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Figure 1: Predicted Physical SF-12 Score by Bodyweight and Perceived Weight among Men Aged 29

Figure 2: Predicted Physical SF-12 Score by Bodyweight and Perceived Weight among Women Aged 29

Figure 3: Predicted Mental SF-12 Score by Bodyweight and Perceived Weight among Men Aged 29

Figure 4: Predicted Mental SF-12 Score by Bodyweight and Perceived Weight among Women Aged 29

Summary

Men who accurately perceive their overweight status have lower ratings of mental and physical HRQoL than overweight men who perceive their weight as About Right.

Healthy weight and overweight men who perceive themselves as Underweight report lower ratings of physical HRQoL.

Overweight men who perceive their weight as About Right have higher ratings of mental HRQoL than men at a healthy weight.

Women who accurately perceive their overweight status have lower ratings of mental HRQoL than overweight women who perceive their weight as About Right.

Healthy weight women who perceive themselves as either Under/Overweight report lower mental HRQoL than overweight women who perceive their weight as About Right.

Conclusions

In the context of an increasingly overweight society, it is important to understand how weight perceptions may influence the degree to which young adults with excess weight may experience diminished HRQoL.

Increasing awareness of healthy weight levels, may have an impact of weight-related behavior change.

Table 1: Weighted Proportion of Young Adults aged 29 with (In)accurate Weight Perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BMI Status</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underweight</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overweight</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Some studies find a connection between obesity and HRQoL, others do not suggesting that there may be significant modifiers of this relationship.

As average BMI in the US has increased, fewer overweight men and women perceive themselves as being overweight (Burke, Heiland & Nadler 2010).

Adults who misperceive their weight as healthy may be doing so to avoid the stigma often associated with excess weight.

An accurate perception of overweight status may combine with an identification of stigmatizing beliefs leading to lower ratings of quality of life; whereas a more optimistic perception of weight status may have higher ratings.

The NLSY97 is a nationally representative, longitudinal survey of youth born in 1980-84 who were living in the US in 1997. Pregnant women are excluded. N=6,052.
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Healthy weight and overweight men who perceive themselves as Underweight report lower ratings of physical HRQoL.

Overweight men who perceive their weight as About Right have higher ratings of mental HRQoL than men at a healthy weight.

Women who accurately perceive their overweight status have lower ratings of mental HRQoL than overweight women who perceive their weight as About Right.

Healthy weight women who perceive themselves as either Under/Overweight report lower mental HRQoL than overweight women who perceive their weight as About Right.

In the context of an increasingly overweight society, it is important to understand how weight perceptions may influence the degree to which young adults with excess weight may experience diminished HRQoL.

Increasing awareness of healthy weight levels, may have an impact of weight-related behavior change.

Men and women’s physical and mental HRQoL depends on the intersection of bodyweight and their perception of weight
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Figure 3: Predicted Mental SF-12 Score by Bodyweight and Perceived Weight among Men Aged 29

Figure 4: Predicted Mental SF-12 Score by Bodyweight and Perceived Weight among Women Aged 29
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In the context of an increasingly overweight society, it is important to understand how weight perceptions may influence the degree to which young adults with excess weight may experience diminished HRQoL.

Increasing awareness of healthy weight levels, may have an impact of weight-related behavior change.

Conclusions

In the context of an increasingly overweight society, it is important to understand how weight perceptions may influence the degree to which young adults with excess weight may experience diminished HRQoL.

Increasing awareness of healthy weight levels, may have an impact of weight-related behavior change.
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Key Measures at Age 29

• HRQoL. Dependent variables are the Physical Component Summary Score and the Mental Health Component Summary Score.

• Bodyweight. BMI at age 29. BMI cutoffs define underweight (BMI ≤ 18.5), healthy weight (18.5 > BMI < 25) and overweight (BMI ≥ 25).

• Perceived Weight. We collapse perceived weight into three categories Underweight, About Right and Overweight.

Results

A sizeable proportion of the sample did not accurately perceive their weight status

Table 1: Weighted Proportion of Young Adults aged 29 with (In)accurate Weight Perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BMI Status</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underweight</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overweight</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Some studies find a connection between obesity and HRQoL, others do not suggesting that there may be significant modifiers of this relationship.

As average BMI in the US has increased, fewer overweight men and women perceive themselves as being overweight (Burke, Heiland & Nadler 2010).

Adults who misperceive their weight as healthy may be doing so to avoid the stigma often associated with excess weight.

An accurate perception of overweight status may combine with an identification of stigmatizing beliefs leading to lower ratings of quality of life; whereas a more optimistic perception of weight status may have higher ratings.

We examine the relationship between bodyweight and physical and mental- HRQoL among a national sample of young adults aged 29. Weight perception is considered as a potential moderator of the relationship between bodyweight and HRQoL.

Current Study

We examine the relationship between bodyweight and physical and mental- HRQoL among a national sample of young adults aged 29. Weight perception is considered as a potential moderator of the relationship between bodyweight and HRQoL.

Data and Sample

The NLSY97 is a nationally representative, longitudinal survey of youth born in 1980-84 who were living in the US in 1997. Pregnant women are excluded. N=6,052.

Background

• Measures of Health Related Quality of Life (HRQoL) have become increasingly important in efforts to assess the health of individuals and populations and are a key component of Healthy People 2020.

• Some studies find a connection between obesity and HRQoL, others do not suggesting that there may be significant modifiers of this relationship.

• As average BMI in the US has increased, fewer overweight men and women perceive themselves as being overweight (Burke, Heiland & Nadler 2010).

• Adults who misperceive their weight as healthy may be doing so to avoid the stigma often associated with excess weight.

• An accurate perception of overweight status may combine with an identification of stigmatizing beliefs leading to lower ratings of quality of life; whereas a more optimistic perception of weight status may have higher ratings.

• We examine the relationship between bodyweight and physical and mental- HRQoL among a national sample of young adults aged 29. Weight perception is considered as a potential moderator of the relationship between bodyweight and HRQoL.

• The NLSY97 is a nationally representative, longitudinal survey of youth born in 1980-84 who were living in the US in 1997. Pregnant women are excluded. N=6,052.
Scholars have increasingly examined the influence of macro-level factors on intimate partner violence. Research has moved beyond examination of individual factors to consider the ways in which cultural norms influence violence patterns. Yet, the influence of the neighborhood normative climate likely extends beyond norms regarding the use of violence, shaping cultural understandings about dating and the opposite sex.

**Prior Research**

**Contextual Influences on Behavior**

Research on IPV finds evidence of an association between neighborhood structural features and partner violence.

**Community Norms and Violence**

The social environment facilitates the transmission of messages regarding conduct across multiple domains.

**Subcultural theories** suggest the potential for wider context to shape violence, shaping cultural understandings about dating and the opposite sex.

**Attitudes about Dating and the Opposite Sex**

Liberal dating norms and gender mistrust are both related to relationship quality, and may influence negative styles of interaction between partners.

**Current Investigation**

To assess the extent to which individuals’ attitudes about dating and the opposite sex influence patterns of IPV perpetration over time.

To examine whether the neighborhood normative climate contributes to our understanding of IPV perpetration, net of individual attitudes and beliefs.

**Limitations/Future Research**

Explore these pathways in other cities/samples.

Consider additional normative and cultural definitions.

Examine these processes across a broader age range.

**Conclusions**

Move beyond notion that “IPV knows no class boundaries”

Both individual- and aggregate-level measures of gender mistrust exerted independent effects on the odds of perpetration, and neighborhood levels of mistrust explained a substantial portion of the between-neighborhood variation in IPV.

**Data and Sample**

Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study (TARS)

Five waves of data collected (2001-2011)

Respondents were 22-29 at the last interview

Analyses rely on all 5 waves of structured interviews

Analyses suggest that future programs may benefit from considerations of the social environment.

**Results**

Liberal dating norms appear to be more salient than the neighborhood normative climate with regard to such attitudes; however, the effect of liberal norms was exacerbated at higher levels of disadvantage.

Both individual- and aggregate-level measures of gender mistrust exerted independent effects on the odds of perpetration, and neighborhood levels of mistrust explained a substantial portion of the between-neighborhood variation in IPV.

**Key Measures**

- IPV Perpetration: 4-item version of the Conflict Tactics Scale
- Liberal Dating Norms: “It’s ok to date more than one person at a time”
- Gender Mistrust: “You can’t trust most girls/guys”

**Analyses**

- 3-level hierarchical logistic regression model (HLM 7)

**Conclusions**

Move beyond notion that “IPV knows no class boundaries”

The neighborhood normative climate has implications for IPV perpetration.

These neighborhood effects depend, in part, on the level of disadvantage.

Findings suggest that future programs may benefit from a community-based approach to IPV.

Programmatic focus on potentially modifiable risk factors may prove more feasible than tackling issues of socioeconomic disadvantage.
The Living Arrangements of Young Parents and Their Children

Karen Benjamin Guzzo (kguzzo@bgsu.edu)
Department of Sociology
Bowling Green State University

Analytical Plan

1) Describe the living arrangements of young parents at birth through age 24. Living arrangements taken from yearly household rosters, linked to survey year of 1st birth:

- Not living at home at 1st birth
- Living at home at 1st birth, subsequently moved out
- Living at home at 1st birth continuously through age 24

2) Identify characteristics associated with returning to the parental home among nonresident parents (N = 1,707)
- Event history analysis using person-years
- Enter analyses at 1st birth or when move out; censored at 1st parental coresidence or age 24 survey year

3) Examine the family & household characteristics of those who return home

Event History Results

Do the odds of returning home vary by socioeconomic and demographic factors? Yes, but modestly
- Odds increase with age and peak 2–3 years after birth or leaving the parental home the first time
- Foreign-born Hispanics, those whose mother had some college, and those whose own education was less than HS had higher odds
- Lower odds for those growing up in an “other” household

Do the odds of returning home vary by child-related characteristics? Not really
- Only those NOT living with their 1st child (a time-varying variable) are more likely to move home during the year

Do the odds of returning home vary by union status & stability? Yes, strongly
- Young parents with no coresidential union at either the prior or current survey are 2.4 times as likely to move home to their parents during the year than those stably partnered
- Those who experienced a break-up are highly likely to move home (OR = 8.3 for cohabiters & OR = 6.5 for married)

Descriptive Results

Complicated households for “returners” (N = 561):
- 70% have all their children living with them
- Nearly half are returning home to a single-parent family, with 21% returning to a stepfamily
- 6% report their own grandparent or other relative is also present

Conclusions & Next Steps

This work demonstrates that young parents use their families as a safety net for many reasons. Research on adult children living with their own parents has largely focused on economic factors but should incorporate family behaviors. Similarly, work on young parents should expand beyond family structure instability to consider residential changes and instability in household composition.

Summary

Young parents often live with their own parents either at birth or at some point thereafter, with over half of young parents reporting parental coresidence at least once by age 24. Union instability seems to be a strong predictor of moving back home. Interestingly, not living with one’s child also increases the odds of moving back home. For those who move back home, these multigenerational households are often complex, involving stepparents, the young parent’s own partner, and young children.

Limitations

- Unable to more precisely define living arrangements at birth or between surveys
- Did not include income or employment status
- Parental coresidence definition excludes living with partner’s family
- Possible (but unlikely) that parents move in with adult children rather than vice versa
- Not measuring other residential changes

Data

National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, 1997 (NLSY97)
- Individuals born 1980-84 & interviewed annually

Analytical sample:
- Participate yearly through age 24 (N = 5,584)
- Had at least 1 child by age 24 (N = 1,984)

Covariates include age, gender, race-ethnicity, family structure at age 12, multigenerational household in the past, mother’s education & age at 1st birth, respondent’s education & enrollment, receipt of aid, number & coresidence of children, & union status

Research Questions

Are young parents living independently?
- Of those living independently at birth or who subsequently move out, how many return home?
- Do the odds of returning home vary by socioeconomic and demographic factors?
- Fertility and child-related characteristics?
- Union status and stability?
- What are the family and household characteristics of those returning home?

Background

Multigenerational households and “boomerang” children are a common phenomenon in the U.S. Moves in and out of the parental home seem particularly likely for young adults as the transition to adulthood has become more prolonged. One aspect of returning home that has yet to be explored, however, is the behavior of young parents. Such individuals have taken on an adult role (parenthood), but their lives tend to be unstable, making full residential independence unlikely.
Preferences Constrained: Racial and Ethnic Variations in Parents’ Neighborhood Choice Considerations
Andrea G. Krieg (garbera@bgsu.edu), Raymond Swisher, Danielle Kuhl, and Jorge Chavez
Department of Sociology
Bowling Green State University

Background
- Residential preferences are based on a variety of factors including life cycle and socioeconomic considerations, housing, and neighborhood racial composition (Rosen and Morrow-Jones 2011; Fox and Krysan 1997; Krysan and Foxley 2002, Clark 2009).
- Less attention has been given to how other neighborhood characteristics, like neighborhood advantage, affect preferences.
- Research suggests that whites and minorities have varying foci when choosing neighborhoods.

Current Study
1) Do demographic characteristics predict which neighborhood characteristics parents say were most important in their choice of their present neighborhood?
2) Are there racial and ethnic differences in the salience of neighborhood characteristics by family socioeconomic status?
3) Does neighborhood racial/ethnic composition moderate the associations between an individual’s race/ethnicity and parents’ reasons for living in the neighborhood?

Data, Sample, & Methods
- National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health)
- Add Health respondents with completed parent questionnaire
- Analytic sample: 13,818 respondents
- Factor analyses and multilevel multinomial logistic regressions

Dependent Variable
Which one statement describes the most important reason why you live in this neighborhood?
- Less crime: Less crime and less illegal activity by adolescents
- Better schools: Better schools or children of appropriate ages
- Other: Near old workplace, near current workplace, had outstanding previous housing, affordable good housing, close to friends or relatives, born here

Measure

Results

Table 1. Multinominal Multilevel Models of Parents’ Focal Consideration in Choice of Neighborhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.84***</td>
<td>0.62***</td>
<td>1.83***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. White</td>
<td>0.01***</td>
<td>0.02***</td>
<td>0.01***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>0.01***</td>
<td>0.02***</td>
<td>0.01***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions
- Black and Hispanic parents are more likely to choose neighborhoods on the basis of crime.
- Black parents are much less likely (than whites) to choose neighborhoods based on schools.
- Neighborhood advantage of chosen neighborhoods moderates associations between race/ethnicity and neighborhood considerations.

This research was supported by funding from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (1R15HD070098-01A1). This research uses data from Add Health, a program project directed by Kathleen Mullan Harris and designed by J. Richard Udry, Peter S. Bearman, and Kathleen Mullan Harris at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and funded by grant P01 HD31921 from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, with cooperative funding from 23 other federal agencies and foundations. Special acknowledgment is due Ronald R. Haynsworth, of toilet paper, for his assistance in the original design. Information on how to obtain the Add Health data files is available on the Add Health website (http://www.cpc.unc.edu/addhealth). No direct support was received from grant HD31921 for this analysis. This research was supported in part by the Center for Family and Demographic Research, Bowling Green State University, which has core funding from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (R24 HD31921).
**Change in Stability of Premarital Cohabitation, 1980-2009**
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**Background**

- Remarkable increase in prevalence of cohabitation in the past quarter century
- Cohabitation in the US is short-lived
- Half of all first premarital cohabitations among women aged 15-44 dissolve within 22 months (Copen et al. 2013)
- Reduced selection - diffusion perspective (Leibroer & Dourleijn 2006; Manning & Cohen 2012)

**The Present Study**

- Expanded interval between the cohabiting cohorts
- Utilizes more recent data (2011-2013 NSFG)
- Shifts in the duration of cohabitation based on presence of children, race/ethnicity, and education

**Data and Sample**

- The National Survey of Family Growth
- Cycle 4 (1988) and the 2011-2013 interview
- Combined sample size of 1479 women aged 15-44

**Method**

- Multiple decrement life tables
- Discrete-time multinomial logistic regression
- Outcome of first premarital cohabitation (0 = intact, 1 = marriage, 2 = dissolution)

**Probabilities of Survival and Dissolution of First Premarital Cohabitation within Five Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probability in %</th>
<th>Intact</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Separated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980-1984</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2009</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Presence of Children and Outcomes of First Premarital Cohabitation within Five Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probability in %</th>
<th>Intact</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Separated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980-1984</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2009</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Race/Ethnicity and Outcomes of First Premarital Cohabitation within Five Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probability in %</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980-1984</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2009</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education and Outcomes of First Premarital Cohabitation within Five Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probability in %</th>
<th>Intact</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Separated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980-1984</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2009</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multivariate Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Ratios from Multinomial Logistic Regression of Transitions Out of First Premarital Cohabiting unions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probability (%): Intact &gt; Married &gt; Separated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

- Recent cohabitations last longer than those formed 30 years ago (on average 27.7 months)
- The lengthening of cohabitation results mostly from the declining rate of transitioning to marriage
- Cohabitations with children last longer than those without children
- Blacks and Whites are similarly likely to remain together, Blacks more often remain cohabiting and Whites transition into marriage
- Increasing education divergence in the stability of cohabiting unions

**Next Steps**

- Explain the shift in cohabitation stability
- Explore the stability of postmarital cohabitation
- Integrate serial cohabitation into analyses

**Implications**

- Institutionalization of cohabitation
- Evolving relationship between cohabitation and marriage
- Shifting implications of cohabitation for child outcomes

This research was supported in part by the Center for Family and Demographic Research, Bowling Green State University, which has core funding from the Social and Behavioral Sciences Cluster (R01HD050959) National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.
Pet Ownership and Access as Predictors of Self-Reported Health in a National Sample of U.S. Elders
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Background
• Growing research, media, and policy attention explores pets as therapy, companion, and exercise animals for elders.
• The National Institutes of Health calls for more research on human-animal interactions (HAI) with a focus on health and national samples.

Prior Research
• Animal companions are associated with physical, psychological, and emotional benefits.
• Most studies on animal companions and elders’ well-being use institutionalized samples or small convenience-based samples.
• No research distinguishes between ownership versus access to animal companions.
• Very little and largely qualitative research addresses racial/ethnic minorities and animal companions.

Present Study
• Our study explores patterns of pet ownership and access to animal companions across racial/ethnic groups.
• We also examine the effects of pet ownership and access on elders’ self-reported health, controlling for sociodemographic, economic and social capital, religiosity, and physical activity indicators.
• Last, we test how race/ethnicity mediates and moderates the effects of pet ownership and access on elders’ self-reported health.

Data and Sample
• Health and Retirement Study (HRS, University of Michigan, and supported by the National Institute of Aging and Social Security Administration).
• We use the sub-sample from Module 9 on Human-Animal Interaction from the 2012 wave of HRS.
• We select elders age 50 and older for a final effective sample size of 1,658.

Limitations
• We find racial/ethnic differences in pet ownership and access.
• Blacks and Hispanics have poorer self-reported health than Whites; Hispanics have worse self-reported health than Blacks.
• Race/ethnicity mediates, but does not moderate, the effects of pet ownership and access.
• Core Finding: Self-reported health for elders is higher for those who own pets, but now simply have access to companion animals, as compared to those who currently own and maintain responsibility for pets.

Future Research
• Explore effects of pet ownership and access on specific medical conditions.
• Design population-based studies on potential reasons why current access, but not currently owning a companion animal facilitates better self-reported health among elders.
• Conduct qualitative research on the contextual reasons for differences found across racial/ethnic groups.

References

Conclusions
• We find racial/ethnic differences in pet ownership and access.
• Blacks and Hispanics have poorer self-reported health than Whites; Hispanics have worse self-reported health than Blacks.
• Race/ethnicity mediates, but does not moderate, the effects of pet ownership and access.
• Core Finding: Self-reported health for elders is higher for those who own pets, but now simply have access to companion animals, as compared to those who currently own and maintain responsibility for pets.

Table 2. Pet Owner Status and Current Pet Access by Race (%) (N=1,658)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>current owner</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>owned, access</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never owned</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never owned, access</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Regression Models for Pet Ownership and Access on Self-Rated Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>P&lt;.000</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>P&lt;.000</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>P&lt;.000</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>P&lt;.1</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>P&lt;.05</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>P&lt;.01</th>
<th>Centered Education</th>
<th>P&lt;.01</th>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th>P&lt;.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Number of Dogs Among Owners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Owner</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>1368</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>1454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Own</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Number of Cats Among Owners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Owner</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Own</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Pets Other Than Cats and Dogs by Race (N=1,658)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Owner</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>1368</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>1454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Own</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Regressions Models for Pet Ownership and Access on Self-Rated Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>P&lt;.000</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>P&lt;.000</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>P&lt;.1</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>P&lt;.1</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>P&lt;.05</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>P&lt;.01</th>
<th>Centered Education</th>
<th>P&lt;.01</th>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th>P&lt;.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Nonmarital Childbearing
- Steady increase in proportion of nonmarital births in Western countries
- Large variation across countries – why?
  - Differences in nonmarital unions
  - Differences in social policy
  - Differences in women’s employment
  - Differences in attitudes and social norms
- Comparative research linking attitude and levels of nonmarital childbearing is scarce

Why Might Attitudes Matter?

Second Demographic Transition Theory
- Weakening of traditional attitudes toward marriage and childbearing
- Increased emphasis on individual autonomy and self-actualization

Theory of Planned Behavior
- Behavior is more likely to occur if individuals maintain positive attitudes toward the behavior
- Attitudes may impact behavior more if the behavior has some support in society
- Regardless of individual attitudes, behavior is discouraged if it is not supported by broader norms

Research Questions
- How have countries changed over time in both attitudes towards single parents and levels of nonmarital childbearing?
- Are nonmarital childbearing and attitudes correlated, and have these correlations changed over time?
- Does the pace of changes in nonmarital childbearing predict level of support for nonmarital childbearing?

Data
- Nonmarital birth ratios (NMBRs): Eurostat, National Center for Health Statistics (US), Statistics Canada, & Australian Bureau of Statistics
- Used linear extrapolation for missing NMBRs
- Limited US data to non-Hispanic whites

Measures
- Key dependent variable
  - Proportion of births that are nonmarital
- Independent variable
  - Attitude toward nonmarital childbearing/single parenthood is proxied by responses to the statement “If people want to have kids they ought to get married.”
  - Used as a proxy for support for nonmarital childbearing in other research (Thornton & Young-DeMarco 2001; Gubernskaya 2010)

Research

Multivariate Analysis

Two stages
1) Regress nonmarital birth ratio on time in five-year groups corresponding to five years preceding each attitudinal measure - Centered time variable
   - Time coefficient represents pace of fertility change
2) Pool data into country-level analysis (n = 57) to predict attitudes - Hausman test to determine fixed vs. random effects - Control for compositional differences as measured in surveys

Correlations and Multivariate Results

Limitations
- No direct measure of support for nonmarital childbearing
- Lack of information on nonmarital unions, (i.e., cohabitations)
- Limited availability of measures to account for differences across countries
- Not controlling for policy measures or other economic/institutional/structural factors

Conclusions
- Overall, attitudes toward single parenthood and nonmarital fertility are not strongly linked at the country level
- Suggests contextual, economic, and policy factors are likely more relevant for nonmarital fertility levels
- Changes in attitudes and changes in nonmarital fertility may part of broader societal changes
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