Age Assortative Mating in Second Marriages After Divorce

Kevin Shafer[1]
Kyle Standiford
Russell Brock Hathcock II

Arkansas State University

Abstract

Although remarriage after divorce is common in the United States, few studies have focused on the remarriage process. We address this shortcoming by focusing on age assortative mating patterns among remarried men and women using NLSY79. We pay particular attention to the effects of socioeconomic status, fertility intention, fertility history, and age on differences in age marital sorting. Our results indicate that each has important effects on age assortative mating for both men and women, though important gender differences are observed. Specifically, homogamy and hypergamy are most common among men, though the likelihood of each outcome varies across our key variables. Among women, remarriage is less common and age assortative mating outcomes are strongly related to age, while fertility intentions, fertility history, and socioeconomic status have smaller effects on sorting. The results have implications for understanding the remarriage market, gender dynamics in remarriage, and childbearing after divorce are considered.

[1] Please direct correspondence to Kevin Shafer, Department of Criminology, Sociology, & Geography, Arkansas State University, PO Box 2410 State University, AR 72467. E-mail: kshafer@astate.edu . Support for this research was provided, in part, by a seed grant through the Office of Research and Technology Transfer at Arkansas State University.

Assortative mating, or how husbands and wives match on a given characteristic, is of particular interest to sociologists, demographers, economists, and other social scientists. Mate selection patterns both reflect and influence social stratification within a society (Kremer 1997; Fernandez & Rogerson 2001), can affect individual well-being (Huijts et al. 2009), and is correlated with marital statisfaction (Tynes 1990; White & Rogers 2000; Brennen et al. 2001). Assortative mating patterns are also associated with how marriage markets are structured. Indeed, Mare (1991) argues that marital sorting research is a "fundamental building block in understanding social structure and social life [15]." Similarly, Atkinson and Glass (1985) find that assortative mating patterns indicate the level of gender, racial/ethnic, and socioeconomic inequality within marriage, while Qian (1998) contends that the level of homogamy on a given characteristic is associated with the quality of a marriage market. Age is a particular salient characteristic on which men and women match. Age differences between husbands and wives can reflect individual views about gender roles and equity within marriage. Generally, smaller age differences are correlated with more contemporary views about gender relations (Richman 1977; Atkinson & Glass 1985). In addition, the percentage of individuals marrying similarly-aged spouses reflects how many well-matched potential partners are available to single men and women.

Empirical evidence from first marriage suggests that men and women have a preference for homogamy and actively seek out partners with similar social, economic, and demographic characteristics as themselves (England & Farkas 1986; Oppenheimer 1988; Lichter 1990; Mare 1991; Bergstron & Bagnoli 1993; Lichter et al. 1995; Qian 1998; Schwartz & Mare 2005). Rates of age homogamy in first marriage increased until the 1970s (Van Poppel et al. 2001), but recently leveled off (Qian 1998). There are several reasons why age homogamy is common in remarriage. First, it may be a byproduct of matching on other attributes such as education or race/ethnicity (Kalmijn 1994). For example, schools support high levels of educational and age homogamy because students tend to be homogeneous on education-level and age (Mare 1991; Selten 1993). Second, the first marriage market has become increasingly age stratified as cultural barriers between age groups have strengthened (South 1991; Raley & Bratter 2004). In fact, age homogamy is likely the product of finding a spouse who shares similar interests, likes, and dislikes (Modell 1989; Easterlin & Crimmins 1991; Mitterauer 1992). Third, the leveling off of age homogamy may be the product of increased emphasis on some characteristics, such as

education, which can lead to trade-offs on age (Qian 1998). In other words, emphasizing educational attainment may lead individuals to accept a younger or older partner in order to make the preferred educational match. Nevertheless, the level of age homogamy in first marriage remains high (Kalmijn 1998; Qian 1998; Van Poppel et al. 2001).

Despite significant research on age assortative mating patterns in first marriage, very few studies have addressed age matching in remarriage (but see Gelissen 2004). This is unfortunate because age matching reveals important information about the nature of remarriage, the remarriage market, and gender differences in marital behavior after divorce. A study of marital sorting in remarriage provides us with evidence of who remarries and to whom they remarry following a divorce, provides insight into the "quality" of the remarriage market, and is one way to evaluate gender dynamics within remarriages. Age assortative mating patterns in remarriage can also provide some insight into how people marry with regard to prior marital status[2]. The majority of age heterogamous remarriages are also heterogamous on marital history (Ono 2005; Ono 2006)[3]. Finally, age assortative mating may be important in that it relates to fertility behavior in remarriage (Griffith et al. 1985; Wineberg 1990). Divorced men and women in the remarriage market are older, which may affect their ability to have children. Age assortative mating may help alleviate difficulties in childbearing by divorcees (Davis 1998).

We expect that age assortative mating in remarriage will differ significantly from age sorting in first marriage for a number of reasons. First, divorced men and women may have different partner preferences than the never-married, especially since individuals seeking a remarriage are older than individuals marrying for the first time. Age hypergamy should be particularly prominent in remarriage, in light of empirical evidence which shows that older men often prefer to marry women younger than themselves (Vera et al. 1985; England & Farkas 1986; Jacobs & Furstenberg 1986; Oppenheimer 1988; England & McClintock 2008). Second, compositional differences play an important role in age assortative mating. The remarriage market is more age diverse than the first marriage market (Bumpass et al. 1990), meaning that any byproduct matching on other characteristics, such

[2] Studies of assortative mating by marital status are limited (but, see Ono 2005 and Ono 2006), primarily because only vital statistics have information on the marital history of spouses. Survey data such as the NLSY79 do not include such information, making an analysis of matching by marital status difficult.

[3] Data limitations do not allow us to capture matting by marital status. Nevertheless, age remains an important characteristic for divorced men and women to consider in remarriage. Often, age heterogamy is a good indicator of marital status heterogamy.

as education, favors age heterogamy. In fact, race/ethnicity, education, and parental status tend to be important characteristics in the remarriage market and may take precedence over age (Jacobs & Furtenberg 1986; Ni Brochlain 1988; Bumpass et al. 1990; South 1991). Third, market composition and preferences can also combine to favor age heterogamy. The number of single women outpaces the number of single men at later ages (White & Rogers 2000). That, combined with men's preferences for younger women suggests older divorced women are more likely to remain unmarried after divorce. Fourth, unlike never-married men and women, divorcees are unlikely to find spouses in age segregated locations like schools[4]. Instead, divorcees are more likely to search for spouses in more heterogeneous locations, such as social organizations, neighborhood groups, and churches to meet potential partners (deGraaf & Kalmijn 2003).

Gender, Socioeconomic Status, Fertility Desires, Age and Assortative Mating

Using the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 cohort (NLSY79), our paper considers the variation in age assortative mating by gender, socioeconomic status, fertility desires, and age among remarried men and women. We include a gender component in our analysis because of potentially important differences in remarriage and age assortative mating between men and women. Women are less likely than men to remarry after a divorce (Bumpass et al. 1990; Coleman et al. 2000; deGraaf & Kalmijn 2003; Wu & Schimmele 2005). The gender dynamics of partnering mean that the experiences of men and women within marriage are unique from one another. For example, the expectations on men and women are highly specialized if age assortative mating follows a more traditional pattern where older men marry younger women (Becker 1981). There are also important differences in the characteristics of divorcees by gender. Men experience a substantial increase in their economic well-being after divorce, while women see a decline (Peterson 1996). Women are much more likely to have primary responsibility for children from the first marriage than men (Goldscheider & Sassler 2006). Age, socioeconomic attributes, and other characteristics seem to affect the remarriage chances of men and women differently (e.g., deGraaf & Kalmijn 2003; Wu & Schimmele 2005). Finally, we consider variation by sex because we are specifically interested in how age assortative mating in remarriage differs by gender.

[4] For example, in the NLSY79 sample used in this paper, only about 3% of men and 7% of women are enrolled in school at anytime between divorce/separation and remarriage/censoring.

Socioeconomic status also influences on marital sorting by age. Socioeconomic status can have a particularly strong effect on the remarriage prospects of men which, in turn, increases their ability to realize their marriage preferences. High status divorced men's marriage prospects may be enhanced, in particular, because they tend to have more established careers and conspicuous economic status than never-married men (Sweeney 1997). Among women, socioeconomic status should have less significant effects. Unlike the first marriage market, where men view women's economic status as important (Kalmijn 1998), women's socioeconomic attributes are less important in the remarriage market. As a result, the spousal choices of high status women may be extremely limited. For example, South (1991) shows that divorced men have a strong preference against marrying high status women. In addition, marrying a high status woman may be unnecessary since many divorced men are more economically established and may not need a spouse who can financially contribute to the family. An alternative perspective suggests that high status women may opt to forego remarriage because a second marriage is economically unnecessary (Becker et al. 1977; Mott & Moore 1983; deGraaf & Kalmijn 2003).

Fecundity is directly associated with age and can affect age assortative mating in remarriage. Fertility in remarriage is common (Wineberg 1990), but associated with the age of both spouses. Men may actively seek out younger women, of reproductive age, in order to have children while younger women may pursue an older man to support their offspring (Davis 1998). Such patterns are supported by empirical evidence which shows that age differences in marriage and fertility are strongly associated with one another. Several studies, across many western nations, have shown that age hypergamy increases the likelihood of childbearing and number of offspring (Kenrick & Keefe 1992; Kenrick et al. 1995; Bereczkei & Csanaky 1996; Fieder & Huber 2007). Thus, we expect that men and women who desire a child will have unique age assortative mating patterns compared to individuals who have no fertility intentions.

One additional issue is how age affects marital sorting. We expect that assortative mating patterns will vary according to the respondent's age. For example, younger divorcees may be much more likely than older divorcees to marry similarly-aged partners. Men and women in their 20s and early 30s are much more inclined to marry someone from the same general age group (Qian 1998; England & Mclintock 2008). Furthermore, it is

unlikely that divorcees in their 20s or early 30s will marry younger people because singles are only seriously engaged in the marriage market around age 18 (Lewis & Oppenheimer 2000). This naturally increases the likelihood of age homogamy for younger divorcees. As noted above, age is also an important characteristic because partner preferences change as people, especially men, age. This means that young divorced women may have a larger pool of potential partners to draw from than older divorced women. We expect little variation in age assortative mating for men, except on hypergamy because of the floor effect in age matching experienced by young male divorcees.

Based on our discussion of the above issues, our hypotheses are as follows:

(1) Age assortative mating patterns will differ significantly by socioeconomic status. We expect that age homogamy and hypergamy will be most likely for high status men. However, this effect will vary by age, with homogamy most likely among young men with high socioeconomic status and hypergamy for older men with high socioeconomic status. We expect little to no differences across socioeconomic status for women.

(2) We expect that fertility intentions will be strongly related to assortative mating outcomes. Specifically, men and who want a child or additional children will be more likely to marry homogamously or hypergamously, while women will seek out hypergamous marriages.

(3) Age assortative mating will vary according to age. Among men, we expect that older men will be more likely to marry younger women. Among women, we expect younger women will be most likely to marry hypergamously. However, the likelihood of each outcome will decline as women age.

Data and Methods

We use the 1979-2008 waves of National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, 1979 cohort (NLSY79) to test the above hypotheses. NLSY79 is a panel survey of 12,686 men and women aged 14-22 in 1979. The survey was administered annually between 1979 and 1993 and biannually since 1994. The sample consists of men and women who divorced between the 1979 and 2008 waves of the data. We only include divorcees because widowhood is rare in the sample and widowers have very different remarriage patterns from men and women who end their marriages by divorcing (Wu & Schimmele 2005). Only men and women whose first marriage ended in

divorce are included in the analytic sample because higher order divorce is selective (Teachman 2002). 535 men and women who divorced prior to 1979 are excluded from the sample because information on their first marriages and part of their time in the remarriage market is missing. The final sample consists of 1,702 men and 1,993 women.

We use event-history data in our analysis where respondents are followed from the time of separation or divorce until they are remarried or are censored. Years in which a respondent self-identifies as separated but is still legally married are included in the sample because many men and women begin searching in earnest for a new spouse when they stop living together. If a respondent does not report being separated prior to divorce they are considered at-risk for remarriage beginning in the year they were legally divorced from their spouse. Once a respondent remarries or is censored through attrition or the end of the data they no longer contribute person-years to the data. The total person-years are 10,368 for men and 14,081 for women.

Variables and Measures

The dependent variable in our analysis is a multinomial outcome for age assortative mating in remarriage with four possible outcomes: (1) homogamy, where the husband is no more than two years younger, but no more than four years younger than his wife; (2) hypergamy, where the husband is at least five years older than his wife; (3) hypogamy, where the wife is at least three years older than her husband; and (4) not remarried. These definitions of homogamy, hypergamy, and hypogamy are derived from previous studies of age assortative mating (Qian 1998).

We detail the independent variables of particular interest to us below. Socioeconomic status is measured by three variables: educational attainment, income, and full-time, year-round employment. Educational attainment is measured through a set of dichotomous variables constructed from a variable for the number of years of schooling completed by the respondent. These time-varying variables capture individual progression through the education system and are coded as: less than high school graduate (less than 12 years of education), high school graduate (12 years of education), some college (13-15 years of education), at least a college graduate (16 or more years of education). Income is a time-varying variable that has been logged in the analyses because of high positive skew and top-coding in the variable offered by the NLSY79. Employment is measured by a dichotomous

variable which indicates if the respondent is employed full-time (an average of 35 or more hours per week), year-round (50 or more weeks a year) in any given year.

Fertility desires are measured by a time-varying dichotomous variable which indicates if the respondent wants children if they are not a parent or additional children if they are already a parent. Men and women who report wanting a child or children are coded as one, while individuals with no fertility desires are coded as zero. Respondents in NLSY79 are asked in most years how many children (if not a parent) or how many more children (if a parent) they want. Respondents were not asked this question in 1980, 1981, 1987, 1991, or 1993. In most cases we used the respondent's answer from the last survey in these missing years. However, in cases where the respondent reported wanting an additional child or children and experienced their desired fertility between responses we coded their fertility desire as zero.

We also include a time-constant dichotomous variable which measures if the respondent cares for a co-residential biological/adopted/or step-child from a previous marriage[5]. This variable was constructed using two measures available in the NLSY79: presence of a co-residential child and age of the child[6]. If the respondent reported having a co-residential child in the first year of divorce, we then identified the age of the child in that year. From the child's age we can derive if the child was born during the respondent's first marriage[7]. If so, the respondent is coded as one for the dichotomous variable. If the respondent does not have children from a prior marriage the respondent is coded as zero.

Finally, age is an important characteristic in remarriage, especially because the availability of potential partners is partially dependent upon a man or woman's age (deGraaf & Kalmijn 2003; Gelissen 2004). Age can also affect partner preferences (South 1991; Gelissen 2004). In our analyses age is a time-varying continuous measure and centered at 36.189 years of age for ease of interpretation.

---

[5] Several alternative constructions were tested for this variable. Some studies have shown that number of children and the age of children are important for remarriage (Wu and Schimmele 2005). Both variables were tested in all models and were statistically insignificant. A time-varying measure of co-residential children, as suggested by Goldschreider and Sassler (2006), was also tested. However, the results for this measure were less theoretically grounded in the concept of "first marriage ties" because men and women could have children after divorce. Nevertheless, the results for the time-varying and time-constant measure of children are substantively similar to one another.

[6] I use this strategy because respondent's fertility history is not available for all years in NLSY 79.

[7] One potential issue with this strategy is for women with pre-marital births. However, in the sample there are only about 50 women who report a pre-marital birth. A variable was constructed to control for non-marital births but was statistically insignificant in all models.

We also include several control variables for demographic, background, and first marriage characteristics. These include: race/ethnicity, family background at age 14, religious affiliation, cohabitation in prior year, urban residence, southern residence, duration of first marriage, age homogamy in first marriage, cohabitation prior to first marriage, and age at first marriage.

Analytic Strategy

We use discrete-time multinomial logistic regression models to analyze age assortative mating patterns in remarriage. We use multinomial models because our dependent variable has four possible outcomes and the use of such regression techniques permits us to compare the likelihood of entering each marriage type across key characteristics and variables. We will analyze the marriage patterns of male and female respondents separately because of potential gender selectivity issues.

Preliminary Results

We report preliminary results for our hypotheses in Tables 1-4. Table 1 provides the main effects of our key variables for men, while Table 2 provides these results for women. Tables 3 for women and Table 4 for women includes interactions between educational attainment and age[8]. We discuss the results in terms of our hypotheses below.

Hypothesis 1: The Effect of Socioeconomic Status

Table 1 shows that age assortative mating varies across educational attainment for men. However, we see virtually no effect of income and employment on marital sorting. College graduates have 40.8% higher odds than high school graduates of marrying homogamously versus remaining unmarried. The comparable figure for hypergamy is 40.4% higher odds, while college graduates are less likely than high school graduates to marry hypogamously. We see no statistically significant difference for college graduates in the likelihood of marrying a younger woman compared to a similarly aged woman. We also note that each outcome is less likely for less than high school educated men when compared to high school graduates. Table 2 shows the comparable results for women. There are three statistically significant effects for socioeconomic status, all for college graduates. College educated women have 40.6% lower odds than high school graduates of marrying a younger man versus

[8] We also attempted interactions between age and income, age and employment, and between age and fertility desires with no effect.

remaining unmarried. These results show hypogamy is also less likely than homogamy or hypergamy for women with a college degree.

Table 3 includes interactions between centered age and educational attainment for men. The interpretation for educational attainment is the odds of a given martial outcome at the mean age in the sample. At the mean age, male college graduates have 39.2% higher odds than high school graduates of marrying a similarly aged woman, compared to not remarrying. Men who did not complete high school are much less likely than high school graduates of marrying hypogamously compared to both homogamy and hyergamy. There are substantively similar results for college educated men on these two outcomes. Turning to the interactions, the results show that older men are more likely to remain unmarried than marry homogamously, as noted by the negative effect for the college graduate and some college interactions. The same effect is present for the comparison between hypergamy and not remarrying for men with some college. Importantly, the comparison between marrying a younger woman and a similarly-aged woman is positive for college graduates. For every year above the mean, male college graduates have 11.6% greater odds than high school graduates of marrying a younger woman compared to marrying homogamously. Interestingly, we notice the same effect for marrying an older woman. Each additional year above the mean increases the odds of hypogamy over homogamy by 14.3% for college graduates compared to high school graduates. We also see that the chances of hypogamy increase with age for men with some college over both homogamy and hypergamy. Therefore, marrying homogamously is less likely for highly-educated, older men, while homogamy is more likely for highly-educated, young men.

Table 4 presents the interactive effects for women and shows only significant main effects for hypogamy compared to both remaining unmarried and hypergamy for college graduates. These results show that women at the mean age are less likely to marry hypogamously than high school graduates. Only one interaction is significant for women. The comparison of homogamy to remaining unmarried shows that homogamy becomes 3.7% less likely than remaining unmarried with each additional year above the mean for college graduates when compared to high school graduates.

Hypothesis 2: Fertility Intentions and History

Returning to Table 1, we find that fertility intentions and history are strongly related to assortative mating for men. We note that men who want a child are more likely to remarry, regardless of sorting outcome, compared to men who do not want children. There is no statistically significant difference between hypergamy and homogamy for men who want an additional child, but hypogamy is about 35% less likely than homogamy and hypergamy for this group. Similarly, men who are primarily responsible for children from their prior marriage are more likely to remarry. The only difference found between outcomes is that the odds of hypogamy are about 13.7% lower than the odds of homogamy for men with children.

Fertility intentions and parental status also affect women's age assortative mating, as indicated in Table 2. Fertility desires increase the likelihood of all three sorting outcomes compared to not remarrying for women. The higher likelihood of each outcome over not remarrying ranges between 48.2% and 1.573 times greater. We also see that hypergamy is less likely than homogamy for women that want children and hypogamy is more likely than hypergamy. We also find that women with children have an increased likelihood of each outcome over not remarrying. This may be sorting on parental status, as noted by Goldscheider and Sassler (2006), who find that women with children have an increased likelihood of repartnering when with a man who already has a child. Unfortunately, this claim is not testable with the NLSY data.

Hypothesis 3: Age

Our third hypothesis relates to age. Table 1 shows that assortative mating varies according to age. We find no significant main effect of age for men, though we do find differences when interacted with education. These findings were discussed above. Among women, as indicated in Table 2, we find that age increases the odds of hypogamy over homogamy and hypergamy. However, compared to not remarrying, the results indicate that homogamy and hypergamy are more likely outcomes. Thus, hypergamy and homogamy are more likely outcomes for younger women.

Conclusion

In conclusion, our findings show significant effects of educational attainment, fertility intentions and history, and age on age assortative mating in remarriage. First, we find that educational attainment increases the

likelihood of marrying a similarly aged or younger woman for men. However, older college educated men are more likely to marry younger women, while younger college educated men are more likely to marry homogamously. We found very few differences for women, except that hypogamy is very unlikely among the best educated women. Second, fertility intentions have a strong effect on age assortative mating for both men and women. Men who want children are likely to marry homogamously or hypergamously, though in supplemental analyses, we found no variation in outcomes by age. Curiously, for women, we find that homogamy and hypogamy are most likely among women who want children. This is contrary to our expectations and to prior research, though the finding appears robust. In future analyses we will conduct additional tests to address this unexpected finding. Likewise, we find that having children increases remarriage, without regard for the age of the spouse, for both men and women. Finally, we find that age affects assortative mating for women, but not men. Older women are more likely to marry hypogamously than homogamously or hypergamously—though homogamy is more likely than not remarrying.

References

Atkinson, Maxine P. and Becky L. Glass. 1985. "Marital Age Heterogamy and Homogamy: 1900 to 1980." *Journal of Marriage and the Family.* 47: 685-691.

Barich, Rachel R. and Denise D. Bielby. 1996. "Rethinking Marriage: Change and Stability in Expectations, 1967-1994." *Journal of Family Issues.* 17: 139-169.

Bartling, Carl A. and Beth Broussard. 1999. "Effects of Experimental Gender, Testing Context, and Marital Status Upon Marital Role Expectations. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth.* 7: 317-326.

Becker, Gary S. 1981. *A Treatise on the Family.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bereczkei, Tamas and Csanaky, Andras. 1996. "Mate Choice, Marital Success, and Reproduction in a Modern Society." *Ethnology and Sociobiology*. 17: 17-35.

Bergstrom, Theodore C. and Mark Bagnoli. 1993. "Courtship as a Waiting Game." *Journal of Political Economy*. 101: 185-202

Bernhardt, Eva and Frances Goldscheider. 2002. "Children and Union Formation in Sweeden." *European Sociological Review.* 18: 289-299.

Blau, Peter M. 1977. *Inequality and Heterogeneity.* New York: Free Press.

Blau, Peter M., Terry C. Blum and Joseph E. Schwartz. 1982. "Heterogeneity and Intermarriage." *American Sociological Review.* 47: 45-62.

Blossfeld, Hans-Peter and Andreas Timms, eds. 2003. *Who Marries Whom? Educational Systems as Marriage Markets in Modern Societies.* Dordrecht. The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Bumpass, Larry L. 1990. "What's Happening to the Family? Interactions Between Demographic and Institutional Change." *Demography*. 27: 483-498.

Bumpass, Larry L., James Sweet, and Teresa Castro Martin. 1990. "Changing Patterns of Remarriage." *Journal of Marriage and the Family.* 52: 747-756.

Bytheway, William R. 1981. "The Variation with Age of Age Differences in Marriage." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 43: 923-927.

Clarkberg, Marin. 1999. "The Price of Partnering: The Role of Economic Well-Being in Young Adults' First Union Experiences." *Social Forces.* 77: 945-968.

Coleman, Marilyn, Lawrence Ganong, and Mark Fine. 2000. "Reinvestigating Remarriage: Another Decade of Progress." *Journal of Marriage and the Family.* 52: 1288-1307.

Davis, Anthony. 1998. "Age Differences in Dating and Marriage: Reproductive Strategies or Social Preferences?" *Current Anthropology* 39: 374-380.

Dean, Gillian and Douglas T. Gurak. 1978. "Marital Homogamy the Second Time Around." *Journal of Marriage and the Family.* 40: 559-570.

deGraaf, Paul M. and Matthijs Kalmijn. 2003. "Alternative Routes in the Remarriage Market: Competing-Risk Analyses of Union Formation after Divorce." *Social Forces.* 81: 1459-1498.

England, Paula and George Farkas. 1986. *Households, Employment and Gender.* New York: Aldine.

England, Paula and Elizabeth McClintock. 2008. "The Gendered Double Standard of Aging in Marriage Markets." Presented at the International Sociological Research Association RC28 Conference: Social Stratification and Mobility Meetings. Palo Alto, California: August 6-9, 2008.

Fernandez, Raquel, Nezih Gunner and John Knowles. 2005. "Love and Money: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis of Household Sorting and Inequality." *Quarterly Journal of Economics.* 120: 273-344.

Fieder, Martin and Huber, Susanne. 2007. "Parental Age Difference and Offspring Count in Humans." *Biology Letters.* 3: 689-691.

Gelissen, John. 2004. "Assortative Mating after Divorce: A Test of Two Competing Hypotheses Using Marginal Models." *Social Science Research.* 33: 361-384.

Goldin, Claudia and Lawrence F. Katz. 2000. "Decreasing (and then Increasing) Inequality in America: A Tale of Two Half-Centuries." Pp. 37-82 in *The Causes and Consequences of Increasing Inequality,* edited by F. Welch. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Goldscheider, Frances and Sharon Sassler. 2006. "Creating Stepfamilies: Integrating Children into the Study of Union Formation." *Journal of Marriage and Family.* 68: 275-291.

Jacobs, J.A. and F.F. Furstenberg. 1986. "Changing Places: Conjugal Careers and Women's Marital Mobility." *Social Forces.* 64: 714-732.

Kalmijn, Matthijs 1991. "Status Homogamy in the United States." *American Journal of Sociology*. 97: 498-523.

_____. 1994. "Assortative Mating by Cultural and Economic Occupational Status." *American Journal of Sociology.* 100: 422-452.

_____. 1998. "Intermarriage and Homogamy: Causes, Patterns, Trends." *Annual Review of Sociology.* 24: 495-421.

Kalmijn, Matthijs and Henk Flapp. 2001. "Assortative Meeting and Mating: Unintended Consequences of Organized Settings for Partner Choices." *Social Forces.* 79: 1289-1312.

Kenrick, Douglas T., Keefe, Richard C. 1992. "Age Preferences in Mates Reflect Sex Differences in Human Reproductive Strategies." Behavioral and Brain Sciences. 15: 75-133.

Kenrick, D. T., Keefe, R. C., Bryan, A., Barr, A. & Brown, S. 1995. "Age preferences and mate choice among homosexuals and heterosexuals: A case for modular psychological mechanisms." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 69: 1166-1172.

Kitson, Gay C. and Leslie A. Morgan. 1990. "The Multiple Consequences of Divorce: A Decade Review." *Journal of Marriage and the Family.* 52: 913-924.

Klein, Thomas. 1990. "Remarriage after Divorce in Germany." *Kolner Zeitschrift fur Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie.* 42: 60-80.

Koo, Helen and C.M. Suchindran. 1980. "Effects of Children on Women's Remarriage Prospects." *Journal of Family Issues.* 1: 497-515.

Koo, Helen, C.M. Suchindran, and Janet D. Griffith. 1984. "The Effects of Children on Divorce and Remarriage: A Mulitivariate Analysis of Life Table Probabilities." *Population Studies.* 38: 451-471.

Lampard, Richard and Kay Peggs. 1999. "Repartnering: The Relevance of Parenthood and Gender to Cohabitation and Remarriage among the Formerly Married." *British Journal of Sociology.* 50: 443-465.

Lewis, Susan K. and Valerie K Oppenheimer. 2000. "Educational Assortative Mating Across Marriage Markets: Non-Hispanic Whites in the United States." *Demography*. 37: 29-40.

Lichter, Daniel T. 1990. "Delayed Marriage, Marital Homogamy and the Mate Selection Process Among White Women." *Social Science Quarterly*. 71: 802-811.

Lichter, Daniel T., Felicia B. LeClere and Diane K. McLaughlin. 1991. "Local Marriage Markets and the Marital Behavior of African American and White Women." *American Journal of Sociology*. 96: 843-867.

Lichter, Daniel T., Robert N. Anderson and Mark D. Hayward. 1995. "Marriage Markets and Marital Choice." *Journal of Family Issues.* 16: 412-431.

Milardo, Robert M. 1987. "Changes in Social Networks of Women and Men Following Divorce." *Journal of Family Issues.* 8: 78-96.

Mott, Frank L. and Sylvia F. Moore. 1983. "The Tempo of Remarriage among Young American Women." *Journal of Marriage and the Family.* 41: 427-436.

Mueller, Charles W. and Hallowell Pope. 1980. "Divorce and Female Remarriage Mobility: Data on Marriage Matches After Divorce for White Women." *Social Forces.* 58: 726-738.

Ni Brolchain, Maire. 1988. "Changing Partners: A Longitudinal Study of Remarriage." *Population Trends.* 54: 27-34.

Ono, Hiromi. 2005. "Marital History Homogamy Between the Divorced and the Never Married Among Non-Hispanic Whites." *Social Science Research.* 34: 333-356.

_____. 2006. "Homogamy Among the Divorced and the Never Married on Marital History in Recent Decades: Evidence from Vital Statistics Data." *Social Science Research.* 35: 356-383.

Oppenheimer, Valerie K. 1988. "A Theory of Marriage Timing." *American Journal of Sociology*. 94: 563-591.

_____. 1997. "Women's Employment and the Gain to Marriage: the Specialization and Trading Model." *Annual Review of Sociology* 23:431-53.

_____. 2003. "Cohabiting and Marriage During Young Men's Career-Development Process." *Demography*. 40: 127-149.

Peterson, Richard R. 1996. "A Re-evaluation of the Economic Consequences of Divorce." *American Sociological Review.* 61: 528-536.

Pyke, Karen D. 1994. "Women's Employment as a Gift or Burden?: Marital Power Across Marriage, Divorce, and Remarriage." *Gender and Society.* 8: 73-91.

Qian, Zhenchao. 1998. "Changes in Assortative Mating: The Impact of Age and Education, 1970-1990." *Demography.* 35: 279-292.

Raley, R. Kelly and Jenifer Bratter. 2004. "Not Even if You Were the Last Person on Earth!" *Journal of Family Issues.* 25: 167-181.

Richman, Naomi. 1977. "Behaviour Problems in Pre-School Children: Family and Social Factors." *British Journal of Psychiatry.* 131: 523-527.

Rockwell, Richard C. 1976. "Historical Trends and Variations in Educational Homogamy." *Journal of Marriage & Family*. 38: 83-95.

Schwartz, Christine R. and Robert M. Mare. 2005. "Trends in Educational Assortative Marriage From 1940 to 2003." *Demography.* 42: 621-646.

Smock, Pamela J. 1990. "Remarriage Patterns of Black and White Women: Reassessing the Role of Educational Attainment." *Demography*. 27: 467-473.

South, Scott J. 1991. "Sociodemographic Differentials in Mate Selection Preferences." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 53: 928-940.

Sweeney, Megan M. 1997. "Remarriage of Women and Men After Divorce: The Role of Socioeconomic Prospects." *Journal of Family Issues.* 18: 479-502.

_____. 2002. "Two Decades of Family Change: The Shifting Economic Foundations of Marriage." *American Sociological Review.*67: 132-147.

Sweeney, Megan M. and Maria Cancian. 2004. "The Changing Importance of White Women's Economic Prospects for Assortative Mating." *Journal of Marriage and Family.*66: 1015-1028.

Teachman, Jay D. 2002. "Childhood Living Arrangements and the Intergenerational Transimssion of Divorce." *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 64: 717-729.

Tynes, Sheryl R. 1990. “Educational Heterogamy and Marital Satisfaction Between Spouses.” *Social Science Research.* 19: 153-174

Wu, Zheng and Chritoph M. Schimmele. 2005. “Repartnering After First Union Disruption.” *Journal of Marriage and Family.* 67: 27-36.

Table 1. Discrete-Time Multinomial Logistic Regression Results for Age Assortative Mating Outcomes for Divorced Men in Remarriage

	Homogamy vs. Not Remarried	Hypergamy vs. Not Remarried	Hypogamy vs. Not Remarried	Hypergamy vs. Homogamy	Hypogamy vs. Homogamy	Hypogamy vs. Hypergamy
Duration & Time						
Years since dissolution	0.868 ***	0.856 *	0.926	0.986	1.066	1.081
Years since dissolution-squared	1.000	0.991 *	0.994	0.991 *	0.994	1.003
Age, centered	1.013	1.196 ***	1.033	1.180 ***	1.020	0.864 ***
Educational Attainment						
Less than high school	0.773 *	0.784	0.335 ***	1.015	0.433 **	0.427 *
High school graduate	---	---	---	---	---	---
Some college	1.056	1.181	0.997	1.118	0.944	0.845
College graduate	1.408 *	1.404 *	0.565 *	0.997	0.401 **	0.402 *
Current Economic Status						
Income, logged	1.016	1.022	1.002	1.006	0.986	0.981
Full-time, year-round employed	1.309 *	1.191	1.273	0.909	0.972	1.069
Fertility Intentions & History						
R wants children or additional children	1.129 **	1.148 **	0.744 **	1.017	0.659 ***	0.649 ***
Child from prior relationship	1.535 ***	1.493 ***	1.326 ***	0.972	0.863 *	0.888
N, person-years	10,368					
N, respondents	1,702					
-2 log likelihood	825.87					
Pseudo R^2	0.100					

Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, 1979 cohort ***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

Note: model includes controls for race/ethnicity, family background at age 14, religious affiliation, cohabitation in prior year urban residence, southern residence, duration of first marriage, age homogamy in first marriage, cohabitation prior to first marriage, and age at first marriage

Table 2. Discrete-Time Multinomial Logistic Regression Results for Age Assortative Mating Outcomes for Divorced Women in Remarriage

	Homogamy vs. Not Remarried	Hypergamy vs. Not Remarried	Hypogamy vs. Not Remarried	Hypergamy vs. Homogamy	Hypogamy vs. Homogamy	Hypogamy vs. Hypergamy
Duration & Time						
Years since dissolution	0.834 ***	0.913 *	0.751 ***	1.094 *	0.900	0.823 **
Years since dissolution-squared	1.000	0.998	0.995	0.998	0.995	0.997
Age, centered	1.047 **	1.018	1.313 ***	0.973	1.254 ***	1.289 ***
Educational Attainment						
Less than high school	0.898	1.037	0.756	1.156	0.842	0.728
High school graduate	---	---	---	---	---	---
Some college	1.072	1.191	0.891	1.111	0.832	0.749
College graduate	1.073	1.284	0.594 *	1.197	0.554 *	0.463 *
Current Economic Status						
Income, logged	1.017	1.023	1.035	1.006	1.018	1.012
Full-time, year-round employed	0.861	0.894	0.962	1.038	1.117	1.076
Fertility Intentions & History						
R wants children or additional children	2.330 ***	1.482 **	2.573 ***	0.636 *	1.104	1.736 *
Child from prior relationship	1.160 **	1.109 *	1.247 **	0.955	1.074	1.125
N, person-years	14,081					
N, respondents	1,993					
-2 log likelihood	1,041.66					
Pseudo R^2	0.111					

Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, 1979 cohort ***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

Note: model includes controls for race/ethnicity, family background at age 14, religious affiliation, cohabitation in prior year urban residence, southern residence, duration of first marriage, age homogamy in first marriage, cohabitation prior to first marriage, and age at first marriage

Table 3. Discrete-Time Multinomial Logistic Regression Results for Age Assortative Mating Outcomes for Divorced Men in Remarriage, Interactive Model

	Homogamy vs. Not Remarried	Hypergamy vs. Not Remarried	Hypogamy vs. Not Remarried	Hypergamy vs. Homogamy	Hypogamy vs. Homogamy	Hypogamy vs. Hypergamy
Duration & Time						
Years since dissolution	0.869 ***	0.855 *	0.930	0.984	1.070	1.088
Years since dissolution-squared	1.000	0.991 *	0.993	0.991 *	0.994	1.002
Age, centered	1.018	1.164 ***	1.015	1.143 ***	0.997	0.872 ***
Educational Attainment, Main Effects						
Less than high school	0.785	0.795	0.292 ***	1.014	0.372 **	0.367 **
High school graduate	---	---	---	---	---	---
Some college	0.978	1.211	0.913	1.238	0.934	0.755
College graduate	1.392 *	1.261	0.511	0.905	0.367 *	0.405 *
Education-Age Interactions						
Less than high school * age, centered	0.999	1.014	0.963	1.015	0.964	0.950
Some college * age, centered	0.943 **	0.949 *	1.072 *	1.007	1.137 ***	1.130 **
College graduate * age, centered	0.919 **	1.026	1.051	1.116 **	1.143 *	1.024
Current Economic Status						
Income, logged	1.017	1.025	0.999	1.008	0.982	0.975
Full-time, year-round employed	1.308 *	1.178	1.288	0.901	0.985	1.093
Fertility Intentions & History						
R wants children or additional children	1.122 **	1.142 **	0.746 **	1.018	0.665 ***	0.653 ***
Child from prior relationship	1.545 ***	1.493 ***	1.326 ***	0.967	0.859 *	0.888
N, person-years			10,368			
N, respondents			1,702			
-2 log likelihood			857.92			
Pseudo R^2			0.104			

Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, 1979 cohort ***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

Note: model includes controls for race/ethnicity, family background at age 14, religious affiliation, cohabitation in prior year urban residence, southern residence, duration of first marriage, age homogamy in first marriage, cohabitation prior to first marriage, and age at first marriage

Table 4. Discrete-Time Multinomial Logistic Regression Results for Age Assortative Mating Outcomes for Divorced Women in Remarriage, Interactive Model

	Homogamy vs. Not Remarried	Hypergamy vs. Not Remarried	Hypogamy vs. Not Remarried	Hypergamy vs. Homogamy	Hypogamy vs. Homogamy	Hypogamy vs. Hypergamy
Duration & Time						
Years since dissolution	0.838 ***	0.912 *	0.751 ***	1.094 *	0.901	0.823 *
Years since dissolution-squared	0.999	0.998	0.994	0.998	0.995	0.996
Age, centered	1.057 *	1.027	1.317 ***	0.971	1.246 ***	1.283 ***
Educational Attainment, Main Effects						
Less than high school	0.825	1.025	0.749	1.227	0.897	0.731
High school graduate						
Some college	1.028	1.161	0.866	1.124	0.838	0.745
College graduate	1.082	1.291	0.696 *	1.250	0.674	0.540 *
Education-Age Interactions						
Less than high school * age, centered	0.985	0.994	1.001	1.010	1.017	1.007
Some college * age, centered	0.991	0.983	1.013	0.994	1.024	1.030
College graduate * age, centered	0.963 *	0.977	0.947	1.018	0.986	0.969
Current Economic Status						
Income, logged	1.020	1.024	1.037	1.006	1.019	1.013
Full-time, year-round employed	0.843	0.887	0.943	1.039	1.103	1.062
Fertility Intentions & History						
R wants children or additional children	2.325 ***	1.483 **	2.532 ***	0.638 *	1.089	1.707 *
Child from prior relationship	1.129 **	1.112 *	1.248 **	0.957	1.074	1.123
N, person-years	14,081					
N, respondents	1,993					
-2 log likelihood	1,048.38					
Pseudo R^2	0.111					

Source: National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, 1979 cohort ***p<.001, **p<.01, *p<.05

Note: model includes controls for race/ethnicity, family background at age 14, religious affiliation, cohabitation in prior year urban residence, southern residence, duration of first marriage, age homogamy in first marriage, cohabitation prior to first marriage, and age at first marriage