of the relationship for men than for women, which is interesting considering that both neighborhood disadvantage and low self-control were only significant for women (both predicted a higher number of partners). Gender similarity rather than dissimilarity seems to explain this relationship, but the mechanisms underlying it show some divergence by gender.

My final set of hypotheses applied to the same outcome but examined the impact of violent crime. Due to gendered expectations and the rarity of violent crime observed in the descriptive statistics, Hypothesis 4a predicted that this behavior would be especially stigmatizing for women from a labeling perspective. Therefore, women engaged in violent crime would have fewer partners. As with the previous sets of hypotheses, Hypothesis 4b predicted that those engaged in crime will involve themselves with others engaged in crime, meaning that sexual

risk-taking would be just as likely as for those with no criminal behavior. The interaction term between gender and violent crime was significant for both groups, so I embarked on gender-separated analyses. The first model showed that violent crime led to more partners for both women and men, but the relationship only remained significant for men. As in the property crime models, neighborhood disadvantage and low self-control only predicted more partners for women, so these factors could account for the insignificance observed for women in Model 2. It also could be some of the other significant predictors added in that model, mainly incarceration, victimization, and substance use. This is different from the previous outcome, where the relationship between property crime and sexual initiation was explained away for men but not for women. Again, though the direction of the relationship was the same no matter what gender was examined, the models suggest that the mechanisms included seem to explain the relationship for women but not for men. The significance of low self-control may imply support for the GTC. Overall, I conclude that there is more gender similarity than dissimilarity found in the connection between crime and sexual risk-taking. The strength of the mechanisms may differ, but the direction of the relationship remains the same across crime type and the type of sexual risk examined.

CHAPTER III. STUDY 2: OFFENDING AND FIRST UNION TIMING

Introduction

Studies focusing on unions have focused on the inequalities that differentiate outcomes. McLanahan's (2004) concept of "diverging destinies" follows the observation that family patterns in the U.S. are increasingly adhering to two trajectories based on inequality. Specifically, those who have advanced education and other markers of advantage are having more stable unions, fewer partners, and better well-being, while those who are disadvantaged experience multiple cohabiting unions, multiple-partner fertility, and poor child outcomes. Importantly, criminal offending is a unique type of disadvantage that may make union formation occur in risky ways, yet offending is usually left out of union studies.

While criminological research has focused on the potential positive benefits of union formation on desistance, little research has examined how crime can impact the timing of relationship entry (Forrest 2014; King et al. 2007). Those with criminal involvement could be less likely to enter into relationships in general or could enter into them later in life, particularly if they are incarcerated and removed from the relationship pool. Criminal activity also could be stigmatizing, such that potential partners avoid those with deviant behavior. Offending in general has been declining since the 1990s, but those who do still engage in criminal behavior might be less desirable as partners, particularly if they engage in more stigmatizing types of crime (Rosenfeld 2002). This could be especially true for those who engage in violent offending, meaning they would have lower rates of early union formation or may never form unions at all. Offending behaviors are consistently lower for women, which may make these effects especially strong by gender. Violent crime is potentially even more stigmatizing than nonviolent types of crime for women. The relative rarity of violent offending for women and the disconnect between

the norms of femininity and violent behavior may make these types of crime especially damaging. An alternative prediction focuses on a low self-control perspective, by which those engaged in risky behaviors such as criminal offending will also have other risky transitions, such as early union formation. Or, in accordance with social homogamy and differential association theory, those involved in crime could be just as likely to form relationships, just with others also engaged in crime (Sutherland 1939).

While research has focused on the link between unions and desistance, little research has examined the reverse —how criminal offending influences union formation. In a recent exception, Landeis et al. use data from the Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study to examine multiple adult transitions and find that those who experienced an arrest transitioned to parenthood earlier than those without an arrest (2021). However, no research has examined this relationship using a nationally representative data set or looked at patterns by gender. My main research aim is to discern whether and how different types of offending predict first relationship timing. Specifically, are people involved in criminal offending more, less, or equally likely to have early unions than non-offenders? Does property offending matter more or less than violent offending for predicting early union formation? Are there gender differences in these associations?

Literature Review

Crime and Relationship Timing

As far as timing, several research findings suggest that delinquency is associated with earlier union formation. Mack finds that delinquency is associated with early union formation, but this research uses a different measure of delinquency than the current work (2012). A study from the Netherlands finds that past criminal offending reduces the chance of being in a romantic

relationship, which would mean that early union formation is unlikely (Zoutewelle-Terovan et al. 2016). The overlap between perpetration and victimization also may indicate that those involved in criminal activity will experience earlier unions because of their victimization (Kuhl et al. 2012). This has the potential to lead to further disadvantage, as early unions are associated with future negative outcomes such as relationship dissolution and economic disadvantage. As for types of offending, research is sparse. A vignette study finds, surprisingly, that violent offenders were rated as just as desirable to cohabit with as serious property offenders (Beijers et al. 2016). Sex offenders were the only group that was consistently rated negatively in terms of starting a cohabiting union (ibid). This may imply that offending type is unimportant in union formation, or that only the most stigmatizing types of offending would reduce the odds of an early union.

One argument would suggest that individuals will be less likely to form unions with those engaged in criminal behavior due to the labeling effects and negative associations the general public has with criminal offenders, particularly violent offenders (Bernburg 2019). Fear and distrust could be a common reaction from society and future potential relationship partners, which would make those engaged in crime unlikely to form serious, romantic partnerships in young adulthood. Violent offenses may create the impression that these individuals are dangerous and dissuade others from forming a union with them. Labeling theory would suggest that individuals involved in crime are perceived as incompatible with family life (Lyngstad and Skardhamar 2016). Part of this is because crime makes it difficult to hold down a job and thus to support a family financially (ibid). These labeling effects could depend on crime type, with those involved in violent crime perceived as more dangerous or unable to be present for a family unit given incarceration.

A more mechanical explanation argues that incarceration simply reduces the opportunities to form relationships. Those who offend could be removed from society for an extended period of time, especially for violent offending, thereby not having the chance to interact with others and develop romantic relationships. Violent offenses generally face harsh consequences and long prison terms, and even minor offenses can result in long-term imprisonment if the individual falls under "three-strikes" statutes (Kovandzic et al. 2004). These individuals would have little way of forming serious relationships when they are isolated in criminal justice facilities. This explanation would suggest that those involved in criminal offending, especially violent offending, will be delayed in relationship formation. Relationships for these individuals may occur later or in life or may not occur at all.

A selection-based argument would discredit these previous explanations. Individuals who have low self-control as defined by Gottfredson and Hirschi will tend to be impulsive in decision-making (1990). These individuals tend to focus on short-term rather than long-term consequences and prefer immediate gratification to investing large amounts of time and effort into goals that extend far into the future. Rather than criminal behavior influencing union formation, this framework would suggest that initial characteristics of the individual explain both outcomes.

Another pathway which would lead to criminal behavior being associated with early union formation is violent victimization. Those exposed to violence experience a variety of early adult transitions, such as running away and having children (Haynie et al. 2009). Those involved in crime could have exposure to violence, which would increase the likelihood of early unions. Victimization is likely for those involved in crime, which can also lead to early exits to adulthood. This is supported by Kuhl et al., who find that those who are violently victimized start

dating earlier and move into unions earlier than those who are not victimized (2015). I incorporate various types of victimization to account for this relationship.

In contrast to the theoretical perspectives provided above, differential association could imply little difference in union formation based on criminal behavior. Individuals generally form relationships with those similar to them, in an idea known as social homogamy (Kalmijn 2005; van Leeuwen and Maas 2019). This could mean that those involved in crime would form relationships with others involved in crime. Relationship formation is also based on a combination of preferences and opportunities, and part of a large part of an individual's preferences are based on resources (Kalmijn 1998). Though those involved in crime may not have resources in the traditional sense, criminal knowledge could be considered a resource. Differential association theory notes the importance of close relationships in learning dynamics (Sutherland 1939). In particular, individuals learn more from relationships they value. Criminal attitudes and techniques are learned in interaction with others and could be learned from serious long-term relationships more so than just a fleeting interaction. Duration, or how long a relationship has existed, is one of the key characteristics in determining whether learning occurs (ibid). Therefore, those involved in crime could be just as likely to form relationships but could offend more due to forming these relationships with those who are similar to them in terms of criminal activity.

Crime, Gender, and Relationships

The link between crime and relationships could differ by gender. Men are more likely to be single than women (Brown and Manning 2021). There are some gender differences in how young men and women want their relationships to progress (Choukas-Bradley et al. 2015). Young adult women also prefer entering into dating relationships as opposed to just sexual

encounters, while young men have the opposite preference (Bradshaw et al. 2010). This may mean that women enter into serious, coresidential relationships, such as marriage and cohabiting unions, earlier than men.

However, similarities also exist between predictors of union formation for men and women. Parental education has similar effects on union entry for both men and women (Mooyart and Liefbroer 2016). Unemployment and temporary unemployment both reduce the odds of union formation for men and women (Bolani and Vignoli 2021). Jalovaara finds similar economic predictors of union entry regardless of gender: those who had a higher education and income were more likely to enter into unions (2012). This may be due to greater gender equality, such that markers of advantage matter for both men and women in the union market now more so than in the past. While little research examines the impact of crime on unions, plenty focuses on the effects of unions on crime. Marriage, but not cohabitation, has been linked to desistance (Forrest 2014; King et al. 2007). Little research examines the opposite causal direction of how criminal activity could impact union transitions.

Predictors of Union Timing

Early union formation is influenced by numerous characteristics, including crime measures. Violent victimization in late adolescence has been associated with earlier union formation (Warner et al. 2017). Men who were victimized were more likely to enter into early marriage, whereas women were more likely to enter into early cohabiting unions. Given the overlap between criminal offending and victimization, those who are involved in criminal activity could be victimized more, meaning that victimization would explain the relationship between criminal behavior and early union formation. Cigarette usage in adolescence is associated with early marriage (Martino et al. 2004). Religion is significant in predicting early

marriage (Uecker and Stokes 2008). Family experiences in early life influence later union outcomes for individuals. Early union formation is associated with family instability, specifically number of family transitions, throughout childhood and adolescence (Fomby and Bosick 2013). Those who spend time in single-mother families as children are more likely to enter early cohabiting unions (Ryan et al. 2009). Early marriage risk is increased for those who lived in stepfamilies in childhood (ibid).

Measures of socioeconomic status are also important for union timing. Uecker and Stokes find that early marriage is more likely for those who come from disadvantaged families and for those with just a high school degree (2008). Those with less-educated parents enter into cohabiting unions more quickly than those in more advantaged families (Wiik 2009). Conversely, those with more educated parents tend to delay union formation (Mooyart and Liefbroer 2016). Those who drop out of school are more likely to enter into unions early in Canada, meaning that multiple early transitions could be linked together (Hango and Bourdais 2007).

Several other demographic factors predict union entry. Students are less likely to enter into unions in early adulthood (Liefbroer 1991). Research in Norway suggests that having criminal participation among biological family is associated with lower odds of marriage, but higher odds of parenthood (Lyngstad and Skardhamar 2016). Though this is the family unit rather than the individual, this study implies that crime is stigmatizing even when it is others who are engaged.

Consequences of Union Timing

Life events that occur early may be challenging and place many demands on the individual before they are ready, leading to negative outcomes. Though much research

documents the protective effect of union formation on desistance, those that experience "precocious exits" may not be mature enough to handle these transitions (Kuhl et al. 2015). Early union formation is associated with relationships marked by higher conflict and instability (Zito 2015). Specifically, early marriages are often of lower quality and are more likely to end in divorce (Amato et al. 2007). Cohabiting unions are less stable in general, but those that occur off time are likely to be of even shorter duration (Guzzo 2014b). These dissolutions of early relationships provide a longer window for repartnering. Those who marry early are also more likely to be impoverished later in life, which could be linked to the dissolution of early marriages (Dahl 2010).

Many of the consequences of early union formation are due to later dissolution and are economic in nature. Family complexity is associated with economic disadvantage and welfare receipt (Brown et al. 2015). Divorce reduces income, though the effect has lessened somewhat over time (Smock et al. 1999; McKeever and Wolfinger 2001). Economic losses also occur with the dissolution of cohabiting unions (Avellar and Smock 2005). Cohabiting unions are also relatively short-lived, meaning that individuals could experience this type of dissolution multiple times (Lichter et al. 2006). The increases in family instability also have implications for the children in these families. Family instability is associated with problem behaviors for children (Fomby and Osborne 2017). Patterns of family instability also tend to be intergenerational: those whose parents divorce are themselves more likely to experience divorce (Martin et al. 2005). This indicates the transfer of disadvantage to future generations as a result of relationship timing and instability.

Early relationship formation is associated with a variety of health outcomes, both physical and mental (Wickrama et al. 2010). For instance, precocious life events (life events that

occur earlier than is normative) are associated with young adult alcohol and drug use (Krohn et al. 1997). Those who are younger when they form their unions are more likely to experience domestic violence (DeMaris et al. 2003). Thus, out of time events can lead to numerous adverse outcomes, which can impact future relationship formation and childbearing. Those who are involved in crime likely already face disadvantage, meaning that family complexity could lead to further inequalities.

Relationships characterized by risk also could be associated with other negative outcomes. Overall, Multiple-Partner Fertility, or MPF, is more likely with unintended and nonmarital births, both of which could occur with the risky sexual behaviors outlined in Study 1 (Guzzo 2014a). Multiple-partner fertility, or having a child with more than one person, is linked to relationship outcomes. Those who cohabit or marry early are at increased risk of having a child (Manning and Cohen 2015). Fathers who had a child young (which could occur with risky sexual behaviors) or who had a child outside of a cohabiting union or marriage are more likely to experience MPF (Manlove et al. 2008). Those who have children young have a longer window to repartner and have children with different partners. More than half of men and about 40% of women will repartner within five years of the dissolution of their first union (Wu and Schimmele 2005). This may indicate a link between my first study outcomes of risky sexual behaviors, later relationship characteristics, and subsequent fertility.

Current Study

Study 2 Hypotheses

Study 2 focuses on the research questions: Is early union formation more likely for certain types of offending? Does gender alter these relationships?

Hypothesis 1a: Early unions will be just as likely for men involved in property crime, but less likely for those involved in violent crime. For women, all types of crime will reduce the odds of entering into early unions.

Hypothesis 1b: Crime will be associated with the same risk of early union entry for both men and women, as they will form relationships with those who are also involved in criminal activity.

Data

This study uses data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health). Add Health is a nationally representative school-based sample of individuals in grades 7-12 in 1994-1995. The in-home interview at Wave I occurred in 1995; some key groups were oversampled. Wave II interviewed those who were still in school in 1996. Waves III, IV, and V were interviews of the original Wave I respondents and occurred in 2001-2002 (ages 18-24), 2008 (ages 26-31), and 2016-2018 (35-40).[2] In this study, I use Waves I, III, and IV.

The full sample size of 20,774 is reduced to 13,034 when considering only those who participated in all three waves (I, III, and IV). Those without valid weights were also dropped (746 respondents, n=12,288). MICE was used for imputation. Those missing on the dependent variable were included in the MICE statement but dropped after imputation occurred (von Hippel 2007). A total of 1,851 were missing on any of the dependent variables in studies 1, 2, and 3 (n=10,437).

Study 2 Dependent Variable

Relationship timing is calculated from birth month and year and relationship month and year, with early unions being those that occur before 21 for men and before 20 for women,

[2] The full age range at Wave IV is 24-34, but 93% of the respondents are ages 26-31.

following the lead of Kuhl et al. (2015). *Early union formation* has the following categories: no union formation, later union formation, and early union formation. A total of 235 individuals are missing on this variable and are excluded from the analysis.

Study 2 Independent Variables

My key independent variables include several measures of criminal involvement, taken at Waves I and III. Respondents were asked about their involvement in a variety of criminal activities: 1) deliberately damage property that didn't belong to you, 2) steal something worth more than $50, 3) hurt someone badly enough to need bandages or care from a doctor or nurse, 4) go into a house or building to steal something, 5) steal something worth less than $50, 6) take part in a fight where a group of your friends was against another group, and 7) use or threaten to use a weapon to get something from someone. I separate these measures into two binary measures: violent offending and property offending, coded as one if the respondent reported engaging in any of the behaviors in these categories at either Wave I or Wave III. *Violent offending* uses questions three, six, and seven listed above. *Property offending* uses questions one, two, four, and five.

Study 2 Control Variables

I include the demographic controls of age, race/ethnicity, education, income, family structure, religiosity, and household socioeconomic status in adolescence. All of these variables are from Wave I with the exception of age, income, and education, which are from Wave IV. *Race/ethnicity* has the categories of non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic, and Asian/other. *Education* assesses the level of education reached by Wave IV: less than a high school degree, a high school degree or GED, some college, an AA or vocational college degree, and a graduate degree. *Income* is a categorical variable with 12 possible categories, which are

listed in Appendix A. *Family structure* includes the following categories: two-parent, single parent, stepparent, and other. *Religiosity* asks respondents about the importance of religion: 1) not at all important, 2) somewhat important, 3) very important, and 4) more important than anything else. *Household socioeconomic status* uses Bearman and Moody's conceptualization, examining occupation and education of both parents (2004).

I also include number of times incarcerated, victimization, neighborhood disadvantage, substance use, and low self-control. *Number of times incarcerated* asks about the number of times the individual spent time in a correctional facility, with the options: 1) never, 2) once, and 3) more than once. *Victimization* is a measure from Wave IV that asks how many times in the last 12 months: 1) someone pulled a knife or gun on them, 2) someone cut or stabbed them, 3) someone shot them, or 4) they were jumped. These variables are created into dummy variables and victimization is coded as 1 if they have experienced any of the types of victimization (alpha=0.9242). I use a series of questions to gauge *neighborhood disadvantage* at Wave III: the proportion Black, the proportion of female-headed households, the unemployment rate, the male unemployment rate, the median family income, the proportion of families below the poverty line, and the proportion of those 25 and over without a bachelor's degree. These are turned into a standardized alpha (alpha=0.8610). I create a measure of *substance use* at Wave I regarding use of cigarettes, chewing tobacco, alcohol, marijuana, cocaine, and other illegal substances (LSD, PCP, ecstasy, mushrooms, speed, ice, heroin, or pills). The categories are 1) no substance use, 2) alcohol or tobacco use, 3) marijuana use, and 4) other substance use. Finally, *low self-control* consists of 23 questions which are combined into a sum scale, with higher scores reflecting lower self-control (alpha=0.7596). This is the same measure used by Beaver et al. (2009). Details on the questions included and the coding used can be found in Appendix A.

I also include the dependent variables age at first sex and number of opposite-sex partners from Study 1 as predictors. Both variables come from questions at Wave IV. *Age at first sex* is a continuous variable taken from a question asking about the respondent's age at first vaginal intercourse, with those being under the age of 10 or above the age of 25 coded as missing. *Number of opposite-sex partners* is a continuous variable.

Study 2 Analytical Strategy

All analyses are weighted using longitudinal survey weights for Wave IV. Descriptive statistics are shown in Table 2.1 and are separated by gender. Bivariate relationships between early union formation and offending type are shown in Table 2.2. I then use multinomial logistic regression to examine the relationship between union timing and crime type. I first present pooled models (Tables 2.3. for property crime and 2.4. for violent crime), then models that separate males and females in the sample to determine if relationships differ for these two groups (Tables 2.5 and 2.6 for property crime and Table 2.7 and 2.8 for violent crime). Model includes controls for basic demographic information such as age, education, income, and race. Model 2 includes incarceration experiences, victimization, neighborhood disadvantage, substance use, and self-control measures. The final model includes the dependent variables from Study 1 as controls (Model 3).

Study 2 Results

I first discuss the weighted descriptive statistics, found in Table 2.1. The majority of women have not engaged in either type of crime, with only about 29% reporting property crime and 25% participating in violent crime. The rates for men are around 48% and 46%, respectively. Women tend to be slightly younger than men (28.191 compared to 28.364). The majority of the sample identifies as non-Hispanic white, followed by non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic, and then

Asian/other. The majority of the sample has some college, followed by a high school degree or GED. Over 50% of women and men report being in a two-parent family in adolescence, while around 20% lived in single parent families. Religion is important to most of the sample, with almost 90% reporting that religion was either “very important” or “more important than anything else” to them. Most respondents in this sample were about halfway up the socioeconomic scale at Wave I. The vast majority of women (about 93%) and men (about 76%) have never been incarcerated. More men than women report incarceration experiences (approximately 20% versus 7%). Only about one-fifth of the sample say they have experienced any of the types of victimization measured in Add Health. The most common type of substance use was alcohol or tobacco use for both men and women in the study. Over a quarter did not report any substance use. Interesting, women report slightly lower self-control than men (higher scores indicate lower self-control). Women are younger on average at first sex than men but report fewer partners than men. Only about 10% of women and 15% of men have never been in a union at the time of Wave IV. Over 50% experienced a union, but after the age of 20 for women and 21 for men. Finally, about 38% of women and 32% of men experienced early union formation.

I now describe the patterns observed on the bivariate level in Table 2.2. When examining women engaged in property crime, only later union formation and early union formation are significantly different, implying that a significantly different share of women reported early versus later unions based on property crime involvement. A different pattern can be observed for men engaged in property crime. The only significant differences in proportion are between those who never experienced a union and those who experienced a union, be it early or later. Men and women engaged in violent crime exhibit the same pattern: the proportions of those involved in early unions is significantly different than those who report no unions or later unions.

Results from the pooled models examining the multinomial logistic regression of early union formation on property crime are shown in Table 2.3. The first set of models does not include an interaction term between gender and property crime. When comparing early union formation to no unions, property crime engagement is significant across models and increases the risk of early unions (by 8% in Model 1, 26.4% in Model 2, and 27.7% in Model 3). When comparing earlier unions to later unions, property crime involvement significantly decreases the risk of early unions, but only in Model 1 (15.9% reduction). Including the additional controls in Model 2 reduces the relationship to nonsignificance, and this persists in Model 3 with the addition of the Study 1 dependent variables. Across all models and reference categories, women are less likely to marry early than men (51.1% when compared to no unions and 31.9% when compared to later unions in Model 3). Risk of early union formation is significantly higher for all racial/ethnic minorities in these models. The risk is especially high for non-Hispanic Black individuals when comparing early unions to no unions (374.2% in Model 3) but remains high when the reference category is shifted to later unions (106.2%). The risk is also higher for Hispanic and Asian/other individuals when the reference category is no union (112.9% for Hispanic respondents and 103.9% for Asian/other respondents). When the comparison group is shifted to later unions, these groups are still 32.6% and 12.6% more likely to experience early unions when compared to non-Hispanic whites. Across all models and both reference categories, those in the three lowest educational levels (less than a high school degree, a high school degree, and some college) are less likely to experience early unions than those with a bachelor's degree. Compared to no union in Model 3, the less educated are 87.9% (less than a high school degree), 80.8% (high school degree or GED), and 63.1% less likely to have an early union. When compared to later unions, the percentages are 83.3%, 77.3%, and 65.1% less likely to experience

an early union, respectively. Those with a higher adult income are more likely to experience an early union when compared to later unions, but less likely to experience an early union than no unions. This relationship persists across all three models. In the first two models, those in family structures other than two-parent in adolescence are less likely to form a union early (compared to no union in Model 2: 21.6% for single parent, 50.2% for stepparent, and 66.6% for other family structures; when compared to later unions in Model 2: 15.7% for single parent, 30.9% for stepparent, and 52.9% for other family structures). However, by Model 3 only stepparent and other family structures are associated with a reduced risk of early union formation relative to both no unions and later unions. Socioeconomic status in adolescence is associated with increased risk of early unions, with risk being 11.2% higher when compared to no unions and 6.2% higher when compared to later unions (Model 3). Risk of early union is reduced in Models 2 and 3 for those who have been incarcerated, regardless of the reference category. Though victimization initially decreases early union risk in Model 2 for both comparison groups, only the comparison to later unions remains significant in Model 3 (12.8% reduction in odds). Similarly, all forms of substance use make early unions less likely in Model 2, but by Model 3 only alcohol or tobacco and marijuana use significantly reduce odds compared to no unions. When compared to later unions, only alcohol or tobacco use reduces the risk of early unions in Model 3. Both dependent variables from Model 1 attain significance. Compared to no unions, age at first sex increases early union risk by 41.7%, while number of opposite-sex partners increases risk by 0.4%. When compared to later unions, age at first sex increases risk by 28.6% and number of opposite-sex partners increases risk by 0.3%. I briefly discuss the interaction between female and property crime, shown in Table 2.4. Across all models and reference categories, the interaction

term is significant. Due to this finding, I presented gender-separated results for the relationship between property crime and early union formation below.

I first present the results for the female sample in Table 2.5. In Model 1 property crime reduces the risk of early union formation by 19.3% compared to no unions and by 27.2% compared to later unions. However, by Model 2 only the comparison to later unions is significant, and property crime is insignificant for both reference categories by Model 3. The additional controls included in Model 2 and the previous study's dependent variables in Model 3 seem to explain the association between property crime and early unions. Across all models, racial/ethnic minorities have high odds of early union formation when compared to non-Hispanic whites and no unions (598.2% for non-Hispanic Black women, 103.0% for Hispanic women, and 162.9% for Asian/other women). For the comparison of later unions, only non-Hispanic Black women and Hispanic women are at greater risk of early union formation in Models 1 and 2. By Model 3, only non-Hispanic Black women are more likely to experience an early union when compared to later unions (156.2%). Across both reference groups and all models, those in the lowest educational categories (less than a high school degree, a high school degree or GED, and some college) have reduced odds of experiencing an early union. As with the pooled models, income in adulthood decreases odds of an early union relative to no union and increases the odds of an early union relative to later unions across all models (5.6% reduction and 7.7% increase in Model 3). All other family structures are significant in decreasing the odds of early unions compared to two-parent families. With no unions as the reference category, single parent homes decrease the risk by 30.4%, stepparent families decrease risk by 48.8%, and other family structures reduce risk by 69.9%. These reductions are 16.6%, 34.7%, and 55.0% when later unions serve as the reference category. Adolescent family socioeconomic status increases the

risk of early unions in all models and for both comparison categories. When compared to no unions, being incarcerated once and more than once decreases the risk of early unions in both models (45.8% for incarcerated once and 69.8% for incarcerated more than once in Model 3). Compared to later unions, only those women who are incarcerated more than once have significantly lower odds of early union formation (26.8%). Victimization reduces early union risk by 22.6% compared to no unions and 18.6% compared to later unions in Model 3. In Model 2, all forms of substance use reduce early union risk for both reference categories. However, by Model 3 only marijuana use decreases early union risk compared to no unions. For the reference of later unions, only alcohol or tobacco use decreases the odds of early union risk. Both of the Study 1 dependent variables are significant and both predict increased risk of early unions. For no unions, age at first sex increases early union risk by 49.5% and number of opposite-sex partners early union risk by 1.1%. When shifting the reference category to later unions, age at first sex increases early union risk by 33.1% and number of opposite-sex partners early union risk by 0.8%.

The impact of property crime on early union formation for men is shown in Table 2.6. When compared to no unions, property crime engagement predicts higher odds of early union formation across all models (23.4% in Model 1, 51.0% in Model 2, 48.2% in Model 3). The comparison to later unions fails to achieve significance in any of the models. Across all models, all racial/ethnic categories have greater risk of early unions compared to no unions (206.9% for non-Hispanic Black men, 133.2% for Hispanic men, and 67.5% for Asian/other men in Model 3). For later unions, only Hispanic men have significantly greater odds across all models. Though non-Hispanic Black men are at significantly higher risk in Model 3, this effect is not observed in the previous two models. The two lowest educational categories have lower risk of

early union formation relative to no unions in first two models. However, by Model 3 only those with less than a high school degree have reduced risk of early unions (70.6%). The three lowest educational categories of less than a high school degree, a high school degree or GED, and some college have significantly lower odds of experiencing an early union relative to a later union in all models. In Model 1, those who grew up in stepparent or other family structures have lower odds of early union compared to no unions and later unions. In the two subsequent models, these categories remain significant when comparing to no unions (35.2% for stepparent and 46.7% for other family structures in Model 3), but only those in other family structures are at a reduced risk when comparing to later unions (36.4%). Adolescent household socioeconomic status increases early union odds in all models (12.4% for comparison to no union and 6.2% for comparison to later unions). The second model reveals that incarceration experiences decrease early union odds regardless of reference category. By Model 3, this effect holds for the comparison to later unions, but only being incarcerated more than once is significant when compared to no unions. Though all forms of substance use are significant in Model 2 for both reference categories, by Model 3 the only significant comparisons are to no union. Alcohol and tobacco use decreases early union risk by 22.1% and marijuana use decreases risk by 32.7%. Of the two Study 1 outcomes, only age at first sex is significant and associated with greater odds of early union formation (34.4% for no unions and 23.9% for later unions).

I now examine pooled models using the other independent variable of violent crime (Table 2.7). Violent crime is highly significant and reduces the risk of early union formation in the first model (30.7% compared to no unions and 31.6% compared to later unions). It remains significant (though less so) in the second model. However, by Model 3 only the comparison with later unions is significant, decreasing risk by 12.9%. Across all models and regardless of the

reference category, women have lower odds of an early union than men. For the first two models, all racial/ethnic categories are at increased risk of early unions compared to non-Hispanic whites (compared to no unions: 233.9% for non-Hispanic Blacks, 125.1% for Hispanics, and 118.9% for Asian/other respondents in Model 2; compared to later unions: 68.7% for non-Hispanic Blacks, 40.7% for Hispanics, and 18.3% for Asian/other individuals in Model 2). These relationships remain for the no union comparison in Model 3, but compared to later unions only non-Hispanic Black and Hispanic respondents are at increased risk of early union formation in Model 3. When comparing to no unions and later unions, the less educated (less than a high school degree, a high school degree or GED, and some college) are at reduced risk of early unions across all models. As in the pooled property crime models, increases in income in at Wave IV reduce early union risk compared to no unions (4.1%) and increase early union risk compared to later unions (6.2%) in Model 3. Family structure in adolescence exerts similar effects on the risk of early union formation regardless of reference category. In the first two models, all other family forms are associated with significantly lower risk of early unions. In the last model, only stepparent and other family structures remain significant. Higher adolescent family socioeconomic status increases early union risk by 11.6% compared to no unions and by 6.1% compared to later unions (Model 3). Incarceration is highly significant regardless of the number of times incarcerated and the reference category and decreases the risk of experiencing an early union. Victimization decreases risk by 18.9% (no unions) and 15.2% in Model 2, but only the latter comparison remains significant in Model 3. Initially all types of substance use reduce early union risk, but by Model 3 there is divergence based on the reference group. Compared to no unions, those who use alcohol or tobacco (19.2%) or marijuana (30.1%) are significantly less likely to be in an early union. In reference to later unions, only those who use

alcohol or tobacco have reduced odds of experiencing an early union (14.0%). Both dependent variables from the previous study are significant and increase risk (age at first sex: 41.7% for no unions and 28.2% for later unions; number of opposite-sex partners: 0.4% for no unions and 0.3% for later unions). I also included an interaction term between gender and violent crime, models for which can be seen in Table 2.6. The interaction term only attains significance in the final model in reference to those with later unions. Though the interaction is largely insignificant, I present gender-separated analyses in Tables 2.9 and 2.10 to examine the gender divergence that appears in the final model.

I examine the effect of violent crime on early union risk for women in Table 2.9. Violent crime is significant and associated with a decreased risk of early union formation in Model 1 (31.6% compared to no unions and 36.1% compared to later unions). In the other two models, only the comparison to later unions remains significant, where violent crime still reduces the risk of early unions (26.4% in Model 2 and 20.1% in Model 3). I discuss the comparison to men below. As in the property crime models, racial/ethnic minorities have far higher risk of earlier unions when compared to non-Hispanic whites. Non-Hispanic Black women have odds of early union formation that are 610.5% higher compared to no unions and 162.8% compared to later unions (Model 3). Hispanic women have 104.7% and 17.6% higher odds, respectively, while Asian/other women have 167.0% and 13.3% higher odds of early unions. For both reference categories and for all models, risk of early union formation is lower for the less educated, specifically for those with less than a high school degree, a high school degree or GED, or some college. When compared to no unions, income in adulthood reduces early union risk by 5% in Model 1. This relationship remains relatively stable over the subsequent models. If the reference category is shifted to later unions, adult income increases early union risk by about 7-8% across

models. Those in single parent families in adolescence have reduced risk of early unions (30.2% compared to no unions and 16.6% compared to later unions in Model 3). Similar effects are observed for those who grew up in stepparent families (48.9% and 34.7%) and those who grew up with other family structures (69.9% and 55.3%). Though I report results for Model 3, these effects are roughly similar throughout the models presented. Increases in household socioeconomic status during adolescence always increase the risk of early unions. In Model 1, the increases are 12.2% compared to no unions and 7.1% compared to later unions. These effects are similar across the models, with the risk reduction being 10.5% and 6.0% in Model 3. Compared to no unions, both categories of incarceration experiences are significant and associated with lower risk of early unions. Only being incarcerated once is significant when compared to later unions, though this experience still reduces early union risk. Victimization decreases the risk of early union formation in both models. In Model 3, early union risk is reduced by 22.8% compared to no unions and 18.3% when compared to later unions. Though in the second model all forms of substance use significantly reduce early union risk, by the final model only marijuana use is significant for the reference group of no unions and alcohol or tobacco use is significant in comparison to later unions. For both reference groups, the previous study's dependent variables are significant. In reference to no unions, age at first sex increases early union risk by 49.3% and number of opposite-sex partners increases risk by 1.1%. These percentages are 32.8% and 0.8% in reference to later unions.

I now examine the analyses using the male sample in Table 2.10. The effects of violent crime on early union risk are the same as those seen for women in the first two models: in Model 1, violent crime reduces the risk of early unions by 30.0% compared to no unions and 27.6% compared to later unions. As with the female sample, only the comparison to later unions is

significant in Model 2 (21.5%). The difference by gender emerges in Model 3, as it did in the models using an interaction term. Here property crime is insignificant for both groups, while for women it remained significant for the comparison to later unions. Therefore, there is a similar effect of violent crime on early union formation for men and women up until Model 3. This may indicate that the mechanisms included are better at explaining this relationship for men than for women. All racial/ethnic categories are at significantly higher risk of early union formation when compared to no unions (Model 3: non-Hispanic Black men have a 198.1% increased risk, Hispanic men have a 131.8% higher risk, and Asian/other men have an increased risk of 68.7%). When comparing to later unions, only non-Hispanic Black and Hispanic men are at significantly higher risk (56.2% and 58.4%). Initially the two lowest educational categories are at decreased risk of early union formation relative to no unions, but only the less than high school group remains significant by Model 3 (71.4%). The three lowest educational categories of less than a high school degree, a high school degree or GED, and some college have significantly lower odds of early union formation when compared to later unions. This relationship persists across all three models. Income at Wave IV only matters when the reference group is later unions, where it increases risk across all models (4.3% in Model 3). In the first model, both those in stepparent and other family structures have lower risk of early union formation for both reference categories. By Model 2, this is still the case compared to no unions, but only other family structures are significant when compared to later unions. These relationships persist into the final model (compared to no unions: 35.1% for stepparent families and 47.7% for other family structures; compared to later unions: 37.2% for other family structures). Adolescent family socioeconomic status increases risk across all models and for both reference categories. The first model shows that both categories of incarceration experience reduce the risk of early union

formation (compared to no unions: 29.4% for incarcerated once and 50.5% for incarcerated more than once; compared to later unions: 31.2% for incarcerated once and 34.6% for incarcerated more than once). Only being incarcerated more than once decreases risk significantly when compared to no unions in Model 3, while both incarceration categories remain significant when compared to later unions. All types of substance use decrease early union risk when compared to no unions in the second model but only marijuana use significantly decreases risk in the next model (27.4%). For the reference group of later unions, only alcohol or tobacco use and other substance use significantly reduce the odds of early union formation. Substance use is entirely nonsignificant for this reference group in the final model. Out of the Study 1 dependent variables, only age at first sex is significant. Age at first sex increases the odds of early unions by 34.7% compared to no unions and by 23.6% compared to later unions. Again, the effect of violent crime on early union formation is the same for both gender groups until Model 3, when it fails to be significant for men. This could be due to the significance of age at first sex or that with the combination of the significant Model 2 controls of incarceration and victimization. Another gender difference emerges in that both Study 1 outcomes are significant for women, while only age at first sex significantly increases early union risk for men.

Study 2 Discussion

This study attempted to examine the relationship between two types of criminal involvement and early union formation. I posed two competing hypotheses: Hypothesis 1a predicted some gender divergence, in that for men only violent crime would decrease the odds of early unions due to the stigma of the violent offender label. Men involved in property crime would be just as likely to experience early unions because they would seek out partners similar to them in terms of criminal involvement (social homogamy; van Leeuwen and Maas 2019). For

women, I speculated that both types of crime would be stigmatizing due to the rarity of offending for this group. The label of being a female offender would decrease the odds of entering into early unions, regardless of crime type. The counterhypothesis, Hypothesis 1b, stated that risk of early union formation would be just as likely for men and women involved in crime, as they could form relationships with others engaged in crime.

In the first pooled models examining property crime, this type of crime only seemed significant when the reference category was no union. Gender, however, was significant for both comparison categories across all models, implying that women differ significantly in their propensity to enter into early unions. The relative risk ratios indicated that women are less likely to enter into early unions than men. When an interaction term was introduced, this attained significance across all comparisons and models, indicating that the effect of property crime on early union formation risk differed by gender. I consequently undertook gender-separated models, discovering that for women the initial connection between property crime and early union formation was reduced by controls. Though at first property crime reduced early union risk for both reference categories, only the later union comparison was significant in Model 2. This could be explained by the significance of incarceration, victimization, and substance use. Neither comparison group retains significance by the final model, likely due to the significance of the Model 2 controls and the Study 1 dependent variables in Model 3. Both forms of sexual risk-taking from the previous study increase the odds of early union formation. A different pattern emerged for men. Across all models, property crime engagement significantly increased the odds of early union formation, but only when compared to no union. Though some of the controls introduced in Models 2 and 3 were significant, this still did not reduce the property crime risk ratio to insignificance. Therefore, there is gender divergence consistent with Hypothesis 1a when

it comes to property crime, though crime seems to exert an influence on early union formation risk for men. While this type of crime decreased early union risk for women, it actually increased risk for men. This finding indicates support for the low self-control perspective for men, but this variable never attained significance. It seems that crime, a risky behavior, is associated with early union formation, a potentially risky relationship pattern. For women, labeling theory seems supported, as those involved in crime were less likely to form early unions.

The pooled models examining violent crime showed that this type of crime generally reduced the risk of early unions and retained significance until Model 3 when compared to no unions. As with the property crime models, women had lower risk of early union formation across both reference categories and across all models. The interaction term included rarely attained significance with the exception of Model 3. The gender-separated analyses revealed much similarity in regard to gender and violent crime until the last model. Though violent crime reduced early union formation risk when compared to later unions for women and men in the first two models, this relationship only remained significant for women in the final model. From a labeling perspective, it could be that violent crime is equally stigmatizing and deviant for both gender categories. This would be reasonable considering the degree of public fear generated by violent crime. These findings also may indicate that the controls included better explain the relationship between violent crime and early union formation for men than for women. However, for some models and comparisons crime is insignificant, which could support the social homogamy and differential association perspective. These individuals are seemingly just as likely to form early unions, but they may occur with others involved in crime. Therefore, neither hypothesis seems fully supported. Gender similarity is what is observed through most models,

but violent crime reduces the odds of early union formation for men and women rather than the risk being the same.

Future research could examine whether cohabitation or marriage are more likely depending on the individual's involvement in crime. Given the higher financial requirements for marriage and the disadvantage faced by those involved in the criminal justice system, cohabitation could be more likely and marriage less likely (Jalovaara 2018). Examining the criminal activity of partners could provide further support for the idea of differential association. Though I focus on relationship timing, other aspects of relationships such as type of union formed, stability, churning, and conflict should be studies in reference to criminal behavior. Qualitative work could be useful in investigating the details in respondents' relationship histories, noting how their relationships were affected by their criminal involvement and possible prison sentences. In addition, qualitative work might shine light on how those involved in crime approach and form relationships.

CHAPTER IV. STUDY 3: OFFENDING AND MULTIPLE-PARTNER FERTILITY

Introduction

Multiple-partner fertility (MPF) occurs when individuals have children with more than one partner (Guzzo 2014a). Estimates state that around 13% of men and 19% of women experience this phenomenon currently (ibid). The experience of MPF has become more common over time in the United States (Amorim and Tach 2019). The U.S. currently has high rates of unintended, nonmarital pregnancy, with about a third of births being unintended (Guzzo 2014b; Guzzo and Hayford 2020). Unintended pregnancy is also associated with relationship dissolution (Guzzo and Hayford 2012). Divorce has increased, especially among the disadvantaged (Raley and Bumpass 2003). Cohabiting unions are increasingly popular, but also unstable (Lichter et al. 2006). This unintended pregnancy rate paired with high dissolution rates means that individuals have a greater likelihood of having children with one partner and then repartnering throughout their lives, giving them potential to have children in each partnership. When considering a sample of those with nonmarital births, two-thirds had dissolved their relationship with the baby's father within five years (Bzostek et al. 2012). Consequently, more than half of these women repartnered (ibid). However, having children with multiple partners may result in strain on parents' resources and the amount of time they have to spend with their children, leading to negative outcomes for parents and children.

There is an increasing divide in the United States based on socioeconomic status where those who have higher SES such as greater educational attainment are more likely to experience non-risky family transitions, such as marriage and childbirth within these stable marital unions (McLanahan 2004). Conversely, marriage rates have fallen among cohabiting couples with low educational attainment (Kuo and Raley 2016). Women of high SES are less likely to cohabit in

general and transition more slowly into cohabiting unions (Sassler et al. 2018). In addition, their cohabiting unions are far more likely to result in marriage than those with lower SES (ibid). Those engaged in crime, particularly violent crime, likely struggle economically, meaning that they are more likely to experience unintended pregnancy and stay in unstable cohabiting unions. This could increase the likelihood that individuals engaged in offending move from cohabiting union to cohabiting union, having children within each union. Research suggests that this serial cohabitation phenomenon has in fact become more common in the United States (Eickmeyer and Manning 2018). Less educated women are now more likely to have births in cohabiting unions than marital unions (Gibson-Davis and Rackin 2014). Those who have children outside of marriage are likely to dissolve the relationship and the majority repartner (Bzostek et al. 2012). Nonmarital, early childbearing could be more likely with the risky sexual behaviors outlined in Study 1. Early unions could dissolve, leaving a large window of opportunity for individuals to find new partners and have children with them. Early unions tend to be more unstable and early marriages are more likely to dissolve than those that occur at normative ages (Amato et al. 2007; Zito 2015). This is an opportunity to experience MPF that is not as likely for those with economic advantage and high educational attainment. Due to the potential connections between the risky sex, early union formation, and fertility outcomes, this study includes the outcome variables previously assessed in Studies 1 and 2.

There also could be gendered effects of criminal involvement on experiencing MPF. Given the more lenient treatment women face in the criminal justice system for both property and drug offending, their involvement in crime may be less likely to result in long-term incarceration, meaning they would have more opportunities to form unions and have children (Doerner and Demuth 2014; Mustard 2001; Philippe 2020; Rodriguez et al. 2006). This would be

expected to lead to more MPF. Conversely, crime, especially violence, is less normative for women than for men. This could mean that women who engage in crime—especially violent crime—face greater stigma, making them potentially less desirable partners than women engaged in property crime. This would result in reduced fertility for women who report engaging in any type of crime compared to those who fail to participate in any criminal behavior.

Literature Review

Factors Associated with MPF

A variety of life experiences and individual characteristics shape the likelihood of experiencing MPF. Carlson and Furstenberg find that experiencing MPF is associated with race/ethnicity, mothers being young at first birth, and paternal incarceration (2006). Those experiencing a nonmarital first birth that said they had not desired the pregnancy with their partner at that time are more likely to experience MPF (Guzzo and Furstenberg 2007). Both earlier sexual debut and teenage pregnancy increase the risk of MPF (Monahan and Guarin 2019). Those who have children early have a larger window for repartnering and subsequent pregnancies. Family structure also matters, with those living with one or both biological parents being less likely to experience MPF (Carlson and Furstenberg 2006; Guzzo and Furstenberg 2007; Manlove et al. 2008). Similarly, those who have lived in a stepfamily during adolescence have greater odds of MPF (Monahan and Guarin 2019). Individuals who have half-siblings are more likely to experience MPF in adulthood, with the relationship being particularly strong if the half-siblings are maternal (Lappegard and Thomson 2018). Family structure in childhood is significant for women, who are more likely to experience a nonmarital birth and MPF if they have half-siblings, though first birth timing and union status explain the association between

family complexity and MPF (Hays and Guzzo 2022). This indicates an intergenerational impact of MPF and family structure.

Various measures of disadvantage tend to predict greater odds of MPF. Low levels of education predict higher rates of MPF (Carlson and Furstenberg 2006). Those who experience disadvantage are more likely to experience MPF (Burton 2014; Fomby & Osborne 2017; Monte 2019; Stykes and Guzzo 2019). As racial and ethnic minorities tend to experience greater disadvantage, some research finds that those in these groups have greater odds of experiencing MPF (Carlson and Furstenberg 2006; Manlove et al. 2008).

Consequences of MPF

MPF has been associated with a variety of negative health outcomes. Young parents who experience MPF have greater prevalence of depression than those who did not experience MPF (Guzzo 2014a). Women who experienced MPF have a negative decline in their health with each additional father by the time they reach middle age (Dorius 2010). MPF among Colombian women is associated with increased risk of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) compared to those that experience Single Partner Fertility (SPF) (Cardenas and Cuesta 2022). These findings in health declines may be due to the stress associated with MPF. Families experiencing MPF report conflict and jealousy, often causes by competition between the biological father and the coresiding stepfather (Monte 2007). Though Monte highlights the tension experienced by male conflict, women experiencing MPF also report conflict and competition over being the prioritized partner among all of the parental partners (Burton 2014).

MPF can be particularly damaging to parent-child relationships. Fathers experiencing MPF tend to feel less positive towards their parenting ability than those without (Guzzo 2014a). MPF also impacts coresidence patterns, especially for men. Only 7% of fathers with MPF live

with all of their children, compared to 64% of fathers with single partner fertility (SPF) and 87% of mothers with MPF (ibid). Fathers who have experienced MPF tend to have instability both in their residence and their relationships (Petren 2017). All of these factors could be damaging to father-child relationships. Those involved in the criminal justice system may also struggle to maintain relationships with their children even without MPF experience. Men who are involved in repeated criminal behavior often struggle to have relationships with their kids, resulting in low self-esteem (Valdez et al. 2019). Among those released from prison, those parents who experience MPF have less regular contact with their children because dividing time between multiple partners and families is challenging (Tach et al. 2010; Western and Smith 2018). When mothers experience fertility with new partners, the amount of contact the biological father has with their child together also decreases (Berger et al. 2012). These declines are larger when mothers have transitioned to new relationships and parenthood than when fathers do (Tach et al. 2010). Involvement declines upon repartnering tend to be more extreme when children are young (ibid).

Disadvantage is a key consequence of MPF. Parents who experience MPF spend more time caring for dependent children, which could have financial consequences given the prevalence of this event among disadvantaged populations (Andersson 2021). Schwartz et al. also find that MPF is associated with mothers spending more time parenting young children, and that this pattern abides by the educational gradient observed in other family behaviors: those who have lower educational attainment are more likely to experience both of these events (2020). After MPF occurs, women tend to rely on social services and often do not work (Monte 2009).

MPF is challenging because financial resources also must be shared across multiple family units. The occurrence of MPF potentially decreases the number of resources available and

the amount of time spent engaged with each child (Carlson and Furstenberg 2006). Mothers and children involved in MPF tend to receive less financial and emotional support from the father's families (Walker 2020). Fathers themselves provide less support to the mothers of their children after the woman repartners and has a child with a new partner (Meyer and Cancian 2012). MPF could contribute to multigenerational disadvantage through its impact on children and could potentially lead to intergenerational patterns of disadvantage.

MPF has implications for children's well-being as well. MPF among fathers is associated with increased externalizing behaviors and problems with physical health in early childhood (Bronte-Tinkew et al. 2009). Research suggests that fathers who are not married are often low-income and will struggle to pay child support, meaning that children could experience poverty (Cancian and Meyer 2011; Sinkewicz and Garfinkel 2009). Those who have fathers that experience MPF have lower educational attainment (Ginther et al. 2022). They also get lower grades when compared to their older full-siblings (Lillehagen and Isungset 2020). Children in MPF families are more likely to experience maltreatment (Brinig and Garrison 2018). MPF is also associated with self-reported delinquency in childhood (Fomby and Osbourne 2017). If criminal offending is linked to MPF, the phenomenon could repeat itself in the next generation.

The Intersection of Offending and MPF

One of the few studies examining the relationship between incarceration and MPF finds that current imprisonment increases the odds of MPF (Cancian et al. 2016). Incarceration also decreases the odds that a woman will have a child with the same father (ibid). Yao et al. find that convicted offenders had more children than those who had never been convicted (2014). They also had children with more individuals (ibid). This may indicate that serious offending, which is more likely to lead to imprisonment, may be closely associated with experiencing MPF. Women

who were involved in the juvenile justice system as runaways were more likely to experience MPF, though this was a small, Midwestern sample (Brinig and Garrison 2018). Fathers convicted of serious felonies also experienced increased likelihood of MPF (ibid). These types of criminal offending may result in more incarceration, thus disrupting unions and resulting in repartnership with new individuals upon release. This has potential to not just generate inequalities in the lifetime of the individual, but also in the lives of their children, as many of the consequences of MPF fall on the children involved in these families.

Sykes and Pettit (2014) also note some theoretical reasons why offending could be associated with MPF. Specifically, offending could lead to incarceration, relationship dissolution, and then subsequent repartnering. This is supported by research that finds connections between incarceration and relationship dissolution and incarceration and repartnering (Lopoo and Western 2005; Turney and Wildeman 2013). Conversely, incarceration may remove individuals from society for long periods of time, impeding their ability to form relationships. Though early partnership may still occur, repartnership could be difficult or delayed in the context of a long prison sentence. This may be especially likely for those who participate in violent crime. Several MPF fathers in Monte's qualitative sample reported being incarcerated (2007). There is reason to believe that criminal lifestyles in general are disruptive to family formation. Persistent criminals may avoid singular partner attachments in an effort to evade detection, as attachment to the family unit provides law enforcement with a key place to look when seeking those with warrants (Goffman 2014). Those engaged in crime may also have exposure to violence, which is associated with numerous early transitions to adulthood, most importantly of which is parenthood (Haynie et al. 2009).

Those who participate in violent offending may be less desirable as partners, meaning that they would be less likely to experience parenthood at all. This is largely explained by labeling theory, which predicts that a criminal record symbolizes undesirable character traits to others in society (Bernburg 2019). For the current study, this would mean that those involved in crime are less likely to form serious romantic partnerships. Lyngstad and Skardhamar believe this is because those involved in crime are perceived to be inadequate in their family role fulfillment (2016). Gender differences are possible in this relationship, as certain types of crime are especially unlikely for women. In particular, women are less likely to commit violent crime (Jones 2007). Conversely, women also tend to face less serious sentences for drug and property crime (Rodriguez et al. 2006). This may suggest gender differences in the effect of offending on partnership and fertility outcomes, such that violent offending is particularly stigmatizing, but property crime female offenders are treated more leniently than male offenders engaged in the same behaviors. Or this leniency in sentencing could extend to all women engaged in crime, as women tend to be sentenced less harshly than men in federal courts (Doerner and Demuth 2014).

The life course framework informs this study, particularly the concepts of timing and linked lives (Elder 1994). Though parenthood could be beneficial in desistance, pregnancies that occur early and are unintended could be more challenging to the individual. These contextual details regarding pregnancy have been linked to MPF experience. Linked lives emphasizes that events in an individual's life spill over into the lives of those around them. Given the numerous negative consequences of MPF on children in these families documented above, MPF has the potential to lead to future disadvantage among the next generation. The effects are not constrained to just the parents in these complex family structures.

Sampson and Laub's age-graded theory emphasizes the importance of life events in shifting an individual away from a life of crime (1993). Even long-term trajectories of behavior have the potential to shift dramatically as the result of an important life event, or transition. Parenthood could be a positive life event that increases the stakes of offending; there is more to lose as a result of crime when one has a family dependent on them for emotional and financial support. However, research shows that the context in which parenthood occurs matters. Timing, coresiding with a child, and the level of investment in the parent-child relationship all matter in determining whether or not parenthood causes an individual to desist (Abell et al. 2018). As MPF may be the result of an early, unplanned pregnancy, this could mean this dynamic does little to cease offending behavior (Guzzo 2014a). Fathers who experience MPF often have limited contact with children and are less likely to coreside with them, potentially impeding rather than aiding in the desistance process (ibid).

However, the quality of these bonds could matter for desistance. Though labeling theory predicts that those involved in crime would be less likely to experience unions as adults (and consequently less likely to experience MPF), these relationships could still be formed, just with others involved in crime. Relationships often occur between individuals who are similar, especially in terms of attitudes (Kalmijn 2005). This pattern is known as social homogamy (van Leeuwen and Maas 2019). The choice to form a relationship is based on an interaction between preferences and opportunities to meet those who are different (Kalmijn 1998). Resources are a large part of preferences, and criminal knowledge could be perceived as a resource, particularly to those involved in crime (ibid). This would mean that relationships could be just as likely for those involved in crime, but they would form these relationships with others who also engage in crime. This could serve to amplify offending rather than decrease it (as is typically posited under

the age-graded theory of social control), as differential association theory theorizes that we learn the most from close, long-lasting relationships (Sutherland 1939). If those who engage in crime form relationships with those who also participate in crime, there is the potential for learning to occur, particularly learning of attitudes favorable to crime and the techniques needed to commit crimes. This would serve to increase rather than decrease offending.

The general theory of crime predicts a selection-based explanation. Gottfredson and Hirschi believe that low self-control predicts a variety of risky behaviors (1990). Those who have low self-control will tend to be impulsive in decision-making, often focusing far more on the short-term benefits than the long-term consequences of behavior. Low self-control similarly predicts both offending behaviors and risky sexual behaviors (Larson et al. 2015; Magnusson et al. 2019). Those engaging in behaviors such as unprotected sex may have unplanned pregnancies with multiple people in a short window of time while simultaneously participating in criminal behaviors. Therefore, this perspective suggests that any link discovered between offending and MPF would be a selection effect rather than causal.

Potential Linkages Between Crime, Risky Sexual Behaviors, Union Formation, and Fertility Outcomes

The self-control perspective outlined above indicates that criminal offending and risky sexual behaviors could co-occur. Risky sexual behaviors relate to fertility patterns, especially early sex (Carlson and Furstenberg 2006; Guzzo 2014b; Guzzo and Furstenberg 2007; Manlove et al. 2008). Those involved in crime could be more likely to participate in risky sexual behaviors and to enter into less stable early unions. Risky sexual behaviors could also lead to early pregnancy, which is likely to predict future MPF as there is a larger window for childbearing for those who start at a young age. Manlove et al. find support for the idea that those with an earlier

age at first sex or an early age for their first child are more likely to experience MPF (2008). Monte notes the existence of a variety of problem behaviors among men experiencing MPF, suggesting that sexual risk-taking is associated with MPF (2007). Those entering into early unions could be more likely to go in and out of relationships, in which they could have children with multiple partners. Therefore, I think there are possible connections between the outcomes of all three studies. There is also the potential for those involved in crime to be engaged in more risky sexual behaviors, experience early pregnancy and MPF, but to fail to enter into coresiding unions. This would suggest a pathway between Study 1 and Study 3 outcomes while largely excluding Study 2 outcomes. Conversely, some forms of crime may be so stigmatizing that partnering is unlikely or even impossible in the case of long-term incarceration. For instance, violent offending is particularly stigmatizing for women. Thus, we might expect those involved in rare and stigmatizing offending types, especially women, to have lower odds of MPF as a result of labeling theory and the stigma attached to offending.

Current Study

Study 3 Hypotheses

Study 3 examines the research questions: Does criminal involvement impact multiple-partner fertility? Does type of crime matter? Do any of these effects differ by gender?

Hypothesis 1a: Men engaged in both types of crime will be just as likely to experience MPF. Women engaged in violent crime will have lower odds of experiencing MPF, while those engaged in property crime will have the same odds of MPF as those not involved.

Hypothesis 1b: Despite gender, all individuals involved in crime will be just as likely to experience MPF due to social homogamy and differential association theory.

Data

This study uses data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health). Add Health is a nationally representative school-based sample of individuals in grades 7-12 in 1994-1995. The in-home interview at Wave I occurred in 1995; some key groups were oversampled. Wave II interviewed those who were still in school in 1996. Waves III, IV, and V were interviews of the original Wave I respondents and occurred in 2001-2002 (ages 18-24), 2008 (ages 26-31), and 2016-2018 (35-40).[3] I use Waves I, III, and IV.

Out of 20,774 respondents, only 13,034 individuals participated in Waves I, III, and IV. In addition, 746 respondents have missing or invalid weights and are eliminated (n=12,288). MICE was used to impute for missing data. Individuals missing on the dependent variable were included in the imputations, but eliminated afterwards, following the example of von Hippel (2007). Excluding those missing on any of the study dependent variables left a final sample size of 10,437. Most of the descriptives were similar for observed and imputed data, as can be seen in Appendix B.

Study 3 Dependent Variable

There is one dependent variable in this study. I measure multiple-partner fertility by examining the Wave IV question: "With how many persons have you ever had a romantic relationship or sexual encounter that resulted in a pregnancy?" This measure has three categories: those with no fertility, fertility with one partner, and fertility with multiple partners. Forty respondents are missing on this measure (about 3.255% of the sample).

[3] The full age range at Wave IV is 24-34, but most of the sample is aged 26-31.

Study 3 Independent Variables

My key independent variables include several measures of criminal involvement, taken at Waves I and III. Respondents were asked about their involvement in a variety of criminal activities: 1) deliberately damage property that didn't belong to you, 2) steal something worth more than $50, 3) hurt someone badly enough to need bandages or care from a doctor or nurse, 4) go into a house or building to steal something, 5) steal something worth less than $50, 6) take part in a fight where a group of your friends was against another group, and 7) use or threaten to use a weapon to get something from someone. I separate these measures into two binary measures: violent offending and property offending, coded as one if the respondent reported engaging in any of the behaviors in these categories at either Wave I or Wave III. *Violent offending* uses questions three, six, and seven listed above. *Property offending* uses questions one, two, four, and five.

Study 3 Control Variables

I include the demographic controls of age, race/ethnicity, education, income, family structure, religiosity, and household socioeconomic status in adolescence. All of these variables are from Wave I with the exception of age, income, and education, which are from Wave IV. *Age* is a continuous measure coded from subtracting the interview date from the date of birth. *Race/ethnicity* has the categories of non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic, and Asian/other. *Education* assesses the level of education reached by Wave IV: less than a high school degree, a high school degree or GED, some college, an AA or vocational college degree, and a graduate degree. *Income* is a categorical variable with 12 possible categories, which are listed in Appendix A. *Family structure* includes the following categories: two-parent, single parent, stepparent, and other. *Religiosity* asks respondents about the importance of religion: 1)

not at all important, 2) somewhat important, 3) very important, and 4) more important than anything else. *Household socioeconomic status* uses Bearman and Moody's conceptualization, examining occupation and education of both parents (2004).

I also include number of times incarcerated, victimization, neighborhood disadvantage, substance use, and low self-control. *Number of times incarcerated* asks about the number of times the individual spent time in a correctional facility, with the options: 1) never, 2) once, and 3) more than once. *Victimization* is a measure from Wave IV that asks how many times in the last 12 months: 1) someone pulled a knife or gun on them, 2) someone cut or stabbed them, 3) someone shot them, or 4) they were jumped. These variables are created into dummy variables and victimization is coded as 1 if they have experienced any of the types of victimization (alpha=0.9242). I use a series of questions to gauge *neighborhood disadvantage* at Wave III: the proportion Black, the proportion of female-headed households, the unemployment rate, the male unemployment rate, the median family income, the proportion of families below the poverty line, and the proportion of those 25 and over without a bachelor's degree. These are turned into a standardized alpha (alpha=0.8610). I create a measure of *substance use* at Wave I regarding use of cigarettes, chewing tobacco, alcohol, marijuana, cocaine, and other illegal substances (LSD, PCP, ecstasy, mushrooms, speed, ice, heroin, or pills). The categories are 1) no substance use, 2) alcohol or tobacco use, 3) marijuana use, and 4) other substance use. Finally, *low self-control* consists of 23 questions which are combined into a sum scale, with higher scores reflecting lower self-control (alpha=0.7596). This is the same measure used by Beaver et al. (2009). Details on the questions included and the coding used can be found in Appendix A.

I also include the dependent variables age at first sex and number of opposite-sex partners from Study 1 as predictors, as well as the early union formation variable from Study 3. All

variables come from questions at Wave IV. *Age at first sex* is a continuous variable taken from a question asking about the respondent's age at first vaginal intercourse, with those being under the age of 10 or above the age of 25 coded as missing. *Number of opposite-sex partners* is a continuous variable. Relationship timing is calculated from birth month and year and relationship month and year, with early unions being those that occur before 21 for men and before 20 for women, following the lead of Kuhl et al. (2015). *Early union formation* has the following categories: no union formation, later union formation, and early union formation.

Study 3 Analytical Strategy

I first show descriptive statistics separated by gender (Table 3.1). Bivariate analyses are displayed in Table 3.2. I first present pooled models to determine if gender is a significant predictor of MPF (Table 3.3 for property crime and Table 3.4 for violent crime). Model 1includes controls for basic demographic information such as age, education, income, and race. Model 2 introduces incarceration, victimization, neighborhood disadvantage, substance use, and low self-control. Model 3 includes both the sexual activity variables and the early union formation variable from Studies 1 and 2. Analyses rely on multinomial logistic regression and use property crime and then violent crime as the independent variable.

Study 3 Results

I begin with the descriptive statistics, shown in Table 3.1. A larger share of men report being engaged in either type of crime (about 48% for property crime and 46% for violent crime) when compared to women (about 29% for property crime and 25% for violent crime). Women in the sample tend to be slightly younger, on average, than men in the sample (28.191 years versus 28.364 years). When examining race/ethnicity, the majority of the sample is non-Hispanic white. Smaller shares are non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic, and Asian/other. Most of the sample has some

college followed by a high school degree or GED. The distribution of income by gender is relatively similar for men and women. The most common family structure in adolescence (over 50%) is two-parent, followed by single parent (about 20%) and stepparent (approximately 15%). Around 90% of women and men in the sample report religion is either “very important” or “more important than anything else” to them. Most respondents are about halfway up the scale of family socioeconomic status (5.482 for women and 5.694 for men). While about 20% of men report some incarceration experience, incarceration is relatively rare for women in the sample, with only about 7% reporting being incarcerated. Still, the vast majority of women (about 93%) and men (about 76%) have never been incarcerated. Victimization is also a relatively rare experience, with approximately 18% of women and 24% of men reporting any of the types of victimization included in Add Health. Minor substance use is relatively common, with almost half of the sample reporting alcohol or tobacco use. Still, over a quarter of men and women have not used substance use at Wave I. Self-control at Wave I is, on average, lower for women than for men, as women score higher on the sum scale. Though women tend to younger at sexual initiation than men (16.615 versus 16.730), men have more sexual partners (15.277 for men and 9.503 for women). Most individuals have experienced union formation at Wave IV, with most being formed after the age of 20 for women and after the age of 21 for men. Still, 38% of women and 32% of men have experienced early unions. As for the dependent variable of this study, Multiple-Partner Fertility (MPF), the majority of the sample has no fertility experience to report (about 81% of women and 87% of men). This is likely because the sample is on average in their late 20s at the time of Wave IV. A larger share of women report both Single-Partner Fertility (SPF) and Multiple-Partner Fertility (MPF), but MPF is still very rare at this point in the survey. Only around 5% of women and 3% of men have experienced MPF.

I examine the bivariate relationships between crime and MPF in Table 3.2. First, I focus on the analysis of property crime for women in the sample. Significant differences exist between women with no fertility and SPF and women with MPF. A different finding emerges when examining property crime and MPF for men. Perhaps due to the relative rarity of MPF for men in the sample, the only significant differences that emerge are between those who have experienced no fertility and those who have experienced SPF. More significant differences emerge when examining the impact of violent crime for both women and men. For women, all comparisons are significant. The proportion of those engaged in property crime for no fertility are significantly different from the proportions seen for those who have SPF and MPF. Those with SPF have significant differences in the proportion of those involved in property crime compared to those with no fertility and MPF. And finally, MPF is significantly different from no fertility and SPF. The same patterns emerge for men engaged in violent crime. Significant differences in those engaged in violent crime versus not engaged emerge in reference to: no fertility, significantly different from SPF and MPF; SPF, significantly different from no fertility and MPF; and MPF, significantly different from no fertility and SPF. These findings indicate that regardless of gender, the proportion of those experiencing no fertility, SPF, and MPF are significantly different based on whether the respondent engaged in violent crime.

Pooled models showing the impact of property offending on the odds of MPF experience are displayed in Table 3.3. Models including an interaction term between property crime and gender (not shown) reveal no significance, so I focus on the pooled models with the assumption that the effect of property crime on MPF risk is similar regardless of gender category. Property crime exerts little effect on the odds of MPF. Though in Model 1 property crime significantly reduces the odds of MPF by 27.8% in comparison to no fertility, this relationship is nonexistent

by Model 2. Analyses comparing to the other reference group of SPF reveal that property crime does not achieve significance in any of the models. Therefore, property crime seems to exert little influence on the odds of MPF, especially in reference to SPF. MPF differs from the previous study outcomes in that being female only is significant when comparing MPF to no fertility, where women have lower risk of MPF than men. Women do not significantly differ from men in MPF experience when compared to SPF. When comparing MPF to no fertility, all racial/ethnic groups are at decreased risk compared to non-Hispanic white respondents across all models. Non-Hispanic Black individuals have an 81.7% risk reduction in MPF when compared to no fertility, while Hispanic individuals are at 46.6% lower risk of MPF and Asian/other respondents are at 53.5% lower risk. In reference to SPF, only non-Hispanic Black respondents are at significantly lower risk (40.8% in Model 3). In regard to education, in Model 1 those with less than a high school degree are at lower risk of MPF in comparison to no fertility. However, this relationship vanishes in Model 2. When comparing MPF to SPF, those with an AA/vocational degree have increased risk in Models 1 and 2 (177.1% and 183.7%). However, by Model 3 this relationship is no longer significant. An increase in household income in adulthood increases risk for both reference categories and across models (13.8% compared to no fertility and 6.2% compared to SPF in Model 3). Those who grew up in family structures other than two-parent are at lower odds of MPF relative to no fertility in Model 1, but only those in single parent and other family structures are significantly different in the later models. In Model 3, odds are reduced by 24.6% for single parent and by 35.1% for other family structures. Only other family structures have significantly lower odds of MPF in reference to SPF (37.3%). Though this is still the case in Model 2, family structure becomes insignificant in Model 3 for this reference category. Both being incarcerated once and more than once decrease MPF odds relative to no

fertility (46.0% for incarcerated once and 46.4% for incarcerated more than once in Model 3). In Model 2, being incarcerated more than once significantly reduces odds of MPF relative to SPF. However, this relationship is no longer observed in Model 3. At first all types of substance use reduce MPF odds compared to no fertility, but by Model 3 marijuana use is significant (36.9%). Low self-control is also significant and associated with decreased MPF odds, but only in reference to no fertility. This is counter to expectations that low self-control would be associated with increased MPF risk. All of the previous dependent variables are significant for both reference categories. Age at first sex increases the risk of MPF by 24.8% compared to no fertility and by 6.2% compared to SPF. Interestingly, number of opposite-sex partners appears to decrease risk of MPF, which is counter to expectations. In comparison to no fertility, odds of MPF are reduced by 2.2%. MPF risk is reduced by 0.6% compared to SPF when examining number of opposite-sex partners. Why opposite-sex partners reduces risk remains unclear. Early union formation increases MPF risk, especially for the reference category of no fertility (78.5% for no fertility and 19.4% for SPF). Those who form early relationships may have children earlier and then have a longer window for repartnering and future fertility. Again, as the interaction term models fail to show significant effects, I do not show gender-separated analyses.

I examine pooled models featuring violent crime and MPF risk in Table 3.4. Violent crime significantly reduces MPF risk in Model 1 by 42.1% compared to no fertility and by 31.0% compared to SPF. These relationships persist in Model 2 (22.0% for no fertility and 24.0% for SPF). Perhaps due to the inclusion of the previous dependent variables, only the comparison to SPF remains significant in Model 3, where it again reduces MPF risk by 23.2%. Gender only seems to matter in predicting MPF risk in comparison to no fertility, where it is significant across models, with women being less likely than men to experience MPF. Though

being female is significant in reference to SPF in Model 3, the fact that this relationship is not observed in the other models is unusual. I also conducted analyses with an interaction term between gender and violent crime, but this term failed to achieve significance. Therefore, I conclude that results are similar regardless of gender and I do not display gender-separated analyses. All racial/ethnic groups have lower risk of MPF when compared to no fertility across models (81.2% for non-Hispanic Black individuals, 45.8% for Hispanic respondents, and 52.6% for those in the Asian/other category when compared to non-Hispanic whites in Model 3). As in the property crime models, only non-Hispanic Black individuals have significantly decreased risk of MPF when compared to SPF. This relationship is observed in all models. In Model 1, those with less than a high school degree are at reduced risk of MPF relative to no fertility. When the reference category shifts to SPF, those with an AA/vocational degree are at significantly higher risk (174.5%). Though this comparison remains significant in Model 2, education is no longer significant when comparing MPF to no fertility. By Model 3 no educational categories are significantly different in MPF risk when compared to those with a bachelor's degree. Household income in adulthood increases MPF risk by 13.7% relative to no fertility and by 6.0% relative to SPF (Model 3). For the comparison to no fertility, growing up in a single parent or other family structure decreases MPF risk by 24.4% and 35.3% in Model 3. Only those in other family structures are at significantly lower MPF risk compared to SPF, but this relationship only occurs in the first two models. For the reference group of no fertility, incarceration is significant and decreases MPF risk by 45.1% for incarcerated once and by 45.2% for incarcerated more than once (Model 3). In Model 2 all forms of substance use are significant in reducing MPF risk in comparison to no fertility. Only marijuana use is significant for this reference group in Model 3. Low self-control is also significant in comparison to no fertility, but counterintuitively it

decreases the odds of MPF by 1.5% in Model 3. The other dependent variables from the previous studies are significant and operate in the same direction as the property crime models. Age at first sex increases MPF risk by 24.5% compared to no fertility and by 5.8% compared to SPF. Counter to expectations, number of opposite-sex partners decreases the risk of MPF (2.2% compared to no fertility and 0.6% compared to SPF). Early union formation increases MPF risk by 79.2% in reference to no fertility and by 20.2% in reference to SPF.

Study 3 Discussion

I posed two competing hypotheses for Multiple-Partner Fertility (MPF). The first hypothesis (1a) predicted gender divergence, in which men involved in crime would be just as likely to experience MPF, but women engaged in violent crime would be less likely to face this outcome. I argued that property crime is less stigmatizing, while violent crime would be especially likely to result in a negative label for women. For men, crime and violence may be more normative and would potentially not serve as a deterrent to relationship formation from potential partners. The counterhypothesis, 1b, stated that those involved in both types of crime would be just as likely to experience MPF, as they would form relationships with others involved in crime rather than not forming relationships at all. This hypothesis predicted that the association between criminal involvement and MPF risk would not significantly differ by gender due to social homogamy (van Leeuwen and Maas 2019).

Bivariate analyses found some significant differences, especially when examining violent crime, but little gender variation. I focused on gender-pooled analyses, as both interaction terms examined here (property crime by gender and violent crime by gender) failed to attain significance. Property crime exerts little influence on MPF odds, with significance only attained in the first model in reference to no fertility. Gender was only significant when comparing MPF

to no fertility, so this finding also implied that gender was unimportant. Gender divergence seems unlikely as gender is rarely significant and the interaction term failed to ever achieve significance. The lack of findings connecting property crime to MPF could indicate support for social homogamy and differential association. This would mean that those involved in crime still have just as much potential to form relationships as those not involved, but that relationships are formed with others involved in crime.

Violent crime initially reduces the risk of MPF relative to both reference categories for the first two models. In the final model, only comparing MPF to SPF is significant, but this could be because of the significance of age at first sex, number of opposite-sex partners, and early union formation. However, only age at first sex and early union formation increased MPF risk, while number of opposite-sex partners actually decreased risk. This seems counterintuitive, but perhaps respondents that have numerous partners still have safe, protected intercourse. Women were at lower risk of MPF across the first two models in reference to no fertility. While both reference categories were significant in the final model, the lack of significance of the SPF comparison in the first two models may make this finding suspect. As with property crime, the interaction terms were not significant for either reference category or across any of the models. Therefore, I do not present gender-separated models and conclude that the findings are similar regardless of gender. As with the property crime analyses, I cannot support either hypothesis. Though gender similarity seems to be more accurate than gender divergence, violent crime only is significant in predicting less MPF risk in reference to SPF, while Hypothesis 1b predicted little significance. Women and men are likely similar in how criminal involvement impacts MPF risk, but this behavior seems to decrease risk rather than increase it. This could be perceived as

evidence of labeling theory, as violent crime could be stigmatizing and could prevent relationship formation.

Future analyses that feature an older sample may uncover more significant relationships. As this group is still relatively young at the age of the interview, I could be missing instances of MPF that occur later in the life course. As a result, I have a relatively small group of individuals that have experienced MPF, which could explain the lack of findings uncovered in these models. Future research should also focus on other aspects of fertility, such as unintended pregnancy and abortion access.

CHAPTER V. CONCLUSION

The linkages between crime and risky sex, relationship, and fertility outcomes are important to examine. Criminological research has increasingly focused on the effects of incarceration on children, with incarceration length being determined by the type and persistence of criminal involvement (Geller et al. 2012; Slaughter et al. 2019; Turney 2018). However, the effect of crime itself and the impact it has on family formation behaviors has rarely been examined. The outcomes examined in this study all have intergenerational impacts. Risky sex could lead to unintended pregnancy and consequently MPF. Early union formation is risky and associated with instability and consequently numerous risks that can be passed on to children. MPF decreases the amount of time and resources parents can provide for their children. Criminology also focuses on the importance of life events in determining desistance, but much less scholarship examines the reverse relationship of how crime would influence important life events such as relationship formation or fertility outcomes. While desistance has been associated with marriage, parenthood, and military service, quality of these transitions likely matters in their deterrent effect (King et al. 2007; Abell 2018; Sampson and Laub 1993). Who these relationships are formed with also likely matters. Those involved in crime could be just as likely to form relationships but could form them with others engaged in crime in a phenomenon known as social homogamy (van Leeuwen and Maas 2019). This could serve to amplify rather than decrease offending, as differential association theory states that individuals often learn from those they are closest to (Sutherland 1939). In this study I speculated that the healthy adult transitions of sexual activity, relationship formation, and fertility could all occur in off-time or risky ways. Sexual activity could be early or could occur with numerous partners, potentially leading to fertility at an unplanned and early time. Relationships are an important part of

individuals maturing, but early union formation is associated with numerous poor outcomes. I suggested a pathway through which these three behaviors co-occur: risky sexual behavior could lead to pregnancy, which could be associated with risky union entry, which could lead to dissolution and future fertility with another partner.

Considering the Studies Together

I relied on several theoretical perspectives in this study. The life course perspective, in particular the concepts of timing and linked lives, was used across all three studies. When events occur matters, as early transitions such as young age at first sex and early unions could be associated with negative outcomes. These events are normative and an important part of the life course, but when they occur earlier than is normative the individual may be unprepared to cope with the transitions. Timing could also be linked to MPF, as early unintended childbearing offers a large window of time to repartner and have additional children. Linked lives was largely used to explain how the three outcomes of risky sexual behavior, early union formation, and MPF have far reaching consequences throughout the family unit. Though these outcomes appear to impact the individual the most, transitions that occur in risky ways are associated with a variety of poor outcomes for parents and their children. Risky sex could be associated with early unintended pregnancies. Early unions tend to be conflict-ridden and unstable. Finally, MPF results in less parental investment in children. All of these outcomes have impacts beyond the lives of the parents into those of their children.

Sampson and Laub's age-graded theory of social control predicts the importance of key life events in helping individuals desist (1993). However, criminological research has rarely considered how criminal involvement itself impacts the timing and quality of these transitions. Those with instability in their family lives do not have the prosocial bonds that are vital for

desistance in studies examining marriage, military service, and parenthood (Abell 2018; King et al. 2007, Sampson and Laub 1993). This theory implies that though these events can be vital in knifing off from crime, but those involved in offending could be likely to experience them in a healthy way.

Though these events are often posited to be a key factor in desistance, it could be that relationships still occur, but with partners engaged in crime. Social homogamy states that relationships are often formed with similar individuals (Kalmijn 2005; van Leeuwen and Maas 2019). Preferences, especially resources, are a large part of relationship formation, and criminal skills and knowledge could be a potential resource (Kalmijn 1998). Differential association theory also notes that most knowledge is learned through important, long-lasting relationships (Sutherland 1939). In terms of crime, this knowledge could entail both the skills needed to commit crime and the attitudes necessary for finding crime acceptable. Therefore, I posited that those involved in crime may still experience these important life events, but they could serve to increase rather than decrease offending if both individuals are engaged in crime.

Labeling theory may be a possible reason why those involved in offending are less likely to experience normative adult transitions or why they may experience them in off-time, risky ways. Those who participate in crime may face social stigma, especially for violent crime. I speculated that women could possibly face more stigma for criminal offending due to its rarity and non-normativeness, but there is also the possibility for crime and stigma to be similarly linked regardless of gender. Violence is particularly discordant with gender norms that consider kindness and empathy to be ideal feminine traits, so this type of crime has the potential to be more negative for women than for men.

Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory of crime was used to explain selection results that could occur (1990). Specifically, impulsive individuals with low self-control will make a variety of poor decisions in different areas of their lives. Thus, we would expect those that engage in crime to also engage in risky sex, early union formation, and MPF, as these all could be types of risk-taking. The link between crime and these outcomes would not be causal, but a result of the same underlying characteristic that increases involvement in a variety of risky behaviors. I elaborate on the support found for these various theoretical perspectives below.

My research questions in Study 1 assessed whether sexual risk-taking would be impacted by the type of crime. I speculated that crime could have no impact on sexual risk-taking, as crime could still result in relationships with others involved in crime. I also had the idea that gender variation was possible, such that women engaged in crime, particularly violent crime, would experience an older age at first sex and fewer opposite-sex partners. This pattern would be observed due to the negative label women engaged in crime receive and the impression this label would have on potential partners. Overall, the relationship between crime and risky sexual behavior looked relatively similar for both gender groups: crime generally was associated with more sexual risk-taking. However, the controls included often explained away this relationship for one gender group, as occurred with the effect of property crime on age at first intercourse for men and the link between violent crime and number of partners for women. I tentatively believe these findings are the most in line with the self-control perspective, though this variable only attain significance in the female models. Still, risk-taking seems to occur in multiple life areas simultaneously, perhaps indicating that some individuals are more impulsive and struggle with decision-making.

The Study 2 research questions asked whether crime type would matter in predicting early union formation, and whether these associations would differ by gender. Property crime decreased early union risk at first for women, but for men engaging in property crime increased odds of early unions in comparison to no union formation. This was the most gender divergent finding observed across the three studies, and it may indicate support for labeling theory for women and the low self-control perspective for men. I am lacking in measures that assess the individual's perceptions of stigma, but future research should examine whether this dynamic occurs in partnership seeking. As for violent crime, this behavior decreased the odds of early relationship formation for men and women. This may indicate that labeling is particularly strong for those involved in violent crime and deters partnership formation regardless of gender.

The final set of research questions examined the impact of offending type on the experience of MPF. I also raised the question of whether these associations would differ by gender, as violent offending is rarer for women than for men, and thus potentially more stigmatizing. I first discovered through pooled models that no significant differences existed in the impact of crime on MPF experience by gender, so I presented pooled models. Property crime was largely unimportant when comparing MPF to SPF, as it only achieved significance in reference to no fertility, where it decreased MPF odds. However, this relationship only occurred in Model 1. Violent crime initially reduced the odds of MPF compared to both no fertility and SPF, but the comparison to SPF was the remaining significant association in the final models. I conclude that these findings are the most in line with social homogamy and the labeling perspective. For property crime, MPF risk seems relatively unaffected. In the violent crime analyses, those who engage in crime have lower odds of MPF when the RRR is significant.

I also included the previous outcomes from the prior studies in examining relationship timing and fertility experiences. The belief was that all three would be linked together, as risky sex could lead to early relationships with could in turn lead to early, unintended pregnancy. Experiencing repeated unintended pregnancies along with the high risk of relationship dissolution associated with early unions could result in fertility with multiple partners. In Study 2, both Study 1 dependent variables were significantly and predicted higher early union formation odds when examining property crime for women. For men, only age at first sex was significant, but it again increased the odds of early union formation. When examining the union timing models using violent crime, the same patterns emerged for women: age at first sex and number of opposite-sex partners increased the risk of early union formation regardless of reference category. The findings for men were largely similar to the models with property crime as the main independent variable, in that only age at first sex significantly increased the odds of early union formation.

The pooled MPF models showed that all previous study dependent variables were significant in predicting MPF experience. However, only age at first sex and early union formation increased the risk of MPF, with this relationship occurring whether property or violent crime served as the independent variable. Though I speculated that number of opposite-sex partners would increase MPF experience, it actually significantly decreased the odds of MPF relative to both reference categories. Though this seems strange, perhaps those with multiple sexual partners still practice sexual safety and use contraception to prevent pregnancy. The relationship also could be explained by the significance of number of opposite-sex partners in predicting early union formation for women, meaning that opposite-sex partners has an indirect effect on MPF in the final study. Though I originally speculated that risky-sexual behavior would

lead to early union formation, which would then lead to MPF, it seems that both age at first sex and early union formation exert independent effects on the likelihood of MPF.

Study 1 Summary

The first study examined several measures of sexual risk-taking, attempting to establish if risky behaviors such as age at first sex, number of opposite-sex partners, and crime were linked. Overall, property offending revealed relatively similar patterns for men and women: engagement in this type of crime generally decreased age at first sex and increased the number of sex partners. The mechanisms included, however, seem to explain more of the relationship for men than for women, as they often achieved significance and weakened the property crime coefficient for men. For age at first intercourse, the controls included in Model 2 made this coefficient insignificant for men, but for women the relationship remained significant. Overall, property crime operated in the same direction for men and women, but different mechanisms may be at play. Though these findings seem to support the low self-control perspective in that a variety of risky behaviors seem to be linked together, but this variable only achieved significance for the female group. For the male group, the lack of significance could also indicate support for social homogamy and differential association theory, as those involved in crime could be just as likely to experience these forms of sexual risk-taking as those not involved.

Violent crime findings seemed to support the General Theory of Crime (GTC). Those engaged in violent crime were younger at first intercourse, regardless of gender. As in the property crime models, low self-control was again only significant for women in the sample. Some gender divergence occurred when examining the other outcome of number of opposite-sex partners: while the first model showed that violent criminal activity increased the number of partners for both groups, this relationship only remained significant for men. This seems to imply

that for this analysis, the controls included better explained the relationship for women as opposed to men. This could be due to the significance of neighborhood disadvantage and low self-control for women, neither of which were significant for men. Overall, these findings linked risky behavior like crime to risky sexual behaviors, which seems the most supportive of a low self-control perspective. However, this variable only achieved significance for women.

A variety of other factors were significant in predicting risky sexual behavior. Racial/ethnic minorities reported significantly different outcomes when compared to non-Hispanic whites: non-Hispanic Black respondents reported a younger age at first sex and men reported more partners, while the opposite patterns were observed for Hispanic women and Asian/other respondents in the models. The less educated respondents in the sample had a significantly younger age at first intercourse. Alternative family structures generally resulted in a younger age at first sex and more opposite-sex partners in comparison to those who grew up in two-parent families. The most religious individuals (those who stated that religion was "more important than anything else") engaged in the least sexual risk-taking. Incarceration and substance use decrease age at first sex and increases the number of partners. Overall, these results indicate much similarity by gender, though some relationships operated in opposite directions or were only significant for one group.

Study 2 Summary

While I thought that crime would increase the risk of early union formation, the opposite relationship was found in reference to property crime for women in the sample. Property crime decreased risk at first in comparison to both reference categories, but neither were significant by the final model. This could be due to the significance of incarceration, victimization, age at first sex, and number of opposite-sex partners. The relationship operated in the opposite direction for

men, for whom property crime increased early union risk relative to no union formation. This relationship occurred across all models despite a variety of significant controls being introduced. This is perhaps the greatest point of gender divergence across all three studies, as in the previous study the crime-risky sexual behavior relationship operated in the same direction across both types of crime and both outcomes. Therefore, competing theoretical perspectives may explain the relationship between property crime and early union formation for women and men. A labeling perspective may mean that women involved in property crime are less likely to form early unions, though I am unable to account for stigma to examine this relationship. For men, a low self-control perspective seems more likely, where those involved in crime also are risky in their relationship formation behaviors. However, the low self-control variable is not significant in any of the models.

Violent crime seemed to show more gender similarity, as it decreased odds of early union formation in the first model for both groups. By Model 2, the second reference category of later unions still resulted in significantly lower odds of early unions for women and men. This relationship only remained significant for women in the final model, however, while for men it was insignificant. This could be because age at first sex was highly significant. Though both Study 1 dependent variables for important for women, they did not explain all of the relationship the way age at first sex appears to for men. Violent crime may be particularly stigmatizing and damaging in terms of establishing long-term relationships. Though I cannot test for stigma or negative labeling effects in this study, future research should examine how partners react to violent criminal records. Are individuals reluctant to form relationships with those involved in violent crime? Why is that true for women engaged in property crime, but not for men? Again,

further research should examine these questions, especially from the perspective of potential partners.

I briefly outline other significant factors in predicting early union formation. Non-Hispanic Black individuals are frequently at higher risk of early union formation than non-Hispanic white respondents. Those with less education are generally at decreased risk of early unions. Family structures other than two-parent are extremely significant across all models for women, with the risk of early unions lower for those raised in these family structures. Victimization also decreases risk for women, but not for men. This is an interesting finding in light of other research suggesting opposite findings.

Future research should still examine these areas in more detail and with older samples of respondents. Including measures that examine perceptions of stigma and labeling could provide support for or disprove the labeling perspective proposed to decrease the odds of early union formation in this study. Other aspects of relationship health that are not examined here also could be linked to crime. In particular, crime could lead to relationship dissolution and family instability, with repartnering leading to complex family structures. Qualitative work that allows for complex relationship histories should be considered in determining how crime impacts family life.

Study 3 Summary

Crime could potentially be linked to fertility experiences, especially if those engaged in crime participate in other risky behaviors throughout their lives. Perhaps because so few participants have experienced MPF or SPF, few predictors were consistently found to impact MPF experience and no significant gender and crime interaction effects emerged. Therefore, I only presented pooled analyses for this study. Property crime is only significant relative to no

fertility where it decreases MPF odds, but this relationship is insignificant with further controls. Violent crime significantly reduces MPF risk relative to no fertility and to SPF in the first models, but only the comparison to SPF is significant in the final model. These findings could be indicative of labeling theory, but again I have few measures to test whether labeling actually occurs. The lack of significance could also indicate that partnerships are still being formed, just with others involved in crime, in support of the social homogamy perspective. Future research could assess whether partners consider criminal involvement in fertility decisions.

Some of the controls included also impact the likelihood of experiencing MPF. Non-Hispanic Black respondents are at lower MPF risk relative to non-Hispanic white individuals. Adult household income appears to increase risk across all models. Those in other family structures often have significantly lower MPF risk compared to those raised in two-parent families. Incarceration significantly reduces odds of MPF when compared to no fertility. Conducting these analyses with an older sample would likely result in larger groups of those who have experienced SPF and MPF. This could not only yield different results in regard to the crime measures used, but new crime measures such as trajectories of offending could also be examined.

Limitations

As these studies examine an at-risk population, the fact that Add Health is a school-based sample could be seen as a limitation. Arguably, those most at risk to engage in crime may have already dropped out of school, meaning that the highest risk population for offending is not included in the data set. Additionally, I am unable to examine union formation and MPF past early adulthood, as MPF is not included in Wave V when respondents are 35-40 and the goal was to connect all three outcomes. Therefore, I may miss some occurrences of MPF that occur later on in the life course, thereby underestimating the extent to which these fertility outcomes occur.

However, many who experience MPF begin childbearing early, as those who have children in late adolescence or early adulthood will have a larger window for dissolution, repartnering, and fertility with their new partner (Brinig and Garrison 2018). Unfortunately, the rarity of early marriage and MPF meant that more detailed measures regarding the timing of criminal offending could not be used. Future research should attempt to link offending trajectories to family formation behaviors. Fertility data of men has also been called into question, with Joyner et al. finding that some births to men are missing, especially if those men happen to be disadvantaged (2012). While a concern with assessing an outcome like MPF, this is a problem all fertility studies including males must account for. I also cannot fully account for mechanisms such as stigma and the criminal involvement of partners, which could provide support for labeling theory and the social homogamy perspective.

Contributions to Theory

Self-control was a supported theoretical perspective in Study 1, as multiple types of sexual risk-taking were linked to crime, itself a risky behavior. Those who reported offending tended to have more opposite-sex partners and generally were younger at first sex. However, self-control was only significant for women in this sample, though it did increase risk of both behaviors. Violent crime, potentially a more stigmatizing behavior, seemed to not deter sexual partnership formation. This could potentially discredit labeling theory, though it could be that sexual encounters are relatively brief and informal and subject to less consideration than long-term relationships. The General Theory of Crime (GTC) also had some support in Study 2, as men engaged in property crime were at greater risk of early union formation. This could indicate that those who take risks in terms of criminal behavior also take risks in terms of relationship formation.

The studies examining early union formation and MPF showed more support for labeling theory. Property crime decreased the odds of early union formation for women (though it increased the odds for men). Violent crime decreased the risk of early unions for women and men, which may be due to the serious nature of this type of offending. Potential partners may react with fear to those involved in violent crime, but property crime could be viewed as normative for men. Though property crime was often insignificant in predicting MPF risk, violent crime decreased MPF risk, especially in reference to SPF. This may indicate that similar to long-term relationship formation, parenthood is a serious transition that involves much thought and consideration on partnership selection. Those involved in crime, especially violent crime, may face stigma from potential partners and be less likely to experience fertility with multiple individuals.

The lack of power of property crime in Study 3 also could indicate support for social homogamy and differential association theory. This could indicate that MPF is just as likely for those involved in crime, but that they are experiencing fertility with others involved in crime. These relationships may dissolve due to incarceration and result in repartnering.

Contributions to the Literature

This study contributes to other work that links risk-taking in the family realm to criminal risk-taking. Using different types of offending allowed a brief inspection of mechanisms of stigma and labeling. Whether or not violent crime is more stigmatizing in the partnership market than property offending is unclear based on the studies; for some outcomes violent crime was associated with greater risk, signifying that finding partners did not appear to be a problem. This was primarily the case with the sexual risk-taking study, a logical finding given that sexual encounters could be short-term and casual. Future research should include measures of social

stigma, providing concrete support for a labeling perspective. Examining the criminal behavior of partners could also determine whether partnerships are still occurring, just with similar individuals also engaged in crime. This research could also go further to uncover whether these relationships increase criminal behavior rather than decrease it. I also included gender as a way to examine whether crime type had gendered effects on behavior, with the expectation that violent crime would be deeply stigmatizing for women. Overall, violent crime often operated in similar ways for men and women in the study. In terms of sexual behavior, both types of crime generally increased risk. The studies examining serious adult relationships and parenthood found more evidence of a labeling effect, but this effect was similar for men and women in regard to violent crime. Interestingly, property crime actually decreased risk of early union formation for women, which may indicate that they face harsher labeling for this type of crime than their male counterparts.

Future Research Directions

Research should explore all three of these areas in more detail by incorporating different measures of sexual risks, union formation and characteristics, and fertility experiences. Sexual risk-taking is defined in a variety of ways, so examining issues such as contraceptive use would be of interest. I would expect them to follow the patterns observed here, but any differences would highlight differences by risky behavior type. Numerous relationship variables could assess the stability hinted at in the early relationship research. The length or number of relationships experienced could illustrate how long relationships are lasting and if churning is occurring. Coresidential relationships would be of particular interest, as they are likely more difficult to dissolve. Lifetime measures of ever married, ever cohabited, and the number of each union type

would provide useful detail on whether or not those involved in crime reflect broader trends linking family behaviors to socioeconomic status.

Fertility could be risky in a variety of ways not examined in this group of studies. Unintended pregnancy could result in worse outcomes and relationship dissolution. Of particular interest would be whether the individual has experienced multiple unwanted pregnancies and if they have occurred with different relationship partners. Aspects of timing, such as teenage pregnancy, would be considered risky and would likely be linked with a variety of sexual risk-taking behaviors. Abortion experiences and health behaviors during pregnancy also would yield insight into risky fertility experiences.

As some relationships remained despite all controls, future research should examine alternative mechanisms not examined here. I explored self-control, but it only achieved significance for women and not across all outcomes. In Study 3, it operated in the opposite direction expected, decreasing risk of MPF rather than increasing risk. Other facets of low self-control and decision-making should be explored, as some of the studies provided support for co-occurring risky behaviors. Some of the relationship characteristics listed above may further explain these relationships. If incarceration leads to relationship dissolution, measures assessing relationship instability or repartnering would be of interest. Though most findings did not support a labeling perspective, measures of stigma could also be interesting in assessing how people select their partners for sexual activity, relationship formation, and parenthood. Qualitative research could be useful in determining mechanisms and tracing the relationship histories of those involved in criminal activity and the criminal justice system.

Concluding Thoughts

I speculated a connection between the outcomes of my three studies, and this was often found to be the case. Risky sexual behaviors often significantly increased risk of early union formation and MPF, and early union formation on its own also increased MPF risk. Research should further explore connections between risky sexual behaviors, union formation and union characteristics, and a variety of fertility outcomes. The literature regarding risky sexual behaviors includes other important aspects not examined here, such as contraceptive consistency. Union characteristics such as relationship quality and instability could be additional aspects to examine. Unintended pregnancy and risk-taking during pregnancy, such as substance use, could also prove fruitful.

These studies overall provided the most support for the self-control perspective (GTC) and labeling theory. GTC would indicate that those who struggle with informed decision-making experience those problems in multiple areas of their lives, including criminal activity and family formation patterns. Labeling effects cannot be confirmed due to the lack of variables such as stigma and social acceptance, but the lower likelihood of those involved in crime experiencing early union formation and MPF could indicate that others are less likely to form serious partnerships with those who have the criminal label. Violent crime seemed to exert a particularly negative effect when it came to Studies 2 and 3. Future research should examine the perspective of potential partners as well, in particular examining how a criminal record or behavior influences the likelihood that they will form a partnership with someone. Overall, I conclude that criminal behavior is less important for short-term interactions but can have significant impact on serious adult relationships.

REFERENCES

Abell, Leslie. 2018. “Exploring the Transition to Parenthood as a Pathway to Desistance.” *Journal of Developmental Life-Course Criminology* 4: 395-426.

Adshead, Gwen. 2011. “Same but different: Constructions of female violence in forensic mental health.” *International Journal of Feminist Approaches to Bioethics* 4(1): 41-68.

Amato, Paul R., Booth, Alan, Johnson, David R., and Stacy J. Rogers. 2007. *Alone Together: How Marriage in America is Changing*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Amorim, Mariana and Laura M. Tach. 2019. “Multiple-Partner Fertility and Cohort Change in the Prevalence of Half-Siblings.” *Demography* 56: 2033-2061.

Andersson, Linus. 2021. “Lifetime parenthood in the context of single- and multiple-partner fertility.” *Advances in Life Course Research* 47: 1-11.

Armour, Stacy and Dana L. Haynie. 2007. “Adolescent Sexual Debut and Later Delinquency.” *Journal of Youth Adolescence* 36: 141-152.

Avellar, Sarah and Pamela J. Smock. 2005. “The Economic Consequences of the Dissolution of Cohabiting Unions.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67(2): 315-327.

Beadnell, Blair, Morrison, Diane M., Wilsdon, Anthony, Well, Elizabeth A., Murowchick, Elise, Hoppe, Marilyn, Gillmore, Mary Rogers, and Deborah Nahom. 2005. “Condom Use, Frequency of Sex, and Number of Partners: Multidimensional Characterization of Adolescent Sexual Risk-Taking.” *The Journal of Sex Research* 42(3): 192-202.

Bearman, Peter S. and James Moody. 2004. “Suicide and Friendships Among American Adolescents.” American Journal of Public Health 94(1): 89-95.

Beaver, Kevin M., DeLisi, Matt, Mears, Daniel P., and Eric A. Stewart. 2009. “Low Self-Control and Contact with the Criminal Justice System in a Nationally Representative Sample of

Males." *Justice Quarterly* 26(4): 695-715.

Beaver, Kevin M., Wright, John Paul, and Anthony Walsh. 2008. "A Gene-Based Evolutionary Explanation for the Association Between Criminal Involvement and Number of Sex Partners." *Biodemography and Social Biology* 54(1): 47-55.

Becker, Howard S. 1963. *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. The Free Press: New York, NY.

Beijers, Joris, van Prooijen, Jan Wfillem, and Catrien Bijleveld. 2016. "To marry a thief? Crime type as a deterrent to cohabitation." *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 12: 159-165.

Bennett, Sarah, Farrington, David P., and L. Rowell Huesmann. 2005. "Explaining Gender Differences in Crime and Violence: The Importance of Social Cognitive Skills." *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 10: 263-288.

Berger, Lawrence M., Cancian, Maria, and Daniel R. Meyer. 2012. "Maternal Re-Partnering and New-Partner Fertility: Associations with Nonresident Father Investments in Children." *Child Youth Services Review* 34(2): 426-436.

Bernburg, Jon Gunnar. 2019. "Labeling Theory." Pp. 179-196 in *Handbook on Crime and Deviance*, edited by M. D. Krohn, N. Hendrix, G. P. Hall, and A. J. Lizotte. Springer Nature Switzerland AG: Cham, Switzerland.

Birthrong, Alex and Robert D. Latzman. 2014. "Aspects of impulsivity are differentially associated with risky sexual behaviors." Personality and Individual Differences 57: 8-13.

Biswas, Bipasha and Michael G. Vaughn. 2011. "Really troubled girls: Gender differences in risky sexual behavior and its correlates in a sample of juvenile offenders." *Children and Youth Services Review* 33: 2386-2391.

Blais, Julie and Adelle E. Forth. 2014. "Potential Labeling Effects: Influence of Psychopathy Diagnosis, and Defendant Gender on Mock Juror's Decisions." *Psychology, Crime, & Law* 20(2): 116-134.

Bolani, Danilo and Daniele Vignoli. 2021. "Union formation under conditions of uncertainty: The objective and subjective sides of employment uncertainty." *Demographic Research* 45(5): 141-186.

Bradshaw, Carolyn, Kahn, Arnold S., and Bryan K. Saville. 2010. "To Hook Up or Date: Which Gender Benefits?" *Sex Roles* 62: 661-669.

Brinig, Margaret F. and Marsha Garrison. 2018. "Multipartner Fertility in a Disadvantaged Population." *Family Law Quarterly* 52(1): 27-56.

Bronte-Tinkew, Jacinta, Horowitz, Allison, and Mindy E. Scott. 2009. "Fathering With Multiple Partners: Links to Children's Well-Being in Early Childhood." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 71: 608-631.

Brown, Adrianne R. and Wendy D. Manning. 2021. *Relationship Status Trends According to Age and Gender, 2019-2021. Family Profiles, FP 21-25*. Bowling Green, OH: National Center for Family & Marriage Research.

Brown, Susan L., Manning, Wendy D., and J. Bart Stykes. 2015. "Family Structure and Child Well-Being: Integrating Family Complexity." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 77: 177-190.

Burton, Linda M. 2014. "Seeking Romance in the Crosshairs of Multiple-Partner Fertility: Ethnographic Insights on Low-Income Urban and Rural Mothers." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 654: 185-212.

Bzostek, Sharon H., McLanahan, Sarah S., and Marcia J. Carlson. 2012. "Mothers' Repartnering

after a Nonmarital Birth." *Social Forces* 90(3): 817-841.

Caldeira, Kimberly M., Arria, Amelia M., Zarate, Elizabeth M., Vincent, Kathryn B., Wish, Eric D., and Kevin E. O'Grady. 2009. "Prospective Associations between Alcohol and Drug Consumption and Risky Sex Among Female College Students." *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education* 53(2): 71-92.

Cancian, Maria, Chung, Yiyoon, and Daniel R. Meyer. 2016. "Fathers' Imprisonment and Mothers' Multiple-Partner Fertility." *Demography* 53: 2045-2074.

Cancian, Maria and Daniel R. Meyer. 2011. "Who Owes What to Whom? Child Support Policy Given Multiple-Partner Fertility." *Social Service Review* 85(4): 587-617.

Caputo, Richard K. 2007. "Sex at an Early Age: A Multi-system Perspective." *Race, Gender, & Class* 14(3/4): 206-227.

Cardenas, Iris and Laura Cuesta. 2022. "The association between intimate partner violence and multiple partner fertility among Colombian women." *Family Relations* 71: 1679-1697.

Carlson, Marcia J. and Frank F. Furstenberg Jr. 2006. "The Prevalence and Correlates of Multipartnered Fertility among Urban U.S. Parents." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 68: 718-732.

Chawla, Nishtha and Siddharth Sarkar. 2019. "Defining "High-risk Sexual Behavior" in the Context of Substance Use." *Journal of Psychosocial Health* 1(1): 26-31.

Chiricos, Ted, Barrick, Kelle, Bales, William, and Stephanie Bontrager. 2007. "The Labeling of Convicted Felons and Its Consequences for Recidivism." *Criminology* 45(3): 547-581.

Choukas-Bradley, Sophia, Goldberg, Shoshana, Widman, Laura, Reese, Bianka M., and Carolyn T. Halpern. 2015. "Demographic and developmental differences in the content and sequence of adolescents' ideal romantic relationship behaviors." *Journal of Adolescence*

45: 112-126.

Dahl, Gordon B. 2010. “Early Teen Marriage and Future Poverty.” *Demography* 47(3): 689-718.

Dariotis, Jacinda K. and Frances R. Chen. 2022. “Related Risk Taking among Transition Aged Youth.” *Deviant Behavior* 43(4): 397-414.

Davies, Susan L, DiClemente, Ralph J., Wingood, Gina M., Person, Sharina D., Dix, Emily S., Harrington, Kathy, Crosby, Richard A., and Kim Oh. 2006. “Predictors of Inconsistent Contraceptive Use among Adolescent Girls: Findings from a Prospective Study.” *Journal of Adolescent Health* 39: 43-49.

DeGenna, Natacha M. and Marie D. Cornelius. 2015. “Maternal Drinking and Risky Sexual Behavior in Offspring.” *Health Education & Behavior* 42(2): 185-193.

DeMaris, Alfred, Benson, Michael L., Fox, Greer L., Hill, Terrence, and Judy Van Wyk. 2003. “Distal and Proximal Factors in Domestic Violence: A Test of an Integrated Model.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 65(3): 652-667.

Dembo, Richard, Belenko, Steven, Childs, Kristina, Greenbaum, Paul E., and Jennifer Wareham. 2010. “Gender Differences in Drug Use, Sexually Transmitted Diseases, and Risky Sexual Behavior Among Arrested Youths.” *Journal of Child and Adolescent Substance Abuse* 19: 424-446.

Denver, Megan, Pickett, Justin T., and Shawn Bushway D. 2017. “The Language of Stigmatization and the Mark of Violence: Experimental Evidence on the Social Construction and Use of Criminal Record Stigma.” *Criminology* 55(3): 664-690.

Dir, Allyson, Coskunpinar, Ayca, and Melissa A. Cyders. 2014. “A meta-analytic review of the relationship between adolescent risky sexual behavior and impulsivity across gender, age, and race.” *Clinical Psychology Review* 34: 551-562.

Doerner, Jill K. and Stephen Demuth. 2014. "Gender and Sentencing in the Federal Courts: Are Women Treated More Leniently?" *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 25(2): 242-269.

Dorius, Cassandra. 2010. "Does Serial Parenting Harm Women Over the Long Run? The Link Between Multiple Partner Fertility and Women's Mental and Physical Health at Midlife." PhD Dissertation, Department of Sociology and Demography, Pennsylvania State University.

Durbin, Meg, DiClemente, Ralph J., Siegel, David, Krasnovsky, Flora, Lazarus, Nancy, and Terry Camacho. 1993. "Factors Associated with Multiple Sex Partners Among Junior High School Students." *Journal of Adolescent Health* 14: 202-207.

Eickmeyer, Kasey J. and Wendy D. Manning. 2018. "Serial Cohabitation in Young Adulthood: Baby Boomers to Millenials." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 80: 826-840.

Elder, Glen H. Jr. 1994. "Time, Human Agency, and Social Change: Perspectives on the Life Course." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 57(1): 4-15.

Evans, Douglas N., Blount-Hill, Kwan-Lamar, and Michelle A. Cubellis. 2019. "Examining housing discrimination across race, gender and felony history." *Housing Studies* 34(5): 761-778.

Evans, Douglas N. and Jeremy R. Porter. 2015. "Criminal History and Landlord Rental Decisions: A New York Quasi-Experimental Study." *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 11: 21-42.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. 2013. *Arrests by Sex, 2012*. Washington, DC: Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Field, Elly. 2020. "Material Hardship and Contraceptive Use During the Transition to Adulthood." *Demography* 57(6): 2057-2084.

Fleming, Christopher M., Eisenberg, Nicole, Catalano, Richard F., Kosterman, Rick, Cambron, Christopher, Hawkins, J. David, Hobbs, Timm, Berman, Ilene, Fleming, Tammi, and Jessie Watrous. 2019. "Optimizing Assessment of Risk and Protection for Diverse Adolescent Outcomes: Do Risk and Protective Factors for Delinquency and Substance Use Also Predict Risky Sexual Behavior?" *Prevention Science* 20: 788-799.

Fomby, Paula and Stacey J. Bosick. 2013. "Family Instability and the Transition to Adulthood." Journal of Marriage and Family 75(5): 1266-1287.

Fomby, Paula and Cynthia Osborne. 2017. "Family Instability, Multipartner Fertility, and Behavior in Middle Childhood." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 79: 75-93.

Forrest, Walter. 2014. "Cohabitation, Relationship Quality, and Desistance From Crime." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 76: 539-556.

Galgano, Sarah Wittig. 2009. "Barriers to Reintegration: An Audit Study of the Impact of Race and Offender Status on Employment Opportunities for Women." *Social Thought & Research* 30: 21-37.

Geller, Amanda, Cooper, Carey E., Garfinkel, Irwin, Schwartz-Soicher, Ofira, and Ronald B. Mincy. 2012. "Beyond Absenteeism: Father Incarceration and Child Development." *Demography* 49(1): 49-76.

Gibson-Davis, Christina and Heather Rackin. 2014. "Marriage or Carriage? Trends in Union Context and Birth Type by Education." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 76: 506-519.

Ginther, Donna K., Grasdal, Astrid L., and Robert A. Pollak. 2022. "Fathers' Multiple-Partner Fertility and Children's Educational Outcomes." *Demography* 59(1): 389-415.

Giordano, Peggy C., Seffrin, Patrick M., Manning, Wendy D., and Monica A. Longmore. 2011. "Parenthood and Crime: The Role of Wantedness, Relationships with Partners, and SES."

Journal of Criminal Justice 39: 405-416.

Goffman, Alice. 2014. *On the Run: Fugitive Life in an American City*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Gottfredson, Michael and Travis Hirschi. 1990. *A General Theory of Crime*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Grasmick, Harold G., Tittle, Charles R., Bursik, Robert J., and Bruce J. Arneklev. 1993. "Testing The Core Implications of Gottfredson and Hirschi's General Theory of Crime." *Demography* 30: 5-29.

Grollman, Eric Anthony. 2017. "Sexual Health and Multiple Forms of Discrimination Among Heterosexual Youth." *Social Problems* 64(1): 156-175.

Guo, Jie, Chung, Ick-Joong, Hill, Karl G., Hawkins, J. David, Catalano, Richard F., and Robert D. Abbott. 2002. "Developmental relationships between adolescent substance use and risky sexual behavior in young adulthood." *Journal of Adolescent Health* 31(4): 354-362.

Guzzo, Karen Benjamin. 2014a. "New Partners, More Kids: Multiple-Partner Fertility in the United States." *American Academy of Political and Social Science* 654(1): 66-86.

Guzzo, Karen Benjamin. 2014b. "Trends in Cohabitation Outcomes: Compositional Changes and Engagement Among Never-Married Young Adults." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 76(4): 826-842.

Guzzo, Karen Benjamin and Frank F. Furstenberg. 2007. "Multipartnered Fertility Among Young Women With a Nonmarital First Birth: Prevalence and Risk Factors." *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health* 39(1): 29-38.

Guzzo, Karen Benjamin and Sarah R. Hayford. 2012. "Unintended fertility and the stability of

coresidential relationships." *Social Science Research* 41: 1138-1151.

Guzzo, Karen Benjamin and Sarah R. Hayford. 2018. "Adolescent Reproductive and Contraceptive Knowledge and Attitudes and Adult Contraceptive Behavior." *Maternal and Child Health Journal* 22:32-40.

Guzzo, Karen Benjamin and Sarah R. Hayford. 2020. "Pathways to Parenthood in Social and Family Contexts: Decade in Review, 2020." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 82: 117-144.

Haderxhanaj, Laura T., Leichliter, Jami S., Aral, Sevgi O., and Harrell W. Chesson. 2014. "Sex in a Lifetime." *Sexually Transmitted Diseases* 41(6): 345-352.

Haglund, Kristin A. and Richard J. Fehring. 2010. "The Association of Religiosity, Sexual Education, and Parental Factors with Risky Sexual Behaviors Among Adolescents and Young Adults." *Journal of Religion and Health* 49(4): 460-472.

Hair, Elizabeth, Park, M. Jane, Ling, Thomson J., and Kristin A. Moore. 2009. "Risky Behaviors in Late Adolescence: Co-occurrence, Predictors, and Consequences." *Journal of Adolescent Health* 45: 253-261.

Hallfors, Denise D., Waller, Martha W., Bauer, Daniel, Ford, Carol Ad., and Carolyn T. Halpern. 2005. "Which Comes First in Adolescence—Sex and Drugs or Depression?" *American Journal of Preventative Medicine* 29(3): 163-170.

Hango, Darcy W. and Celine Le Bourdais. 2007. "Early Union Formation in Canada: Links with Education." *European Journal of Population* 23(3/4): 339-368.

Harden, K. Paige, Mendle, Jane, Hill, Jennifer, Turkheimer, Eric, and Robert E. Emery. 2008. "Rethinking Timing of First Sex and Delinquency." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 37(4): 373-385.

Haynie, Dana L., Petts, Richard J., Maimon, David, and Alex Piquero. 2009. "Exposure to Violence in Adolescence and Precocious Role Exits." *Journal of Youth and Violence* 38: 269-286.

Hays, Jake J. and Karen Benjamin Guzzo. 2022. "Does sibling composition in childhood contribute to adult fertility behaviors?" *Journal of Marriage and Family* 84: 53-79.

Jahanfar, Shayesteh and Zahra Pashaei. 2022. "Sexual Attitudes and Associated Factors of Risky Sexual Behaviors Among University Students." Brain Behavior 12(8): 1-8.

Jalovaara, Marika. 2012. "Socio-economic resources and first-union formation in Finland, cohorts born 1969-1981." *Population Studies* 66(1): 69-85.

Jones, Chanika Renee. 2007. "An analysis of gender differences in property crime." PhD Dissertation, Department of Sociology, Louisiana State University.

Joyner, Kara, Peters, H. Elizabeth, Hynes, Kathryn, Sikora, Asia, Taber, Jamie Rubenstein Jamie, and Michael S. Rendall. 2012. The Quality of Male Fertility Data in Major U.S. Surveys. *Demography*, 49, 101-124.

Kalmijn, Matthijs. 1998. "Intermarriage and Homogamy: Causes, Patterns, Trends." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 395-421.

Kalmijn, Matthijs. 2005. "Attitude alignment in marriage and cohabitation: The case of sex-role attitudes." *Personal Relationships* 12: 521-535.

Kastbom, Asa A., Sydsjo, Gunilla, Bladh, Marie, Priebe, Gisela, and Carl-Goran Svedin. 2015. "Sexual debut before the age of 14 leads to poorer psychosocial health and risky behavior in later life." Acta Paediatrica 104: 91-100.

King, Ryan D., Massoglia, Michael, and Ross MacMillian. 2007. "The Context of Marriage and Crime: Gender, The Propensity to Marry, and Offending in Early Adulthood."

Criminology 45(1): 33-65.

Kovandzic, Tomislave V., Sloan, John J., and Lynne M. Vieraitis. 2004. "Striking Out as Crime Reduction Policy: The Impact of "Three Strikes" Laws on Crime Rates in U.S. Cities." *Justice Quarterly* 21 (2): 207-239.

Kreager, Derek A., Matsueda, Ross L., and Elena A. Erosheva. 2010. "Motherhood and Criminal Desistance in Disadvantaged Neighborhoods." *Criminology* 48(1): 221-258.

Kreager, Derek A., Staff, Jeremy, Gauthier, Robin, Lefkowitz, Eva S., and Mark E. Feinberg. 2016. "The Double Standard at Sexual Debut: Gender, Sexual Behavior, and Adolescent Peer Acceptance." *Sex Roles* 75: 377-392.

Krohn, Marvin D., Lizotte, Alan J., and Cynthia M. Perez. 1997. "The Interrelationship Between Substance Use and Precocious Transitions to Adult Statuses." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 38: 87-103.

Kugler, Kari C., Vasilenko, Sara A., Butera, Nicole M., and Donna L. Coffman. 2017. "Long-Term Consequences of Early Sexual Initiation on Young Adult Health: A Causal Inference Approach." *The Journal of Early Adolescence* 37(5): 662-676.

Kuhl, Danielle C., Warner, David F., and Tara D. Warner. 2015. "Intimate Partner Violence Risk Among Victims of Youth Violence: Are Early Unions Bad, Beneficial, or Benign?" *Criminology* 53(3): 427-456.

Kuhl, Danielle C., Warner, David F., and Andrew Wilczak. 2012. "Adolescent Violent Victimization and Precocious Union Formation." *Criminology* 50(4): 1089-1127.

Kuo, Janet Chen-Lan and R. Kelly Raley. 2016. "Diverging Patterns of Union Transition Among Cohabitors by Race/Ethnicity and Education: Trends and Marital Intentions in the United States." *Demography* 53: 921-935.

LaGrange, Teresa C. and Robert A. Silverman. 1999. “Low Self-Control and Opportunity: Testing the General Theory of Crime as an Explanation for Gender Differences in Delinquency.” *Criminology* 37(1): 41-72.

Landeis, Marissa, Manning, Wendy D., Longmore, Monica A., Giordano, Peggy C., and Kara Joyner. 2021. “The Relationship Context of Early Transitions to Parenthood: The Influence of Arrest.” *Population Research and Policy Review* 40: 723-746.

Lansford, Jennifer E., Dodge, Kenneth A., Fontaine, Reid Griffith, Bates, John E., and Gregory S. Pettit. 2014. “Peer Rejection, Affiliation with Deviant Peers, Delinquency, and Risky Sexual Behavior.” *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 43(10): 1742-1751.

Lappegard, Trude and Elizabeth Thomson. 2018. “Intergenerational Transmission of Multipartner Fertility.” *Demography* 55(6): 2205-2228.

Larson, Matthew, Vaughn, Michael G., Salas-Wright, Christopher P. and Matthew Delisi. 2015. “Narcissism, Low Self-Control, and Violence Among a Nationally Representative Sample.” *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 42(6): 573-679.

Lauritsen, Janet L., Heimer, Karen, and James P. Lynch. 2009. “Trends in the Gender Gap in Violent Offending: New Evidence from the National Crime Victimization Survey.” *Criminology* 47(2): 361-399.

Le, Gianna T., Deardorff, Julianna, Lahiff, Maureen, and Kim G. Harley. 2019. “Intergenerational Associations Between Parental Incarceration and Children’s Sexual Risk Taking in Young Adulthood.” *Journal of Adolescent Health* 64: 398-404.

Leasure, Peter, Doyle, R. Caleb, Boehme, Hunter M., and Gary Zhang. 2022. “Criminal History, Race, and Housing Type: An Experimental Audit of Housing Outcomes.” *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 49(10): 1536-1553.

Lemert, Edwin. 1967. *Human Deviance, Social Problems, and Social Control*. Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Lichter, Daniel T., Qian, Zhenchao, and Leanna M. Melliott. 2006. "Marriage or Dissolution? Union Transitions Among Poor Cohabiting Women." *Demography* 43(2): 223-240.

Liefbroer, Aart C. 1991. "The Choice between a Married or Unmarried First Union by Young Adults: A Competing Risk Analysis." *European Journal of Population* 7(3): 273-298.

Lillehagen, Mats and Martin Arstad Isungset. 2020. "New Partner, New Order? Multipartnered Fertility and Birth Order Effects on Educational Achievement." *Demography* 57(5): 1625-1646.

Link, Bruce. 1982. "Mental Patient Status, Work, and Income: An Examination of the Effects of a Psychiatric Label." *American Sociological Review* 47(2): 202-215.

Logan, Cassandra, Manlove, Jennifer, Ikramullah, Erum, and Sarah Cottingham. 2006. *Men Who Father Children with More Than One Woman: A Contemporary Portrait of Multiple-Partner Fertility*. Bethesda, MD: Child Trends.

Lohman, Brenda J. and Amanda Billings. 2008. "Protective and Risk Factors Associated with Adolescent Boys' Early Sexual Debut and Risky Sexual Behaviors." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 37: 723-735.

Longshore, Douglas and M. Douglas Anglin. 1995. "Number of Sex Partners and Crack Cocaine Use: Is Crack an Independent Marker for HIV Risk Behavior?" *Journal of Drug Issues* 25(1): 1-10.

Lopoo, Leonard M. and Bruce Western. 2005. "Incarceration and the Formation and Stability of Marital Unions." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67: 721-734.

Lu, Beibei, Wu, Yougui, Nielson, Carrie M., Flores, Roberto, Abrahamsen, Martha, Papenfuss,

Mary, Harris, Robin B., and Anna R. Giuliano. 2009. “Factors Associated with Acquisition and Clearance of Human Papillomavirus Infection in a Cohort of US Men: A Prospective Study.” *The Journal of Infectious Diseases* 199(3): 362-371.

Lyngstad, Torkild Hovde and Torbjorn Skardhamar. 2016. “Family formation and crime: What role for the family network?” *Advances in Life Course Research* 28: 41-51.

Mack, Julia. 2012. “Union Formation and Maturation of Juvenile Delinquents: A New Look at Development and Desistance in Early Adulthood.” PhD dissertation, Department of Sociology, Bowling Green State University.

Magnusson, B. M., Crandall, A., and K. Evans. 2019. “Early Sexual Debut and Risky Sex in Young Adults: The Role of Low Self-Control.” BMC Public Health 19(1483): 1-8.

Manhart, Lisa E., Epstein, Marina, Bailey, Jennifer A., Hill, Karl G., Haggerty, Kevin P., and Richard F. Catalano. 2016. “HIV/Sexually Transmitted Infection Prevention Messaging: Targeting Root Causes of Sexual Risk Behavior.” *Sexually Transmitted Diseases* 43(2): 71-77.

Manlove, Jennifer, Logan, Cassandra, Ikramullah, Erum, and Emily Holcombe. 2008. “Factors Associated With Multiple-Partner Fertility Among Fathers.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 70(2): 536-548.

Manning, Wendy D. and Jessica A. Cohen. 2015. “Teenage Cohabitation, Marriage, and Childbearing.” *Population Research and Policy Review* 34(2): 161-177.

Martin, Valerie, Mills, Melinda, and Celine Le Bourdais. 2005. “The Consequences of Parental Divorce on the Life Course Outcomes of Canadian Children.” *Canadian Studies in Population* 32(1): 29-51.

Martino, Steven C., Collins, Rebecca L., and Phyllis L. Ellickson. 2004. “Substance Use and

Early Marriage." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66(1): 244-257.

Mason, W. Alex, Hitch, Julia E., Kosterman, Rick, McCarty, Carolyn A., Herrenkohl, Todd I., and J. David Hawkins. 2010. "Growth in adolescent delinquency and alcohol use in relation to young adult crime, alcohol use disorders, and risky sex: a comparison of youth from low- versus middle-income backgrounds." *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 51(12): 1377-1385.

Mayeux, Lara, Sandstrom, Marlene J., and Antonius H. N. Cillessen. 2008. "Is Being Popular a Risky Proposition?" *Journal of Research on Adolescence* 18(1): 49-74.

McGrath, Andrew James. 2014. "The Subjective Impact of Contact With the Criminal Justice System: The Role of Gender and Stigmatization." *Crime & Delinquency* 60(6): 884-908.

McKeever, Matthew and Nicholas H. Wolfinger. 2001. "Reexamining the Economic Costs of Marital Disruption for Women." *Social Science Quarterly* 82(1): 202-217.

McLanahan, Sara. 2004. "Diverging Destinies: How Children are Faring Under the Second Demographic Transition." *Demography* 41(4): 607-627.

Merrill, Renae A. and Xinya Liang. 2019. "Associations between adolescent media use, mental health, and risky sexual behaviors." *Child and Youth Services Review* 103: 1-9.

Meyer, Daniel R. and Maria Cancian. 2012. "I'm Not Supporting His Kids: Nonresident Fathers' Contributions Given Mothers' New Fertility." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 74: 132-151.

Michel, Cedric. 2016. "Violent Street Crime Versus Harmful White-Collar Crime: A Comparison of Perceived Seriousness and Punitiveness." *Critical Criminology* 24: 127-143.

Monahan, Emma Kahle and Angela Guarin. 2019. "The Role of Neighborhood Disadvantage

and Family Structure During Adolescence in Young Adults' Experiences of Multiple Partner Fertility." *Journal of Family Issues* 40(12): 1627-1655.

Monte, Lindsay M. 2007. "Blended but Not the Bradys: Navigating Unmarried Multiple Partner Fertility." Pp. 183-203 in *Unmarried Couples with Children*, edited by Paula England and Kathryn Edin. New York, NY, USA: Russell Sage Foundation.

Monte, Lindsay M. 2009. "Beyond the Dyad: An Exploration of Multiple Partner Fertility." PhD Dissertation, Department of Human Development and Social Policy, Northwestern University.

Monte, Lindsay M. 2019. "Multiple-Partner Fertility in the United States: A Demographic Portrait." *Demography* 56(1): 103-127.

Moore, Erin W., Berkley-Patton, Jannette Y., and Starlyn M. Hawes. 2013. "Religiosity, Alcohol Use, and Sex Behaviors Among College Student-Athletes." *Journal of Religion and Health* 52(3): 930-940.

Mooyart, Jarl E. and Aart C. Liefbroer. 2016. "The Influence of Parental Education on Timing and Type of Union Formation: Changes over the Life Course and Over Time in the Netherlands." *Demography* 53(4): 885-919.

Mustard, David B. 2001. "Racial, Ethnic, and Gender Disparities in Sentencing: Evidence From the U.S. Federal Courts." *Journal of Law and Economics* 44(1): 285-314.

Negriff, Sonya, Elizabeth, J. Susman, and Penelope K. Trickett. 2011. "The Developmental Pathway From Pubertal Timing to Delinquency and Sexual Activity From Early to Late Adolescence." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 40(10): 1343-1356.

Pager, Devah. 2003. "The Mark of a Criminal Record." *American Journal of Sociology* 108(5): 937-1174.

Pager, Devah, Western, Bruce, and Bart Bonikowski. 2009. "Discrimination in a Low-Wage Labor Market: A Field Experiment." *American Sociological Review* 74: 777-799.

Paik, Anthony. 2011. "Adolescent Sexuality and the Risk of Marital Dissolution." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 73(2): 472-485.

Parkes, Alison, Wight, Daniel, Henderson, Marion, and Patrick West. 2010. "Does early sexual debut reduce teenagers' participation in tertiary education? Evidence from the SHARE longitudinal study." *Journal of Adolescence* 33(5): 741-754.

Pedersen, Willy. 2014. "Forbidden Fruit? A Longitudinal Study of Christianity, Sex, and Marriage." *The Journal of Sex Research* 51(5): 542-550.

Petren, Raymond E. 2017. "Paternal Multiple Partner Fertility and Environmental Chaos Among Unmarried Nonresident Fathers." *Journal of Social Service Research* 43(1): 100-114.

Philippe, Arnaud. 2020. "Gender Disparities in Sentencing." *Economica* 87: 1037-1077.

Pyrooz, David C., McGloin, Jean Marie, and Scott H. Decker. 2017. "Parenthood as a Turning Point in the Life Course for Male and Female Gang Members: A Study of Within-Individual Changes in Gang Membership and Criminal Behavior." *Criminology* 55(4): 869-899.

Raley, R. Kelly and Larry Bumpass. 2003. "The Topography of the divorce plateau: Levels and Trends in Union Stability in the United States after 1980." *Demographic Research* 8(8): 245-260.

Raley, R. Kelly, Crissey, Sarah, and Chandra Muller. 2007. "Of Sex and Romance: Late Adolescent Relationships and Young Adult Union Formation." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 69(5): 1210-1226.

Ramrakha, Sandhya, Paul, Charlotte, Bell, Melanie L., Nigel Dickson, Moffitt, Terrie, and

Avshalom Caspi. 2013. “The Relationship Between Multiple Sex Partners and Anxiety, Depression, and Substance Dependence Disorders: A Cohort Study.” *Archival of Sex Behavior* 42(5): 863-872.

Rodriguez, S. Fernando, Curry, Theodore R., and Gang Lee. 2006. “Gender Differences in Criminal Sentencing: Do Effects Vary Across Violent, Property, and Drug Offenses.” *Social Science Quarterly* 87(2): 318-339.

Rosenberg, Melanie, Gurvey, Jill, Adler, Nancy, Dunlop, Miranda, and Jonathan M. Ellen. 1999. “Concurrent Sex Partners and Risk for Sexually Transmitted Diseases Among Adolescents.” *Sexually Transmitted Diseases* 26(4): 208-212.

Rosenfeld, Richard. 2002. “Crime Decline in Context.” *Contexts* 1: 25-34.

Rubens, Muni, Batra, Anamica, Sebekos, Elena, Tanaka, Hideaki, Gabbidon, Kemesha, and William Darrow. 2019. “Exploring the Determinants of Risky Sexual Behavior Among Ethnically Diverse University Students.” *Journal of Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities* 6(5): 953-961.

Ryan, Suzanne, Franzetta, Kerry, Schelar, Erin, and Jennifer Manlove. 2009. “Family Structure History: Links to Relationship Formation Behaviors in Young Adulthood.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 71(4): 935-953.

Sabia, Joseph J. and Daniel I. Rees. 2012. “Does the number of sex partners affect educational attainment? Evidence from female respondents in Add Health.” *Journal of Population Economics* 25: 89-118.

Sampson, Robert J. and John H. Laub. 1993. *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sassler, Sharon, Michelmore, Katherine, and Zhenchao Qian. 2018. “Transitions From Sexual

Relationships Into Cohabitation and Beyond." *Demography* 55: 511-534.

Savioja, Hanna, Helminen, Mika, Frojd, Sari, Marttunen, Mauri, and Riitakertuu Kaltiala-Heino. 2017. "Delinquency and sexual experiences across adolescence: does depression play a role?" *The European Journal of Contraception & Reproductive Health Care* 22(4): 298-304.

Schwartz, Christine R., Doren, Catherine, and Anita Li. 2020. "Trends in Years Spent as Mothers of Young Children: The Role of Completed Fertility, Birth Spacing, and Multiple Partner Fertility." Pp. 237-256 in *Analyzing Contemporary Fertility*, edited by Robert Schoen. Cham, Switzerland: Springer Nature.

Sinkewicz, Marilyn and Irwin Garfinkel. 2009. "Unwed Fathers' Ability to Pay Child Support: New Estimates Accounting for Multiple-Partner Fertility." *Demography* 46(2): 247-263.

Slaughter, Jamel, Davis, Jaya B., and Craig Nagoshi. 2019. "Effects of Paternal Incarceration on Father Involvement on Child Behavior Outcomes at Middle Childhood." *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 28: 2891-2900.

Sly, David F., Quadagno, David, Harrison, Dianne F., Eberstein, Issac, and Kara Riehman. 1997. "The Association Between Substance Use, Condom Use, and Sexual Risk Among Low-Income Women." *Family Planning Perspectives* 29(3): 132-136.

Smock, Pamela J., Manning, Wendy D., and Sanjiv Gupta. 1999. "The Effect of Marriage and Divorce on Women's Economic Well-Being." *American Sociological Review* 64(6): 794-812.

Spriggs, Aubrey L. and Carolyn Tucker Halpern. 2008. "Timing of Sexual Debut and Initiation of Postsecondary Education by Early Adulthood." *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health* 40(3): 152-161.

Steffensmeier, Darrell and John H. Kramer. 1980. "The differential impact of criminal stigmatization on male and female felons." *Sex Roles* 6: 1-8.

Steffensmeier, Darrell, Schwartz, Jennifer, Zhong, Hua, and Jeff Ackerman. 2005. "An Assessment of Recent Trends in Girls' Violence Using Diverse Longitudinal Sources: Is the Gender Gap Closing?" *Criminology* 43(2): 355-406.

Steffensmeier, Darrell, Zhong, Hua, Ackerman, Jeff, Schwartz, Jennifer, and Suzanne Agha. 2006. "Gender Gap Trends for Violent Crimes, 1980 to 2003: A UCR-NCVS Comparison." *Feminist Criminology* 1(1): 72-98.

Stewart, Robert and Christopher Uggen. 2020. "Criminal Records and College Admissions: A Modified Experimental Audit." *Criminology* 58: 156-188.

Stykes, J. Bart and Karen Benjamin Guzzo. 2019. "Multiple-partner fertility: Variation across measurement approaches." Pp. 215-239 in *Analytical Family Demography (The Springer Series on Demographic Methods and Population Analysis)*, edited by Schoen, Robert. New York: Springer.

Sugie, Naomi, Zatz, Noah D., and Dallas Augustine. 2020. "Employer Aversion to Criminal Records: An Experimental Study of Mechanisms." *Criminology* 58: 5-34.

Sutherland, Edwin H. 1939. *Principles of Criminology, 3rd Edition*. Chicago, IL: J. B. Lippincott Company.

Sykes, Bryan L. and Becky Pettit. 2014. "Family Complexity, Poverty, and Public Policy." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 654: 127-149.

Tach, Laura, Mincy, Ronald, and Kathryn Edin. 2010. "Parenting as a "Package Deal": Relationships, Fertility, and Nonresident Father Involvement Among Unmarried Parents." *Demography* 47(1): 181-204.

Teachman, Jay. 2003. “Premarital Sex, Premarital Cohabitation, and the Risk of Subsequent Marital Dissolution Among Women.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 65: 444-455.

Travis, Jeremy. 2002. “Invisible Punishment: An Instrument of Social Exclusion.” Pp. 15-36 in *Invisible Punishment: The Collateral Consequences of Mass Imprisonment*, edited by M. Chesney-Lind and M. Mauer. New Press: New York, NY.

Turchik, Jessica A., Garske, John P., Probst, Danielle R., and Clinton R. Irvin. 2010. “Personality, Sexuality, and Substance Use as Predictors of Sexual Risk Taking in College Students.” *The Journal of Sex Research* 47(5): 411-419.

Turney, Kristin. 2018. “Adverse childhood experiences among children of incarcerated parents.” *Child and Youth Services Review* 89: 218-225.

Turney, Kristin and Christopher Wildeman. 2013. “Redefining relationships: Explaining the countervailing consequences of parental incarceration for parenting.” *American Sociological Review* 78(6): 949-979.

Uecker, Jeremy E. and Charles E. Stokes. 2008. “Early Marriage in the United States.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 70(4): 835-846.

Valdez, Avelardo, Nowotny, Kathryn M., Zhao, Qian-Wei, and Alice Cepeda. 2019. “Interpersonal Partner Relationships, Bonds to Children, and Informal Social Control among Persistent Male Offenders.” *Social Problems* 66(3): 468-483.

van Leeuwen, Marco H. D. and Ineke Maas. 2019. “A historical community approach to social homogamy in the past.” *The History of the Family* 24(1): 1-14.

van Schellen, Marieke, Poortman, Anne-Rigt, and Paul Nieuwbeerta. 2012. “Partners in Crime? Criminal Offending, Marriage Formation, and Partner Selection.” *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 49(4): 545-571.

von Hippel, Paul T. 2007. “Regression with Missing Ys: An Improved Strategy for Analyzing Multiply Imputed Data.” *Sociological Methodology* 37(1): 83-117.

Walker, Jasmine. 2020. “Multiple Partner Fertility and Access to Social Support.” PhD Dissertation, Department of Sociology, East Carolina State University.

Warner, Tara D., Warner, David F., and Danielle C. Kuhl. 2017. “Cut to the Quick: The Consequences of Youth Violent Victimization for the Timing of Dating Debut and First Union Formation.” *American Sociological Review* 82(6): 1241-1271.

Western, Bruce and Natalie Smith. 2018. “Formerly Incarcerated Parents and Their Children.” *Demography* 55(3): 823-847.

Wickrama, Thulitha, Merten, Michael J., and K.A.S. Wickrama. 2012. “Early Socioeconomic Disadvantage and Young Adult Sexual Health.” *American Journal of Health Behavior* 36(6): 834-848.

Wickrama, Thulitha, Wickrama, K.A.S., and Diana L. Baltimore. 2010. “Adolescent Precocious Development and Young Adult Health Outcomes.” *Advances in Life Course Research* 15: 121-131.

Wiik, Kenneth Aarskaug. 2009. “You’d Better Wait!—Socioeconomic Background and Timing of First Marriage versus First Cohabitation.” *European Sociological Review* 25(2): 139-153.

Winter, Virginia Ramseyer, Landor, Antoinette M., Kennedy, Andrea, and Meghan M. Gillen. 2022. “Weight (Mis)perceptions and Sexual Behavior Among U.S. Emerging Adults.” *Emerging Adulthood* 10(6): 1467-1483.

Wright, Bradley R. Entner, Caspi, Avshalom, Moffitt, Terrie E., and Phil A. Silva. 1999. “Low Self-Control, Social Bonds, and Crime: Social Causation, Social Selection, or

Both?" *Criminology* 37(3): 447-702.

Wu, Zheng and Christoph M. Schimmele. 2005. "Repartnering after first union disruption." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67(1): 27-36.

Yao, Shuyang, Långstrom, Niklas, Temrin, Hans, and Hasse Walum. 2014. "Criminal offending as part of an alternative reproductive strategy: investigating evolutionary hypotheses using Swedish total population data." *Evolution and Human Behavior* 35: 481-488.

Zaikman, Yuliana, Marks, Michael J., Young, Tara M., and Jacqueline A. Zeiber. 2016. "Gender Role Violations and the Sexual Double Standard." *Journal of Homosexuality* 63 (12): 1608-1629.

Ziegler, Jessica A., Kuhl, Danielle C., Swisher, Raymond R., and Jorge M. Chavez. 2017. "Parenthood Residency Status and Criminal Desistance across Neighborhood Contexts." *Deviant Behavior* 38(1): 17-33.

Zito, Rena Cornell. 2015. "Family Structure History and Teenage Cohabitation Instability, Socioeconomic Disadvantage, or Transmission?" *Journal of Family Issues* 36(3): 299-325.

Zoutewelle-Terovan, Mioara, van der Geest, Victor, Liefbroer, Aart C., and Catrien Bijleveld. 2016. "The influence of criminal offending on union formation and union dissolution for disadvantaged individuals." *Advances in Life Course Research* 28: 31-40.

APPENDIX A. STUDY TABLES

Table 1.1. Study 1 Weighted Descriptive Statistics

	Women (n=5,834)	Men (n=4,603)
Property Crime		
Engaged	28.71%	47.79%
Never Engaged	71.29%	52.21%
Violent Crime		
Engaged	24.87%	45.89%
Never Engaged	75.13%	54.11%
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics		
Age	28.191 (0.118)	28.364 (0.122)
Race/Ethnicity		
Non-Hispanic White	67.33%	67.26%
Non-Hispanic Black	14.53%	13.00%
Hispanic	10.31%	11.07%
Asian/Other	7.83%	8.67%
Education		
Less than HS	6.59%	8.74%
HS Degree/GED	13.53%	19.65%
Some College	65.36%	62.15%
AA/Vocational Degree	4.52%	3.39%
College Degree	5.91%	3.39%
Graduate Degree	4.09%	2.68%
Household Income		
Less than $5,000	2.83%	1.75%
$5,000-$9,999	2.67%	1.71%
$10,000-$14,999	3.86%	2.69%
$15,000-$19,999	3.31%	3.04%
$20,000-$24,999	5.08%	4.18%
$25,000-$29,999	5.09%	4.95%
$30,000-$39,999	11.27%	10.49%
$40,000-$49,999	11.76%	12.54%
$50,000-$74,999	24.65%	25.28%
$75,000-$99,999	14.74%	16.82%
$100,000-$149,999	10.02%	11.10%
$150,000 or more	4.73%	5.44%
Family Structure at Wave I		
Single Parent	22.29%	21.28%
Stepparent	15.22%	14.70%
Two-Parent	56.82%	58.36%
Other	5.67%	5.66%
Religiosity		
Not at all Important	2.82%	4.32%
Somewhat Important	7.42%	8.44%
Very Important	40.75%	45.12%
More Important Than Anything Else	49.01%	42.12%
Household SES at Wave I (Range 1-10)	5.482 (0.124)	5.694 (0.126)
Other Controls		
Number of Times Incarcerated		
Never Incarcerated	92.70%	76.16%
Incarcerated Once	5.20%	12.36%
Incarcerated More Than Once	2.10%	11.48%
Victimization		
Ever Victimized	18.49%	24.19%
Never Victimized	81.51%	75.81%
Neighborhood Disadvantage	-0.096 (0.024)	-0.092 (0.029)
Substance Use		
No Substance Use	28.06%	25.77%
Alcohol or Tobacco Use	43.00%	43.66%
Marijuana Use	19.43%	21.22%
Use of Other Substances	9.51%	9.35%
Low Self-Control	47.086 (0.204)	46.523 (0.209)
Study 1 Dependent Variables		
Age at First Sex	16.615 (0.075)	16.730 (0.082)
Number of Opposite-Sex Partners	9.503 (0.260)	15.277 (0.538)

Table 1.2. Bivariate Analyses of Age at First Sex on Property and Violent Crime

	Women		Men	
	Mean	SE	Mean	SE
Property Crime				
Engaged	16.180	0.060*	16.679	0.056*
Never Engaged	16.928	0.041	16.899	0.057
Violent Crime				
Engaged	15.877	0.062*	16.031	0.054*
Never Engaged	16.985	0.040	17.436	0.055

Superscripts indicate significant differences across categories at p≤.05. *=significant difference between engaged and never engaged.

Table 1.3. Bivariate Analyses of Number of Opposite-Sex Partners on Property and Violent Crime

	Women		Men	
	Mean	SE	Mean	SE
Property Crime				
Engaged	12.248	0.387*	16.348	0.577*
Never Engaged	8.272	0.295	13.670	0.493
Violent Crime				
Engaged	11.448	0.388*	18.645	0.597*
Never Engaged	8.774	0.290	11.838	0.473

Superscripts indicate significant differences across categories at p≤.05. *=significant difference between engaged and never engaged.

Table 1.4. Pooled Models: OLS Regression of Age at First Sex on Property Crime (n=10,437)

	Model 1		Model 1 + Interaction Term		Model 2		Model 2 + Interaction Term	
	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE
Property Crime	-0.450	0.053***	-0.224	0.075**	-0.031	0.053	0.183	0.074*
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics								
Female	-0.229	0.052***	-0.057	0.066	-0.288	0.051***	-0.127	0.064*
Race/Ethnicity (Non-Hispanic White)								
Non-Hispanic Black	-0.867	0.072***	-0.856	0.071***	-0.972	0.069***	-0.959	0.069***
Hispanic	0.258	0.076**	0.269	0.076***	0.272	0.072***	0.282	0.072***
Asian/Other	0.307	0.079***	0.317	0.079***	0.269	0.075***	0.279	0.075***
Education (BA Degree)								
Less than HS	-2.218	0.153***	-2.205	0.153***	-1.633	0.148***	-1.619	0.148***
HS Degree/GED	-1.451	0.131***	-1.432	0.131***	-1.065	0.126***	-1.047	0.126***
Some College	-1.006	0.113***	-0.997	0.113***	-0.779	0.108***	-0.771	0.108***
AA/Vocational Degree	-0.494	0.164**	-0.483	0.164**	-0.401	0.157*	-0.392	0.157*
Graduate Degree	-0.064	0.166	-0.058	0.165	-0.071	0.158	-0.065	0.158
Household Income	-0.010	0.011	-0.009	0.011	-0.021	0.011*	-0.021	0.011*
Family Structure at Wave I (Two-Parent)								
Single Parent	-0.486	0.065***	-0.488	0.065***	-0.327	0.062***	-0.329	0.062***
Stepparent	-0.777	0.073***	-0.779	0.073***	-0.560	0.070***	-0.561	0.070***
Other	-0.993	0.113***	-0.989	0.112***	-0.691	0.108***	-0.689	0.108***
Religiosity (Not at all Important)								
Somewhat Important	-0.030	0.170	-0.012	0.170	-0.049	0.165	-0.031	0.165
Very Important	0.177	0.152	0.179	0.152	0.005	0.147	0.008	0.147
More Important Than Anything Else	0.816	0.154***	0.820	0.154***	0.427	0.150**	0.433	0.149**
Household SES at Wave I	0.068	0.011***	0.068	0.011***	0.066	0.010***	0.066	0.010***
Other Controls								
Number of Times Incarcerated (Never)								
Once					-0.596	0.089***	-0.598	0.089***
More Than Once					-0.768	0.105***	-0.791	0.105***
Victimization					-0.299	0.059***	-0.301	0.059***
Neighborhood Disadvantage					0.016	0.028	0.015	0.028
Substance Use (No Substance Use)								
Alcohol or Tobacco					-0.940	0.059***	-0.938	0.059***
Marijuana					-1.787	0.074***	-1.785	0.074***
Other Substances					-2.058	0.099***	-2.040	0.099***
Low Self-Control					-0.006	0.004	-0.006	0.004
Property Crime x Female			-0.439	0.104***			-0.419	0.100***
Intercept	17.691	0.227***	17.560	0.228***	19.030	0.268***	18.902	0.269***
F	72.86***		70.19***		90.34***		87.99***	

* $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$

Table 1.5. Pooled Models: OLS Regression of Age at First Sex on Violent Crime (n=10,437)

	Model 1		Model 1 + Interaction Term		Model 2		Model 2 + Interaction Term	
	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE
Violent Crime	-0.990	0.054***	-1.193	0.074***	-0.639	0.054***	-0.800	0.073***
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics								
Female	-0.349	0.051***	-0.494	0.063***	-0.399	0.051***	-0.511	0.061***
Race/Ethnicity (Non-Hispanic White)								
Non-Hispanic Black	-0.762	0.071***	-0.769	0.071***	-0.899	0.069***	-0.906	0.069***
Hispanic	0.281	0.075***	0.282	0.075***	0.299	0.072***	0.299	0.072***
Asian/Other	0.338	0.078***	0.334	0.078***	0.306	0.075***	0.302	0.075***
Education (BA Degree)								
Less than HS	-1.969	0.152***	-1.974	0.152***	-1.521	0.147***	-1.527	0.147***
HS Degree/GED	-1.289	0.129***	-1.296	0.129***	-0.994	0.125***	-1.001	0.125***
Some College	-0.914	0.112***	-0.920	0.112***	-0.731	0.108***	-0.736	0.108***
AA/Vocational Degree	-0.483	0.162**	-0.488	0.162**	-0.391	0.156*	-0.395	0.156*
Graduate Degree	-0.056	0.164	-0.062	0.163	-0.059	0.157	-0.062	0.157
Household Income	-0.015	0.011	-0.014	0.011	-0.024	0.011*	-0.023	0.011*
Family Structure at Wave I (Two-Parent)								
Single Parent	-0.480	0.064***	-0.481	0.064***	-0.329	0.062***	-0.330	0.062***
Stepparent	-0.769	0.072***	-0.770	0.072***	-0.567	0.069***	-0.569	0.069***
Other	-1.007	0.111***	-1.007	0.111***	-0.724	0.107***	-0.724	0.107***
Religiosity (Not at all Important)								
Somewhat Important	-0.036	0.168	-0.037	0.168	-0.055	0.164	-0.056	0.164
Very Important	0.204	0.150	0.210	0.150	0.026	0.146	0.031	0.146
More Important Than Anything Else	0.835	0.152***	0.841	0.152***	0.446	0.148**	0.450	0.148**
Household SES at Wave I	0.059	0.010***	0.060	0.010***	0.063	0.010***	0.063	0.010***
Other Controls								
Number of Times Incarcerated (Never)								
Once					-0.525	0.089***	-0.521	0.089***
More Than Once					-0.652	0.104***	-0.625	0.105***
Victimization					-0.267	0.059***	-0.264	0.059***
Neighborhood Disadvantage					0.015	0.028	0.015	0.028
Substance Use (No Substance Use)								
Alcohol or Tobacco					-0.894	0.059***	-0.894	0.059***
Marijuana					-1.699	0.073***	-1.694	0.073***
Other Substances					-1.928	0.098***	-1.933	0.098***
Low Self-Control					-0.002	0.003	-0.002	0.003
Violent Crime x Female			0.418	0.106***			0.330	0.102**
Intercept	17.876	0.223***	17.959	0.224***	18.974	0.264***	19.045	0.265***
F	88.79***		85.21***		96.63***		93.75***	

* $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$

Table 1.6. Gender-Separated Models: OLS Regression of Age at First Sex on Property Crime

	Women, Model 1 (n=5,834)		Men, Model 1 (n=4,603)		Women, Model 2 (n=5,834)		Men, Model 2 (n=4,603)	
	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE
Property Crime	-0.660	0.072***	-0.263	0.078**	-0.183	0.072*	0.091	0.079
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics								
Race/Ethnicity (Non-Hispanic White)								
Non-Hispanic Black	-0.625	0.092***	-1.184	0.114***	-0.791	0.088***	-1.194	0.111***
Hispanic	0.556	0.100***	-0.079	0.115	0.535	0.095***	-0.024	0.111
Asian/Other	0.315	0.106**	0.316	0.118**	0.274	0.100**	0.288	0.114*
Education (BA Degree)								
Less than HS	-2.073	0.200***	-2.347	0.250***	-1.526	0.191***	-1.713	0.244***
HS Degree/GED	-1.318	0.163***	-1.569	0.224***	-0.986	0.156***	-1.125	0.217***
Some College	-0.914	0.135***	-1.129	0.205***	-0.706	0.128***	-0.867	0.198***
AA/Vocational Degree	-0.502	0.197*	-0.473	0.290	-0.384	0.187*	-0.420	0.279
Graduate Degree	-0.067	0.199	-0.050	0.293	-0.073	0.189	-0.071	0.282
Household Income	0.004	0.014	-0.020	0.017	-0.006	0.013	-0.038	0.017*
Family Structure at Wave I (Two-Parent)								
Single Parent	-0.500	0.085***	-0.459	0.100***	-0.332	0.081***	-0.310	0.097**
Stepparent	-0.800	0.096***	-0.763	0.112***	-0.557	0.091***	-0.567	0.108***
Other	-0.878	0.141***	-1.188	0.186***	-0.564	0.134***	-0.906	0.180***
Religiosity (Not at all Important)								
Somewhat Important	-0.060	0.247	0.013	0.238	-0.044	0.237	-0.047	0.230
Very Important	0.130	0.220	0.219	0.212	-0.055	0.213	0.053	0.203
More Important Than Anything Else	0.879	0.221***	0.713	0.213**	0.429	0.214*	0.390	0.205
Household SES at Wave I	0.075	0.014***	0.060	0.017***	0.069	0.013***	0.061	0.016***
Other Controls								
Number of Times Incarcerated (Never)								
Once					-0.487	0.142**	-0.671	0.117***
More Than Once					-0.751	0.218**	-0.842	0.125***
Victimization					-0.225	0.080**	0.369	0.088***
Neighborhood Disadvantage					-0.009	0.034	0.043	0.045
Substance Use (No Substance Use)								
Alcohol or Tobacco					-1.078	0.076***	-0.736	0.093***
Marijuana					-1.989	0.097***	-1.509	0.113***
Other Substances					-2.269	0.131***	-1.722	0.151***
Low Self-Control					-0.010	0.005*	-0.001	0.005
Intercept	17.191	0.294***	17.976	0.352***	18.788	0.354***	18.910	0.416***
F	48.01***		33.01***		60.49***		37.38***	

* $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$

Table 1.7. Gender-Separated Models: OLS Regression of Age at First Sex on Violent Crime

	Women, Model 1 (n=5,834)		Men, Model 1 (n=4,603)		Women, Model 2 (n=5,834)		Men, Model 2 (n=4,603)	
	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE
Violent Crime	-0.784	0.077***	-1.189	0.076***	-0.412	0.075***	-0.883	0.077***
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics								
Race/Ethnicity (Non-Hispanic White)								
Non-Hispanic Black	-0.558	0.092***	-1.072	0.111***	-0.747	0.088***	-1.118	0.110***
Hispanic	0.530	0.100***	-0.018	0.112	0.535	0.094***	0.026	0.110
Asian/Other	0.302	0.105**	0.370	0.115**	0.283	0.100**	0.341	0.113**
Education (BA Degree)								
Less than HS	-1.936	0.200***	-1.967	0.245***	-1.451	0.191***	-1.557	0.241***
HS Degree/GED	-1.247	0.163***	-1.309	0.219***	-0.943	0.156***	-1.028	0.214***
Some College	-0.887	0.134***	-0.943	0.201***	-0.686	0.128***	-0.781	0.196***
AA/Vocational Degree	-0.526	0.197**	-0.416	0.283	-0.388	0.187*	-0.386	0.275
Graduate Degree	-0.071	0.199	-0.026	0.286	-0.070	0.188	-0.052	0.278
Household Income	0.001	0.014	-0.030	0.017	-0.008	0.013	-0.042	0.017*
Family Structure at Wave I (Two-Parent)								
Single Parent	-0.500	0.085***	-0.446	0.098***	-0.332	0.081***	-0.317	0.096**
Stepparent	-0.791	0.096***	-0.754	0.109***	-0.555	0.091***	-0.587	0.107***
Other	-0.897	0.140***	-1.198	0.182***	-0.578	0.134***	-0.963	0.178***
Religiosity (Not at all Important)								
Somewhat Important	-0.100	0.247	0.008	0.231	-0.060	0.236	-0.059	0.227
Very Important	0.145	0.220	0.270	0.205	-0.056	0.212	0.114	0.200
More Important Than Anything Else	0.912	0.221***	0.724	0.205***	0.431	0.214*	0.432	0.202*
Household SES at Wave I	0.062	0.014***	0.056	0.016**	0.064	0.013***	0.061	0.016***
Other Controls								
Number of Times Incarcerated (Never)								
Once					-0.444	0.142**	-0.582	0.116***
More Than Once					-0.685	0.218**	-0.679	0.124***
Victimization					-0.215	0.080**	-0.298	0.087**
Neighborhood Disadvantage					-0.009	0.034	0.040	0.046
Substance Use (No Substance Use)								
Alcohol or Tobacco					-1.069	0.076***	-0.632	0.092***
Marijuana					-1.981	0.096***	-1.309	0.112***
Other Substances					-2.244	0.130***	-1.492	0.149***
Low Self-Control					-0.009	0.004*	0.007	0.005
Intercept	17.226	0.295***	18.230	0.341***	18.781	0.352***	18.704	0.409***
F	49.27***		48.08***		61.57***		43.18***	

* $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$

Table 1.8. Pooled Models: Poisson Regression of Number of Opposite-Sex Partners on Property Crime (n=10,437)

	Model 1		Model 1 + Interaction Term		Model 2		Model 2 + Interaction Term	
	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE
Property Crime	0.265	0.008***	0.176	0.011***	0.072	0.013***	-0.023	0.015
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics								
Female	-0.399	0.006***	-0.491	0.009***	-0.313	0.009***	-0.410	0.011***
Age	0.032	0.002***	0.032	0.002***	-0.003	0.002	-0.002	0.002
Race/Ethnicity (Non-Hispanic White)								
Non-Hispanic Black	0.255	0.009***	0.250	0.009***	0.266	0.010***	-0.258	0.010***
Hispanic	-0.037	0.010***	-0.043	0.010***	-0.036	0.010***	-0.041	0.010***
Asian/Other	-0.213	0.010***	-0.217	0.010***	-0.197	0.010***	-0.203	0.010***
Education (BA Degree)								
Less than HS	0.155	0.019***	0.147	0.019***	-0.177	0.021***	-0.186	0.021***
HS Degree/GED	0.109	0.016***	0.100	0.016***	-0.105	0.017***	-0.116	0.017***
Some College	0.088	0.014***	0.083	0.014***	-0.036	0.014*	-0.043	0.014**
AA/Vocational Degree	-0.191	0.021***	-0.198	0.021***	-0.224	0.021***	-0.231	0.021***
Graduate Degree	-0.343	0.022***	-0.347	0.022***	-0.330	0.022***	-0.335	0.022***
Household Income	-0.009	0.003**	-0.009	0.003**	0.007	0.003**	0.007	0.003*
Family Structure at Wave I (Two-Parent)								
Single Parent	0.189	0.008***	0.190	0.008***	0.125	0.008***	0.127	0.008***
Stepparent	0.260	0.008***	0.261	0.008***	0.176	0.008***	0.177	0.008***
Other	0.402	0.012***	0.399	0.012***	0.321	0.013***	0.318	0.013***
Religiosity (Not at all Important)								
Somewhat Important	-0.081	0.055	-0.090	0.055	-0.065	0.057	-0.076	0.057
Very Important	-0.188	0.056**	-0.189	0.055**	-0.126	0.057*	-0.128	0.056*
More Important Than Anything Else	-0.272	0.058***	-0.274	0.057***	-0.134	0.058*	-0.138	0.057*
Household SES at Wave I	0.039	0.002***	0.039	0.002***	0.040	0.002***	0.040	0.002***
Other Controls								
Number of Times Incarcerated (Never)								
Once					0.473	0.009***	0.474	0.009***
More Than Once					0.621	0.010***	0.629	0.010***
Victimization					0.231	0.007***	0.232	0.007***
Neighborhood Disadvantage					0.014	0.012	0.014	0.012
Substance Use (No Substance Use)								
Alcohol or Tobacco					0.240	0.010***	0.237	0.010***
Marijuana					0.515	0.014***	0.513	0.014***
Other Substances					0.599	0.019***	0.590	0.019***
Low Self-Control					0.006	0.003*	0.006	0.003*
Property Crime x Female			0.208	0.014***			0.224	0.014***
Intercept	1.513	0.076***	1.551	0.075***	1.741	0.143***	1.776	0.143***
F	334.74***		327.53***		241.91***		241.10***	

* $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$

Table 1.9. Pooled Models: Poisson Regression of Number of Opposite-Sex Partners on Violent Crime (n=10,437)

	Model 1		Model 1 + Interaction Term		Model 2		Model 2 + Interaction Term	
	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE
Violent Crime	0.362	0.008***	0.440	0.011***	0.167	0.011***	0.222	0.013***
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics								
Female	-0.369	0.006***	-0.290	0.009***	-0.293	0.008***	-0.239	0.010***
Age	0.036	0.002***	0.035	0.002***	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.002
Race/Ethnicity (Non-Hispanic White)								
Non-Hispanic Black	0.209	0.009***	0.213	0.009***	0.244	0.010***	0.247	0.010***
Hispanic	-0.047	0.010***	-0.047	0.010***	-0.043	0.010***	-0.043	0.010***
Asian/Other	-0.221	0.010***	-0.218	0.010***	-0.207	0.010***	-0.205	0.010***
Education (BA Degree)								
Less than HS	0.066	0.019**	0.069	0.019***	-0.209	0.020***	-0.206	0.020**
HS Degree/GED	0.048	0.016**	0.052	0.016**	-0.126	0.017***	-0.122	0.017***
Some College	0.054	0.014***	0.057	0.014***	-0.051	0.014***	-0.047	0.014**
AA/Vocational Degree	-0.189	0.021***	-0.187	0.021***	-0.222	0.021***	-0.221	0.021***
Graduate Degree	-0.347	0.022***	-0.344	0.022***	-0.333	0.022***	0.330	0.022***
Household Income	-0.008	0.003**	-0.008	0.003**	0.007	0.003**	0.007	0.003**
Family Structure at Wave I (Two-Parent)								
Single Parent	0.190	0.008***	0.190	0.008***	0.125	0.008***	0.125	0.008***
Stepparent	0.259	0.008***	0.259	0.008***	0.178	0.008***	0.180	0.008***
Other	0.398	0.012***	0.398	0.012***	0.322	0.013***	0.323	0.012***
Religiosity (Not at all Important)								
Somewhat Important	-0.088	0.054	-0.087	0.054	-0.065	0.057	-0.064	0.057
Very Important	-0.206	0.054**	-0.210	0.054***	-0.133	0.056*	-0.134	0.057*
More Important Than Anything Else	-0.294	0.055***	-0.297	0.055***	-0.142	0.057*	-0.143	0.058*
Household SES at Wave I	0.044	0.002***	0.043	0.002***	0.042	0.002***	0.041	0.002***
Other Controls								
Number of Times Incarcerated (Never)								
Once					0.460	0.009***	0.459	0.009***
More Than Once					0.601	0.011***	0.593	0.011***
Victimization					0.222	0.007***	0.220	0.007***
Neighborhood Disadvantage					0.015	0.012	0.014	0.012
Substance Use (No Substance Use)								
Alcohol or Tobacco					0.228	0.010***	0.228	0.010***
Marijuana					0.498	0.015***	0.497	0.015***
Other Substances					0.575	0.020***	0.577	0.020***
Low Self-Control					0.006	0.003*	0.006	0.003*
Violent Crime x Female			-0.192	0.016***			-0.135	0.016***
Intercept	1.382	0.072***	1.371	0.072***	1.626	0.147***	1.612	0.149***
F	374.44***		375.36***		249.78***		248.50***	

* $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$

Table 1.10. Gender-Separated Models: Poisson Regression of Number of Opposite-Sex Partners on Property Crime

	Women, Model 1 (n=5,834)		Men, Model 1 (n=4,603)		Women, Model 2 (n=5,834)		Men, Model 2 (n=4,603)	
	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE
Property Crime	0.366	0.010***	0.201	0.011***	0.147	0.020***	0.032	0.016*
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics								
Age	0.011	0.003***	0.048	0.002***	-0.023	0.003***	0.016	0.003***
Race/Ethnicity (Non-Hispanic White)								
Non-Hispanic Black	-0.006	0.014	0.447	0.012***	0.053	0.014***	0.405	0.014***
Hispanic	-0.087	0.014***	-0.012	0.013	-0.074	0.015***	-0.031	0.014*
Asian/Other	-0.144	0.015***	-0.276	0.014***	-0.133	0.015***	-0.269	0.014***
Education (BA Degree)								
Less than HS	-0.132	0.027***	0.502	0.030***	-0.429	0.033***	0.148	0.032***
HS Degree/GED	-0.243	0.022***	0.488	0.027***	-0.419	0.026***	0.246	0.028***
Some College	-0.139	0.018***	0.418	0.025***	-0.253	0.018***	0.278	0.026***
AA/Vocational Degree	-0.377	0.028***	0.112	0.034**	-0.431	0.028***	0.100	0.034**
Graduate Degree	-0.552	0.029***	-0.015	0.036	-0.550	0.031***	0.030	0.036
Household Income	-0.036	0.002***	0.012	0.005*	-0.020	0.003***	0.029	0.004***
Family Structure at Wave I (Two-Parent)								
Single Parent	0.229	0.012***	0.158	0.010***	0.164	0.012***	0.094	0.011***
Stepparent	0.242	0.013***	0.277	0.011***	0.137	0.014***	0.197	0.011***
Other	0.506	0.018***	0.300	0.018***	0.420	0.018***	0.215	0.018***
Religiosity (Not at all Important)								
Somewhat Important	-0.115	0.085	-0.074	0.079	-0.162	0.080*	-0.026	0.080
Very Important	-0.296	0.079**	-0.107	0.072	-0.277	0.078**	-0.030	0.069
More Important Than Anything Else	-0.384	0.078***	-0.184	0.073*	-0.268	0.079**	-0.054	0.071
Household SES at Wave I	0.041	0.003***	0.036	0.003***	0.043	0.003***	0.036	0.003***
Other Controls								
Number of Times Incarcerated (Never)								
Once					0.592	0.017***	0.409	0.012***
More Than Once					0.651	0.025***	0.604	0.012***
Victimization					0.101	0.011***	0.323	0.009***
Neighborhood Disadvantage					0.035	0.010**	-0.001	0.017
Substance Use (No Substance Use)								
Alcohol or Tobacco					0.270	0.018***	0.202	0.014***
Marijuana					0.536	0.026***	0.482	0.017***
Other Substances					0.554	0.040***	0.592	0.023***
Low Self-Control					0.014	0.005**	-0.001	0.002
Intercept	2.240	0.109***	0.482	0.107***	2.159	0.279***	1.014	0.151***
F	133.31***		119.12***		85.40***		146.29***	

* $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$

Table 1.11. Gender-Separated Models: Poisson Regression of Number of Opposite-Sex Partners on Violent Crime

	Women, Model 1 (n=5,834)		Men, Model 1 (n=4,603)		Women, Model 2 (n=5,834)		Men, Model 2 (n=4,603)	
	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE	b	SE
Violent Crime	0.251	0.012***	0.437	0.011***	0.030	0.019	0.259	0.014***
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics								
Age	0.009	0.003**	0.055	0.002***	-0.029	0.003***	0.024	0.003***
Race/Ethnicity (Non-Hispanic White)								
Non-Hispanic Black	-0.027	0.015	0.396	0.012***	0.058	0.015***	0.379	0.014***
Hispanic	-0.063	0.014***	-0.039	0.013**	-0.061	0.015***	-0.049	0.014***
Asian/Other	-0.125	0.015***	-0.293	0.014***	-0.120	0.015***	-0.286	0.014***
Education (BA Degree)								
Less than HS	-0.157	0.028***	0.366	0.030***	-0.437	0.032***	0.101	0.031**
HS Degree/GED	-0.252	0.022***	0.390	0.027***	-0.421	0.025***	0.216	0.028***
Some College	-0.137	0.018***	0.349	0.025***	-0.253	0.018***	0.251	0.025***
AA/Vocational Degree	-0.351	0.028***	0.090	0.034**	-0.426	0.028***	0.099	0.034**
Graduate Degree	-0.546	0.029***	-0.027	0.036	-0.545	0.031***	0.024	0.036
Household Income	-0.036	0.003***	0.014	0.005**	-0.019	0.003***	0.029	0.004***
Family Structure at Wave I (Two-Parent)								
Single Parent	0.236	0.012***	0.153	0.010***	0.162	0.012***	0.095	0.011***
Stepparent	0.242	0.013***	0.275	0.011***	0.132	0.014***	0.205	0.011***
Other	0.515	0.018***	0.283	0.018***	0.418	0.018***	0.219	0.018***
Religiosity (Not at all Important)								
Somewhat Important	-0.097	0.085	-0.085	0.076	-0.158	0.080	-0.025	0.079
Very Important	-0.311	0.079***	-0.133	0.068	-0.282	0.078**	-0.046	0.069
More Important Than Anything Else	-0.415	0.078***	-0.203	0.069**	-0.274	0.079**	-0.066	0.070
Household SES at Wave I	0.048	0.003***	0.039	0.003***	0.044	0.003***	0.037	0.003***
Other Controls								
Number of Times Incarcerated (Never)								
Once					0.597	0.017***	0.388	0.012***
More Than Once					0.666	0.025***	0.566	0.012***
Victimization					0.100	0.011***	0.303	0.009***
Neighborhood Disadvantage					0.035	0.010**	0.000	0.017
Substance Use (No Substance Use)								
Alcohol or Tobacco					0.282	0.019***	0.170	0.014***
Marijuana					0.566	0.028***	0.426	0.017***
Other Substances					0.601	0.042***	0.524	0.023***
Low Self-Control					0.016	0.005**	-0.003	0.002
Intercept	2.337	0.112***	0.260	0.101*	2.274	0.279***	0.804	0.152***
F	106.15***		167.88***		84.52***		156.64***	

* $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$

Table 2.1. Study 2 Weighted Descriptive Statistics

	Women (n=5,834)	Men (n=4,603)
Property Crime		
Engaged	28.71%	47.79%
Never Engaged	71.29%	52.21%
Violent Crime		
Engaged	24.87%	45.89%
Never Engaged	75.13%	54.11%
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics		
Age	28.191 (0.118)	28.364 (0.122)
Race/Ethnicity		
Non-Hispanic White	67.33%	67.26%
Non-Hispanic Black	14.53%	13.00%
Hispanic	10.31%	11.07%
Asian/Other	7.83%	8.67%
Education		
Less than HS	6.59%	8.74%
HS Degree/GED	13.53%	19.65%
Some College	65.36%	62.15%
AA/Vocational Degree	4.52%	3.39%
College Degree	5.91%	3.39%
Graduate Degree	4.09%	2.68%
Household Income		
Less than $5,000	2.83%	1.75%
$5,000-$9,999	2.67%	1.71%
$10,000-$14,999	3.86%	2.69%
$15,000-$19,999	3.31%	3.04%
$20,000-$24,999	5.08%	4.18%
$25,000-$29,999	5.09%	4.95%
$30,000-$39,999	11.27%	10.49%
$40,000-$49,999	11.76%	12.54%
$50,000-$74,999	24.65%	25.28%
$75,000-$99,999	14.74%	16.82%
$100,000-$149,999	10.02%	11.10%
$150,000 or more	4.73%	5.44%
Family Structure at Wave I		
Single Parent	22.29%	21.28%
Stepparent	15.22%	14.70%
Two-Parent	56.82%	58.36%
Other	5.67%	5.66%
Religiosity		
Not at all Important	2.82%	4.32%
Somewhat Important	7.42%	8.44%
Very Important	40.75%	45.12%
More Important Than Anything Else	49.01%	42.12%
Household SES at Wave I (Range 1-10)	5.482 (0.124)	5.694 (0.126)
Other Controls		
Number of Times Incarcerated		
Never Incarcerated	92.70%	76.16%
Incarcerated Once	5.20%	12.36%
Incarcerated More Than Once	2.10%	11.48%
Victimization		
Ever Victimized	18.49%	24.19%
Never Victimized	81.51%	75.81%
Neighborhood Disadvantage	-0.096 (0.024)	-0.092 (0.029)
Substance Use		
No Substance Use	28.06%	25.77%
Alcohol or Tobacco Use	43.00%	43.66%
Marijuana Use	19.43%	21.22%
Use of Other Substances	9.51%	9.35%
Low Self-Control	47.086 (0.204)	46.523 (0.209)
Study 1 Dependent Variables		
Age at First Sex	16.615 (0.075)	16.730 (0.082)
Number of Opposite-Sex Partners	9.503 (0.260)	15.277 (0.538)
Study 2 Dependent Variable		
Early Union Formation		
No Unions	10.39%	15.11%
Later Union Formation	51.53%	52.54%
Early Union Formation	38.08%	32.35%

Table 2.2. Bivariate Analyses of Early Union Formation on Property and Violent Crime

	Women		Men	
	Proportion	SE	Proportion	SE
Property Crime Trajectory				
No Unions	11.71%	0.008	17.21%[b,c]	0.008
Engaged	11.54%	0.005	14.33%	0.007
Never Engaged				
Later Union Formation				
Engaged	47.26%[c]	0.012	54.01%[a]	0.011
Never Engaged	54.61%	0.008	55.84%	0.010
Early Union Formation				
Engaged	41.03%[b]	0.012	28.79%[a]	0.010
Never Engaged	33.85%	0.007	29.83%	0.009
Violent Crime				
No Unions				
Engaged	10.50%[c]	0.008	14.45%[c]	0.008
Never Engaged	11.95%	0.005	16.76%	0.007
Later Union Formation				
Engaged	42.71%[c]	0.013	51.23%[c]	0.011
Never Engaged	55.69%	0.008	58.11%	0.010
Early Union Formation				
Engaged	46.79%[a,b]	0.013	34.31%[a,b]	0.010
Never Engaged	32.36%	0.007	25.13%	0.009

Superscripts indicate significant differences across categories at $p \leq .05$. a) different from no unions, b) different from later union formation, c) different from early union formation

Table 2.3. Pooled Models: Multinomial Logistic Regression of Early Union Formation on Property Crime (n=10,437)

	Model 1, Earlier Union to No Union		Model 1, Earlier Union to Later Union		Model 2, Earlier Union to No Union		Model 2, Earlier Union to Later Union		Model 3, Earlier Union to No Union		Model 3, Earlier Union to Later Union	
	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE
Property Crime	1.008	0.071	0.841	0.041***	1.264	0.095**	0.970	0.050	1.277	0.098**	0.973	0.052
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics												
Female	0.502	0.035***	0.689	0.033***	0.458	0.033***	0.648	0.033***	0.489	0.037***	0.681	0.036***
Race/Ethnicity (Non-Hispanic White)												
Non-Hispanic Black	3.301	0.309***	1.665	0.116***	3.265	0.312***	1.629	0.115***	4.742	0.475***	2.062	0.151***
Hispanic	2.166	0.223***	1.391	0.097***	2.217	0.230***	1.389	0.097***	2.129	0.227***	1.326	0.095***
Asian/Other	2.143	0.217***	1.169	0.087*	2.133	0.219***	1.163	0.088*	2.039	0.217***	1.126	0.088
Education (BA Degree)												
Less than HS	0.060	0.015***	0.106	0.018***	0.083	0.021***	0.128	0.022***	0.121	0.032***	0.167	0.030***
HS Degree/GED	0.128	0.026***	0.175	0.028***	0.154	0.031***	0.197	0.031***	0.192	0.040***	0.227	0.037***
Some College	0.277	0.049***	0.290	0.043***	0.310	0.056***	0.310	0.046***	0.369	0.068***	0.349	0.053***
AA/Vocational Degree	1.011	0.251	0.787	0.167	1.048	0.263	0.802	0.171	1.208	0.310	0.884	0.193
Graduate Degree	0.928	0.229	0.685	0.144	0.919	0.228	0.676	0.143	0.942	0.240	0.685	0.148
Household Income	0.965	0.014*	1.067	0.011***	0.954	0.014**	1.058	0.011***	0.960	0.014**	1.062	0.011***
Family Structure at Wave I (Two-Parent)												
Single Parent	0.722	0.062***	0.800	0.048***	0.784	0.068**	0.843	0.051**	0.853	0.076	0.895	0.055
Stepparent	0.448	0.048***	0.649	0.042***	0.498	0.054***	0.691	0.045***	0.572	0.063***	0.758	0.051***
Other	0.295	0.051***	0.440	0.044***	0.334	0.059***	0.471	0.047***	0.392	0.070***	0.518	0.053***
Religiosity (Not at all Important)												
Somewhat Important	1.056	0.264	0.914	0.150	1.048	0.265	0.913	0.152	1.071	0.279	0.919	0.157
Very Important	0.920	0.193	1.051	0.149	0.853	0.181	1.013	0.145	0.853	0.185	1.009	0.150
More Important Than Anything Else	1.149	0.244	1.144	0.162	0.953	0.206	1.029	0.148	0.835	0.185	0.941	0.139
Household SES at Wave I	1.129	0.016***	1.074	0.011***	1.129	0.016***	1.074	0.011***	1.112	0.017***	1.062	0.011***
Other Controls												
Number of Times Incarcerated (Never)												
Once					0.639	0.083**	0.688	0.057***	0.761	0.102*	0.760	0.065**
More Than Once					0.445	0.074***	0.673	0.065***	0.541	0.092***	0.762	0.076**
Victimization					0.803	0.068*	0.837	0.047**	0.858	0.074	0.872	0.051*
Neighborhood Disadvantage					1.005	0.035	0.963	0.024	0.996	0.036	0.957	0.024
Substance Use (No Substance Use)												
Alcohol or Tobacco					0.609	0.050***	0.710	0.043***	0.791	0.068**	0.855	0.054*
Marijuana					0.394	0.043***	0.633	0.046***	0.668	0.076***	0.908	0.069
Other Substances					0.409	0.061***	0.558	0.053***	0.756	0.117	0.842	0.083
Low Self-Control					0.996	0.005	0.995	0.003	0.998	0.005	0.997	0.003
Study 1 Dependent Variables												
Age at First Sex									1.417	0.022***	1.286	0.015***
Number of Opposite-Sex Partners									1.004	0.002*	1.003	0.001*
Intercept	1.221	0.390	2.981	0.698***	2.813	1.092**	5.692	1.556***	0.004	0.002***	0.057	0.020***
F	33.34***		33.34***		25.40***		25.40***		30.45***		30.45***	

* $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$

Table 2.4. Pooled Models: Multinomial Logistic Regression of Early Union Formation on Property Crime with Interaction Term (n=10,437)

	Model 1, Earlier Union to No Union		Model 1, Earlier Union to Later Union		Model 2, Earlier Union to No Union		Model 2, Earlier Union to Later Union		Model 3, Earlier Union to No Union		Model 3, Earlier Union to Later Union	
	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE
Property Crime	1.271	0.124*	1.009	0.072	1.619	0.165***	1.175	0.087*	1.539	0.161***	1.122	0.086
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics												
Female	0.603	0.054***	0.788	0.048***	0.556	0.051***	0.744	0.047***	0.566	0.053***	0.754	0.049***
Race/Ethnicity (Non-Hispanic White)												
Non-Hispanic Black	3.338	0.313***	1.677	0.116***	3.313	0.317***	1.645	0.116***	4.786	0.480***	2.074	0.152***
Hispanic	2.191	0.226***	1.401	0.097***	2.245	0.234***	1.400	0.098***	2.151	0.230***	1.335	0.096***
Asian/Other	2.166	0.220***	1.179	0.088*	2.160	0.222***	1.173	0.089*	2.061	0.219***	1.136	0.089
Education (BA Degree)												
Less than HS	0.061	0.015***	0.107	0.019***	0.084	0.021***	0.129	0.023***	0.123	0.032***	0.168	0.030***
HS Degree/GED	0.130	0.026***	0.178	0.028***	0.157	0.032***	0.200	0.032***	0.195	0.041***	0.230	0.037***
Some College	0.280	0.050***	0.292	0.043***	0.313	0.056***	0.313	0.047***	0.372	0.068***	0.351	0.053***
AA/Vocational Degree	1.024	0.255	0.795	0.169	1.061	0.266	0.810	0.173	1.220	0.313	0.891	0.194
Graduate Degree	0.935	0.231	0.689	0.145	0.926	0.230	0.681	0.144	0.949	0.242	0.690	0.149
Household Income	0.966	0.014*	1.068	0.011***	0.954	0.014**	1.058	0.011***	0.960	0.014**	1.063	0.011***
Family Structure at Wave I (Two-Parent)												
Single Parent	0.720	0.062***	0.799	0.048***	0.782	0.068**	0.841	0.051**	0.851	0.076	0.893	0.055
Stepparent	0.446	0.048***	0.647	0.042***	0.496	0.054***	0.690	0.045***	0.570	0.063***	0.756	0.051***
Other	0.296	0.052***	0.441	0.044***	0.334	0.059***	0.472	0.047***	0.392	0.070***	0.518	0.053***
Religiosity (Not at all Important)												
Somewhat Important	1.076	0.269	0.927	0.153	1.069	0.271	0.927	0.154	1.087	0.284	0.929	0.159
Very Important	0.923	0.194	1.052	0.150	0.856	0.182	1.015	0.146	0.855	0.186	1.010	0.150
More Important Than Anything Else	1.154	0.246	1.147	0.163	0.959	0.207	1.034	0.149	0.839	0.186	0.944	0.140
Household SES at Wave I	1.130	0.016***	1.075	0.011***	1.129	0.016***	1.074	0.011***	1.113	0.017***	1.062	0.011***
Other Controls												
Number of Times Incarcerated (Never)												
Once					0.636	0.083**	0.686	0.057***	0.758	0.101*	0.758	0.065**
More Than Once					0.432	0.072***	0.659	0.064***	0.528	0.090***	0.749	0.075**
Victimization					0.801	0.068**	0.834	0.047**	0.856	0.074	0.871	0.050*
Neighborhood Disadvantage					1.004	0.035	0.963	0.024	0.995	0.036	0.956	0.024
Substance Use (No Substance Use)												
Alcohol or Tobacco					0.611	0.050***	0.712	0.043***	0.792	0.068**	0.855	0.054*
Marijuana					0.394	0.043***	0.633	0.046***	0.666	0.076***	0.906	0.069
Other Substances					0.416	0.062***	0.566	0.054***	0.763	0.118	0.849	0.084
Low Self-Control					0.996	0.005	0.995	0.003	0.998	0.005	0.997	0.003
Study 1 Dependent Variables												
Age at First Sex									1.415	0.022***	1.284	0.015***
Number of Opposite-Sex Partners									1.004	0.002*	1.003	0.001*
Property Crime x Female	0.636	0.089**	0.717	0.069**	0.618	0.087**	0.704	0.069***	0.695	0.101*	0.771	0.078*
Intercept	1.061	0.342	2.682	0.633***	2.418	0.945*	5.087	1.400***	0.004	0.002***	0.054	0.019***
F	31.94***		31.94***		24.71***		24.71***		29.54***		29.54***	

* $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$

Table 2.5. Gender-Separated Models: Multinomial Logistic Regression of Early Union Formation on Property Crime, Women (n=5,834)

	Model 1, Early Union to No Union		Model 1, Early Union to Later Union		Model 2, Early Union to No Union		Model 2, Early Union to Later Union		Model 3, Early Union to No Union		Model 3, Early Union to Later Union	
	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE
Property Crime	0.807	0.084*	0.728	0.049***	1.032	0.114	0.867	0.062*	1.081	0.123	0.892	0.066
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics												
Race/Ethnicity (Non-Hispanic White)												
Non-Hispanic Black	4.915	0.639***	2.116	0.194***	4.761	0.630***	2.025	0.189***	6.982	0.970***	2.562	0.248***
Hispanic	2.348	0.349***	1.332	0.123**	2.370	0.355***	1.321	0.123**	2.030	0.315***	1.175	0.114
Asian/Other	2.713	0.389***	1.160	0.117	2.737	0.398***	1.158	0.118	2.629	0.397***	1.126	0.119
Education (BA Degree)												
Less than HS	0.043	0.015***	0.090	0.021***	0.058	0.021***	0.110	0.026***	0.085	0.032***	0.147	0.035***
HS Degree/GED	0.061	0.017***	0.141	0.029***	0.070	0.020***	0.158	0.032***	0.087	0.025***	0.182	0.038***
Some College	0.184	0.041***	0.247	0.046***	0.204	0.046***	0.265	0.050***	0.242	0.056***	0.296	0.057***
AA/Vocational Degree	0.805	0.248	0.687	0.182	0.859	0.267	0.714	0.190	1.039	0.333	0.816	0.223
Graduate Degree	0.766	0.238	0.646	0.171	0.767	0.239	0.642	0.171	0.813	0.262	0.667	0.182
Household Income	0.952	0.018*	1.081	0.014***	0.939	0.019**	1.073	0.014***	0.944	0.020**	1.077	0.015***
Family Structure at Wave I (Two Parent)												
Single Parent	0.589	0.072***	0.737	0.058***	0.641	0.079***	0.786	0.063**	0.696	0.089**	0.834	0.069*
Stepparent	0.396	0.060***	0.546	0.047***	0.446	0.069***	0.592	0.052***	0.512	0.081***	0.653	0.059***
Other	0.243	0.058***	0.387	0.050***	0.272	0.065***	0.423	0.055***	0.301	0.074***	0.450	0.060***
Religiosity (Not at all Important)												
Somewhat Important	0.816	0.302	0.885	0.209	0.850	0.319	0.896	0.213	0.883	0.341	0.908	0.220
Very Important	0.658	0.214	0.872	0.184	0.626	0.207	0.834	0.177	0.658	0.223	0.845	0.184
More Important Than Anything Else	0.896	0.291	1.081	0.226	0.747	0.247	0.941	0.199	0.657	0.222	0.851	0.184
Household SES at Wave I	1.128	0.022***	1.078	0.014***	1.126	0.023***	1.076	0.014***	1.104	0.023***	1.063	0.015***
Other Controls												
Number of Times Incarcerated (Never)												
Once					0.481	0.128**	0.697	0.094**	0.542	0.147*	0.732	0.102*
More Than Once					0.247	0.131**	0.679	0.144	0.302	0.162*	0.743	0.161
Victimization					0.741	0.094*	0.795	0.062**	0.774	0.101*	0.814	0.066*
Neighborhood Disadvantage					1.013	0.051	0.962	0.032	1.010	0.052	0.958	0.033
Substance Use (No Substance Use)												
Alcohol or Tobacco					0.584	0.067***	0.664	0.053***	0.815	0.098	0.834	0.070*
Marijuana					0.359	0.056***	0.538	0.052***	0.686	0.113*	0.827	0.085
Other Substances					0.406	0.090***	0.491	0.063***	0.879	0.203	0.806	0.109
Low Self-Control					0.993	0.007	0.992	0.004	0.995	0.007	0.994	0.005
Study 1 Variables												
Age at First Sex									1.495	0.033***	1.331	0.022***
Number of Opposite-Sex Partners									1.011	0.003***	1.008	0.003**
Intercept	1.352	0.594	2.554	0.794**	3.514	1.930*	5.765	2.127***	0.002	0.001***	0.032	0.016***
F	24.12***		24.12***		17.79***		17.79***		20.55***		20.55***	

* $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$.

Table 2.6. Gender-Separated Models: Multinomial Logistic Regression of Early Union Formation on Property Crime, Men (n=4,603)

	Model 1, Early Union to No Union		Model 1, Early Union to Later Union		Model 2, Early Union to No Union		Model 2, Early Union to Later Union		Model 3, Early Union to No Union		Model 3, Early Union to Later Union	
	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE
Property Crime	1.234	0.120*	0.979	0.070	1.510	0.157***	1.077	0.082	1.482	0.158***	1.054	0.082
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics												
Race/Ethnicity (Non-Hispanic White)												
Non-Hispanic Black	2.042	0.281***	1.193	0.127	2.098	0.297***	1.221	0.133	3.069	0.455***	1.556	0.176***
Hispanic	2.114	0.310***	1.509	0.162***	2.205	0.327***	1.528	0.165***	2.332	0.354***	1.572	0.173***
Asian/Other	1.791	0.261***	1.198	0.135	1.777	0.263***	1.191	0.136	1.675	0.255**	1.150	0.134
Education (BA Degree)												
Less than HS	0.138	0.052***	0.162	0.044***	0.200	0.076***	0.200	0.054***	0.294	0.115**	0.258	0.072***
HS Degree/GED	0.373	0.121**	0.292	0.074***	0.477	0.156*	0.336	0.086***	0.619	0.207	0.393	0.102***
Some College	0.646	0.196	0.441	0.107**	0.752	0.230	0.480	0.117**	0.939	0.294	0.554	0.137*
AA/Vocational Degree	1.829	0.779	1.131	0.407	1.855	0.793	1.131	0.408	2.113	0.922	1.216	0.445
Graduate Degree	1.497	0.620	0.816	0.284	1.486	0.619	0.803	0.280	1.527	0.650	0.808	0.287
Household Income	0.977	0.021	1.051	0.017**	0.963	0.021	1.038	0.017*	0.971	0.022	1.044	0.017*
Family Structure at Wave I (Two Parent)												
Single Parent	0.876	0.108	0.877	0.080	0.944	0.118	0.904	0.084	1.020	0.131	0.952	0.090
Stepparent	0.512	0.078***	0.799	0.079*	0.565	0.087***	0.832	0.083	0.648	0.102**	0.906	0.092
Other	0.380	0.098***	0.535	0.085***	0.428	0.112**	0.554	0.089***	0.533	0.141*	0.636	0.104**
Religiosity (Not at all Important)												
Somewhat Important	1.270	0.432	0.934	0.223	1.235	0.427	0.925	0.224	1.261	0.450	0.934	0.233
Very Important	1.204	0.337	1.273	0.252	1.120	0.318	1.245	0.250	1.115	0.324	1.245	0.259
More Important Than Anything Else	1.327	0.381	1.155	0.237	1.129	0.331	1.085	0.226	1.029	0.308	1.027	0.223
Household SES at Wave I	1.135	0.024***	1.074	0.017***	1.136	0.024***	1.074	0.017***	1.124	0.024***	1.062	0.017***
Other Controls												
Number of Times Incarcerated (Never)												
Once					0.683	0.105*	0.671	0.072***	0.824	0.130	0.752	0.082**
More Than Once					0.458	0.082***	0.624	0.069***	0.567	0.104**	0.710	0.081**
Victimization					0.862	0.100	0.890	0.073	0.946	0.112	0.941	0.080
Neighborhood Disadvantage					0.997	0.056	0.960	0.035	0.983	0.055	0.950	0.036
Substance Use (No Substance Use)												
Alcohol or Tobacco					0.651	0.078***	0.804	0.075*	0.779	0.096*	0.909	0.087
Marijuana					0.448	0.069***	0.788	0.087*	0.673	0.107*	1.027	0.118
Other Substances					0.450	0.092***	0.694	0.099*	0.708	0.150	0.927	0.137
Low Self-Control					1.000	0.007	1.001	0.005	1.000	0.007	1.002	0.005
Study 1 Variables												
Age at First Sex									1.344	0.029***	1.239	0.021***
Number of Opposite-Sex Partners									1.000	0.002	1.002	0.001
Intercept	0.353	0.169*	1.804	0.644	0.591	0.347	2.344	0.981*	0.002	0.002***	0.046	0.024***
F	11.26***		11.26***		8.90***		8.90***		11.19***		11.19***	

* $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$.

Table 2.7. Pooled Models: Multinomial Logistic Regression of Early Union Formation on Violent Crime (n=10,437)

	Model 1, Earlier Union to No Union		Model 1, Earlier Union to Later Union		Model 2, Earlier Union to No Union		Model 2, Earlier Union to Later Union		Model 3, Earlier Union to No Union		Model 3, Earlier Union to Later Union	
	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE
Violent Crime	0.693	0.051***	0.684	0.034***	0.840	0.064*	0.772	0.040***	1.021	0.080	0.871	0.047*
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics												
Female	0.463	0.033***	0.654	0.032***	0.426	0.031***	0.620	0.032***	0.469	0.035***	0.666	0.035***
Race/Ethnicity (Non-Hispanic White)												
Non-Hispanic Black	3.438	0.324***	1.747	0.122***	3.339	0.321***	1.687	0.120***	4.742	0.476***	2.093	0.154***
Hispanic	2.202	0.227***	1.406	0.098***	2.251	0.234***	1.407	0.098***	2.143	0.229***	1.336	0.096***
Asian/Other	2.197	0.223***	1.189	0.089*	2.189	0.225***	1.183	0.090*	2.070	0.220***	1.136	0.089
Education (BA Degree)												
Less than HS	0.066	0.017***	0.115	0.020***	0.085	0.022***	0.133	0.023***	0.120	0.031***	0.170	0.031***
HS Degree/GED	0.136	0.027***	0.185	0.029***	0.155	0.032***	0.203	0.032***	0.190	0.040***	0.230	0.037***
Some College	0.289	0.052***	0.299	0.044***	0.315	0.056***	0.316	0.047***	0.371	0.068***	0.352	0.053***
AA/Vocational Degree	1.024	0.255	0.789	0.168	1.058	0.265	0.804	0.172	1.220	0.313	0.885	0.193
Graduate Degree	0.936	0.231	0.687	0.145	0.929	0.231	0.679	0.144	0.949	0.242	0.688	0.148
Household Income	0.962	0.014**	1.065	0.011***	0.952	0.014**	1.057	0.011***	0.959	0.014**	1.062	0.011***
Family Structure at Wave I (Two-Parent)												
Single Parent	0.727	0.063***	0.800	0.048***	0.785	0.068**	0.841	0.051**	0.856	0.077	0.893	0.055
Stepparent	0.450	0.048***	0.649	0.042***	0.495	0.054***	0.688	0.045***	0.571	0.063***	0.755	0.051***
Other	0.292	0.051***	0.435	0.043***	0.327	0.057***	0.464	0.047***	0.390	0.070***	0.513	0.053***
Religiosity (Not at all Important)												
Somewhat Important	1.044	0.262	0.910	0.150	1.038	0.264	0.911	0.152	1.061	0.277	0.919	0.157
Very Important	0.918	0.193	1.059	0.151	0.854	0.181	1.020	0.147	0.847	0.184	1.015	0.151
More Important Than Anything Else	1.124	0.240	1.148	0.164	0.943	0.204	1.037	0.150	0.819	0.181	0.948	0.141
Household SES at Wave I	1.128	0.016***	1.071	0.011***	1.132	0.016***	1.072	0.011***	1.116	0.017***	1.061	0.011***
Other Controls												
Number of Times Incarcerated (Never)												
Once					0.655	0.086**	0.706	0.059***	0.767	0.103*	0.769	0.066**
More Than Once					0.471	0.078***	0.703	0.068***	0.553	0.094**	0.777	0.078*
Victimization					0.811	0.069*	0.848	0.048**	0.857	0.074	0.877	0.051*
Neighborhood Disadvantage					1.006	0.035	0.963	0.024	0.998	0.036	0.957	0.024
Substance Use (No Substance Use)												
Alcohol or Tobacco					0.630	0.052***	0.723	0.044***	0.808	0.069*	0.860	0.054*
Marijuana					0.425	0.046***	0.653	0.047***	0.699	0.079**	0.918	0.070
Other Substances					0.452	0.067***	0.586	0.055***	0.803	0.123	0.857	0.084
Low Self-Control					1.000	0.005	0.997	0.003	1.000	0.005	0.998	0.003
Study 1 Dependent Variables												
Age at First Sex									1.417	0.022***	1.282	0.015***
Number of Opposite-Sex Partners									1.004	0.002*	1.003	0.001*
Intercept	1.444	0.460	3.238	0.759***	2.633	1.021*	5.588	1.530***	0.004	0.002***	0.059	0.021***
F	34.12***		34.12***		25.49***		25.49***		30.35***		30.35***	

* $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$

Table 2.8. Pooled Models: Multinomial Logistic Regression of Early Union Formation on Violent Crime with Interaction Term (n=10,437)

	Model 1, Earlier Union to No Union		Model 1, Earlier Union to Later Union		Model 2, Earlier Union to No Union		Model 2, Earlier Union to Later Union		Model 3, Earlier Union to No Union		Model 3, Earlier Union to Later Union	
	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE
Violent Crime	0.706	0.069***	0.729	0.052***	0.889	0.090	0.844	0.062*	1.140	0.120	0.989	0.075
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics												
Female	0.470	0.041***	0.687	0.042***	0.444	0.039***	0.660	0.042***	0.509	0.046***	0.730	0.047***
Race/Ethnicity (Non-Hispanic White)												
Non-Hispanic Black	3.438	0.324***	1.751	0.122***	3.347	0.322***	1.694	0.121***	4.769	0.479***	2.108	0.155***
Hispanic	2.202	0.227***	1.405	0.098***	2.250	0.234***	1.406	0.098***	2.142	0.229***	1.335	0.096***
Asian/Other	2.198	0.223***	1.190	0.089*	2.192	0.225***	1.186	0.090*	2.076	0.220***	1.140	0.089
Education (BA Degree)												
Less than HS	0.067	0.017***	0.115	0.020***	0.085	0.022***	0.134	0.024***	0.121	0.032***	0.171	0.031***
HS Degree/GED	0.136	0.028***	0.186	0.030***	0.156	0.032***	0.204	0.033***	0.192	0.040***	0.232	0.038***
Some College	0.289	0.052***	0.300	0.045***	0.316	0.057***	0.317	0.047***	0.373	0.069***	0.354	0.054***
AA/Vocational Degree	1.025	0.255	0.790	0.168	1.061	0.266	0.806	0.172	1.224	0.314	0.889	0.194
Graduate Degree	0.937	0.232	0.688	0.145	0.931	0.231	0.681	0.144	0.952	0.243	0.690	0.149
Household Income	0.962	0.014**	1.065	0.011***	0.952	0.014**	1.057	0.011***	0.959	0.014**	1.061	0.011***
Family Structure at Wave I (Two-Parent)												
Single Parent	0.728	0.063***	0.801	0.048***	0.785	0.069**	0.842	0.051**	0.858	0.077	0.894	0.055
Stepparent	0.450	0.048***	0.649	0.042***	0.496	0.054***	0.689	0.045***	0.572	0.063***	0.757	0.051***
Other	0.292	0.051***	0.435	0.043***	0.328	0.058***	0.464	0.047***	0.391	0.070***	0.513	0.053***
Religiosity (Not at all Important)												
Somewhat Important	1.044	0.262	0.910	0.151	1.039	0.264	0.911	0.152	1.061	0.277	0.919	0.157
Very Important	0.917	0.193	1.057	0.151	0.853	0.181	1.017	0.146	0.842	0.183	1.009	0.150
More Important Than Anything Else	1.123	0.240	1.146	0.164	0.941	0.204	1.034	0.149	0.815	0.180	0.943	0.140
Household SES at Wave I	1.128	0.016***	1.070	0.011***	1.132	0.016***	1.072	0.011***	1.116	0.017***	1.060	0.011***
Other Controls												
Number of Times Incarcerated (Never)												
Once					0.655	0.086**	0.705	0.059***	0.765	0.102*	0.767	0.066**
More Than Once					0.467	0.078***	0.694	0.067***	0.545	0.093***	0.763	0.077**
Victimization					0.810	0.069*	0.846	0.048**	0.855	0.074	0.875	0.051*
Neighborhood Disadvantage					1.006	0.035	0.963	0.024	0.998	0.036	0.957	0.024
Substance Use (No Substance Use)												
Alcohol or Tobacco					0.630	0.052***	0.722	0.044***	0.808	0.069*	0.859	0.054*
Marijuana					0.424	0.046***	0.651	0.047***	0.697	0.079**	0.915	0.069
Other Substances					0.453	0.067***	0.587	0.055***	0.806	0.124	0.860	0.085
Low Self-Control					1.000	0.005	0.997	0.003	1.001	0.005	0.998	0.003
Study 1 Dependent Variables												
Age at First Sex									1.418	0.022***	1.284	0.015***
Number of Opposite-Sex Partners									1.004	0.002*	1.003	0.001*
Violent Crime x Female	0.982	0.143	0.880	0.087	0.908	0.134	0.842	0.084	0.814	0.123	0.785	0.080*
Intercept	1.425	0.456	3.142	0.740***	2.548	0.992*	5.340	1.468***	0.004	0.002***	0.055	0.019***
F	32.45***		32.45***		24.65***		24.65***		29.43***		29.43***	

* $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$

Table 2.9. Gender-Separated Models: Multinomial Logistic Regression of Early Union Formation on Violent Crime, Women (n=5,834)

	Model 1, Early Union to No Union		Model 1, Early Union to Later Union		Model 2, Early Union to No Union		Model 2, Early Union to Later Union		Model 3, Early Union to No Union		Model 3, Early Union to Later Union	
	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE
Violent Crime	0.684	0.077**	0.639	0.045***	0.843	0.098	0.736	0.054***	0.966	0.116	0.799	0.060**
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics												
Race/Ethnicity (Non-Hispanic White)												
Non-Hispanic Black	5.143	0.673***	2.222	0.206***	4.923	0.656***	2.106	0.199***	7.105	0.992***	2.628	0.256***
Hispanic	2.345	0.349***	1.322	0.122**	2.393	0.358***	1.322	0.123**	2.047	0.317***	1.176	0.114
Asian/Other	2.740	0.393***	1.164	0.117	2.793	0.406***	1.170	0.119	2.670	0.402***	1.133	0.120
Education (BA Degree)												
Less than HS	0.046	0.017***	0.098	0.023***	0.060	0.022***	0.116	0.027***	0.086	0.032***	0.153	0.037***
HS Degree/GED	0.063	0.018***	0.147	0.030***	0.072	0.020***	0.163	0.034***	0.088	0.026***	0.186	0.039***
Some College	0.188	0.042***	0.252	0.047***	0.207	0.047***	0.269	0.051***	0.244	0.056***	0.300	0.058***
AA/Vocational Degree	0.800	0.247	0.679	0.180	0.862	0.268	0.713	0.189	1.044	0.335	0.814	0.222
Graduate Degree	0.768	0.238	0.646	0.171	0.772	0.241	0.644	0.172	0.817	0.263	0.668	0.182
Household Income	0.950	0.018**	1.079	0.014***	0.938	0.019**	1.072	0.014***	0.944	0.020**	1.076	0.015***
Family Structure at Wave I (Two Parent)												
Single Parent	0.590	0.072***	0.737	0.058***	0.641	0.079***	0.786	0.063**	0.698	0.089**	0.834	0.069*
Stepparent	0.398	0.061***	0.548	0.047***	0.444	0.068***	0.593	0.052***	0.511	0.081***	0.653	0.059***
Other	0.240	0.057***	0.382	0.049***	0.270	0.065***	0.418	0.055***	0.301	0.074***	0.447	0.060***
Religiosity (Not at all Important)												
Somewhat Important	0.794	0.294	0.861	0.204	0.844	0.317	0.882	0.211	0.880	0.339	0.896	0.217
Very Important	0.651	0.212	0.869	0.183	0.621	0.205	0.829	0.177	0.651	0.220	0.840	0.183
More Important Than Anything Else	0.886	0.288	1.082	0.227	0.737	0.244	0.938	0.199	0.646	0.218	0.848	0.183
Household SES at Wave I	1.122	0.022***	1.071	0.014***	1.125	0.023***	1.073	0.014***	1.105	0.023***	1.060	0.015***
Other Controls												
Number of Times Incarcerated (Never)												
Once					0.493	0.131**	0.719	0.098*	0.546	0.149*	0.748	0.104*
More Than Once					0.256	0.136*	0.717	0.152	0.304	0.164*	0.772	0.167
Victimization					0.744	0.094*	0.800	0.063**	0.772	0.100*	0.817	0.066*
Neighborhood Disadvantage					1.014	0.050	0.963	0.032	1.012	0.052	0.959	0.033
Substance Use (No Substance Use)												
Alcohol or Tobacco					0.592	0.068***	0.668	0.053***	0.824	0.099	0.836	0.070*
Marijuana					0.367	0.057***	0.540	0.052***	0.699	0.115*	0.826	0.084
Other Substances					0.424	0.093***	0.499	0.064***	0.905	0.208	0.810	0.109
Low Self-Control					0.995	0.007	0.993	0.004	0.997	0.007	0.995	0.005
Study 1 Variables												
Age at First Sex									1.493	0.033***	1.328	0.022***
Number of Opposite-Sex Partners									1.011	0.003***	1.008	0.003**
Intercept	1.432	0.630	2.667	0.832**	3.339	1.827*	5.723	2.112***	0.002	0.001***	0.034	0.016***
F	24.49***		24.49***		17.95***		17.95***		20.61***		20.61***	

* $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$.

Table 2.10. Gender-Separated Models: Multinomial Logistic Regression of Early Union Formation on Violent Crime, Men (4,603)

	Model 1, Early Union to No Union		Model 1, Early Union to Later Union		Model 2, Early Union to No Union		Model 2, Early Union to Later Union		Model 3, Early Union to No Union		Model 3, Early Union to Later Union	
	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE
Violent Crime	0.700	0.069***	0.724	0.052***	0.826	0.085	0.785	0.059**	1.054	0.112	0.915	0.071
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics												
Race/Ethnicity (Non-Hispanic White)												
Non-Hispanic Black	2.064	0.284***	1.233	0.132*	2.078	0.294***	1.249	0.137*	2.981	0.441***	1.562	0.177***
Hispanic	2.153	0.316***	1.540	0.165***	2.225	0.330***	1.558	0.169***	2.318	0.351***	1.584	0.174***
Asian/Other	1.834	0.268***	1.221	0.138	1.813	0.268***	1.213	0.139	1.687	0.256**	1.156	0.135
Education (BA Degree)												
Less than HS	0.157	0.059***	0.178	0.048***	0.200	0.077***	0.206	0.056***	0.286	0.112**	0.259	0.072***
HS Degree/GED	0.400	0.130**	0.311	0.079***	0.468	0.153*	0.340	0.087***	0.593	0.199	0.392	0.102***
Some College	0.689	0.209	0.463	0.112**	0.758	0.232	0.488	0.119**	0.928	0.290	0.554	0.137*
AA/Vocational Degree	1.873	0.799	1.145	0.413	1.875	0.802	1.137	0.411	2.128	0.928	1.217	0.445
Graduate Degree	1.514	0.628	0.819	0.286	1.495	0.622	0.803	0.281	1.532	0.652	0.809	0.287
Household Income	0.971	0.021	1.048	0.017**	0.960	0.021	1.037	0.017*	0.969	0.022	1.043	0.017*
Family Structure at Wave I (Two Parent)												
Single Parent	0.891	0.110	0.881	0.081	0.949	0.118	0.902	0.084	1.029	0.132	0.950	0.090
Stepparent	0.518	0.079***	0.800	0.079*	0.563	0.087***	0.826	0.082	0.649	0.102**	0.903	0.092
Other	0.374	0.097***	0.529	0.085***	0.412	0.107**	0.541	0.087***	0.523	0.138*	0.628	0.103**
Religiosity (Not at all Important)												
Somewhat Important	1.235	0.423	0.930	0.223	1.193	0.415	0.918	0.222	1.219	0.436	0.932	0.233
Very Important	1.207	0.338	1.291	0.256	1.132	0.322	1.269	0.256	1.104	0.321	1.257	0.262
More Important Than Anything Else	1.274	0.367	1.152	0.237	1.110	0.326	1.097	0.230	0.995	0.298	1.033	0.224
Household SES at Wave I	1.140	0.024***	1.075	0.017***	1.142	0.024***	1.075	0.017***	1.131	0.024***	1.063	0.017***
Other Controls												
Number of Times Incarcerated (Never)												
Once					0.706	0.108*	0.688	0.074***	0.834	0.131	0.758	0.083*
More Than Once					0.495	0.089***	0.654	0.073***	0.589	0.108**	0.723	0.083**
Victimization					0.880	0.102	0.910	0.075	0.947	0.112	0.948	0.080
Neighborhood Disadvantage					0.999	0.056	0.959	0.035	0.986	0.055	0.950	0.036
Substance Use (No Substance Use)												
Alcohol or Tobacco					0.689	0.083**	0.832	0.078*	0.803	0.099	0.919	0.089
Marijuana					0.510	0.078***	0.843	0.093	0.726	0.115*	1.055	0.121
Other Substances					0.518	0.106**	0.750	0.108*	0.770	0.163	0.956	0.141
Low Self-Control					1.007	0.007	1.004	0.005	1.005	0.007	1.003	0.005
Study 1 Variables												
Age at First Sex									1.347	0.029***	1.236	0.021***
Number of Opposite-Sex Partners									1.000	0.002	1.002	0.001
Intercept	0.451	0.215	1.997	0.711	0.529	0.310	2.196	0.923	0.002	0.002***	0.047	0.025***
F	11.58***		11.58***		8.77***		8.77***		11.01***		11.01***	

* $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$.

Table 3.1. Study 3 Weighted Descriptive Statistics

	Women (n=5,834)	Men (n=4,603)
Property Crime		
Engaged	28.71%	47.79%
Never Engaged	71.29%	52.21%
Violent Crime		
Engaged	24.87%	45.89%
Never Engaged	75.13%	54.11%
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics		
Age	28.191 (0.118)	28.364 (0.122)
Race/Ethnicity		
Non-Hispanic White	67.33%	67.26%
Non-Hispanic Black	14.53%	13.00%
Hispanic	10.31%	11.07%
Asian/Other	7.83%	8.67%
Education		
Less than HS	6.59%	8.74%
HS Degree/GED	13.53%	19.65%
Some College	65.36%	62.15%
AA/Vocational Degree	4.52%	3.39%
College Degree	5.91%	3.39%
Graduate Degree	4.09%	2.68%
Household Income		
Less than $5,000	2.83%	1.75%
$5,000-$9,999	2.67%	1.71%
$10,000-$14,999	3.86%	2.69%
$15,000-$19,999	3.31%	3.04%
$20,000-$24,999	5.08%	4.18%
$25,000-$29,999	5.09%	4.95%
$30,000-$39,999	11.27%	10.49%
$40,000-$49,999	11.76%	12.54%
$50,000-$74,999	24.65%	25.28%
$75,000-$99,999	14.74%	16.82%
$100,000-$149,999	10.02%	11.10%
$150,000 or more	4.73%	5.44%
Family Structure at Wave I		
Single Parent	22.29%	21.28%
Stepparent	15.22%	14.70%
Two-Parent	56.82%	58.36%
Other	5.67%	5.66%
Religiosity		
Not at all Important	2.82%	4.32%
Somewhat Important	7.42%	8.44%
Very Important	40.75%	45.12%
More Important Than Anything Else	49.01%	42.12%

Household SES at Wave I (Range 1-10)	5.482 (0.124)	5.694 (0.126)
Other Controls		
Number of Times Incarcerated		
Never Incarcerated	92.70%	76.16%
Incarcerated Once	5.20%	12.36%
Incarcerated More Than Once	2.10%	11.48%
Victimization		
Ever Victimized	18.49%	24.19%
Never Victimized	81.51%	75.81%
Neighborhood Disadvantage	-0.096 (0.024)	-0.092 (0.029)
Substance Use		
No Substance Use	28.06%	25.77%
Alcohol or Tobacco Use	43.00%	43.66%
Marijuana Use	19.43%	21.22%
Use of Other Substances	9.51%	9.35%
Low Self-Control	47.086 (0.204)	46.523 (0.209)
Study 1 Dependent Variables		
Age at First Sex	16.615 (0.075)	16.730 (0.082)
Number of Opposite-Sex Partners	9.503 (0.260)	15.277 (0.538)
Study 2 Dependent Variable		
Early Union Formation		
No Unions	10.39%	15.11%
Later Union Formation	51.53%	52.54%
Early Union Formation	38.08%	32.35%
Study 3 Dependent Variable		
Multiple-Partner Fertility (MPF)		
No Fertility	80.92%	86.60%
Single-Partner Fertility (SPF)	14.48%	10.10%
Multiple-Partner Fertility (MPF)	4.60%	3.30%

Table 3.2. Bivariate Analyses of Multiple-Partner Fertility (MPF) on Property and Violent Crime

	Women		Men	
	Proportion	SE	Proportion	SE
Property Crime Trajectory				
No Fertility				
Engaged	77.28%[c]	0.010	84.89%[b]	0.008
Never Engaged	79.91%	0.006	87.74%	0.007
Single-Partner Fertility (SPF)				
Engaged	16.20%[c]	0.009	11.59%[a]	0.007
Never Engaged	15.40%	0.006	9.08%	0.006
Multiple-Partner Fertility (MPF)				
Engaged	6.52%[a,b]	0.006	3.52%	0.004
Never Engaged	4.69%	0.003	3.18%	0.004
Violent Crime				
No Fertility				
Engaged	73.36%[b,c]	0.012	82.97%[b,c]	0.008
Never Engaged	81.06%	0.006	89.25%	0.006
Single-Partner Fertility (SPF)				
Engaged	18.61%[a,c]	0.010	12.09%[a,c]	0.007
Never Engaged	14.64%	0.005	8.74%	0.006
Multiple-Partner Fertility (MPF)				
Engaged	8.03%[a,b]	0.007	4.94%[a,b]	0.005
Never Engaged	4.30%	0.003	2.00%	0.003

Superscripts indicate significant differences across categories at $p \leq .05$. a) different from no fertility, b) different from SPF, c) different from MPF

Table 3.3. Pooled Models: Multinomial Logistic Regression of Multiple-Partner Fertility (MPF) on Property Crime (n=10,437)

	Model 1, MPF to no fertility		Model 1, MPF to SPF		Model 2, MPF to no fertility		Model 2, MPF to SPF		Model 3, MPF to no fertility		Model 3, MPF to SPF	
	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE
Property Crime	0.722	0.076**	0.858	0.098	0.994	0.112	0.959	0.117	1.016	0.118	0.961	0.119
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics												
Female	0.584	0.063***	1.002	0.120	0.499	0.059***	0.911	0.117	0.374	0.047***	0.793	0.107
Age	0.899	0.026***	0.934	0.030*	0.941	0.029*	0.946	0.032	0.915	0.029**	0.943	0.032
Race/Ethnicity (Non-Hispanic White)												
Non-Hispanic Black	0.159	0.021***	0.591	0.084***	0.143	0.019***	0.566	0.082***	0.183	0.026***	0.592	0.088***
Hispanic	0.571	0.096**	0.790	0.146	0.548	0.092***	0.779	0.145	0.534	0.093***	0.785	0.148
Asian/Other	0.535	0.094***	0.836	0.162	0.512	0.091***	0.823	0.160	0.465	0.085***	0.779	0.153
Education (BA Degree)												
Less than HS	0.440	0.141*	1.263	0.454	0.693	0.225	1.469	0.534	0.586	0.200	1.286	0.480
HS Degree/GED	0.727	0.219	1.659	0.563	0.974	0.297	1.835	0.628	0.844	0.270	1.670	0.588
Some College	0.643	0.174	1.291	0.398	0.766	0.209	1.379	0.428	0.702	0.202	1.270	0.406
AA/Vocational Degree	1.706	0.794	2.771	1.392*	1.859	0.869	2.837	1.428*	1.731	0.826	2.629	1.337
Graduate Degree	1.430	0.665	1.549	0.800	1.449	0.678	1.569	0.811	1.261	0.604	1.421	0.743
Household Income	1.150	0.023***	1.067	0.023**	1.127	0.023***	1.058	0.023**	1.138	0.023***	1.062	0.023**
Family Structure at Wave I (Two-Parent)												
Single Parent	0.660	0.082**	0.823	0.113	0.724	0.091*	0.852	0.117	0.754	0.097*	0.855	0.118
Stepparent	0.686	0.103*	1.002	0.162	0.779	0.118	1.050	0.171	0.817	0.127	1.055	0.174
Other	0.542	0.098**	0.627	0.127*	0.604	0.110**	0.652	0.132*	0.649	0.123*	0.673	0.139
Religiosity (Not at all Important)												
Somewhat Important	1.008	0.402	0.855	0.366	1.020	0.413	0.866	0.374	1.044	0.439	0.890	0.388
Very Important	1.283	0.426	1.200	0.435	1.177	0.396	1.167	0.427	1.127	0.388	1.175	0.431
More Important Than Anything Else	1.612	0.534	1.271	0.463	1.284	0.432	1.169	0.432	1.170	0.403	1.177	0.437
Household SES at Wave I	0.993	0.021	1.008	0.023	0.992	0.021	1.007	0.023	1.008	0.022	1.018	0.024
Other Controls												
Number of Times Incarcerated (Never)												
Once					0.448	0.068***	0.726	0.120	0.540	0.086***	0.789	0.134
More Than Once					0.395	0.068***	0.673	0.127*	0.536	0.097**	0.738	0.142
Victimization					0.820	0.094	0.981	0.122	0.894	0.106	1.009	0.127
Neighborhood Disadvantage					1.070	0.048	1.043	0.051	1.065	0.051	1.042	0.051
Substance Use (No Substance Use)												
Alcohol or Tobacco					0.662	0.097**	0.884	0.140	0.770	0.116	0.904	0.146
Marijuana					0.441	0.072***	0.737	0.130	0.631	0.108**	0.796	0.145
Other Substances					0.401	0.086***	0.719	0.168	0.643	0.146	0.807	0.196
Low Self-Control					0.982	0.008*	0.996	0.008	0.983	0.008*	0.996	0.008
Study 1 Dependent Variables												
Age at First Sex									1.248	0.032***	1.062	0.029*
Number of Opposite-Sex Partners									0.978	0.002***	0.994	0.002***
Study 2 Dependent Variable												
Early Union Formation									1.785	0.147***	1.194	0.105*
Intercept	6.358	0.983***	2.503	1.079*	6.714	1.079***	2.678	1.181*	3.368	1.163**	1.767	1.252
F	23.32***		23.32***		18.44***		18.44***		20.28***		20.28***	

* $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$ Note: Intercepts presented as coefficients.

Table 3.4. Pooled Models: Multinomial Logistic Regression of Multiple Partner Fertility (MPF) on Violent Crime

	Model 1, MPF to No Fertility		Model 1, MPF to SPF		Model 2, MPF to No Fertility		Model 2, MPF to SPF		Model 3, MPF to No Fertility		Model 3, MPF to SPF	
	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE	RRR	SE
Violent Crime	0.579	0.061***	0.690	0.080**	0.780	0.088*	0.760	0.093*	0.855	0.099	0.768	0.095*
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics												
Female	0.546	0.060***	0.946	0.115	0.476	0.057***	0.871	0.113	0.360	0.046***	0.751	0.102*
Age	0.891	0.026***	0.926	0.030*	0.931	0.029*	0.936	0.032	0.908	0.029**	0.934	0.032*
Race/Ethnicity (Non-Hispanic White)												
Non-Hispanic Black	0.170	0.022***	0.619	0.088**	0.149	0.020***	0.591	0.087***	0.188	0.026***	0.614	0.092**
Hispanic	0.578	0.097**	0.800	0.148	0.558	0.094**	0.794	0.147	0.542	0.094***	0.799	0.151
Asian/Other	0.549	0.097**	0.857	0.166	0.527	0.094***	0.846	0.165	0.474	0.086***	0.800	0.158
Education (BA Degree)												
Less than HS	0.507	0.163*	1.407	0.508	0.729	0.237	1.554	0.566	0.601	0.205	1.340	0.501
HS Degree/GED	0.796	0.240	1.775	0.605	1.008	0.308	1.906	0.653	0.856	0.274	1.713	0.603
Some College	0.683	0.185	1.356	0.419	0.787	0.215	1.420	0.441	0.712	0.205	1.298	0.415
AA/Vocational Degree	1.679	0.781	2.745	1.379*	1.841	0.860	2.808	1.413*	1.714	0.817	2.595	1.319
Graduate Degree	1.465	0.682	1.585	0.818	1.472	0.689	1.595	0.825	1.271	0.608	1.432	0.749
Household Income	1.146	0.023***	1.065	0.023**	1.126	0.023***	1.057	0.023*	1.137	0.023***	1.060	0.023**
Family Structure at Wave I (Two-Parent)												
Single Parent	0.666	0.083**	0.831	0.114	0.727	0.092*	0.856	0.118	0.756	0.097*	0.858	0.119
Stepparent	0.692	0.104*	1.011	0.164	0.778	0.118	1.048	0.171	0.815	0.127	1.052	0.174
Other	0.545	0.098**	0.631	0.128*	0.603	0.110**	0.651	0.132*	0.647	0.123*	0.669	0.138
Religiosity (Not at all Important)												
Somewhat Important	0.996	0.397	0.845	0.363	1.011	0.410	0.858	0.371	1.035	0.436	0.880	0.385
Very Important	1.300	0.433	1.202	0.437	1.185	0.399	1.176	0.431	1.128	0.389	1.179	0.433
More Important Than Anything Else	1.621	0.539	1.258	0.460	1.286	0.434	1.173	0.435	1.167	0.403	1.178	0.439
Household SES at Wave I	0.986	0.021	1.003	0.023	0.990	0.021	1.005	0.023	1.007	0.022	1.016	0.024
Other Controls												
Number of Times Incarcerated (Never)												
Once					0.460	0.070***	0.746	0.124	0.549	0.088***	0.810	0.138
More Than Once					0.410	0.071***	0.700	0.132	0.548	0.100**	0.762	0.147
Victimization					0.828	0.095	0.991	0.123	0.896	0.106	1.015	0.128
Neighborhood Disadvantage					1.070	0.048	1.042	0.051	1.065	0.051	1.042	0.051
Substance Use (No Substance Use)												
Alcohol or Tobacco					0.679	0.100**	0.906	0.144	0.780	0.118	0.920	0.148
Marijuana					0.464	0.075***	0.774	0.136	0.651	0.111*	0.824	0.149
Other Substances					0.431	0.093***	0.769	0.180	0.672	0.151	0.849	0.204
Low Self-Control					0.984	0.008*	0.997	0.008	0.985	0.008*	0.997	0.008
Study 1 Dependent Variables												
Age at First Sex									1.245	0.032***	1.058	0.029*
Number of Opposite-Sex Partners									0.978	0.002***	0.994	0.002***
Study 2 Dependent Variable												
Early Union Formation									1.792	0.148***	1.202	0.106*
Intercept	6.712	0.988***	2.843	1.084**	6.989	1.083***	2.948	1.186*	3.600	1.170**	2.086	1.260
F	23.63***		23.63***		18.54***		18.54***		20.37***		20.37***	

* $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ *** $p \leq 0.001$ Note: Constants are presented as coefficients.

APPENDIX B. VARIABLE TABLE

Construct	Indicators and Response Options	Age at First Sex	Number of Opposite-Sex Partners	Relationship Outcomes	Pregnancy Outcomes
Dependent Variables					
Age at First Sex	How old were you the first time you ever had vaginal intercourse?	X		X	X
Number of Opposite-Sex Partners	If male: Considering all types of sexual activity, with how many female partners have you ever had sex? Female: Considering all types of sexual activity, with how many male partners have you ever had sex?		X	X	X
Early Union	In what month [and year] did you being to live with/ marry X? (Early union is one that occurs at or before age 20 for women and at or before age 21 for men)			X	X
Multiple-Partner Fertility (MPF)	With how many persons have you ever had a romantic relationship or sexual encounter that resulted in a pregnancy? (2=2 or more live births with 2 or more different partners, 1=fertility with 1 partner, 0=no fertility)				X
Independent Variables					
	Criminal Involvement				
Violent Crime	In the past 12 months, how often did you: a) hurt someone badly enough to need bandages or care from a doctor or nurse, b) take part in a fight where a group of your friends was against another group, c) use or threaten to use a weapon to get something from someone (1=yes at Wave I or Wave III, 0=no engagement at either wave)	X	X	X	X
Property Crime	In the past 12 months, how often did you: a) deliberately damage property that didn't belong to you, b) steal something worth more than $50, c) steal something worse less than $50, d) go into a house or building to steal something (1=yes at Wave I or Wave III, 0=no engagement at either wave)	X	X	X	X
Controls					
Age	Birth date subtracted from interview date		X		X
Race/Ethnicity	Dummy variables for non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic black, Hispanic, and Asian/other	X	X	X	X
Family Structure	Family structure at Wave I, with the categories: a) two-parent, b) single parent, c) stepparent, d) other	X	X	X	X
Religiosity	How important is religion to you: a) not important, b) somewhat important, c) very important, d) more important than anything else	X	X	X	X
Family Structure at Wave I	Using household roster to develop the following categories: two-parent, single parent, stepparent, and other	X	X	X	X
Household Socioeconomic Status at Wave I	Uses occupation and education of both parents	X	X	X	X
Income	Thinking about your income and the income of everyone who lives in your household and contributes to the household budget, what was the total household income before taxes and deductions in {2006/2007/2008}? Include all sources of income, including non-legal sources. Categories: 1) <$5000, 2) $5000-$9,999, 3) $10,000-$14,999, 4) $15,000-$19,999, 5) $20,000-$24,999, 6) $25,000-$29,999, 7) $30,000-$39,999, 8) $40,000-$49,999, 9) $50,000-$74,999, 10) $75,000-$99,999, 11) $100,000-$149,999, 12) $150,000 or more	X	X	X	X

Victimization	How many times in the last 12 months: a) someone pulled a knife or gun on them, b) someone cut or stabbed them, c) someone shot them, d) they were jumped (0=not experienced victimization, 1=they have experienced any types of victimization)	X	X	X	X
Neighborhood Disadvantage	A standardized alpha scale created from the items, a) the proportion black, b) the proportion of families with own children headed by female householder, no husband present, c) unemployment rate all persons 16 and over, d) unemployment rate males 16 years and over, e) median family income in 1999, f) the proportion of families below the poverty line in 1999, g) proportion 25 years and over without bachelor's degree or more (1-proportion 25 years and over with bachelor's degree or more)	X	X	X	X
Substance Use	Created from the following items: a) Have you ever tried cigarette smoking, even just 1 or 2 puffs? b) During the past 30 days, on how many days did you use chewing tobacco (such as Redman, Levi Garrett, or Beechnut) or snuff (such as Skoal, Skoal Bandits, or Copenhagen)? c) Have you ever had a drink of beer, wine, or liquor—not just a sip or taste of someone else's drink—more than 2 or 3 times in your life? d) How old were you when you first tried marijuana for the first time? If you never tried marijuana, enter "0". e) How old were you when you tried any kind of cocaine—including powder, freebase, or crack cocaine—for the first time? If you never tried cocaine, enter "0". f) How old were you when you first tried any other type of illegal drug, such as LSD, PCP, ecstasy, mushrooms, speed, ice, heroin, or pills, without a doctor's prescription? If you never tried any other type of illegal drug, enter "0". All variables are dichotomized if the respondent has or has not used substances; categories include 1) no substance use, 2) alcohol or tobacco use, 3) marijuana use, 4) other substance use.	X	X	X	X
Self-Control	Sum scale of the following questions: Respondent questions (strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree): a) You never argue with anyone. b) When you get what you want, it's because you worked hard for it. c) You never get sad. d) You never criticize other people. e) You usually go out of your way to avoid having to deal with problems in your life (reverse coded). f) Difficult problems make you very upset (reverse coded). g) When making decisions, you usually go with your "gut feeling" without thinking too much about the consequences of each alternative (reverse coded). h) when you have a problem to solve, one of the first things you do is get as many facts about the problem as possible. i)When you are attempting to find a solution to a problem, you usually try to think of as many different ways to approach the problem as possible. j) When making decisions, you generally use a systematic method for judging and comparing alternatives. k) After carrying out a solution to a problem, you usually try to analyze what went right and what went wrong. l) You like yourself just the way you are. m) You feel like you are doing everything just about right. n) You feel socially accepted. o) You had trouble keeping your mind on what you were doing. p) You enjoyed life (reverse coded). Parent questions: q) Does {NAME} have a bad temper? r) All things considered, how is {NAME}'s life going? s) You get along well with (him/her). School questions for respondent: t) During the 1994-1995 school year, how often did you have trouble getting along with your teachers? u) During the 1994-1995 school year, how often did you have trouble paying attention in school? v) During the 1994-1995 school year, how often did you have trouble getting your homework done? w) During the 1994-1995 school year, how often did you have trouble getting along with other students?	X	X	X	X
Number of Times Incarcerated	How many times have you been in a jail, prison, juvenile detention center or other correctional facility? Categories: a) never, b) once, c) more than once	X	X	X	X

APPENDIX C. MISSING AND IMPUTED DATA TABLES

Table B.1. Percent Missing

	Women (n=6,682)	Men (n=5,606)
Offending Type		
Property Crime	0.73%	1.28%
Violent Crime	0.66%	1.12%
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics		
Age	0.01%	0.07%
Race/Ethnicity	0.07%	0.04%
Education	0.03%	0.04%
Household Income	6.26%	6.49%
Family Structure at Wave I	0.00%	0.00%
Religiosity	12.56%	14.57%
Household SES at Wave I (Range 1-10)	5.33%	5.46%
Other Controls		
Victimization	0.21%	0.27%
Neighborhood Disadvantage	28.11%	28.09%
Substance Use	0.84%	1.64%
Low Self-Control	16.16%	15.27%
Number of Times Incarcerated	0.01%	0.11%
Age at First Sex	7.30%	10.67%
Number of Opposite-Sex Partners	4.71%	6.03%
Early Union	1.51%	2.39%
Multiple-Partner Fertility (MPF)	0.25%	0.41%

Table B.2. Study 1 Percent Complete

	Percent Complete											
	41%	16%	7%	6%	4%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%
Property Crime	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Violent Crime	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Age	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Race/Ethnicity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Education	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Income	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Religiosity	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Household SES, Wave I	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
Times Incarcerated	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Victimization	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Neighborhood Disadvantage	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
Substance Use	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Low Self-Control	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-
Age at First Sex	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+
Number of Opposite-Sex Partners	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+

*Note: All other patterns <1%.

Table B.3. Study 2 Percent Complete

	Percent Complete											
	41%	16%	7%	6%	4%	3%	3%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%
Property Crime	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Violent Crime	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Age	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Race/Ethnicity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Education	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Income	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Religiosity	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Household SES, Wave I	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
Times Incarcerated	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Victimization	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Neighborhood Disadvantage	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
Substance Use	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Low Self-Control	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-
Age at First Sex	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+
Number of Opposite Sex Partners	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Early Union	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

*Note: All other patterns <1%.

Table B.4. Study 3 Percent Complete

	Percent Complete											
	41%	16%	7%	5%	4%	3%	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%
Property Crime	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Violent Crime	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Age	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Race/Ethnicity	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Education	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Income	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+
Religiosity	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-
Household SES, Wave I	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
Times Incarcerated	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Victimization	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Neighborhood Disadvantage	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
Substance Use	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Low Self-Control	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-
Age at First Sex	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+
Number of Opposite-Sex Partners	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+
Early Union	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Multiple-Partner Fertility (MPF)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

*Note: All other patterns <1%.

Table B.5. Comparison of Observed vs. Imputed Data (n=10,437)

	Weighted Observed		Imputed	
	Women	Men	Women	Men
Property Crime				
Engaged	28.71%	47.79%	29.42%	47.81%
Never Engaged	71.29%	52.21%	70.58%	52.19%
Violent Crime				
Engaged	24.87%	45.89%	24.95%	45.72%
Never Engaged	75.13%	54.11%	75.05%	54.28%
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics				
Age	28.191 (0.118)	28.364 (0.122)	28.348 (0.023)	28.559 (0.026)
Race/Ethnicity				
Non-Hispanic White	67.33%	67.26%	54.26%	56.09%
Non-Hispanic Black	14.53%	13.00%	20.48%	16.21%
Hispanic	10.31%	11.07%	13.76%	14.88%
Asian/Other	7.83%	8.67%	11.51%	12.82%
Education				
Less than HS	6.59%	8.74%	5.64%	8.02%
HS Degree/GED	13.53%	19.65%	12.98%	17.91%
Some College	65.36%	62.15%	65.84%	64.06%
AA/Vocational Degree	4.52%	3.39%	4.49%	3.22%
College Degree	5.91%	3.39%	6.67%	3.67%
Graduate Degree	4.09%	2.68%	4.39%	3.13%
Household Income				
Less than $5,000	2.83%	1.75%	2.66%	1.63%
$5,000-$9,999	2.67%	1.71%	2.59%	1.67%
$10,000-$14,999	3.86%	2.69%	3.62%	2.16%
$15,000-$19,999	3.31%	3.04%	3.44%	2.87%
$20,000-$24,999	5.08%	4.18%	5.01%	3.72%
$25,000-$29,999	5.09%	4.95%	5.01%	4.80%
$30,000-$39,999	11.27%	10.49%	10.98%	10.27%
$40,000-$49,999	11.76%	12.54%	11.69%	12.41%
$50,000-$74,999	24.65%	25.28%	24.77%	25.42%
$75,000-$99,999	14.74%	16.82%	14.81%	16.99%
$100,000-$149,999	10.02%	11.10%	10.37%	12.05%
$150,000 or more	4.73%	5.44%	5.06%	6.02%
Family Structure at Wave I				
Single Parent	22.29%	21.28%	23.38%	21.44%
Stepparent	15.22%	14.70%	14.90%	14.69%
Two-Parent	56.82%	58.36%	55.42%	59.20%
Other	5.67%	5.66%	6.31%	4.67%
Religiosity				
Not at all Important	2.82%	4.32%	2.86%	4.16%
Somewhat Important	7.42%	8.44%	6.95%	8.45%
Very Important	40.75%	45.12%	39.78%	43.58%
More Important than Anything Else	49.01%	42.12%	50.41%	43.82%
Household SES at Wave I (Range 1-10)	5.482 (0.124)	5.694 (0.126)	5.494 (0.036)	5.771 (0.040)
Other Controls				
Times Incarcerated				
Never Incarcerated	92.70%	76.16%	92.75%	76.94%

Incarcerated Once	5.20%	12.36%	5.16%	11.85%
Incarcerated More Than Once	2.10%	11.48%	2.09%	11.22%
Victimization				
Ever Victimized	18.49%	24.19%	18.56%	23.55%
Never Victimized	81.51%	75.81%	81.44%	76.45%
Neighborhood Disadvantage	-0.096 (0.024)	-0.092 (0.029)	-0.122 (0.020)	-0.102 (0.022)
Substance Use				
No Substance Use	28.06%	25.77%	29.11%	26.19%
Alcohol or Tobacco Use	43.00%	43.66%	42.87%	42.73%
Marijuana Use	19.43%	21.22%	19.33%	22.03%
Use of Other Substances	9.51%	9.35%	8.69%	9.04%
Low Self-Control	47.086 (0.204)	46.523 (0.209)	47.090 (0.122)	46.163 (0.128)
Study 1 Dependent Variables				
Age at First Sex	16.615 (0.075)	16.730 (0.082)	16.708 (0.034)	16.794 (0.040)
Number of Opposite Sex Partners	9.503 (0.260)	15.277 (0.538)	9.442 (0.238)	14.951 (0.376)
Study 2 Dependent Variable				
Early Union Formation				
No Unions	10.39%	15.11%	11.59%	15.71%
Later Union Formation	51.53%	52.54%	52.45%	54.96%
Early Union Formation	38.08%	32.35%	35.96%	29.33%
Study 3 Dependent Variable				
Multiple-Partner Fertility (MPF)				
No Fertility	80.92%	86.60%	79.14%	86.38%
Single-Partner Fertility (SPF)	14.48%	10.10%	15.63%	10.28%
Multiple-Partner Fertility (MPF)	4.60%	3.30%	5.23%	3.35%