Parenthood and Partnerships Among Young Adults

Tayelor Valerio[1]

U.S. Census Bureau[2]

Abstract

Understanding the relationships and living arrangements of young parents and their children is crucial because they overlap during critical stages in life. For the parents, childbearing is taking place during emerging adulthood, when education, employment, and partnership decisions can have lasting implications for their futures. At the same time, these events are taking place during their children's first few years of life, which are important for their own cognitive and behavioral development. Using 2018 data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation, this paper analyzes the current socioeconomic characteristics, living arrangements, and parental involvement patterns of young parents 15-22 years old. I make select comparisons to nonparent peers and older parents and estimate regressions to model connections between socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of young parents and their likelihood of living with their children.

Introduction

The average age at which Americans transition to parenthood has continued to rise in recent decades (Guzzo and Payne, 2018; Stykes, 2011). According to the National Center for Health Statistics, the mean age at first birth for women rose to 26.9 years in 2018, up from 25.4 years in

[1] This paper is released to inform interested parties of research and evaluation and to encourage discussion. The views expressed on statistical, measurement, or methodological issues are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the U.S. Census Bureau.

[2]The U.S. Census Bureau reviewed this data product for unauthorized disclosure of confidential information and approved the disclosure avoidance practices applied to this release. CBDRB-FY21-POP001-0167.

2010 (Martin et al., 2019). This increase has been driven by declining first births to teenage women, in tandem with a rise in first births to women in their 30s and 40s (Martin et al., 2018). However, delays in childbearing have not been consistent. A strong divergence in marriage and childbearing trends has occurred in the past few decades that has set Americans onto different family trajectories based on social class (Lundberg, Pollak, and Stearns, 2016). For instance, well-educated couples tend to follow traditional marriage and childbearing patterns; while they may cohabit with a partner before marriage, they often do so for shorter periods and transition to marriage quickly if pregnancy occurs. Among those with lower educational attainment, on the other hand, childbearing occurs earlier, is often unplanned, and frequently takes place outside marriage (Gibson-Davis, 2009; Lundberg, Pollak, and Stearns, 2016).

Decades of research on the transition to early parenthood suggest that those who give birth at younger ages are a select group whose lives have been shaped by common elements, such as poverty and family instability (Hofferth and Goldsheider, 2010). For instance, sustained exposure to neighborhood poverty, living in households with fewer resources, being raised by a single parent, and experiencing multiple family transitions are associated with an increased risk of early parenthood (Barber, 2001; Hofferth and Goldsheider, 2010; Wodtke, 2013). Young parents are also more likely to experience these outcomes in their own adult lives. Several longitudinal studies have documented lower educational attainment, lower household incomes, and greater receipt of welfare assistance in the following years among those who had earlier first births (Furstenberg Brooks-Gunn, and Morgan, 1987; Taylor, 2009). They are also less likely to get married and more likely to experience a divorce (Furstenberg, Brooks-Gunn, and Morgan, 1987). These characteristics often result in “fragile families” with greater instances of union dissolution and

family complexity, which have negative consequences for the health and well-being of parents and their children (Manning, 2015; Ferraro et al., 2015; McLanahan and Percheski, 2008).

While a large body of literature now documents the causes and consequences of early parenthood, the experiences that young parents have as they navigate early childbearing has received less attention. These experiences may differ dramatically depending on whether the parents live with their childbearing partner, other family members, and/or their children. Seltzer (2019) has argued that for demographers to better understand families, they must pay greater attention to the relationships of individuals within them. Whom young parents live with may affect the level of resources they can access to manage work and school schedules, child care, and finances, among other things.

Young parents are navigating their journey into adulthood with increasing variability in pathways during uncertain times (Shanahan, 2000). In the past, one of the traditional markers of adulthood was establishing an independent residence from parents. Yet among young adults aged 18-34, living arrangements have changed drastically in the past couple of decades, to the point that it is now more common for them to live with parents than with a spouse (Vespa, 2017). Less than one in three young adults were financially independent from their parents by the age at which they expected they should be in 2016 (Vespa, 2017). Doubling up, defined as households that include extra adults who are not the spouse or cohabiting partner of the householder, became more common among young adults and those not in the labor force after the 2007 economic recession (Mykyta and Macartney, 2011). Doubling up can be beneficial for addressing material hardship but is also linked to difficulties obtaining medical care and higher levels of food insecurity (Mykyta and Pilkauskas, 2016).

Parents' living arrangements, and any associated changes, can also shape their children's lives. Changes in household composition, such as the exit or entry of parents, other relatives, or nonrelatives, can be disruptive to resources like household income, and also to family roles and power dynamics. These changes, with some exceptions, are usually linked to negative child developmental, educational, and health outcomes (Lee and McLanahan, 2015; Perkins, 2019; Waldfogel, Craigie, and Brooks-Gunn, 2010). Children are more likely to experience changes in household composition when they are young, have cohabiting parents, or live with one parent (vs. two parents) (Perkins, 2017; Rackin and Gibson-Davis, 2012). For example, one study of union transitions among first time parents found that 40 percent of cohabiting relationships dissolved within three years of a child's birth, leaving the child with one coresident parent (Rackin and Gibson-Davis, 2012).

Another important piece to consider is the relationship status of young parents and how that may affect their relationship with their children. The high rate of union dissolution among cohabiting couples, in which many births to young women take place, increases the likelihood of a child living with only one biological parent and with a married or cohabiting stepparent figure at some point (Kennedy and Bumpass, 2008; Manning, 2015). This may complicate relationships and lead to children spending less time with the nonresident parent (typically the father). Several studies have documented a decrease in paternal involvement in the years following a separation (Seltzer and Bianchi, 1988; Seltzer, 1991; Juby et al., 2007). New unions and the birth of children within new unions are also associated with less contact with nonresident children (Seltzer, 1991; Manning, Stewart, and Smock, 2003; Juby et al., 2007; Gibson-Davis, 2008). For resident parents, research suggests that married and cohabiting biological parents have similar patterns of engagement, perceived parenting difficulty, and instrumental support (Gibson-Davis, 2008), while

single parents exhibit lower levels of parental involvement, likely due to their dual roles of breadwinner and parent (McLanahan and Sandefur, 1994). Because stress, economic uncertainty, and relationship instability can undermine parental well-being and indirectly influence effective parenting (McLanahan and Percheski, 2008), young parents could have lower levels of involvement than older parents. On the other hand, having a child may bring a new source of meaning and direction into new parent's lives, particularly among young mothers (Edin and Kefalas, 2005), resulting in similar patterns of involvement.

Using new data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), this paper analyzes the living arrangements and parental involvement patterns of young biological parents in the United States in 2018. By focusing on the relationships between young parents and their current coresident partners, other household members, and their children, this research provides new insight into the experiences that young parents and their children have with one another in several domains, and provides a basis for future studies. Moreover, the relationships of young parents and their children are particularly important to study because they overlap in critical times. For the parents, childbearing is taking place during emerging adulthood, when the decisions they make regarding education, employment, and partnerships can have lasting implications for their futures. At the same time, these events are taking place during their children's first few years of life, which are critical for their cognitive and behavioral development (Cavanagh and Fomby, 2019).

Because young parents inhabit two important spheres—the young adult population and the parent population—I make select comparisons between young parents and these two groups. Parenthood is relatively rare in young adulthood: only about 5 percent of young adults are parents

by age 22.[3] Thus, I compare the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of young parents to young adults who are not parents, as distinctions during these critical years may be of particular interest to policy makers. I compare the living arrangements and relationships of young parents to older parents because these dynamics have important implications for children's well-being.

This project answers the following questions:

- What are the socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of young parents? How do these characteristics compare to young adults of the same age group who are not parents?
- What are the current living arrangements of young parents? How do these living arrangements compare to older parents?
- Among young parents, how do the odds of living with the respondent's children vary by sex, race, and Hispanic origin, controlling for socioeconomic and demographic factors?
- What are the parental involvement patterns of young parents? How do these patterns compare to older parents?

Data

The SIPP is a nationally representative survey of the civilian, non-institutionalized population of the United States living in households.[4] The 2018 survey was administered in the first half of 2018 and collected data reflecting people's lives and households in calendar year 2017 and as of the time of the interview. Although the SIPP has been administered by the U.S. Census Bureau since 1985, the 2014 redesign makes it a unique source of data for studying young parents and their relationships. First, the redesign added a full set of fertility history questions, which are

[3] Estimate is from the 2018 Survey of Income and Program Participation.
[4] For information on sampling and non-sampling error and nonresponse bias, see <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/sipp/tech-documentation/complete-documents/2018/2018_SIPP_Wave_1_Nonresponse_Bias_Report.pdf> and <https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/sipp/tech-documentation/source-accuracy-statements/2018/sipp-2018-SA-statement-calendar-yr-data-coll.pdf>.

asked of both women and men, as well as information on shared and non-shared childbearing and multiple partner fertility (having biological children with more than one person).[5] Second, the revised instrument collects detailed relationship information for all household members. When coupled with additional measures of child well-being, SIPP data can provide detailed insight on young parents' characteristics, living arrangements, and parenting.

Approach

This paper primarily focuses on young adults aged 15-22 who are biological parents that were living in households at the time of interview. Though the SIPP collects fertility histories of all adults ages 15 and older, the age range of 15 to 22 was chosen because these are formative years for educational and career outcomes. For comparison purposes, I include the characteristics of young adults aged 15-22 who are not parents, and the characteristics of older parents aged 23-50.[6] After age 50, I expect fewer parents to have children who are under age 18. Moreover, very few young adults in the 15-22 age group were parents to step or adopted children and not biological children (about 1 percent). As the characteristics of young step or adoptive parents may differ from those who are biological parents, but are not large enough to analyze separately, I exclude them from these analyses.

The first part of this paper presents a demographic profile of the social and economic characteristics of young parents in the United States. Using descriptive statistics, I provide estimates of the percentage of young adults aged 15-22 who are currently parents by race and

[5] Some scholars are concerned over the quality of the fertility data reported by men and the coverage of men/fathers in surveys. Reviews of SIPP fertility data suggest that most surveyed men report their fertility information without high levels of missing data, and that the fertility information of mothers and fathers is similar (Monte and Fields, 2020; Monte and Knop, 2019 (Appendix)). However, there is also evidence that some fathers-- particularly those who are young, have multiple partner fertility, and do not live with their children-- are underrepresented in national surveys such as SIPP, which contributes to an overestimation of childlessness among men. See Monte and Fields (2020) for further discussion of the coverage of men in SIPP data.

[6] Sensitivity analyses changing the age range of older parents from 23-50 to 26-50 did not substantively change the results.

Hispanic origin. I also present estimates of their current levels of educational attainment, labor force participation, and their interviewed household's economic standing. I then compare this information to young adults of the same age group who are not parents.

The next section documents the current living arrangements of these young parents and compares them to the living arrangements of older parents. Specifically, I present estimates of the percentage of parents living with a spouse or cohabiting partner; all, some, or none of their biological children; and whether they share children with their current spouse or partner. This section also provides estimates for the percentage of parents living with other family members and non-family members. To better understand how coresidence with children varies by demographic characteristics, I use logistic regression to predict the odds of living with all of the respondent's children by race and Hispanic origin, controlling for sex, age, educational attainment, and household poverty.

Finally, I provide estimates of parental involvement between young parents and their child(ren), compared to older parents. The SIPP includes several variables capturing the number of days in the previous week that the parent engaged in a specific activity with children living in the interviewed household. The activities that this study analyzes are eating dinner with the child and going on outings with the child. These analyses are subset to two specific groups: the activities performed between partnered parents and their children, and parents who live with their children but do not live with a spouse or unmarried partner (solo parents).

Measures

Living arrangements are assessed through information collected from the household roster at the time of the interview, and through information about month 12 of the reference year (December 2017). I examine several binary variables capturing the respondent's relationship with

a romantic partner at the time of the interview, including variables for living with a spouse or cohabiting partner, and whether or not the respondent shares biological children with his or her current spouse or cohabiting partner. Regarding coresidence with children (also at interview month), I create categorical variables that capture whether the respondent lives with all, some, or none of his or her biological children. An additional binary variable captures those who are living with at least one biological child and no spouse or partner. A final variable captures living with step or adopted children, in addition to biological children. To capture coresidence with others, I use the monthly relationship matrix at month 12. Unlike the relationship information at interview month, which is based on the respondent's relationship to the household reference person, the monthly relationship matrix provides information on how each person in the household is related to every other person in the household for each month they lived together. The analysis includes dummy variables for living alone, with a parent or parent-in law, with a grandparent, with a sibling or sibling-in-law, with another relative, and with a nonrelative. These categories are not mutually exclusive.

I evaluate parental involvement through four binary measures related to the frequency of shared meals and outings. The measures described below were answered by the *reference* parent of the child, usually the mother, and are on that parent's record, even if that parent is answering questions about the *other* parent. I include binary variables for *reference* parents having dinner with their 0-17-year-old children 0-4 times per week vs. five times or more. A similar variable captures how frequently the *other* parent had dinner with the children (0-4 times vs. five or more). Another set of binary variables identifies *reference* parents and *other* parents separately and captures taking their 0-5-year-old children out two or more times per week vs. taking the children

out 0-1 times.[7] These questions were asked about all children in the appropriate age range; in other words, they are not responses specific to a particular child. Because a *reference* parent is not always the biological parent of the child in the household (it may be a step or adoptive parent, or another relative or nonrelative if no parents are available or live in the household at the time of interview), I subset the sample of *reference* parents to only include those who lived with at least one of their biological children in the appropriate age range.

Hypotheses

Based on previous research, I expect that young parents will live in households that are more socioeconomically disadvantaged than other young adults, as these elements are associated with an increased risk of early parenthood (Barber 2001; Hofferth and Goldsheider 2010; Wodtke 2013). I also expect that young parents will have higher rates of "doubling up," meaning that they will be more likely to share their households with other family or non-family members, compared to older parents. This may be used as a strategy by young parents to reduce material hardships and ease the transition into parenthood. Finally, I hypothesize that young parents will have less parent-child engagement than older parents, who may experience fewer of the stressors that negatively impact parental well-being and effective parenting (McLanahan and Percheski 2008).

Results

Demographic Profile of Young Parents

Table 1 presents the socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of young parents and provides parallel estimates for their nonparent peers of the same age group. In total, there are about 1.8 million biological parents aged 15 to 22 in the United States. The young parents in this sample

[7] The categorization of the parental involvement variables used in this paper was primarily chosen to be consistent with other Census products. For an example, see <www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2018/demo/P70-159>.

are older, on average, than their nonparent peers: the average age of parents in this age group is 20.6 years, compared to 18.4 years for nonparents.[8]

Young parents and nonparents are comparable in regard to their racial composition: Around 73 percent of young parents and nonparents are White, about 15 percent are Black, and about 12 percent belong to all other races or multiple races.[9,10] However, young parents are more likely to be Hispanic (of any race)—about one-third of young parents are Hispanic, while only 22.1 percent of nonparents are. About 90 percent of parents and nonparents are native born.[11]

Despite their slightly older age profile, young parents have lower educational attainment than their nonparent peers. A smaller share of young parents has any education beyond high school than nonparents: about 74 percent of young parents have at most a high school degree, compared to only 64 percent of nonparents. Given that most young adults are still attending high school and college at ages 15 to 22, very few parents or nonparents have received a bachelor's degree or higher yet (about 4 percent, which does not statistically differ between parents and nonparents). Educational attainment may still increase in the future for both groups, but longitudinal studies have found that early child bearers ultimately complete less schooling than those who delayed child bearing (Taylor, 2009). One pathway for this may be parents choosing to leave school to

[8] All comparative statements in this report have undergone statistical testing, and, unless otherwise noted, all comparisons are statistically significant at the 10 percent significance level.

[9]This paper refers to the White-alone population as White, the Black-alone population as Black, and the White-alone, non-Hispanic population as non-Hispanic White, unless otherwise noted. Hispanic ethnicity is a measure independent of race, and someone who is Hispanic can be of any race. The SIPP allows for self-identification with any combination of five different race categories, as well as a variety of ethnic origins. Here, I present only the most populous racial categories. For more information, see <www.census.gov /mso/www/training/pdf/race-ethnicity - onepager.pdf>.

[10] The percentages of young parents and nonparents who are White do not significantly differ from one another. Additionally, the percentages of young parents and nonparents who are Black do not significantly differ from another. The percentages of young parents and nonparents who belong to all other races or multiple races also do not significantly differ from one another.

[11] The percentage of young parents who are native born does not significantly differ from the percentage of nonparents who are native born.

enter the workforce. Indeed, about 65 percent of young parents are in the labor force, compared to about 44 percent of nonparents.

The results for the economic indicators suggest that young parents live in households with fewer resources than their nonparent peers. For instance, a greater share of young parents has a family income below the poverty line (30.9 percent, compared to 20.9 percent among nonparents). Young parents are also about 3 times as likely to live in households that received Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits in the last twelve months.

Living Arrangements of Parents

Results for the current profile of young parents suggests that they live in less advantaged households than their nonparent peers, as evident by a greater likelihood of poverty and receiving SNAP benefits. As such, the presence of other household members, if any, and the relationships they share with one another may be particularly important. Table 2 explores the living arrangements of young parents in comparison to older parents (those ages 23-50). I also present the average ages of young parents and older parents to better contextualize the characteristics of these two groups. The average age of the young parent group is 20.6 years, while the average age for the older parent group is 38.7 years.

Even though the median age at first marriage is closer to thirty,[12] many young parents live with a spouse or cohabiting partner. About 23 percent of young parents live with a spouse and an additional 30 percent live with a cohabiting partner. Twenty-seven percent are cohabiting with someone with whom they share a biological child, while 4 percent are cohabiting with someone with whom they do not share a biological child. In contrast, a greater share of older parents is

[12] For more information, visit <www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/families/marital.html>.

living with a spouse rather than a cohabiting partner. About 66 percent of older parents live with a spouse, and 11 percent live with a cohabiting partner. This is an important distinction, as cohabiting relationships have higher rates of union dissolution than marriages and do not have the same legal protections that married parent families do (Manning, 2015). However, research also suggests that stable cohabiting families consisting of two biological parents have many of the same health and behavioral benefits as stable married biological parent families (Manning, 2015).

Regarding coresidence with children, about three-quarters of young parents live with at least one of their children, while 83.5 percent of older parents do. A greater percentage of young parents live with all of their children (71.6 percent, compared to 67.0 percent of older parents). This may be because most young parents have only had one child and have less prevalence of multiple partner fertility than older parents, and because older parents may have children who have moved out of the household. Indeed, 16.5 percent of older parents live with some, but not all, of their children, compared to only 4.9 percent of young parents. Young parents are also less likely to live with step or adopted children in addition to biological children (2.8 percent, compared to 5.1 percent).

Young parents are about twice as likely to be a solo parent (living with at least one child and no spouse or partner) than older parents are—about 26 percent of young parents are solo parents, compared to only about 15 percent of older parents. However, young parents are also more likely to live with other relatives or nonrelatives than older adults. For instance, about 40 percent of young parents live with their own parent or parent-in-law, while only about 11 percent of older parents do. Young parents are also about twice as likely to live with a nonrelative (12.6 percent, compared to 5.2 percent of older parents). These additional household members may provide

important resources to young parents, such as child care or financial contributions to household and other expenses.

Few parents (young or older) live alone. Only about four percent of parents live alone, and this does not statistically differ between the two groups.

Table 3 shows the results of a logistic regression model predicting the odds of young parents living with all of their children, controlling for socioeconomic factors. Net of the effects of education, poverty level, and labor force participation, young mothers are more likely than young fathers to live with all of their children. The odds of living with all of one's children do not significantly differ between those who are non-Hispanic Black or non-Hispanic White, but young parents who are non-Hispanic and belong to all other races or multiple races are significantly less likely than non-Hispanic Whites to live with all of their children. Additionally, young adults who are Hispanic (of any race) are less likely to live with all of their children than those who are non-Hispanic. Each additional year of age significantly increases the odds of living with all the respondents' children. The socioeconomic variables are not significantly related to the odds of young parents living with all of their children net of the effects of the demographic variables.

Parental Involvement Patterns

Table 4 examines the parental involvement patterns of young parents and their children in comparison to older parents. Questions about involvement with children are asked of one *reference* parent, usually the mother, and this *reference* parent provides information about his or her own involvement with the children in addition to information about the involvement of the children's *other* parent. Thus, the sample for Table 4 is *reference* parents who lived with at least one biological child in the appropriate age range. To understand how these patterns vary by the

reference parent's partnership status, results are shown for partnered parents (those living with a spouse or partner) and solo parents separately, by the age group of the reference parent.[13]

Among partnered parents, most *reference* parents had dinner with their children 5 or more times a week (90.1 percent of young parents and 86.6 percent of older parents) versus 0 to 4 times a week, and this did not statistically differ between young and older parents. The majority of *other* parents also had dinner with their children 5 or more times a week (for both young and older parents).

A different pattern can be seen among solo parents. Young solo *reference* parents were more likely to eat dinner with their children 5 or more times a week than older solo *reference* parents. Meanwhile, the majority of solo *other* parents (both young and older) had dinner only 0-4 times a week with their children. As these other parents are not living in the household with their children, this pattern is not surprising. Interestingly, young solo *reference* parents reported that their children's *other* parent had dinner with them 5 or more times a week more often than older solo parents did (28.5 percent, compared to 13.4 percent).

In regard to going on outings with their children, the majority of partnered *reference* parents went out with their children at least two times a week versus 0-1 times a week, but this was most common among older *reference* parents. Seventy-seven percent of young partnered *reference* parents went out with their children at least twice a week, compared to 85.4 percent of older *reference* parents. Most *other* parents also went out with their children at least twice a week compared to 0-1 times a week (for both young and older parents), and there were no differences in engagement levels between young and older parents. For solo parents, young parents seem to

[13] It is possible that having multiple partner fertility could affect reference parents' answers about parental engagement, since it may be unclear whom the respondent is thinking about when he or she answers questions about the other parent. While multiple partner fertility is relatively rare for young parents, it is much more common among the older adult population and may play more of a role there.

have a greater level of engagement than older parents again: younger *reference* parents were more likely to go on outings with their children 2 or more times a week, compared to older parents.

Discussion and Conclusion

This paper presented a demographic portrait of young parents ages 15 to 22 in the United States and provided an important snapshot of the households of young parents in several different spheres. By comparing their characteristics to those of their nonparent peers and to older parents, the results speak to whether young parents are a unique group with specific needs and opportunities for further support, which may be of particular interest to policy makers.

There are about 1.8 million biological parents ages 15 to 22 in the United States. Young parents are more likely to be Hispanic (of any race) than their nonparent peers of the same age group but are otherwise similar in racial composition. They also appear to be more socioeconomically disadvantaged than young adults who are not parents—young parents have lower educational attainment, are more likely to have family incomes below the poverty line, and are more likely to live in households that received SNAP benefits in the previous year. Young parents are also more likely to be in the labor market than young adults who are not parents, which could hinder further educational attainment.

About 50 percent of young parents are living with a spouse or partner, compared to 77 percent of older parents (ages 23-50). Notably, a greater share of young parents is cohabiting instead of living with a spouse, unlike the pattern seen for older parents. About three-quarters of young parents live with at least one of their children, while 83.5 percent of older parents do. Net of socioeconomic effects, logistic regression models show that young mothers are more likely than young fathers to live with all of their children, while young parents who are non-Hispanic and belong to all other races or multiple races are significantly less likely to live with all of their

children than non-Hispanic Whites. Hispanics (of any race) are also less likely to live with all of their children than non-Hispanics.

Solo parenting, or living with at least one child and no spouse or partner, is more common among young parents than older parents. However, young parents are also more likely to live with additional relatives or nonrelatives than older parents. This may be a strategic way to share resources across household members.

Indicators of parent-child involvement show surprising results when looking at engagement levels by the *reference* parent's partnership status and age group. For partnered parents, the dining habits of young and older parents were similar to one another, and a majority of both *reference* parents and *other* parents had dinner with their children at least 5 times a week. But for solo parents, young parents had dinner with their children more often than older parents, whether they were the *reference* or the *other* parent. Young solo *reference* parents also had greater interaction with their children than older solo *reference* parents when it came to going on outings twice or more per week. Thus, rather than having much lower rates of engagement with children, young solo parents seem to have an advantage over older parents in regard to these two activities with their children. Young parents may work fewer hours than older parents, which may better permit spending time with their children even if they do not live with them. They may also live closer to their children than older parents or have more cordial relationships with the *reference* parent, which could influence the *reference* parent's reporting of their engagement with the shared child. It may also be that these young parents are in a romantic relationship with one another but are not living together. Since SIPP only collects relationship information about household members, there is no way to discern this.

In sum, young parents may be more economically vulnerable than other young adults, but this does not prevent them from engaging with their children. Living in households with additional family and nonfamily members may help to meet the demands of daily life and parenting. Future studies should explore the work hours and occupations of young parents to better understand their socioeconomic positions and examine how this varies by coresidence with children.

References

Barber, J.S. (2001). The Intergenerational Transmission of Age at First Birth among Married and Unmarried Men and Women. *Social Science Research,* 30, 219-47.

Cavanagh, S. E., & Fomby, P. (2019). Family Instability in the Lives of American Children. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 45, 493-513.

Edin, K., & Kefalas, M. (2005). Unmarried with Children. *Contexts*, 4(2), 16-22.

Ferraro, K.F., Schafer, M.H., & Wilkinson, L.R. (2015). Childhood Disadvantage and Health Problems in Middle and Later Life: Early Imprints on Physical Health? *American Sociological Review,* 81(1), 107-133.

Furstenberg, F.F., Brooks-Gunn, J., Morgan, S.P. (1987). *Adolescent Mothers in Later Life*. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Gibson-Davis, C. M. (2008). Family Structure Effects on Maternal and Paternal Parenting in Low-Income Families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70(2), 452-465.

Guzzo, K. B. & Payne, K. K. (2018). Average Age at First Birth, 1970 - 2017. Family Profiles, FP-18-25. Bowling Green, OH: National Center for Family & Marriage Research. Retrieved July 20, 2020, from https://doi.org/10.25035/ncfmr/fp-18-25.

Hofferth, S. L., & Goldscheider, F. (2010). Family Structure and the Transition to Early Parenthood. *Demography*, 47(2), 415-437.

Juby, H., Billette, J. M., Laplante, B., & Le Bourdais, C. (2007). Nonresident Fathers and Children: Parents' New Unions and Frequency of Contact. *Journal of Family Issues*, 28(9), 1220-1245.

Kennedy, S., & Bumpass, L. (2008). Cohabitation and Children's Living Arrangements: New Estimates from the United States. *Demographic Research*, 19, 1663.

Lee, D., & McLanahan, S. (2015). Family Structure Transitions and Child Development: Instability, Selection, and Population Heterogeneity. *American Sociological Review*, 80(4), 738-763. Retrieved July 24, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/24756424.

Lundberg, S., R.A. Pollak & J. Stearns (2016). Family Inequality: Diverging Patterns in Marriage, Cohabitation, and Childbearing. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 30(2), 79-102.

Manning, W. D. (2015). Cohabitation and Child Wellbeing. *The Future of children/Center for the Future of Children, the David and Lucile Packard Foundation*, 25(2), 51.

Manning, W. D., Stewart, S. D., & Smock, P. J. (2003). The Complexity of Fathers' Parenting Responsibilities and Involvement with Nonresident Children. *Journal of Family Issues*, 24(5), 645-667.

Martin, J.A., Hamilton, B.E., Osterman, M.J.K., Driscoll, A.K., & Drake, P. (2018). Births: Final data for 2017. *National Vital Statistics Reports;* 67(8). Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr67/ nvsr67_08-508.pdf.

Martin, J.A., Hamilton, B.E., Osterman, M.J.K., & Driscoll, A.K. (2019). Births: Final Data for 2018. *National Vital Statistics Reports,* 68(13*)*. Retrieved July 20, 2020, from https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr68/nvsr68_13-508.pdf.

McLanahan, S., & Percheski, C. (2008). Family Structure and the Reproduction of Inequalities. *Annual Review of Sociol*ogy 34, 257-276. Retrieved July 20, 2020 from https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.soc.34.040507.134549.

McLanahan, S., & Sandefur, G. (1994). *Growing Up with a Single Parent. What Hurts, What Helps*. Harvard University Press, 79 Garden Street, Cambridge, MA 02138.

Monte, L.M., & Knop, B. (2019). Men's Fertility & Fatherhood: 2014, *Current Population Reports*, P70-162, U.S. Census Bureau, Washington, DC.

Monte, L. M., & Fields, J.M. (2020). Where's Daddy? Challenges in the Measurement of Men's Fertility, in Schoen, Robert (ed.), *Analyzing Contemporary Fertility*, Springer, 257-284. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-48519-1_11.

Mykyta, L., & Macartney, S. (2011). The Effects of Recession on Household Composition: 'Doubling Up' and Economic Well-Being. US Census Bureau. Social, Economic and Household Statistics Division Working Paper, 4.

Mykyta, L., & Pilkauskas, N. (2016). Household Composition and Family Well-Being: Exploring the Relationship Between Doubling Up and Hardship. US Census Bureau, SEHSD Working Paper, 10.

Perkins, K. L. (2017). Household Complexity and Change Among Children in the United States, 1984 to 2010. *Sociological Science*, *4*, 701-724.

Perkins, K.L. (2019). Changes in Household Composition and Children's Educational Attainment. *Demography* 56, 525–548. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-018-0757-5.

Rackin, H., & Gibson-Davis, C. M. (2012). The Role of Pre-and Postconception Relationships for First-Time Parents. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74(3), 526-539.

Seltzer, J. A. (1991). Relationships Between Fathers and Children Who Live Apart: The Father's Role after Separation. *Journal of Marriage and Family,* 53(1), 79-101.

Seltzer, J. A. (2019). Family Change and Changing Family Demography. *Demography,* 56(2), 405-426.

Seltzer, J. A., & Bianchi, S. M. (1988). Children's Contact with Absent Parents. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 50(3), 663-677.

Shanahan, M. J. (2000). Pathways to Adulthood in Changing Societies: Variability and Mechanisms in Life Course Perspective. *Annual review of sociology*, 26(1), 667-692.

Stykes, J. (2011). Fatherhood in the U.S.: Men's Age at First Birth, 1987-2010. Family Profiles, FP-11-04. Bowling Green, OH: National Center for Family & Marriage Research. Retrieved July 20, 2020, from http://ncfmr.bgsu.edu/pdf/family_profiles/file99036.pdf.

Taylor, J. L. (2009). Midlife Impacts of Adolescent Parenthood. *Journal of Family Issues*, 30(4), 484-510.

Vespa, J. (2017). The Changing Economics and Demographics of Young Adulthood: 1975-2016. US Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, US Census Bureau.

Waldfogel, J., Craigie, T. A., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2010). Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing. *The Future of children*, 20(2), 87–112. https://doi.org/10.1353/foc.2010.0002.

Wodtke, G. T. (2013). Duration and Timing of Exposure to Neighborhood Poverty and the Risk of Adolescent Parenthood. *Demography*, 50(5), 1765-1788.

Table 1.
Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics of Young Adults (Ages 15-22): 2018
(Numbers in thousands.)

Characteristics	Young Adults Who Are Parents[1]		Young Adults Who Are Not Parents	
	Percent	Standard Error	Percent	Standard Error
Total Percent	100.0	-	100.0	-
Total in Thousands	1,805		31,490	
Mean Age	20.6	0.1	18.4	0.0
Race				
White alone	71.3	2.7	73.6	0.3
White alone, non-Hispanic	41.8	2.5	54.5	0.4
Black alone	17.5	2.3	14.6	0.2
All other races, race combinations	11.2	1.7	11.8	0.2
Hispanic Origin				
Hispanic (of any race)	33.9	2.8	22.1	0.3
Nativity				
Native-born	89.3	1.9	90.7	0.4
Foreign-born	10.7	1.9	9.3	0.4
Educational Attainment				
High school degree or less	74.3	2.4	64.1	0.6
Some college	22.0	2.2	31.7	0.6
Bachelor's degree or higher	3.7	1.1	4.1	0.3
Labor Force Participation[2]				
In labor force	64.6	2.6	43.9	0.7
Not in labor force	35.4	2.6	56.1	0.7
Poverty Level[2]				
Below poverty	30.9	2.6	20.9	0.7
At or above poverty	69.1	2.6	79.1	0.7
Received SNAP Benefits in Last 12 Months	29.4	2.8	9.6	0.4

1 In this table, 'parents' include those who have at least 1 biological child.

2 Measured at month 12 of the previous calendar year (December 2017).

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation, 2018.

Table 2.
Living Arrangements of Parents (Ages 15-50): 2018
(Numbers in thousands.)

Characteristics	Young Parents (Ages 15-22)[1]		Older Parents (Ages 23-50)	
	Percent	Standard Error	Percent	Standard Error
Total Percent	100.0	-	100.0	-
Total in Thousands	1,805		73,540	
Mean Age	20.6	0.1	38.7	0.1
Current Relationship Status				
Live with a spouse	22.7	2.4	65.9	0.5
Share biological children with their spouse	21.5	2.3	59.9	0.5
Don't share biological children with their spouse	1.2	0.5	5.9	0.3
Live with a partner	30.2	3.0	10.9	0.4
Share biological children with their partner	26.7	2.9	6.9	0.3
Don’t share biological children with their partner	3.5	0.9	4.0	0.2
Coresidence with Children[2,3]				
Live with at least one of their children	76.5	2.2	83.5	0.4
Live with all of their children	71.6	2.4	67.0	0.5
Live with some of their children	4.9	1.2	16.5	0.4
Live with none of their children	23.5	2.2	16.5	0.4
Live with step or adopted children and biological children	2.8	0.9	5.1	0.2
Live with at least one child and no spouse or partner	26.2	2.6	14.9	0.3
Coresidence with Others[2]				
Live with parent or parent-in-law	39.1	2.8	10.9	0.3
Live with grandparent	5.5	1.2	0.5	0.1
Live with siblings or siblings-in-law	21.1	2.4	3.5	0.2
Live with other relative	11.4	1.9	4.4	0.2
Live with other nonrelative	12.6	2.0	5.2	0.3
Live Alone	3.8	1.3	4.1	0.2
Fertility Measures				
Children ever born				
One child	75.7	2.3	28.8	0.5
Two or more children	24.3	2.3	71.2	0.5
Have children with more than one partner	6.3	1.3	18.1	0.3

1 In this table, 'parents' include those who have at least 1 biological child.

2 Categories are not mutually exclusive. Parents living with children or others may also be living with a spouse or partner.

3 'Children' refers to biological children, unless otherwise specified.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation, 2018.

Table 3.
Logistic Regression Model Results Predicting Young Parents Living with All Their Children: 2018
(Numbers in thousands.)

Characteristic	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient	Standard Error	Significance Level	Odds Ratio
Intercept	-4.41	1.83	*	
Demographic Characteristics				
Female (Ref. Male)	1.34	0.30	***	3.83
Black alone, non-Hispanic (Ref. White alone, non-Hispanic)	-0.78	0.48		0.46
Other Race or race combinations, non-Hispanic	-0.96	0.44	*	0.38
Hispanic (Ref. Non-Hispanic)	-1.00	0.29	***	0.37
Age[1]	0.26	0.09	**	1.30
Socioeconomic Characteristics				
Some College (Ref. High school degree or less)	-0.19	0.34		0.83
Bachelor's degree or higher	-1.41	0.87		0.24
Below Poverty Level[1] (Ref. Above poverty level	0.24	0.33		1.28
In labor force[1] (Ref. Not in labor force)	-0.28	0.30		0.75
Weighted Observations	1,805			

1 Measured at month 12 of the previous calendar year (December 2017).

Note: Statistical significance †p < 0.1; *p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation, 2018.

Table 4.
Parental Involvement Patterns (Parents Ages 15-50): 2018
(Numbers in thousands.)

Characteristics	Partnered Parents[1]				Solo Parents[1]			
	Young Parents (Ages 15-22)		Older Parents (Ages 23-50)		Young Parents (Ages 15-22)		Older Parents (Ages 23-50)	
	Percent	Standard Error	Percent	Standard Error	Percent	Standard Error	Percent	Standard Error
Total Percent (Only Reference Parents)	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	-	100.0	-
Total in Thousands (Only Reference Parents)	533		25,240		428		9,323	
Parents living with 0-17-year-old children								
Reference parent had dinner with children 0-4 times a week	9.9	3.4	13.4	0.5	10.9	4.4	21.5	1.0
Reference parent had dinner with children 5+ times a week	90.1	3.4	86.6	0.5	89.1	4.4	78.5	1.0
Other parent had dinner with children 0-4 times a week	23.5	4.5	27.1	0.7	71.5	5.5	86.6	1.0
Other parent had dinner with children 5+ times a week	76.5	4.5	72.9	0.7	28.5	5.5	13.4	1.0
Parents living with 0-5-year-old children								
Reference parent went out with children 0-1 times a week	23.0	4.4	14.6	0.9	7.9	3.4	15.1	1.4
Reference parent went out with children 2+ times a week	77.0	4.4	85.4	0.9	92.1	3.4	84.9	1.4
Other parent went out with children 0-1 times a week	33.5	5.0	26.7	1.0	51.1	5.8	61.2	2.1
Other parent went out with children 2+ times a week	66.5	5.0	73.3	1.0	48.9	5.8	38.8	2.1

1 In this table, 'partnered parents' are those who are living with a spouse or unmarried partner. Solo parents do not live with a spouse or unmarried partner.

Note: A reference parent is the adult who answers questions about children and is usually the mother of the child.

All reference parents included here live with at least one of their own biological children in the appropriate age range.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Survey of Income and Program Participation, 2018.