Racial Differences in Remarital Fertility in 1910

Andrew S. London*
Syracuse University

Cheryl Elman
University of Akron

* Please direct all correspondence to:
Andrew S. London, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Sociology
Syracuse University
Maxwell School for Citizenship & Public Affairs
Center for Policy Research
426 Eggers Hall
Syracuse, NY 13244-1020
(315) 443-5067
(315) 443-1081 (fax)
aslondon@maxwell.syr.edu

Abstract
In this paper, we develop a new approach for studying historical remarital fertility differentials with individual-level, cross-sectional data and use it to investigate hypotheses related to racial differences in remarital fertility. Data come from the 1910 IPUMS. Our methodology provides a means to evaluate differentials in remarital fertility net of the influences of mortality and fostering/aging out/home leaving, as well as other contextual influences. Consistent with "traditional" interpretations of historical African American fertility patterns, which emphasize involuntary influences on fecundity and fertility (e.g., venereal disease, poor health, complications from childbirth), we find that African Americans are less likely than European Americans to have had a remarital birth. However, conditional on having at least one remarital birth (i.e., among those with proven fecundity), there is no significant difference between European and African Americans with respect to the number of remarital births they had. Supplemental analyses indicate that these results are robust.

There has been little research on historical patterns of remarriage in the United States at least in part because of data constraints (for recent exceptions, see London and Elman 2001; Elman and London 2002). For the same reason and because there are methodological issues that must be resolved there has been almost no historical research on remarital fertility. In order to estimate remarital fertility at the individual level, it is necessary to know how many children each woman in a higher-order marriage has given birth to since her higher-order marriage was contracted. Using census data, the researcher could identify remarital births by comparing the ages of biological children enumerated in the household with the duration of the woman's current marriage; biological children who are younger than the duration of the marriage can reasonably be presumed to be the result of remarital births. However, because of mortality, fostering, and aging out/home leaving, some children who were born in the context of a remarriage will not be present in the households of their parents. Thus, any method that seeks to examine variation in remarital fertility using individual-level, cross-sectional data must be able to account for these "missing" children in some manner. In this paper, we develop a new approach for studying historical remarital fertility differentials with individual-level, cross-sectional data and use it to investigate hypotheses related to racial differences in remarital fertility.

For our analyses, we use data from the 1910 Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS) (Ruggles and Sobek 1997). The 1910 census of population was the first to document whether married persons were in first or higher-order marriages, and enumerators also collected data on the duration of the current marriage. For women, census enumerators collected data on the number of children ever born and the number of children surviving; the age and relationship to the head of household of each child resident in the household at the time of enumeration were also collected. Using these data, it is possible to identify all marriages in which at least one spouse was in a higher-order marriage and to link biological children in the household to their mothers. Furthermore, for children in the household, it is possible to compare their ages with the duration of their mother's marriage to determine if they were born prior to the current union or since it was contracted. Finally, it is possible to estimate the number of children missing from the household due to mortality (the difference between children ever born and children surviving) and due to fostering or aging out/home leaving combined (the difference between children surviving and the number of children enumerated in the household).

The analytic approach we take helps more with understanding differentials in remarital fertility than it does with estimating overall levels of remarital fertility because it is not possible to know if "missing" children (due to death or fostering/aging out/home leaving) were from a first or higher-order marriages. For those women for whom both of these terms are zero, we can conclude that all of their biological children are enumerated in the household and thus we can be reasonably sure we are getting a good measure of their remarital fertility. By controlling statistically for these two terms in regression models, we can partial out the influence of mortality, fostering, and aging out/home leaving; if other differentials in remarital fertility exist once these factors are accounted for statistically, then some other factor or factors besides mortality, fostering, and aging out/home leaving must account for them.

We use this methodological approach and data from the 1910 IPUMS to study race differences in remarital fertility around the turn of the twentieth century. Between 1880 and 1940, the total fertility rate of African Americans dropped from 7.5 to approximately 3 children per woman (Coale and Rives 1973, p. 27). According to Tolnay (1987), two schools of thought have developed to account for the African American fertility transition; "more traditional interpretations" focus on involuntary influences on African American fertility (such as venereal disease and infecundability arising from poor health or complications due to childbirth), while "revisionist interpretations" suggest a larger role for voluntary fertility limitation. Tolnay's (1987) own analysis using the Coale-Trussell method (1974; 1978) for indirectly estimating the degree of deliberate fertility control in a population indicates a potentially "modest" role for voluntary fertility limitation among non-farm African Americans in the period from 1905-10 and "only very weak evidence of voluntary fertility control among rural blacks…the *m*-value of .338 for farm women is very close to the range typically associate with natural fertility populations" (p. 213). Given this evidence of limited voluntary fertility control among rural African Americans around 1910, especially in rural areas where most African Americans lived, and that rates of venereal disease, substandard medical care, and poor health were higher among African Americans than European Americans (Brandt 1985; Cutright and Shorter 1979; Engerman 1977; Farley 1970; McFalls and McFalls 1984; Pagnini 1992; Tolnay 1987), the "traditional" interpretation (i.e., infecundability) becomes the most likely alternate hypothesis regarding racial differences in remarital fertility once the known racial differences in mortality (Ewbank 1987) and fostering (McDaniel 1994), and possible racial differences in aging out/home leaving, on differential remarital fertility are accounted for statistically.

We do not have a direct measure of fecundability available in the census. However, we can examine whether a woman ever had a remarital birth and determine whether there is a race difference in the odds of ever having a remarital birth net of other contextual factors and the methodological controls we developed to account for children who had died and children who were fostered or aged out/left home respectively. Because African Americans had higher mortality than European Americans, had higher rates of fostering, and their children were potentially more likely to leave home at earlier ages than European American children, our methodology should yield a negative coefficient for the African American – European American contrast when we do not control for "missing" children. If differential mortality, fostering, and aging out/home leaving account for this race difference, then the negative coefficient should be reduced substantially, and could even become positive, when these controls are included in the model. If the negative coefficient remains net of other factors in the model, we will interpret this as evidence of a racial difference in impaired fecundability in keeping with the "traditional" interpretation outlined above. Since impaired fecundability may also emerge over the course of a woman's childbearing career, even after one or more remarital births, we also examine racial differences in the number of remarital births among those who have had at least one remarital birth (i.e., those with proven remarital fecundity).

Preliminary Results

Table 1 presents a multivariate logistic regression analysis of ever having a remarital birth among women in remarital unions who were 15-49 years old at (re)marriage, which is the first stage of the two part model we estimate. Model 1 in Table 1 does not include the two control variables we developed to account for children missing from the household due to death and fostering/aging out/home leaving respectively; Model 2 includes these two control variables. As indicated at the bottom of Table 1, these models fit the data well; Somers' D is 0.597 for Model 1 and 0.612 for Model 2.

As seen in Model 1, net of other factors, the odds of ever having a remarital birth are significantly lower among African Americans than European Americans, and the effect is large. African Americans are almost 60 percent less likely than European Americans to have had at least one remarital birth. Controlling for missing children in Model 2 slightly *increases* the magnitude of this effect; with these two variables controlled, African Americans are 63 percent less likely than Euro-Americans to have had a re-marital birth. This increase occurs due to an apparent paradox: African Americans are more likely than European Americans to have missing children, but having missing children increases the odds of ever having a remarital birth.

Why might this be the case? It is well-documented in the literature on developing country mortality and mortality in natural fertility populations that approximately 50 percent of dead children are "replaced". The significant, positive coefficient on children missing from the household due to death suggests that remarriage provides a context within which such replacement fertility is manifested. That the effect of having children who are fostered or have aged out of the family is also significant and increases the odds of a remarital birth is a little harder to explain. This effect may reflect a family strategy for the support of high fertility; older children may leave the household early to increase available resources for younger siblings and, possibly, to provide remittances that help their parents support additional younger children. Alternatively, some women may not bring all of their children from prior unions into their remarriages because their husbands don't want to be responsible for children that are not "his," and such husbands may be particularly likely to select women from the marriage market who can bear him children.

The addition of the control variables does not alter substantially the effects of other variables; almost all of the variables that were significant in Model 1 remained significant in Model 2. [1] Age at (re)marriage and duration of marriage strongly affected the odds of having a remarital birth. Women who were older at (re)marriage were significantly less likely than women who were younger at (re)marriage to have had a remarital birth; each additional year of age at (re)marriage reduced the odds of having a remarital birth by 13 percent. The relationship between duration of marriage and the odds of having a remarital birth was non-linear. Remarital configuration, the number of children the woman had from her own prior union, and whether the woman's husband

[1] In Model 1, the coefficient on West is statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level. I Model 2, the coefficient drops to marginal significance ($p<0.10$). Additionally, the coefficients on highest occupational prestige and literacy are marginally significant in Model 1 and become non-significant in Model 2. Given that these latter two variables are indicative of socioeconomic status, which is in turn associated with the likelihood of infant and child mortality (Preston and Haines 1991), it is not surprising that the effects of these two variables are attenuated in the presence of a control for the number of children missing from the household due to mortality.

had children from a prior union each had significant, positive effects on the odds of ever having a remarital birth. Compared to unions where both spouses were remarried, women who remarried a previously-never married man were 60 percent more likely to have ever had a remarital birth and women who married a previously-married man were 30 percent more likely to ever have a remarital birth. Women who had more children from their previous union in the household were more likely to have had a remarital birth; each additional prior child increased the odds of a remarital birth by 30 percent. Women whose spouses had at least one child from a prior union in the household were 18 percent more likely to have had a remarital birth than women whose spouses did not have prior children in the household.[2]

Contextual factors other than marital configuration and the presence of other children in the household also influence the odds of ever having a remarital birth. Women living in the South have higher remarital fertility than women living in other regions. The odds of having a remarital birth are 23 percent lower in the North and 17 percent lower in the Midwest than they are in the South. Women living in cities and towns are respectively 31 percent and 19 percent less likely to have had a remarital birth than are women living in rural areas, which may reflect greater access to abortions and contraception, as well as preferences for smaller family sizes. Tenant farmers are 32 percent more likely to have had a remarital birth, which is consistent with Tolnay's (1999) arguments about the effects of tenancy on fertility.

Table 2 presents the second stage of our two part model by presenting an OLS regression analysis of the number of remarital births among women with at least one remarital birth (i.e., women with proven fecundity). Here again, we estimate models without and with controls for the number of children missing from the household due to death and fostering/aging out/home leaving respectively in order to ascertain if and how missing children affect the conclusions we draw about racial differences in remarital fertility. The models fit the data reasonably well; the adjusted R^2 for Model 1 and 2 is 0.27

As seen in Table 2, the coefficient on African American is non-significant in both Model 1 and Model 2. Given proven fecundity, African and European Americans have an equivalent number of remarital births, even after accounting for children missing from the household due to death or fostering/aging out/home leaving. The coefficients on the two variables that account for the number of missing children are also non-significant. When considered in relation to the findings for the first part of the model, these results suggest that some factor other than children missing as a consequence of mortality, fostering, or aging out/home leaving substantially lowers the odds that African

---

[2] The fact that these coefficients are all positive could reflect structural and potentially attitudinal orientations to larger family sizes. Women, who were in the first union, even though married to a previously-married man, would face normative pressure to bear a child in that union and become a mother for the first time. Remarried women who are married to men in their first union would face similar pressures (at least from their partners who had not fathered any of their own children within marriage). That both the coefficients on having other children in the household increase the odds of having a remarital birth net of the other factors in the model may be indicative of indirectly measured preferences for large families and pronatalist attitudes.

Americans will experience a remarital birth, and that there is no racial difference in the number of remarital births among women with proven remarital fecundity.

Controlling for missing children does not appear to substantially affect the magnitude or significance of most of the other variables in the model. Moreover, most of the other variables affected the number of births in the same way they affected the odds of having at least one remarital birth in the first part of the model. As was the case in the first part of the model, women with older ages at (re)marriage have fewer remarital births, while the relationship between duration of marriage and the number of births is non-linear. The number of remarital births was higher among remarried women who married previously never-married men and women who were in first marriages with men who remarried respectively (relative to women in unions where both partners were remarried). The number of births was also higher among women who had more children from their prior union in their household had more remarital births.[3]

Contextual factors also operated in the same ways that they did in the first part of the model. Women living outside the South had fewer remarital births.[4] Women living in cities and towns had fewer remarital births than women living in rural areas, and women residing on tenant farms had more remarital births.

Finally, and in contrast to what we observed in the first part of the model, socioeconomic status, as measured by the highest prestige score of any worker in the family is significantly associated with the number of remarital births. Women in higher prestige households had fewer remarital births, which may reflect greater access to contraception and abortion, or different preferences for quality of children that are reflected in smaller family size preferences that allow for greater investments in children.[5]

In order to evaluate how robust our findings are, we did a number of supplemental analyses. First, we re-estimated Model 2 from Tables 1 and 2 respectively on the sub-sample residing in the South, where the majority of African Americans lived in 1910 (Tolnay 1999) (results not shown). As was the case with the models estimated on the national sample, these models fit the data well; Somers' D for the first equation is 0.640 and the R^2 for the second equation is 0.32. Our conclusions regarding racial differences in remarital fertility are the same. In the first stage of the model, the coefficient on African American is -0.899 ($p < 0.001$) and in the second stage it is -0.062 (non-significant).[6] These coefficients are virtually identical to those presented in Table 1 and

---

[3] In contrast to the first part of the model that examined the odds of ever having a remarital birth, whether the woman's spouse had a child from a prior marriage in the household did not have a significant effect on the number of remarital births the couple had.

[4] In contrast to the first part of the model where the coefficient on West was marginally significant, in the second stage of the model, the coefficient on West is statistically significant.

[5] The coefficient on literacy is negative and marginally significant in Model 1, but becomes non-significant in Model 2, when controls for missing children are added into the model.

[6] Interestingly, the coefficients for the control variables are slightly different in the South-only models, and they are the same as what we observe in the models run only on African

Table 2 for the same equations estimated on the national sample. Thus, our fundamental conclusions about racial differences in remarital fertility derived from the national sample are upheld when we focus on the South only.[7]

We conducted a second supplemental analysis to evaluate the sensitivity of our findings and conclusions to unobserved children in the household. We begin by noting that a 68.4 percent of remarital households had all of the children the woman had ever born enumerated in the household at the time of the census. Moreover, there is little racial difference in this proportion: 69.8 percent of European American households were not missing any children and 64.6 percent of African American households were not missing any children. In Tables 3 and 4, we present the results of our two-part model estimated on the sub-sample of women who had all of their children ever born enumerated in their households at the time of the Census and the sub-sample of women who were missing one or more children respectively. We control for the number of missing children due to death and fostering/aging out/leaving home in Table 4; we do not do so in Table 3 because the number of missing children, by definition, is zero and constant.[8]

Our results indicate that having missing children does reduce the race difference in the odds of having a remarital birth compared to what we observe among women who

---

Americans (which we present later in this paper). In Model 1, the coefficient on number of children missing due to death is positive and significant, as it was in the model estimated on the national sample. However, the coefficient on number of children missing due to fostering/aging out/home leaving is non-significant. The precise opposite is found in the second stage, where the coefficient on number of children missing due to death is non-significant (as it was in the equation estimated on the national sample) and the coefficient on number of missing children due to fostering/aging out is negative and significant. In the South, this does seem to have a dampening effect on our estimate of remarital fertility.

[7] Our findings regarding most other variables are robust. In Model 1, age at marriage, duration of marriage, remarital configuration (except the coefficient on wife remarried to a never previously married man), number of children from a prior union, whether the man has at least one child from a prior union, residential location, and tenancy all operate in the same way as in the model estimated on the national sample and are all significant statistically. In Model 2, age at marriage, duration of marriage, number of children from a prior union, residential location, tenancy, and occupational prestige operate the same as they do in the model estimated on the national sample and all are significant statistically. The only major difference between the models estimated on the Southern sub-sample and the national sample is that, in the South, remarital configuration is not associated significantly with the number of remarital births. As shown in Table #, both coefficients are positive and statistically significant in the equation based on the national sample.

[8] As has been the case previously, the models fit the data well. For the equations based on the sub-sample of women who have all of their children in their households, Somers' D for the first equation is 0.599 and the R^2 for the second equation is 0.31. For the equations based on the sub-sample of women who were missing children, Somers' D is 0.652 and R^2 is 0.21.

had all of their children present in their households. However, in both cases, in Model 1 the coefficient on African American is large and significant statistically (-0.980 versus -0.794; $p < 0.001$ in both cases). Also, in both cases, the coefficient on African American is non-significant in Model 2. Once again, we find evidence that our findings are robust. These fundamental findings we report cannot be discounted because of concerns that our measure of remarital fertility is based only on observed children and the likelihood of having children missing from the household varies by race.

Preliminary Conclusion

Our methodology provides a means to evaluate racial differentials in remarital fertility net of the influences of mortality and fostering/aging out/home leaving, as well as other contextual influences. Consistent with "traditional" interpretations of historical African American fertility patterns, which emphasize involuntary influences on fecundity and fertility (e.g., venereal disease, poor health, complications from childbirth), we find that African Americans are much less likely than European Americans to have had a remarital birth. However, conditional on having at least one remarital birth (i.e., among those with proven fecundity), there is no significant difference between European and African Americans with respect to the number of remarital births they had. Supplemental analyses suggest that these results are robust.

References

Brandt, A. M. 1985. *No Magic Bullet: A Social History of Venereal Disease in the United States Since 1880*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coale, A., and N. W. Rives. 1973. A Statistical Reconstruction of the Black Population of the United States, 1880-1970: Estimates of the True Numbers by Age and Sex, Birth Rates, and Total Fertility. *Population Index* 39: 3-36.

Coale, A., and T. J. Trussell. 1974. Model Fertility Schedules: Variations in the Age Structure of Childbearing in Human Populations. *Population Index* 40:185-258.

Coale, A., and T. J. Trussell. 1978. Technical Note: Finding the Two Parameters that Specify a Model Schedule of Marital Fertility. *Population Index* 44: 203-213.

Cutright, P., and E. Shorter. 1979. The Effects of Health on the Completed Fertility of Nonwhite and White U.S. Women Born Between 1867 and 1935. *Journal of Social History* 13: 191-217.

Elman, C., and A. S. London. 2002. Sociohistorical and Demographic Perspectives on U.S. Remarriage in 1910. *Social Science History* 26 (1): 199-242.

Engerman, S. 1977. Black Fertility and Family Structure in the U.S., 1880-1940. *Journal of Family History* 2:117-138.

Ewbank, D.C. 1987. History of Black Mortality and Health Before 1940. *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly* 65 (Supp. 1): 100-128.

Farley, R. 1970. *Growth of the Black Population*. Chicago: Markham.

London, A. S., and C. Elman. 2001. The Influence of Remarriage on the Racial Difference in Family Structure in 1910. *Demography* 38: 283-297.

McDaniel, A. 1994. Historical Racial Differences in Living Arrangements of Children. *Journal of Family History* 19:57-77.

McFalls, J. A., and M. McFalls. 1984. *Disease and Fertility*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Pagnini, D. L. 1992. American Fertility in Transition: Rural Family Building Patterns in the Early Twentieth Century. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Dissertation Services.

Preston, S. H., and M. R. Haines. 1991. *Fatal Years: Child Mortality in Late Ninteenth-Century America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ruggles, S., and M. Sobek. 1997. Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 2.0. Minneapolis: Historical Census Projects, University of Minnesota.

Tolnay, S. E. 1999. *The Bottom Rung: African American Family Life on Southern Farms*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Table 1: Logistic Regression Analysis of Ever Having a Remarital Birth Among Women in Remarital Unions, Women Aged 15-49 Years Old at (Re)marriage, 1910 IPUMS.

	Model 1			**Model 2**		
Variable *(Reference Category or Range)*	**b**	**(SE)**	**Odds Ratio**	**b**	**(SE)**	**Odds Ratio**
African American *(Euro-American)*	-0.892***	(0.075)	0.410	-0.997***	(0.076)	0.369
Age at Marriage *(##-## Years)*	-0.127***	(0.004)	0.881	-0.135***	(0.004)	0.874
Duration of Marriage *(##-## Years)*	0.205***	(0.008)	1.228	0.198***	(0.009)	1.219
Duration*Duration	-0.005***	(0.000)	0.995	-0.005***	(0.000)	0.995
Remarital Configuration: *(Both Remarried)*						
Wife Remarried/Husband in First Marriage	-0.053	(0.070)	0.948	-0.024	(0.071)	0.976
Wife in First Marriage/Husband Remarried	0.358***	(0.065)	1.430	0.471***	(0.067)	1.601
# of Children from Own Prior Union *(##-##)*	0.277***	(0.028)	1.319	0.263***	(0.028)	1.301
Spouse Has Child from Prior Union in Household *(No)*	0.148*	(0.062)	1.159	0.166**	(0.062)	1.180
Region: *(South)*						
North	-0.308***	(0.081)	0.735	-0.268**	(0.082)	0.765
Midwest	-0.219**	(0.072)	0.803	-0.189**	(0.072)	0.828
West	-0.234*	(0.109)	0.792	-0.194#	(0.110)	0.823
Residential Location: *(Rural)*						
City	-0.383***	(0.069)	0.682	-0.378***	(0.070)	0.686
Town	-0.224**	(0.078)	0.799	-0.213**	(0.078)	0.808
Tenant Farmer *(No)*	0.249***	(0.071)	1.283	0.274***	(0.071)	1.315
Highest Occupational Prestige in Household *(##-##)*	-0.002#	(0.001)	0.998	-0.001	(0.001)	0.999
Literate *(No)*	-0.140#	(0.073)	0.869	-0.040	(0.075)	0.961
Number of Children Missing Due to Death *(0-##)*	-----	-----	-----	0.190***	(0.018)	1.209
Number of Children Missing Due to Fostering/Aging Out *(0-##)*	-----	-----	-----	0.060**	(0.022)	1.061
Intercept	2.639***	(0.169)		2.615***	(0.170)	
N	9,105			9,099		
Somers' D	0.597			0.612		

Table 2: OLS Regression Analysis of Number of Remarital Births Among Women in Remarital Unions Who Had At Least One Remarital Birth, Women Aged 15-49 Years Old at (Re)marriage, 1910 IPUMS.

	Model 1		**Model 2**	
Variable *(Reference Category or Range)*	**B**	**(SE)**	**b**	**(SE)**
African American *(Euro-American)*	-0.057	(0.066)	-0.068	(0.067)
Age at Marriage *(##-## Years)*	-0.069***	(0.004)	-0.069***	(0.004)
Duration of Marriage *(##-## Years)*	0.259***	(0.008)	0.257***	(0.008)
Duration*Duration	-0.006***	(0.000)	-0.006***	(0.000)
Remarital Configuration: *(Both Remarried)*				
Wife Remarried/Husband in First Marriage	0.163*	(0.071)	0.162*	(0.071)
Wife in First Marriage/Husband Remarried	0.212***	(0.063)	0.211**	(0.064)
# of Children from Own Prior Union *(##-##)*	0.090**	(0.028)	0.086**	(0.029)
Spouse Has Child from Prior Union in Household *(No)*	-0.015	(0.066)	-0.015	(0.056)
Region: *(South)*				
North	-0.254***	(0.074)	-0.250***	(0.074)
Midwest	-0.275***	(0.061)	-0.268***	(0.061)
West	-0.234*	(0.099)	-0.228*	(0.099)
Residential Location: *(Rural)*				
City	-0.328***	(0.067)	-0.334***	(0.067)
Town	-0.325***	(0.074)	-0.325***	(0.074)
Tenant Farmer *(No)*	0.121*	(0.059)	0.125*	(0.059)
Highest Occupational Prestige in Household *(##-##)*	-0.005***	(0.001)	-0.005***	(0.001)
Literate *(No)*	-0.108#	(0.065)	-0.096	(0.066)
Number of Children Missing Due to Death *(0-##)*	-----	-----	0.025	(0.015)
Number of Children Missing Due to Fostering/Aging Out *(0-##)*	-----	-----	-0.019	(0.021)
Intercept	2.663***	(0.155)	2.655***	(0.155)
N	4,650		4,646	
Adjusted R^2	0.27		0.27	

Table 3: Logistic Regression Analysis of Ever Having a Remarital Birth and OLS Regression Analysis of Number of Remarital Births Among Women Who Had At Least One Remarital Birth, Women Aged 15-49 Years Old at (Re)marriage Who Had All of the Children They Had Ever Born in the Household, 1910 IPUMS.

	Model 1			Model 2	
Variable *(Reference Category or Range)*	**b**	**(SE)**	**Odds Ratio**	**b**	**(SE)**
African American *(Euro-American)*	-0.980***	(0.090)	0.375	-0.085	(0.074)
Age at Marriage *(##-## Years)*	-0.127***	(0.005)	0.881	-0.056***	(0.005)
Duration of Marriage *(##-## Years)*	0.257***	(0.012)	1.293	0.286***	(0.011)
Duration*Duration	-0.008***	(0.000)	0.992	-0.007***	(0.000)
Remarital Configuration: *(Both Remarried)*					
Wife Remarried/Husband in First Marriage	-0.070	(0.092)	0.932	0.114	(0.088)
Wife in First Marriage/Husband Remarried	0.409***	(0.081)	1.505	0.128#	(0.075)
Number of Children from Own Prior Union *(##-##)*	0.278***	(0.034)	1.321	0.047	(0.031)
Spouse Has Child from Prior Union in Household *(No)*	0.121#	(0.070)	1.129	-0.025	(0.058)
Region: *(South)*					
North	-0.334***	(0.097)	0.716	-0.309***	(0.081)
Midwest	-0.285**	(0.087)	0.752	-0.352***	(0.069)
West	-0.134	(0.130)	0.875	-0.266*	(0.108)
Residential Location: *(Rural)*					
City	-0.373***	(0.082)	0.689	-0.311***	(0.074)
Town	-0.215*	(0.095)	0.806	-0.355***	(0.083)
Tenant Farmer *(No)*	0.201*	(0.089)	1.223	0.086	(0.068)
Highest Occupational Prestige in Household *(##-##)*	-0.004*	(0.001)	0.996	-0.006***	(0.001)
Literate *(No)*	-0.132	(0.094)	0.876	-0.087	(0.076)
Intercept	2.595***	(0.204)		2.324***	(0.175)
N	6,224			3,261	
Somers' D	0.599			-----	
Adjusted R^2	-----			0.31	

Table 4: Logistic Regression Analysis of Ever Having a Remarital Birth and OLS Regression Analysis of Number of Remarital Births Among Women Who Had At Least One Remarital Birth, Women Aged 15-49 Years Old at (Re)marriage Who Did Not Have All of the Children They Had Ever Born in the Household, 1910 IPUMS.

	Model 1			Model 2	
Variable *(Reference Category or Range)*	**b**	**(SE)**	**Odds Ratio**	**b**	**(SE)**
African American *(Euro-American)*	-0.794***	(0.143)	0.452	0.009	(0.141)
Age at Marriage *(##-## Years)*	-0.137***	(0.008)	0.872	-0.099***	(0.009)
Duration of Marriage *(##-## Years)*	0.216***	(0.016)	1.241	0.197***	(0.019)
Duration*Duration	-0.005***	(0.000)	0.995	-0.005***	(0.000)
Remarital Configuration: *(Both Remarried)*					
Wife Remarried/Husband in First Marriage	0.005	(0.112)	1.005	0.213#	(0.122)
Wife in First Marriage/Husband Remarried	0.231#	(0.126)	1.260	0.343**	(0.125)
Number of Children from Own Prior Union *(##-##)*	0.330***	(0.053)	1.391	0.121#	(0.068)
Spouse Has Child from Prior Union in Household *(No)*	0.128	(0.143)	1.136	0.017	(0.154)
Region: *(South)*					
North	-0.103	(0.158)	0.902	-0.124	(0.158)
Midwest	-0.013	(0.131)	0.987	-0.087	(0.124)
West	-0.450*	(0.211)	0.638	-0.158	(0.218)
Residential Location: *(Rural)*					
City	-0.424**	(0.136)	0.655	-0.395**	(0.151)
Town	-0.246#	(0.142)	0.782	-0.291#	(0.150)
Tenant Farmer *(No)*	0.344**	(0.121)	1.410	0.197#	(0.113)
Highest Occupational Prestige in Household *(##-##)*	0.003	(0.002)	1.003	-0.001	(0.003)
Literate *(No)*	0.047	(0.126)	1.048	-0.104	(0.124)
Number of Children Missing Due to Death *(0-##)*	0.198***	(0.025)	1.218	0.022	(0.024)
Number of Children Missing Due to Fostering/Aging Out *(0-##)*	0.109***	(0.032)	1.115	-0.013	(0.032)
Intercept	1.800***	(0.340)		3.909***	(0.363)
N	2,875			1,384	
Somers' D	0.652			-----	
Adjusted R^2	-----			0.21	