



Research Report

Jennifer S. Barber, Yasamin Kusunoki,
Heather Gatny, and Jamie Budnick

Relationship Between Dating
Conflict and Pregnancy:
Preliminary Results

Report 10-720

The Relationship Between Dating Conflict and Pregnancy: Preliminary Results

Jennifer S. Barber
University of Michigan

Yasamin Kusunoki
University of Michigan

Heather Gatny
University of Michigan

Jamie Budnick
University of Michigan

Population Studies Center Research Report 10-720

October 2010

* Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, August 14-17, 2010, Atlanta, GA. Corresponding author: Jennifer Barber, University of Michigan, Population Studies Center, Institute for Social Research, 426 Thompson St., Room 2252, Ann Arbor, MI, 48106-1248, jebarber@umich.edu. This research is supported by funding from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health & Human Development (R01 HD050329).

ABSTRACT

In this paper we investigate the role of dating conflict in early pregnancy. Using data from a weekly journal-based study, we explore conflict at three levels among a sample of 1,003 young women. First, we examine *current conflict* within a specific relationship at the approximate time the pregnancy occurred. Being in a relationship that includes arguing and fighting and/or unequal decision-making is associated with early pregnancy net of socioeconomic characteristics and prior experiences related to pregnancy that are highly predictive of pregnancy. Second, we examine *history of conflict with the current partner*. A history of arguing and fighting, swearing, threats/violence, and unequal decision-making with the current partner is associated with early pregnancy. Third, we examine young women's *history of conflict with any partner*. A history of arguing and fighting, swearing, threats/violence, and unequal decision-making with any partner is also associated with early pregnancy. We also confirm that the association between conflict and pregnancy is true regardless of a three or more year age difference between the partners. These results suggest that, the tendency to enter conflictual relationships, conflictual relationships themselves, and current experiences with conflict are all associated with increased risk of early pregnancy.

INTRODUCTION

Although teen pregnancy rates recently declined, they have risen again, particularly among African Americans. According to the National Campaign to Prevent Teen and Unplanned Pregnancy, 51% of African-American teen girls and 19% of non-Hispanic whites experience a pregnancy. The consequences of early pregnancy are serious and wide-reaching – including abortion, curtailed educational attainment, and later-life health problems (Geronimus and Korenman 1992; Hardy et al. 1998; Kost et al. 2010; Ventura et al. 2008). Current U.S. policies call for its reduction – proposed Healthy People 2020 goals include reducing adolescent pregnancy rates, virtually the same as in Healthy People 2010.

The formation, dissolution, and character of heterosexual romantic relationships are key determinants of early childbearing that are understudied. Most existing research on relationships as a context for unintended, premarital, or early pregnancy has focused on the intensity of relationships. Demographers have focused on relationship characteristics like age at first intercourse (sexual debut), dating/“going steady” at a young age, and cohabiting behavior, finding that intense relationships are linked to unintended childbearing. Edin and Kefalas’ (2005) found that once a relationship has reached “the next level” (i.e., sexually exclusive and identity as a “couple”) contraception may stop, with the woman figuring “If I get pregnant, I get pregnant.” (p. 38). Intensity is clearly an important determinant of pregnancy.

Others have focused on instability in relationships suggesting that the ambiguities during transitions – juggling multiple partners, breaking up and getting back together, conflict, etc. – produce less predictable sexual behavior, less effective contraceptive use, and higher unintended pregnancy rates (Miller 1973). Elijah Anderson (1999) describes a “game” in which young men have multiple sexual partners, fight against identity as a couple, and engage in a great deal of conflict with their partners. It is precisely this type of instability and these transition points that may increase the risk of an early, premarital, and/or unintended birth (Miller 1973; Schoen et al. 1999).

Relationships are complex; different types of people form different types of relationships, and those relationships vary over time. In addition, individuals themselves may behave differently in different relationships. For instance, individuals may prefer specific contraceptive methods in general, and their preferences may be different depending on the specific relationship. In addition, their contraceptive practices within a specific relationship may change

as length of time and level of commitment change (Ford, Sohn, & Lepkowski, 2001; Katz, Fortenberry, Zimet, Blythe, & Orr, 2000; Manning, Longmore, & Giordano, 2000).

Experiences with dating violence within a relationship have been shown to compromise the use of contraceptive methods (DiClemente et al., 2001; Wingood et al., 2001). In this paper, we focus on the role of dating conflict in early pregnancy. We investigate conflict at three levels. First, we examine *current conflict* at the approximate time the pregnancy occurred. This tests the hypothesis that conflict at a particular time might influence behavior at that same time – e.g., a fight affecting condom use due to lack of planning or communication. Second, we examine young women's *history of conflict with the current partner*. This tests the hypothesis that conflictual relationships lead to early pregnancy, relative to relationships that involve less conflict. Third, we examine young women's *history of conflict with any partner*. This tests the hypothesis that some women experience more conflictual relationships, in general, and that something about these women themselves increases the risk of pregnancy, regardless of whether there is conflict within the current relationship.

DATA AND METHODS

Study Design

The Relationship Dynamics and Social Life (RDSL) study uses a population-based sample of 1,003 young women, ages 18-19, residing in a Michigan county. A 60-minute face-to-face baseline survey interview was conducted between March 2008 and July 2009, to assess important aspects of family background; demographic information; key attitudes, values, and beliefs; current and past friendship and romantic relationships; education; and career trajectories. At the conclusion of this baseline interview, all respondents were invited to participate in a weekly journal-based study – a mixed mode (Internet and phone) survey for 2.5 years. Each week respondents choose to complete the journal either by logging into the study's secure website, or by calling a toll free number and completing the journal with a live interviewer. To date, respondents have completed 38,576 weekly journals; this portion of the study is still in the field, and will be completed in January 2012.

Respondents are paid \$1 per weekly journal with \$5 bonuses for on-time completion of five weekly journals in a row. Automated reminder email and/or text messages are sent to respondents weekly. If a respondent is late, study staff first attempt to contact her by phone, and

later by email and letter in attempt to regain her participation. Respondents who become 60 or more days late are offered an increased incentive for completing the next journal. Small gifts (e.g., pen, chapstick, compact, pencil) are also given to respondents to award continued participation.

Our incentive scheme, coupled with the cooperative nature of this age group and their interest in the subject matter, has resulted in extremely high cooperation rates: an 83% response rate and a 94% cooperation rate for the baseline interviews. Over 99% of respondents who completed a baseline interview enrolled in the weekly journal portion of the study (N=992). Weekly journal participation rates are approximately 61% (the proportion of respondents who have completed a journal in the past 30 days).

Measures

Pregnancy. Each week, in the journal, respondents are asked, “Do you think there might be a chance that you are pregnant right now?” Respondents who answer yes are asked, “Has a pregnancy test indicated that you are pregnant?” Respondents who answer “yes” to the question about the pregnancy test are coded “1” for pregnant.

Conflict. For the analyses presented here, we use information collected in the weekly journal to create time-varying measures of conflict and unequal decision-making in their relationship during the past week. They are first asked, “Did you and [Partner Name] fight or have any arguments” during the period since the last journal interview. Each respondent who answer yes is then asked about three specific types of conflict, whether her partner: 1) swore at her, called her names or insulted her, 2) threatened her with violence, and/or 3) pushed, hit, or threw something at her that could hurt. The final, mutually exclusive measure we use in the analyses presented here includes the following categories: 1) did not fight or argue, 2) fought or argued only (no swearing/name calling/threats/violence), 3) swore/called names/insulted, and 4) threatened with violence, or pushed/hit/threw. Did not fight or argue is the reference category.

Unequal decision-making is based on a weekly journal question that asks, “Who decides what to do or where to go when you go out? Would you say you do, [Partner Name] does, or do you both decide?” Reports of the respondent or the partner (but not both) making these decisions are coded “1” for unequal decision-making; others are coded “0”.

We created three versions of each of these measures: 1) current, 2) history with current partner, and 3) history with any partner. Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for these

measures. Young women reported *current conflict* at the approximate time the pregnancy occurred in 15% of weekly journals (10% fought/argued only, 4% swore/called names/insulted, and 1% threatened/actual violence). Young women who reported any relationships, had an average of 59% of those relationships include some type of conflict. 78% of young women reported ever experiencing a relationship with any type of conflict (15% for the most serious type of conflict) (not shown in tables). In addition, young women reported unequal decision-making at the current time in 5% of weekly journals.

Controls. Several sociodemographic characteristics measured at the baseline interview are included as controls in the current analysis. *Age* is categorical and ranges from 18 to 20 years; the reference category is 18. *Race* is included as a dichotomous indicator for African American (33%) versus non-African American. *School enrollment/type* includes the following categories: 1) not enrolled and did not graduate from high school (8%), 2) not enrolled and graduated from high school (21%), 3) enrolled in high school (13%), 4) enrolled in two year college/vocational/technical/other (29%), and 5) enrolled in four year college (29%). Four year college is the reference category. A respondent is coded as *received public assistance* (23%) if she reported currently receiving at least one of the following: 1) WIC, 2) FIP, 3) cash welfare, or 4) food stamps. *Religious importance* is based on the question, “How important if at all is your religious faith to you - would you say not important, somewhat important, very important, or more important than anything else?”, and is coded as not important (1) to more important than anything else (4). The mean is 2.69. A dichotomous measure indicates whether the respondent is *living with a romantic partner* (14%), based on the question, “Do you have a place you live that is separate from where [Partner Name] lives?”. A dichotomous measure indicates whether the *respondent’s biological mother was less than 20 years old at her first birth* (35%). *Family structure* is based on the questions, “While you were growing up, which of the following people did you live with?/Which of these people did you live with for the majority of the time when you were growing up?.” It includes the following three categories: 1) Two parents (both biological parents = 48%; biological parent + step-parent = 8%); 2) one biological parent only (38%), and 3) other (8%). Two-parent family is the reference category. (Note: this category also includes adoptive parents, n = 14 families.) A dichotomous measure indicates whether the respondent’s *mother’s education is less than high school* (8%). *Parents’ income* is coded as medium/high (\$15,000+) (68%), low (\$14,999 or less) (13%), or don’t know/refused (19%).

Multiple prior pregnancy-related experiences are also included as controls. *Age at first sex* is coded as 14 years or less (15%), 15-16 years old (35%), or 17+ (including those who have not yet had sex) (50%). Number of sexual partners is coded as 0 (xx%), 1 (xx%), 2 (xx%), 3 (xx%), or 4+ (xx%). Zero is the reference category. A dichotomous measure indicates whether a respondents *ever had sex without birth control* (45%). Number of prior pregnancies is coded as: 1) none (79%), 2) one (14%), and 3) two or more (7%). No prior pregnancies is the reference.

In some models, we also include a control for an age difference between the respondent and her partner(s). For relationship-specific conflict (i.e., current conflict and history of conflict with current partner), we include an indicator for whether the current partner is three or more years older than the respondent. Of the current relationships, 14% are with a partner who is three or more years older than the respondent.

Analytic Strategy

We use event history methods to model the risk of pregnancy. Because the data are precise to the week, we use discrete-time methods to estimate these models. Person-weeks of exposure are the unit of analysis. We consider women to be at risk of pregnancy during all weeks they report that they are not currently pregnant. Although using person-weeks of exposure to risk as the unit of analysis substantially increases the sample size, Petersen (1986, 1991) and Allison (1982, 1984) have shown that using discrete-time methods does not deflate the standard errors and thus provides appropriate tests of statistical significance. Furthermore, because the probability of becoming pregnant is so small within each week, the estimates obtained using discrete-time methods are similar to those that would be obtained using continuous methods. In addition, because the probability of becoming pregnant is so small within each week, the hazard of pregnancy is similar to the pregnancy *rate*. Thus, in the text that follows we sometimes refer to the effects of the covariates on the pregnancy rate.

Our time-varying measures of respondents' relationship conflict and unequal decision-making are measured three weeks prior to the current week of pregnancy status, in order to measure these characteristics *prior to* the sexual intercourse that resulted in the pregnancy. In other words, all time-varying covariates are lagged by three weeks. We adopt this strategy to guard against reciprocal causation. For instance, a young woman's recent discovery that she is pregnant may increase the level of conflict in her current relationship. Of course, a couple's

sexual and contraceptive behavior may be important predictors of conflict in their relationship, and thus the reciprocal causation problem is not completely solved by the use of the time lag.

We adopt a hierarchical modeling strategy, beginning with the relationship measures and adding the control variables to a subsequent model. Thus, the second model is nested within the first. This strategy enables us to examine whether the measures of relationship conflict shrink toward zero with the introduction of earlier life course measures. If they do, this provides evidence that earlier life course factors explain the influence of relationship conflict. In other words, it allows us to test the hypothesis that early life-course factors *lead to* conflictual relationships, which in turn elevate pregnancy rates. We also control the age difference between partners to determine whether the relationship between conflict and pregnancy is due to increased conflict in age-heterogeneous relationships.

RESULTS

Table 2 shows the models of the relationship between the three levels of relationship conflict and respondents' hazard of pregnancy. Model 1a focuses on the overall relationship between *current conflict* and pregnancy, demonstrating higher pregnancy rates among respondents who experienced any type of conflict. Model 1b adds the measures of socioeconomic characteristics and prior experiences related to pregnancy. Many of these measures are highly predictive of pregnancy, consistent with prior research. These measures explain much of the relationship between conflict and pregnancy. For example, young women with earlier and more intensive sexual experiences experience more conflict in their relationships, and this in turn increases pregnancy rates. Fighting/arguing with a partner, however, remains statistically significant when baseline controls are added to Model 1b. Regardless of early experiences, being in a relationship that includes a lot of arguing and fighting is associated with early pregnancy.

Models 2a and 2b focus on a respondent's *history of conflict with the current partner*. Model 2a shows higher pregnancy rates among respondents who ever reported a fight/argument with the current partner, had the current partner swear at them, or had the current partner violently threaten, push, hit, or throw something at them. A substantial proportion of these effects are explained by whether the respondent grew up in an intact family and her early pregnancy-related experiences – 19% for fought/argued, 34% for swearing, and 45% for

threatened/pushed/hit/threw. However, all of the effects remain statistically significant when baseline controls are included, indicating that net of the characteristics that influence whether young women enter into a relationship with these types of conflict, the experiences increase the risk of pregnancy.

Models 3a and 3b focus on a respondent's *history of conflict with any partner*. Model 3a shows higher pregnancy rates among respondents who ever reported a fight/argument with any partner, had any partner swear at them, or had any partner violently threaten, push, hit, or throw something at them. A substantial proportion of these effects are explained by whether the respondent grew up in an intact family and her early pregnancy-related experiences – 34% for fought/argued, 45% for swearing, and 41% for threatened/pushed/hit/threw. However, all of the effects remain statistically significant when baseline controls are included, indicating that net of the characteristics that influence whether young women enter into any relationships with these types of conflict, the experiences increase the risk of pregnancy.

The final model in Table 2 includes measures of current conflict, history of conflict with the current partner, and history of conflict with any partner. This model shows that once we account for ever having experienced conflict with any partner, current conflict and history of conflict with the current partner are not significantly related to the risk of pregnancy. This suggests that perhaps it is either something about young women who enter into these types of relationships, in general, that elevates their pregnancy risk, or it is something about ever having experienced conflict in any relationship that elevates pregnancy risk. Other models (not shown in tables) demonstrate that ever experiencing the most serious type of conflict we examine – having been threatened with or experienced actual violence – drives this effect.

Table 3 presents parallel models of unequal decision-making. Model 1a shows higher pregnancy rates among respondents who reported unequal decision making at the *current* point in their relationships. Approximately 40% of the magnitude of this effect is explained when including the controls for socioeconomic background and early sexual behavior. This suggests that young women who have earlier and more intense sexual experiences and disadvantaged backgrounds tend to get into relationships with unequal decision-making, which in turn have higher pregnancy rates. Unequal decision-making, however, remains statistically significant when baseline controls are included, indicating that regardless of the selection into these relationships, young women with this experience have higher pregnancy rates.

Models 2a and 2b in Table 3 focus on a respondent's *history of unequal decision-making with the current partner*. Model 2a demonstrates higher pregnancy rates among respondents who ever reported unequal decision-making with her partner. 19% of the magnitude of this coefficient is explained by growing up in an intact family and early pregnancy-related experiences, however, suggesting that part of the reason the history of unequal decision-making within the current relationship affects pregnancy is because of the early pregnancy-related experiences and family background characteristics that predict who will have this type of relationship.

Models 3a and 3b in Table 3 focus on a respondent's *history of unequal decision-making with any partner*. Model 3a demonstrates higher pregnancy rates among respondents who ever reported unequal decision-making with any partner. However, 37% of the magnitude of this coefficient is explained by growing up in an intact family and early pregnancy-related experiences. This suggests that part of the reason unequal decision-making affects pregnancy is because of the early experiences that predict who will have these experiences.

The final model in Table 3 includes each of these measures of unequal decision-making in the same model. This model shows that regardless of history with another partner, and regardless of current unequal decision-making, having a history of unequal decision-making with the current partner elevates the risk of pregnancy. In other words, being in a relationship that has been unequal, regardless of whether it is currently unequal, is associated with higher pregnancy rates.

The models in Table 4 include a control for age heterogamy: whether the respondent has a current or prior boyfriend who was three or more years older. The first three models (Models 1-3) show that even net of having an older partner, the effects of all three measures of conflict remain significantly associated with an increased risk of pregnancy. The second three models (Models 4-6) demonstrate a similar finding for unequal decision-making, except that current unequal decision-making is not associated with higher pregnancy rates net of having an older partner. Rather, current unequal decision-making appears to increase the risk of pregnancy because of its association with age heterogamy, while having a history of unequal decision-making, either with the current partner or a prior partner, is associated with increased pregnancy risk regardless of age heterogamy. The effects of age heterogamy appear to be explained by history of conflict with any partner – in other words, women with a history of age heterogamy also tend to have a history of conflictual relationships, and the heterogamy influences pregnancy because of its relationship to conflict.

Although not shown in the tables, the final models in Tables 2 and 3, which include current and historical measures of conflict and unequal decision-making, do not change when we include a measure of age heterogamy in those models. These effects, described above, are net of age heterogamy.

DISCUSSION

The current study examines the role of dating conflict in early pregnancy. A unique feature of this study is the ability to capture dynamic relationship experiences over time. Using new longitudinal data from a weekly mixed-mode (online or phone) journal-based survey, we investigate the effects of three time-varying measures of relationship conflict. First, we examine *current conflict* at the approximate time the pregnancy occurred. Being in a relationship that includes arguing and fighting and/or unequal decision-making is associated with early pregnancy net of socioeconomic characteristics and prior experiences related to pregnancy that are highly predictive of pregnancy. Second, we examine young women's history of violence with her current partner. Having a history of arguing and fighting, swearing, threats/violence, and unequal decision-making within the current relationship are associated with early pregnancy. Third, we examine young women's history of conflict within all of their relationships. Having a history of conflict in any relationship is also associated with early pregnancy. These results are preliminary as we are still collecting data, but suggest that net of whether young women tend enter into relationships with conflict, conflict itself increases the risk of early pregnancy.

REFERENCES

- Allison, P. D. (1982). "Discrete-Time Methods for the Analysis of Event Histories." *Sociological Methodology*, 13: 61-98.
- Allison, P. D. (1984). *Event History Analysis: Regression for Longitudinal Event Data*. Beverly Hills, Sage.
- Anderson, E. (1999). *Code of the Street: Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Axinn, W.G., Barber, J.S., and Thornton, A. (1998). "The Long-Term Impact of Parents' Childbearing Decisions on Children's Self-Esteem." *Demography*, 35(4): 435-443.
- Barber, J.S., Axinn, W.G., and Thornton, A. (1999). "Unwanted Childbearing, Health and Mother-Child Relationships." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 40(3): 231-257.
- Baydar, N. (1995). "Consequences for Children of their Birth Planning Status." *Family Planning Perspectives*, 27: 228-234+245.
- Brown, S.S., and Eisenberg, L. (1995). "Demography of Unintended Pregnancy." In *The Best Intentions: Unintended Pregnancy and the Well-Being of Children and Families*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, pp. 21-49.
- Brown, B.B., Feiring, C., and Furman, W. (1999). "Missing the Love Boat: Why Researchers Have Shied Away from Adolescent Romance." In W. Furman, B.B. Brown, and C. Feiring (eds.), *The Development of Romantic Relationships in Adolescence*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-16.
- Chandra, A., Martinez, G.M., Mosher, W.D., Abma, J.C., and Jones, J. (2005). "Fertility, Family Planning, and Reproductive Health of U.S. Women: Data from the 2002 National Survey of Family Growth." National Center for Health Statistics, *Vital Health Stat*, 23(25).
- DiClemente, R.J., Wingood, G.M., Crosby, R.A., Sionean, C., Brown, L., Rothbaum, B., et al. (2001). "A Prospective Study of Psychological Distress and Sexual Risk Behavior among Black Adolescent Females." *Pediatrics*, 108:e85.
- Edin, K., and Kefalas, M. (2005). *Promises I Can Keep*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Ford, K., Sohn, W., and Lepkowski J. (2001). "Characteristics of Adolescents' Sexual Partners and Their Association with Use of Condoms and Other Contraceptive Methods." *Family Planning Perspectives*, 33(3): 100-105+132.
- Katz, B. P., Fortenberry, J., Zimet, G. D., Blythe, M. J., & Orr, D. P. (2000). Partner-specific relationship characteristics and condom use among young people with sexually transmitted diseases. *Journal of Sex Research*, 37, 69-75.
- Manning, W.D., Longmore, M.A., and Giordano, P.C. (2000). "The Relationship Context of Contraceptive Use at First Intercourse." *Family Planning Perspectives*, 32(3): 104-110.
- Miller, W.B. (1973). "Psychological Vulnerability to Unwanted Pregnancy." *Family Planning Perspectives*, 5(4): 199-201.
- Petersen, T. (1986). "Estimating Fully Parametric Hazard Rate Models With Time-Dependent Covariates: Use of Maximum Likelihood." *Sociological Methods and Research*, 14: 219-246.
- Petersen, T. (1991). "The Statistical Analysis of Event Histories." *Sociological Methods and Research*, 19: 270-323.

Schoen, R., Astone, N.M., Kim, Y.J., Nathanson, C.A., and Fields, J.M. (1999). "Do Fertility Intentions Affect Fertility Behavior?" *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61(3): 790-799.

United States. Dept. of Health and Human Services. (1990). *Healthy People 2000 Objectives*. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services.

United States. Dept. of Health and Human Services. (2000). *Healthy People 2010 Objectives*. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services.

Wingood, G.M., DiClemente, R.J., McCree, D.H., Harrington, K., & Davies, S.L. 2001. "Dating Violence and the Sexual Health of Black Adolescent Females. *Pediatrics*, 107:e72.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Measures Used in the Analyses (n=844 respondents; 32,090 observations)

	Mean	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
<i>Pregnancy</i>	0.13		0	1
<i>Conflict</i>				
Current				
Fought/argued only	0.10		0	1
Swore/called names/insulted	0.04		0	1
Threatened/violence	0.01		0	1
History with current partner				
Fought/argued only	0.24		0	1
Swore/called names/insulted	0.13		0	1
Threatened/violence	0.06		0	1
History with any partner				
Fought/argued only	0.36		0	1
Swore/called names/insulted	0.23		0	1
Threatened/violence	0.10		0	1
<i>Unequal decision-making</i>				
Current	0.05		0	1
History with current partner	0.13		0	1
History with any partner	0.27		0	1
<i>Partner three or more years older</i>				
Current partner	0.14		0	1
Any partner	0.26		0	1
<i>Baseline Control Measures</i>				
Sociodemographic Characteristics				
Age				
18 years old	0.42		0	1
19 years old	0.50		0	1
20 years old	0.08		0	1
African American	0.33		0	1
School enrollment/type				
Not enrolled and did not graduate	0.08		0	1
Not enrolled and did graduate	0.21		0	1
Enrolled in high school	0.13		0	1
Enrolled in 2 year college/vocational/technical/other	0.29		0	1
Enrolled in 4 year college	0.29		0	1
Receiving public assistance	0.23		0	1
Religious importance	2.69	0.92	1	4
Living with romantic partner	0.14		0	1
Biological mother less than 20 years old at first birth	0.35		0	1

Family Structure				
Two parents	0.54		0	1
One biological parent only	0.38		0	1
Other	0.08		0	1
Mother's education less than high school graduate	0.08		0	1
Parent's income				
\$14,999 or less	0.13		0	1
\$15,000 or greater	0.68		0	1
Don't know/Refused	0.19		0	1
Early Pregnancy-Related Experiences				
Age at first sex				
14 years or less	0.15		0	1
15-16 years	0.35		0	1
17 years or greater/never had sex	0.50		0	1
Number of sexual partners	3.24	4.90	0	57
Ever had sex without birth control	0.45		0	1
Number of prior pregnancies				
0 prior pregnancies	0.79		0	1
1 prior pregnancy	0.14		0	1
2 or more prior pregnancies	0.07		0	1

Table 2. Logistic Regression Estimates of Effects of Conflict on Hazard of Pregnancy (N=844 individuals, 32,090 observations)

	1a	1b	2a	2b	3a	3b	4
Conflict							
Current							
Fought/argued only	0.56 *	0.51 *					
	(0.26)	(0.26)					
Swore/called names/insulted	0.73 *	0.27					
	(0.36)	(0.36)					
Threatened/violence	1.32 **	0.58					
	(0.47)	(0.48)					
No conflict	(reference)	(reference)					
History with current partner							
Fought/argued only			0.70 **	0.57 *			
			(0.23)	(0.25)			
Swore/called names/insulted			0.82 **	0.54 *			
			(0.28)	(0.29)			
Threatened/violence			1.59 ***	0.87 **			
			(0.28)	(0.30)			
No conflict			(reference)	(reference)			
History with any partner							
Fought/argued only					1.21 ***	0.80 *	
					(0.33)	(0.35)	
Swore/called names/insulted					1.24 ***	0.68 *	
					(0.36)	(0.37)	
Threatened/violence					2.49 ***	1.46 ***	
					(0.34)	(0.37)	
No conflict					(reference)	(reference)	
Current - Fought/argued only							0.19
							(0.27)
History with current partner - Any conflict							0.35
							(0.25)
History with any partner - Any conflict							0.63 *
							(0.37)
Baseline Control Measures							
Sociodemographic Characteristics							
Age							
19 years old		0.03		0.05		0.09	0.04
		(0.21)		(0.21)		(0.21)	(0.21)
20 years old		-1.20 *		-1.18 *		-1.12 *	-1.14 *
		(0.61)		(0.61)		(0.61)	(0.61)
African American		0.09		0.1		0.07	0.12
		(0.26)		(0.26)		(0.26)	(0.26)
School enrollment and type							
Not enrolled and did not graduate		-0.25		-0.25		-0.18	-0.27
		(0.46)		(0.46)		(0.46)	(0.46)
Not enrolled and did graduate		0.71 *		0.73 *		0.68 *	0.70 *
		(0.32)		(0.32)		(0.33)	(0.32)
Enrolled in high school		0.52		0.52		0.52	0.51
		(0.38)		(0.38)		(0.38)	(0.38)
Enrolled in 2 year college		-0.06		-0.08		-0.05	-0.13
		(0.33)		(0.33)		(0.33)	(0.33)
Receiving public assistance		0.13		0.18		0.16	0.18
		(0.25)		(0.25)		(0.25)	(0.25)
Religious importance		-0.02		-0.03		-0.06	-0.03
		(0.12)		(0.12)		(0.12)	(0.12)
Living with romantic partner		0.68 **		0.51 *		0.48 *	0.50 *
		(0.24)		(0.24)		(0.24)	(0.25)
Biological mother <20 years old at 1st birth		0.39 *		0.36 *		0.37 *	0.38 *

	(0.21)		(0.21)		(0.21)	(0.21)	
Family structure							
One biological parent only	0.56 **		0.60 **		0.58 **	0.59 **	
	(0.23)		(0.23)		(0.23)	(0.23)	
Other	0.38		0.39		0.37	0.42	
	(0.34)		(0.34)		(0.34)	(0.34)	
Mother's education <high school graduate	-0.1		-0.06		-0.05	-0.08	
	(0.34)		(0.34)		(0.34)	(0.34)	
Parent's income							
\$14,999 or less	0.35		0.3		0.39	0.35	
	(0.27)		(0.27)		(0.27)	(0.27)	
Don't know/refused	0.1		0.17		0.16	0.19	
	(0.26)		(0.26)		(0.26)	(0.26)	
Early Pregnancy-Related Experiences							
Age at first sex							
14 years or less	0.60 *		0.56 *		0.53	0.53	
	(0.33)		(0.33)		(0.33)	(0.33)	
15-16 years	0.82 **		0.80 **		0.74 **	0.73 **	
	(0.28)		(0.28)		(0.28)	(0.28)	
Number of sexual partners	0.02 *		0.03 *		0.02	0.02 *	
	(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.01)	(0.01)	
Ever had sex without birth control	0.50 *		0.46 *		0.38	0.45 *	
	(0.27)		(0.27)		(0.27)	(0.26)	
Number of prior pregnancies							
1 prior pregnancy	0.89 ***		0.83 **		0.87 ***	0.87 ***	
	(0.27)		(0.27)		(0.27)	(0.27)	
2 prior pregnancies	1.20 ***		1.25 ***		1.25 ***	1.19 ***	
	(0.32)		(0.32)		(0.32)	(0.32)	
Baseline Hazard Controls							
Journal number	-0.05 ***	-0.02	-0.05 ***	-0.02 *	-0.07 ***	-0.04 **	-0.03 *
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Journal number squared	0.00 **	0.00 *	0.00 ***	0.00 *	0.00 ***	0.00 **	0.00 *
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Constant	-5.08 ***	-7.49 ***	-5.25 ***	-7.60 ***	-5.75 ***	-7.61 ***	-7.89 ***
	(0.24)	(0.53)	(0.25)	(0.54)	(0.33)	(0.57)	(0.57)
X ²	27.44	195.83	46.5	201.54	81.05	210.28	204.12
Log-likelihood	-737.41	-653.21	-727.88	-650.36	-710.6	-645.99	-649.07

Coefficients are effects on log-odds. Standard errors in parentheses. All model X² values are statistically significant at the .001 level.

* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001 (one-tailed tests).

Table 3. Logistic Regression Estimates of Effects of Unequal Decision-Making on Hazard of Pregnancy (N=844, 32,090 observations)

	1a	1b	2a	2b	3a	3b	4
Unequal Decision-Making							
Current	0.89 ** (0.30)	0.53 * (0.31)					-0.12 (0.38)
History with current partner			1.02 *** (0.21)	0.83 *** (0.23)			0.86 * (0.44)
History with any partner					0.73 *** (0.20)	0.46 * (0.21)	-0.24 (0.43)
Baseline Control Measures							
Sociodemographic Characteristics							
Age							
19 years old		0.04 (0.21)		0.08 (0.22)		0.05 (0.22)	0.13 (0.24)
20 years old		-1.18 * (0.61)		-1.10 * (0.61)		-1.12 * (0.61)	-0.87 (0.62)
African American		0.07 (0.26)		0.04 (0.26)		0.03 (0.26)	-0.22 (0.29)
School enrollment and type							
Not enrolled and did not graduate		-0.25 (0.46)		-0.19 (0.46)		-0.25 (0.46)	-0.47 (0.53)
Not enrolled and did graduate		0.72 * (0.32)		0.78 ** (0.32)		0.75 ** (0.32)	0.91 ** (0.35)
Enrolled in high school		0.5 (0.38)		0.49 (0.38)		0.51 (0.38)	0.68 (0.41)
Enrolled in 2 year college		-0.07 (0.33)		-0.07 (0.33)		-0.06 (0.33)	-0.07 (0.37)
Receiving public assistance		0.13 (0.25)		0.20 (0.25)		0.20 (0.25)	0.40 (0.27)
Religious importance		-0.03 (0.12)		-0.02 (0.12)		0.00 (0.12)	-0.01 (0.13)
Living with romantic partner		0.72 ** (0.24)		0.70 ** (0.24)		0.74 *** (0.24)	0.57 * (0.25)
Biological mother <20 years old at 1st birth		0.39 * (0.21)		0.41 * (0.21)		0.40 * (0.21)	0.40 * (0.23)
Family structure							
One biological parent only		0.57 ** (0.23)		0.64 ** (0.23)		0.57 ** (0.23)	0.66 ** (0.25)
Other		0.34 (0.34)		0.40 (0.34)		0.31 (0.34)	0.76 * (0.35)
Mother's education <high school graduate		-0.09 (0.34)		-0.06 (0.34)		-0.11 (0.34)	0.00 (0.36)
Parent's income							
\$14,999 or less		0.30 (0.27)		0.26 (0.27)		0.31 (0.27)	0.37 (0.30)
Don't know/refused		0.07 (0.26)		0.03 (0.26)		0.03 (0.26)	0.34 (0.29)
Early Pregnancy-Related Experiences							
Age at first sex							
14 years or less		0.60 * (0.34)		0.56 * (0.34)		0.61 * (0.34)	0.53 (0.35)
15-16 years		0.82 ** (0.28)		0.82 ** (0.28)		0.80 ** (0.28)	0.70 ** (0.29)
Number of sexual partners		0.02 * (0.01)		0.02 (0.01)		0.02 (0.01)	0.03 * (0.02)
Ever had sex without birth control		0.53 * (0.27)		0.47 * (0.27)		0.50 * (0.27)	0.16 (0.28)
Number of prior pregnancies							
1 prior pregnancy		0.85 *** (0.27)		0.84 ** (0.27)		0.85 *** (0.27)	0.76 ** (0.29)
2 prior pregnancies		1.20 *** (0.32)		1.25 *** (0.32)		1.20 *** (0.32)	1.35 *** (0.35)
Baseline Hazard Controls							
Journal number	-0.05 *** (0.01)	-0.02 * (0.01)	-0.06 *** (0.01)	-0.03 * (0.01)	-0.06 *** (0.01)	-0.03 * (0.01)	-0.02 (0.02)
Journal number squared	0.00 ** (0.00)	0.00 * (0.00)	0.00 *** (0.00)	0.00 * (0.00)	0.00 *** (0.00)	0.00 * (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
Constant	-4.90 *** (0.22)	-7.32 *** (0.52)	-4.95 *** (0.22)	-7.44 *** (0.53)	-4.91 *** (0.22)	-7.37 *** (0.53)	-7.30 *** (0.60)
X ²	23.02	194.02	35.87	203.75	28.47	195.84	152.50
Log-likelihood	-739.62	-654.12	-733.19	-649.25	-736.89	-653.21	-529.58

Coefficients are effects on log-odds. Standard errors in parentheses. All model X² values are statistically significant at the .001 level.

* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001 (one-tailed tests).

Table 4. Logistic Regression Estimates of Effects of Conflict, Unequal Decision-Making, and Partner Older on Hazard of Pregnancy (N=844 individuals, 32,090 observations)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Conflict						
Current						
Fought/argued only	0.50 *					
	(0.26)					
Swore/called names/insulted	0.23					
	(0.36)					
Threatened/violence	0.55					
	(0.48)					
No conflict	(reference)					
History with current partner						
Fought/argued only		0.51 *				
		(0.25)				
Swore/called names/insulted		0.48 *				
		(0.29)				
Threatened/violence		0.80 **				
		(0.30)				
No conflict		(reference)				
History with any partner						
Fought/argued only			0.79 *			
			(0.35)			
Swore/called names/insulted			0.68 *			
			(0.37)			
Threatened/violence			1.44 ***			
			(0.37)			
No conflict			(reference)			
Unequal Decision-Making						
Current						
				0.44		
				(0.31)		
History with current partner						
					0.76 ***	
					(0.23)	
History with any partner						
						0.43 *
						(0.22)
Partner(s) three or more years older	0.46 *	0.42 *	0.10	0.43 *	0.39 *	0.20
	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.22)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.22)
Baseline Control Measures						
Sociodemographic Characteristics						
Age						
19 years old	-0.02	0.00	0.08	0.00	0.04	0.03
	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.21)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.22)
20 years old	-1.25 *	-1.24 *	-1.13 *	-1.23 *	-1.15 *	-1.15 *
	(0.61)	(0.61)	(0.61)	(0.61)	(0.61)	(0.61)
African American	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.03	0.05
	(0.26)	(0.26)	(0.26)	(0.26)	(0.26)	(0.26)
School enrollment and type						
Not enrolled and did not graduate	-0.35	-0.34	-0.21	-0.35	-0.27	-0.29
	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)	(0.46)
Not enrolled and did graduate	0.68 *	0.70 *	0.66 *	0.69 *	0.75 *	0.71 *
	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.33)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.33)
Enrolled in high school	0.53	0.53	0.52	0.51	0.51	0.5
	(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.38)	(0.38)
Enrolled in 2 year college	-0.05	-0.06	-0.05	-0.06	-0.05	-0.06
	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)	(0.33)
Receiving public assistance	0.14	0.18	0.15	0.15	0.21	0.19
	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.25)
Religious importance	-0.01	-0.02	-0.06	-0.01	-0.01	0.01
	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)
Living with romantic partner	0.60 **	0.45 *	0.47 *	0.64 **	0.63 **	0.72 **

	(0.24)	(0.25)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.24)
Biological mother <20 years old at 1st birth	0.36 *	0.33	0.36 *	0.37 *	0.38 *	0.39 *
	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)
Family structure						
One biological parent only	0.56 **	0.59 **	0.58 **	0.55 **	0.63 **	0.56 **
	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.23)
Other	0.36	0.38	0.35	0.32	0.38	0.28
	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)
Mother's education <high school graduate	-0.16	-0.11	-0.07	-0.15	-0.11	-0.14
	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)
Parent's income						
\$14,999 or less	0.34	0.29	0.39	0.29	0.26	0.32
	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.27)
Don't know/refused	0.11	0.17	0.15	0.09	0.05	0.02
	(0.26)	(0.26)	(0.26)	(0.26)	(0.26)	(0.26)
Early Pregnancy-Related Experiences						
Age at first sex						
14 years or less	0.55	0.52	0.52	0.56 *	0.52	0.58 *
	(0.34)	(0.33)	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)	(0.34)
15-16 years	0.82 **	0.80 **	0.74 **	0.82 **	0.81 **	0.80 **
	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.28)	(0.28)
Number of sexual partners	0.02 *	0.03 *	0.02	0.02 *	0.02	0.02
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Ever had sex without birth control	0.52 *	0.48 *	0.38	0.54 *	0.48 *	0.51 *
	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.27)
Number of prior pregnancies						
1 prior pregnancy	0.90 ***	0.86 ***	0.88 ***	0.87 ***	0.86 ***	0.87 ***
	(0.27)	(0.28)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.27)
2 prior pregnancies	1.21 ***	1.25 ***	1.24 ***	1.21 ***	1.26 ***	1.18 ***
	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)	(0.32)
Baseline Hazard Controls						
Journal number	-0.02	-0.03 *	-0.04 **	-0.03 *	-0.03 *	-0.03 *
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Journal number squared	0.00 *	0.00 *	0.00 **	0.00 *	0.00 *	0.00 **
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Constant	-7.54 ***	-7.62 ***	-7.61 ***	-7.37 ***	-7.46 ***	-7.37 ***
	(0.53)	(0.54)	(0.57)	(0.52)	(0.53)	(0.53)
X ²	199.69	204.71	210.5	197.34	206.65	196.72
Log-likelihood	-651.28	-648.77	-645.88	-652.46	-647.8	-652.77

Coefficients are effects on log-odds. Standard errors in parentheses. All model X² values are statistically significant at the .001 level.

* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001 (one-tailed tests).



Population Studies Center Research Reports

The **Population Studies Center (PSC)** at the University of Michigan is one of the oldest population centers in the United States. Established in 1961 with a grant from the Ford Foundation, the Center has a rich history as the main workplace for an interdisciplinary community of scholars in the field of population studies.

Currently PSC is one of five centers within the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research. The Center receives core funding from both the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (R24) and the National Institute on Aging (P30).

PSC Research Reports are **prepublication working papers** that report on current demographic research conducted by PSC-affiliated researchers. These papers are written for timely dissemination and are often later submitted for publication in scholarly journals.

The **PSC Research Report Series** was initiated in 1981.

Copyrights for all Reports are held by the authors. Readers may quote from this work as long as they properly acknowledge the authors and the Series and do not alter the original work.

Population Studies Center
University of Michigan
Institute for Social Research
PO Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248 USA
<http://www.psc.isr.umich.edu/pubs/>