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## INTRODUCTION

Births to women living in the United States are tracked throughout the year by the National Vital Statistics System (NVSS), which is overseen by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). While the NVSS provides administrative counts of births in the United States and basic characteristics of the mothers such as age, race, and marital status, other characteristics of the mother may provide a fuller profile of differences among groups of mothers. ${ }^{1}$ This report focuses on survey data from the American Community Survey (ACS) that is unavailable in administrative birth records and highlights the characteristics of currently unmarried women who report having had a birth in the last year. ${ }^{2}$

The percentage of U.S. births to unmarried women has been increasing steadily since the 1940s and has increased even more markedly in recent years. According to NCHS, the birth rate for unmarried women in 2007 was 80 percent higher than it was in 1980 and increased 20 percent between 2002 and 2007. ${ }^{3}$ Trends in nonmarital fertility reflect changing norms regarding sexual behavior and family formation. The increase in nonmarital fertility may be due to both an increase in pregnancies conceived outside of marriage and to a decrease in marriage rates overall. Social scientists, journalists, and policy makers consider nonmarital

[^0]fertility to be an important topic because it is linked to measures of child well-being. ${ }^{4}$

Births outside of marriage are often associated with disadvantage for both children and their parents. Women and men who have children outside of marriage are younger on average, have less education, and have lower income than married parents. ${ }^{5}$ Children who are born to unmarried parents are more likely to live in poverty and to have poor developmental outcomes. ${ }^{6}$ Shifts away from childbearing in the context of marriage may be largely due to an increase in cohabitation. According to one estimate, two-fifths of all children in the United States will live in a cohabiting household by age 12, and this proportion continues to grow. ${ }^{7}$ The poorer developmental and behavioral outcomes experienced by children living in cohabiting households may be due in part to family instability. ${ }^{8}$ An estimated 40

[^1]percent of children may see their parents break up by the time they are $15 .{ }^{9}$

The data analyzed in this report come from the 2011 ACS. This report discusses women aged 15 to 50 who gave birth in the last year and who were unmarried at the time of the survey. ${ }^{10}$ Estimates of numbers and percentages of recent births to unmarried women are presented at the national and state levels, with an additional table with metropolitan area level estimates provided on the Internet. The mothers discussed in this report include both women who do not live with the father of their child and women in cohabiting unions living in households in which the father of the child may be present.

## NATIONAL FINDINGS

This section presents nationallevel estimates and explains how the ACS estimates differ from the administrative data published by NCHS. In 2011, 4.1 million women reported that they had a birth in the last year (see Table 1). Of these women, 35.7 percent were unmarried at the time of the survey. ${ }^{11}$ The percentage of women who had a birth in the last year and who were unmarried has been tracked in the ACS since 2005, when an estimated 30.6 percent of recent births were to unmarried women.

National-level ACS estimates of the percentages of women with a birth in the last year who are unmarried, as well as state-level estimates discussed later in this report, differ from the NCHS vital statistics

[^2]
## What Is The American Community Survey?

The American Community Survey (ACS) is a nationwide survey designed to provide communities with reliable and timely demographic, social, economic, and housing data for the nation, states, congressional districts, counties, places, and other localities every year. It had a 2011 sample size of about 3.3 million addresses across the United States and Puerto Rico and includes both housing units and group quarters (e.g., nursing facilities and prisons). The ACS is conducted in every country throughout the nation and every municipio in Puerto Rico, where it is called the Puerto Rico Community Survey. Beginning in 2006, ACS data for 2005 were released for geographic areas with populations of 65,000 and greater. For information on the ACS sample design and other topics, visit <www.census.gov/acs/www>.
estimates of nonmarital births for two main reasons. First, while the NCHS's vital statistics system records information on all births, the ACS is a survey, and while it is nationally representative, it does not have information on every birth that occurred in the United States. Second, the time frames covered by vital statistics and the ACS are quite different. Birth records reported through the vital statistics system are collected at the time of the birth itself and reported for a 1-year period. The ACS interviews respondents throughout a calendar year, asking them whether they had a birth in the 12 months prior to the interview. So births reported in the 2011 1-year ACS data could have occurred as early as January 2010 or as late as December 2011.

The difference in timeframe affects other characteristics as well, including marital status and place of residence. ACS survey respondents report their marital status at the time of the interview, which may differ from their marital status at the time of the birth. Thus it is possible that some of the respondents who indicate in the ACS that they are unmarried and had a birth in the last 12 months may have been married at the time of the birth
even though they were unmarried at the time of the survey. It is also possible that some of the respondents who indicated that they are married and had a birth in the last year were unmarried at the time of the birth and got married before the survey date. Another source of differences between vital statistics counts and ACS estimates is that birth certificates are filed at the place where the birth occurred, while the ACS records the place the mother is living at the time of the survey.

Despite these differences, the ACS offers the important advantage of collecting social, demographic, and economic information about the women to whom these births occurred and the households in which they lived. We discuss some of these characteristics below, before looking at the geographic variation by state and metropolitan area. ${ }^{12}$

[^3]Table 1.
Recent Births to Unmarried Women Aged 15 to 50, by State: 2011
For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www.census.gov/acs/www

| State | Total |  | Nonmarital births |  | Percent nonmarital births |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Margin of error ${ }^{1}$ | Number | Margin of error ${ }^{1}$ | Percent | Margin of error ${ }^{1}$ |
| U.S. total. . | 4,113,472 | 38,124 | 1,467,435 | 22,785 | 35.7 | 0.5 |
| Alabama | 70,601 | 4,956 | 28,385 | 2,828 | 40.2 | 3.5 |
| Alaska | 12,883 | 2,123 | 4,573 | 1,155 | 35.5 | 7.7 |
| Arizona | 84,696 | 6,441 | 33,440 | 4,002 | 39.5 | 3.5 |
| Arkansas | 36,586 | 3,760 | 13,167 | 2,092 | 36.0 | 4.3 |
| California | 518,722 | 12,551 | 175,858 | 7,386 | 33.9 | 1.1 |
| Colorado | 75,261 | 5,050 | 21,980 | 2,729 | 29.2 | 3.1 |
| Connecticut | 39,770 | 3,134 | 15,167 | 2,324 | 38.1 | 4.2 |
| Delaware | 10,066 | 1,528 | 4,106 | 1,099 | 40.8 | 8.3 |
| District of Columbia . | 7,070 | 1,539 | 3,591 | 1,117 | 50.8 | 10.1 |
| Florida . | 206,786 | 9,924 | 82,756 | 6,766 | 40.0 | 2.4 |
| Georgia | 135,886 | 6,729 | 52,417 | 4,205 | 38.6 | 2.5 |
| Hawaii | 22,942 | 2,229 | 6,804 | 1,428 | 29.7 | 5.5 |
| Idaho. | 27,418 | 3,145 | 8,210 | 1,836 | 29.9 | 5.7 |
| Illinois. | 161,456 | 7,195 | 58,402 | 4,639 | 36.2 | 2.0 |
| Indiana. | 88,441 | 4,365 | 34,754 | 2,793 | 39.3 | 2.6 |
| lowa. | 37,621 | 2,983 | 11,847 | 1,798 | 31.5 | 3.8 |
| Kansas. | 43,443 | 3,262 | 13,239 | 1,795 | 30.5 | 3.7 |
| Kentucky | 56,213 | 3,774 | 21,347 | 2,754 | 38.0 | 3.9 |
| Louisiana. | 65,280 | 4,243 | 31,761 | 3,841 | 48.7 | 4.5 |
| Maine. | 13,843 | 1,731 | 4,577 | 1,000 | 33.1 | 5.8 |
| Maryland | 78,351 | 4,707 | 30,221 | 3,134 | 38.6 | 3.2 |
| Massachusetts. | 79,641 | 4,641 | 26,201 | 2,833 | 32.9 | 3.1 |
| Michigan | 122,324 | 5,410 | 45,304 | 3,400 | 37.0 | 2.3 |
| Minnesota | 74,548 | 4,049 | 22,873 | 2,464 | 30.7 | 2.7 |
| Mississippi | 36,711 | 3,079 | 17,673 | 2,290 | 48.1 | 4.3 |
| Missouri. | 78,269 | 4,764 | 28,929 | 3,213 | 37.0 | 3.1 |
| Montana. | 12,558 | 1,567 | 2,988 | 865 | 23.8 | 6.0 |
| Nebraska . | 25,777 | 2,129 | 6,509 | 962 | 25.3 | 3.3 |
| Nevada | 35,270 | 3,347 | 12,121 | 1,895 | 34.4 | 4.3 |
| New Hampshire. | 14,182 | 2,156 | 2,779 | 837 | 19.6 | 5.4 |
| New Jersey | 108,843 | 5,368 | 30,917 | 2,711 | 28.4 | 2.2 |
| New Mexico. | 29,765 | 3,335 | 14,181 | 2,370 | 47.6 | 6.0 |
| New York | 247,202 | 8,018 | 86,053 | 5,379 | 34.8 | 1.9 |
| North Carolina . | 133,512 | 7,165 | 48,543 | 4,698 | 36.4 | 3.0 |
| North Dakota | 10,400 | 1,586 | 3,131 | 827 | 30.1 | 6.6 |
| Ohio. | 142,781 | 5,673 | 56,278 | 3,795 | 39.4 | 2.1 |
| Oklahoma | 53,718 | 2,766 | 21,333 | 2,265 | 39.7 | 3.3 |
| Oregon. | 49,012 | 4,085 | 15,256 | 2,214 | 31.1 | 3.8 |
| Pennsylvania | 147,720 | 5,553 | 59,696 | 3,515 | 40.4 | 1.9 |
| Rhode Island | 13,199 | 1,918 | 5,844 | 1,265 | 44.3 | 6.4 |
| South Carolina. | 68,937 | 4,391 | 30,275 | 3,445 | 43.9 | 3.8 |
| South Dakota. | 11,258 | 1,892 | 4,210 | 1,061 | 37.4 | 7.5 |
| Tennessee . | 85,632 | 4,922 | 32,345 | 3,507 | 37.8 | 3.1 |
| Texas. | 384,330 | 12,633 | 137,495 | 7,636 | 35.8 | 1.5 |
| Utah. | 51,272 | 3,509 | 7,559 | 1,446 | 14.7 | 2.5 |
| Vermont. | 6,255 | 1,016 | 1,767 | 482 | 28.2 | 7.1 |
| Virginia. | 110,163 | 5,732 | 34,591 | 3,114 | 31.4 | 2.5 |
| Washington | 92,152 | 4,902 | 25,538 | 2,538 | 27.7 | 2.2 |
| West Virginia | 18,305 | 2,228 | 6,518 | 1,339 | 35.6 | 5.7 |
| Wisconsin | 69,390 | 3,718 | 21,713 | 2,089 | 31.3 | 2.5 |
| Wyoming . . . . . . . . . | 7,011 | 1,344 | 2,213 | 791 | 31.6 | 8.6 |

[^4]
## CHARACTERISTICS OF UNMARRIED WOMEN WITH A RECENT BIRTH

Education: Among women who had a birth in the last year, those with more education had lower percentages of nonmarital births (Table 2). Although births to women with
less than a high school degree constituted the smallest number of total births by educational group out of the national total, these women had the largest percentage unmarried (57.0 percent) compared with the other education groups. Women with a bachelor's degree or higher who had a birth in the last
year had the lowest level who were unmarried, 8.8 percent.

Household income: Percentages of women with a birth in the last year who were unmarried decreased with each sequentially higher income level. Women with a birth in the last year at the lowest

Table 2.

## Recent Births to Unmarried Women Aged 15 to 50, by Selected Characteristics: 2011

For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www.census.gov/acs/www

| Characteristics | Total births |  | Nonmarital births |  | Percent nonmarital births |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Margin of error ${ }^{1}$ | Number | Margin of error ${ }^{1}$ | Percent | Margin of error ${ }^{1}$ |
| U.S. total. | 4,113,472 | 38,125 | 1,467,435 | 22,785 | 35.7 | 0.5 |
| EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than high school | 675,127 | 16,572 | 384,605 | 11,099 | 57.0 | 1.1 |
| High school graduate. | 941,463 | 16,769 | 460,974 | 12,446 | 49.0 | 1.0 |
| Some college. | 1,295,505 | 21,041 | 515,912 | 13,326 | 39.8 | 0.7 |
| Bachelor's degree or more | 1,201,377 | 19,043 | 105,944 | 6,032 | 8.8 | 0.5 |
| HOUSEHOLD INCOME ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than \$10,000. | 314,630 | 9,766 | 216,777 | 8,709 | 68.9 | 1.5 |
| \$10,000 to \$14,999 | 190,684 | 6,978 | 116,416 | 6,133 | 61.1 | 2.1 |
| \$15,000 to \$24,999 | 419,568 | 12,612 | 221,662 | 8,141 | 52.8 | 1.4 |
| \$25,000 to \$34,999 | 406,314 | 12,153 | 188,907 | 7,850 | 46.5 | 1.3 |
| \$35,000 to \$49,999 | 546,395 | 14,937 | 215,029 | 9,390 | 39.4 | 1.3 |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 748,000 | 16,248 | 221,478 | 10,035 | 29.6 | 1.1 |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 533,085 | 13,094 | 117,818 | 7,286 | 22.1 | 1.2 |
| \$100,000 to \$149,999 | 558,394 | 13,624 | 102,425 | 6,440 | 18.3 | 1.0 |
| \$150,000 to \$199,999 | 197,011 | 8,056 | 27,250 | 3,374 | 13.8 | 1.5 |
| \$200,000 and above | 166,796 | 7,549 | 15,045 | 2,186 | 9.0 | 1.2 |
| AGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 to 19 | 251,460 | 9,487 | 216,436 | 9,153 | 86.1 | 1.2 |
| 20 to 24 | 871,445 | 14,724 | 535,779 | 14,226 | 61.5 | 1.0 |
| 25 to 29 | 1,094,949 | 18,613 | 349,305 | 10,714 | 31.9 | 0.8 |
| 30 to 34 | 1,032,090 | 16,703 | 199,462 | 8,237 | 19.3 | 0.7 |
| 35 to 39 | 565,148 | 13,991 | 98,284 | 6,218 | 17.4 | 1.0 |
| 40 to 44 | 208,275 | 8,159 | 43,266 | 3,566 | 20.8 | 1.5 |
| 45 to 50 | 90,105 | 5,040 | 24,903 | 2,798 | 27.6 | 2.7 |
| RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White alone | 2,812,958 | 34,048 | 820,975 | 18,327 | 29.2 | 0.5 |
| White, non-Hispanic. | 2,209,244 | 29,691 | 575,107 | 15,915 | 26.0 | 0.6 |
| Black alone | 595,983 | 12,796 | 403,820 | 11,025 | 67.8 | 1.2 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native alone | 46,902 | 3,502 | 30,040 | 3,015 | 64.0 | 3.5 |
| Asian alone | 243,814 | 8,865 | 27,514 | 3,180 | 11.3 | 1.2 |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone. | 11,602 | 2,089 | 4,703 | 1,436 | 40.5 | 9.6 |
| Some Other Race alone | 289,582 | 11,028 | 130,111 | 7,164 | 44.9 | 1.9 |
| Two or More Races | 112,631 | 5,777 | 50,272 | 3,693 | 44.6 | 2.7 |
| Hispanic (any race) | 944,717 | 21,698 | 405,836 | 12,987 | 43.0 | 1.1 |
| NATIVITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Native | 3,264,025 | 33,520 | 1,266,807 | 20,939 | 38.8 | 0.5 |
| Foreign born . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 849,447 | 18,705 | 200,628 | 8,983 | 23.6 | 0.9 |

[^5]household income level-less than \$10,000 per year-had the highest percentage, 68.9 percent, who were unmarried. In contrast, just 9 percent of women whose household income in 2010 was \$200,000 or above and had a recent birth were unmarried.

Age: Younger mothers had higher percentages of nonmarital births. Among women aged 15 to 19 with a birth in the last year, 86.1 percent were unmarried, while 61.5 percent of women aged 20 to 24 were unmarried. Women aged 35 to 39 with a birth in the last year had the lowest percentage unmarried, at 17.4 percent.

Race and Hispanic Origin: Percentages of women with a birth in the last year who were unmarried varied by race and Hispanic origin. Among those who listed their race as Black or African-American alone and who had a birth in the last year, 67.8 percent (the highest percentage) were unmarried.

Among those who listed their race as Asian alone and who had a birth in the last year, 11.3 percent (the lowest percentage) were unmarried. Forty-three percent of recent births to Hispanic women and 26 percent of recent births to nonHispanic Whites were to unmarried women.

Nativity: Native-born women had a higher percentage of nonmarital births than women born outside of the United States. While 38.8 percent of native-born women with a recent birth were unmarried, this was true of 23.6 percent of foreignborn women with a recent birth.

## STATE FINDINGS

Table 1 shows estimates of the percentage of recent births to unmarried women by state. The areas with the highest percentages of currently unmarried women who
had a birth in the last year include the District of Columbia (50.8 percent), Louisiana ( 48.7 percent), Mississippi (48.1 percent), and New Mexico (47.6 percent). ${ }^{13}$ Among the states with the lowest percentage of women with a birth in the last year who were unmarried were New Hampshire (19.6 percent) and Utah (14.7 percent). ${ }^{14}$

State-level percentages of unmarried women with a birth in the last year are also shown in the map in Figure 1. Coastal states in the south-Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, and South Carolina-had levels that were significantly higher than the national average. In contrast, states on the west coast-Washington, Oregon, and California—had significantly lower proportions of recent births that were to unmarried women than in the nation as a whole. Another group of states in the middle of the country also had levels that were below the national average, including Utah, Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, lowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

Research has shown that income is negatively related to the likelihood of having a nonmarital birth. ${ }^{15}$ Table 3 shows state-level estimates of income, poverty, and educational attainment. It shows the median household income for all people living in each state, as well as the percentage of individuals in each state who lived in households

[^6]below the poverty level. The Pearson's $r$ correlation between the percentage of recent births that were to unmarried women and the percent of people in households below the poverty line was about . 6 at the state level. It also shows the percentage of all women aged 15 to 50 within each state who had a bachelor's degree or more and the percentage of all women aged 15 to 50 within each state who had less than a high school degree. Educational attainment is linked, on average, to earnings and economic well-being. ${ }^{16}$

Since, on average, higher income tends to be associated with a lower likelihood of nonmarital births, we expect that states with higher median income and a lower percentage in poverty would also have lower percentages of unmarried women with a recent birth. Women with more education are less likely to have a nonmarital birth, so we would expect states with high proportions of women with a bachelor's degree to have lower proportions of recent births to unmarried women. Mississippi's poverty rate was among the highest (21.2 percent), while it had the lowest median income $(\$ 36,919)$ and one of the lowest percentages of women aged 15 to 50 with a bachelor's degree or more (17.9 percent). As shown earlier in Table 1, Mississippi also had one of the highest percentages of women with a recent birth who were unmarried.

Another state with one of the highest proportions of recent births to unmarried women-New Mexicohad a high percentage of residents

[^7]
living in poverty ( 20.3 percent) $)^{17}$ and a high percentage of women aged 15 to 50 with less than a high school degree ( 22.5 percent). It was also among the states with a lower percentage of women aged 15 to 50 with a bachelor's degree or more (19.6 percent). In addition to its high level of nonmarital births, Louisiana also had a high poverty rate, with 19.3 percent of its residents living in poverty.

The exception was the District of Columbia which had a high proportion of births to unmarried women ( 50.8 percent) as well as one of the highest median incomes ( $\$ 63,124$ ), one of the highest percentages of women aged 15 to 50 with a

[^8]bachelor's degree or more (50.2 percent), and one of the lowest percentages of women aged 15 to 50 with less than a high school degree (11 percent).

New Hampshire, which had one of the lowest percentages of nonmarital births also had one of the lowest percentages of its residents living in poverty ( 7.9 percent), as well as a relatively low percentage of women aged 15 to 50 with less than a high school degree (13 percent).

Statistical models allow the opportunity to assess the level of association among various characteristics simultaneously. Due to the high level of intercorrelation among the various income and education variables in Table 3, it is not advisable to put all of them into one model.

However, the model makes it possible to assess the relationship among the proportion of recent births to unmarried women and educational and income levels across states. By including a measure of the proportion of unmarried women in the model as well, we can control for that basic demographic condition, and assess the effects of education and income, net of the basic demography. The results of this regression model based on state levels, show that the proportion of women who have less than a high school degree in a state is positively associated with the level of recent births to unmarried women. The opposite relationship holds for income; states with higher median income have a lower proportion, in general, of recent births to unmarried women.

Table 3.
Recent Births to Unmarried Women Aged 15 to 50 by State, With Other State-Level Characteristics: 2011
For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www.census.gov/acs/www

| State | Percent nonmarital births |  | Median household income |  | Percent in poverty ${ }^{1}$ |  | Percent of women 15-50 with a bachelor's degree or more |  | Percent of women 15-50 with less than a high school degree |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | Margin of error ${ }^{2}$ | In 2011 dollars | Margin of error ${ }^{2}$ | Percent | Margin of error ${ }^{2}$ | Percent | Margin of error ${ }^{2}$ | Percent | Margin of error ${ }^{2}$ |
| U.S. total. | 35.7 | 0.5 | 50,502 | 73 | 15.1 | 0.1 | 26.2 | 0.1 | 18.3 | 0.1 |
| Alabama | 40.2 | 3.5 | 41,415 | 550 | 18.0 | 0.5 | 20.8 | 0.6 | 19.5 | 0.6 |
| Alaska | 35.5 | 7.7 | 67,825 | 1,948 | 8.8 | 0.8 | 23.9 | 1.6 | 15.5 | 0.9 |
| Arizona | 39.5 | 3.5 | 46,709 | 554 | 17.9 | 0.6 | 21.4 | 0.6 | 21.7 | 0.6 |
| Arkansas | 36.0 | 4.3 | 38,758 | 761 | 18.2 | 0.6 | 18.8 | 0.7 | 18.8 | 0.7 |
| California | 33.9 | 1.1 | 57,287 | 279 | 15.2 | 0.2 | 25.8 | 0.2 | 22.6 | 0.2 |
| Colorado | 29.2 | 3.1 | 55,387 | 605 | 12.4 | 0.4 | 31.9 | 0.7 | 16.1 | 0.5 |
| Connecticut | 38.1 | 4.2 | 65,753 | 854 | 9.7 | 0.5 | 33.4 | 0.8 | 15.9 | 0.5 |
| Delaware | 40.8 | 8.3 | 58,814 | 1,586 | 10.6 | 0.9 | 26.9 | 1.5 | 16.1 | 1.1 |
| District of Columbia | 50.8 | 10.1 | 63,124 | 2,407 | 16.3 | 1.3 | 50.2 | 1.6 | 11.0 | 0.8 |
| Florida | 40.0 | 2.4 | 44,299 | 406 | 15.7 | 0.3 | 23.2 | 0.4 | 17.5 | 0.3 |
| Georgia | 38.6 | 2.5 | 46,007 | 454 | 17.9 | 0.4 | 25.0 | 0.6 | 19.2 | 0.5 |
| Hawaii | 29.7 | 5.5 | 61,821 | 1,035 | 10.4 | 0.9 | 26.0 | 1.0 | 13.0 | 0.7 |
| Idaho | 29.9 | 5.7 | 43,341 | 1,320 | 15.7 | 0.9 | 20.9 | 1.5 | 17.3 | 0.9 |
| Illinois. | 36.2 | 2.0 | 53,234 | 511 | 14.0 | 0.3 | 30.2 | 0.4 | 17.3 | 0.3 |
| Indiana. | 39.3 | 2.6 | 46,438 | 455 | 14.8 | 0.4 | 21.5 | 0.5 | 18.6 | 0.5 |
| lowa. | 31.5 | 3.8 | 49,427 | 693 | 11.8 | 0.4 | 26.0 | 0.8 | 15.3 | 0.5 |
| Kansas. | 30.5 | 3.7 | 48,964 | 756 | 12.7 | 0.5 | 28.2 | 0.7 | 16.4 | 0.5 |
| Kentucky | 38.0 | 3.9 | 41,141 | 464 | 17.9 | 0.6 | 20.9 | 0.8 | 17.9 | 0.6 |
| Louisiana | 48.7 | 4.5 | 41,734 | 528 | 19.3 | 0.5 | 19.7 | 0.8 | 20.1 | 0.7 |
| Maine. | 33.1 | 5.8 | 46,033 | 802 | 12.8 | 0.7 | 26.6 | 1.0 | 13.2 | 0.6 |
| Maryland | 38.6 | 3.2 | 70,004 | 804 | 9.0 | 0.4 | 34.4 | 0.6 | 14.8 | 0.4 |
| Massachusetts. | 32.9 | 3.1 | 62,859 | 902 | 10.5 | 0.4 | 36.6 | 0.6 | 14.3 | 0.4 |
| Michigan | 37.0 | 2.3 | 45,981 | 330 | 16.2 | 0.3 | 24.0 | 0.4 | 16.6 | 0.3 |
| Minnesota | 30.7 | 2.7 | 56,954 | 488 | 10.7 | 0.3 | 31.4 | 0.5 | 14.4 | 0.4 |
| Mississippi | 48.1 | 4.3 | 36,919 | 583 | 21.2 | 0.7 | 17.9 | 0.9 | 20.5 | 0.7 |
| Missouri . | 37.0 | 3.1 | 45,247 | 529 | 14.6 | 0.4 | 25.5 | 0.7 | 17.1 | 0.4 |
| Montana. | 23.8 | 6.0 | 44,222 | 1,078 | 13.2 | 0.9 | 25.7 | 1.5 | 13.9 | 0.9 |
| Nebraska | 25.3 | 3.3 | 50,296 | 687 | 12.2 | 0.6 | 27.1 | 1.0 | 15.7 | 0.6 |
| Nevada | 34.4 | 4.3 | 48,927 | 1,020 | 14.4 | 0.8 | 18.7 | 1.0 | 22.9 | 0.9 |
| New Hampshire. | 19.6 | 5.4 | 62,647 | 1,415 | 7.9 | 0.7 | 31.0 | 1.2 | 13.0 | 0.6 |
| New Jersey | 28.4 | 2.2 | 67,458 | 721 | 9.6 | 0.3 | 33.8 | 0.4 | 15.8 | 0.3 |
| New Mexico | 47.6 | 6.0 | 41,963 | 803 | 20.3 | 0.9 | 19.6 | 0.9 | 22.5 | 1.1 |
| New York | 34.8 | 1.9 | 55,246 | 398 | 14.6 | 0.2 | 32.6 | 0.3 | 17.6 | 0.2 |
| North Carolina | 36.4 | 3.0 | 43,916 | 519 | 16.6 | 0.4 | 25.4 | 0.6 | 17.8 | 0.4 |
| North Dakota | 30.1 | 6.6 | 51,704 | 1,260 | 11.0 | 0.8 | 28.0 | 1.6 | 12.0 | 0.8 |
| Ohio. | 39.4 | 2.1 | 45,749 | 319 | 15.3 | 0.3 | 23.6 | 0.4 | 16.7 | 0.3 |
| Oklahoma | 39.7 | 3.3 | 43,225 | 607 | 16.1 | 0.5 | 21.6 | 0.6 | 18.8 | 0.4 |
| Oregon. | 31.1 | 3.8 | 46,816 | 711 | 15.8 | 0.6 | 25.5 | 0.6 | 17.5 | 0.6 |
| Pennsylvania | 40.4 | 1.9 | 50,228 | 292 | 12.5 | 0.3 | 27.3 | 0.4 | 15.5 | 0.3 |
| Rhode Island | 44.3 | 6.4 | 53,636 | 1,699 | 13.2 | 0.9 | 27.9 | 1.4 | 16.0 | 0.9 |
| South Carolina. | 43.9 | 3.8 | 42,367 | 559 | 17.8 | 0.5 | 21.6 | 0.6 | 17.8 | 0.6 |
| South Dakota. | 37.4 | 7.5 | 48,321 | 1,598 | 12.5 | 0.9 | 24.8 | 1.3 | 16.8 | 1.2 |
| Tennessee. | 37.8 | 3.1 | 41,693 | 423 | 17.1 | 0.5 | 23.1 | 0.6 | 17.0 | 0.4 |
| Texas | 35.8 | 1.5 | 49,392 | 391 | 17.4 | 0.2 | 22.6 | 0.3 | 22.8 | 0.3 |
| Utah. | 14.7 | 2.5 | 55,869 | 805 | 12.7 | 0.7 | 22.1 | 0.8 | 16.9 | 0.6 |
| Vermont. | 28.3 | 7.1 | 52,776 | 1,420 | 10.3 | 0.9 | 32.0 | 1.4 | 12.1 | 0.7 |
| Virginia. | 31.4 | 2.5 | 61,882 | 507 | 10.5 | 0.3 | 32.9 | 0.5 | 15.0 | 0.4 |
| Washington | 27.7 | 2.2 | 56,835 | 569 | 12.6 | 0.3 | 26.8 | 0.6 | 16.6 | 0.4 |
| West Virginia | 35.6 | 5.7 | 38,482 | 875 | 17.2 | 0.8 | 19.3 | 1.0 | 17.5 | 0.9 |
| Wisconsin | 31.3 | 2.5 | 50,395 | 428 | 12.2 | 0.4 | 25.5 | 0.5 | 15.3 | 0.3 |
| Wyoming . . . . . . . | 31.6 | 8.6 | 56,322 | 1,890 | 10.7 | 1.1 | 22.5 | 1.9 | 14.9 | 1.4 |

[^9] interval.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011 American Community Survey.

While the model does not explain all of the variance in recent births to unmarried women, it explains about 67 percent, indicating that educational level and income are important factors associated with the occurrence of recent births to unmarried women. Clearly, however, these two factors alone do not account for all of the variation that is observed across states. In short, there are other unmeasured factors which also affect the proportion of births to unmarried women at the state level.

## METRO FINDINGS

Figure 2 shows percentages of women with a birth in the last year who are unmarried for the metropolitan statistical areas in the United States. ${ }^{18}$ Since having a birth in the 12 months prior to the survey is a relatively rare event, estimates of the proportions of these births that are to unmarried women can be quite variable, even at the metropolitan level. Because of this, we show only whether estimates differ significantly from the national average, rather than showing a range of values.

Among the metropolitan areas with estimates at least 10 percentage points higher than the national average are Flagstaff, Arizona (74.6 percent), Greenville, North Carolina (69.4 percent), Lima, Ohio (67.5 percent), Myrtle Beach-North Myrtle Beach-Conway, South Carolina (67.4 percent), and Danville, VA (67.3 percent). None of these estimates

[^10]Table 4.

## Selected Metropolitan Statistical Areas With Among the Highest and Lowest Percentages of Recent Births to Unmarried Women Aged 15 to 50: 2011

For information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, and definitions, see www.census.gov/acs/www

| State | Percent nonmarital births |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | Margin of error ${ }^{1}$ |
| U.S. total. | 35.7 | 0.5 |
| Among the highest ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
| Flagstaff, AZ | 74.6 | 15.2 |
| Greenville, NC | 69.4 | 15.2 |
| Lima, OH | 67.5 | 13.7 |
| Myrtle Beach-North Myrtle Beach | 67.4 | 17.9 |
| Danville, VA | 67.3 | 24.0 |
| Brunswick, GA | 66.2 | 35.2 |
| Redding, CA | 63.8 | 30.8 |
| Monroe, LA | 62.5 | 17.7 |
| Sumter, SC | 61.6 | 24.9 |
| Albany, GA. | 61.5 | 17.0 |
| Among the lowest ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
| Cheyenne, WY. | 4.7 | 8.5 |
| Palm Coast, FL | 6.2 | 14.4 |
| Jonesboro, AR. | 8.0 | 12.8 |
| Provo-Orem, UT | 8.2 | 4.5 |
| Missoula, MT | 8.6 | 11.3 |
| St. George, UT. | 10.4 | 15.9 |
| Logan, UT-ID . | 10.7 | 10.3 |
| Kennewick-Pasco-Richland, WA | 12.2 | 10.4 |
| Bremerton-Silverdale, WA . | 12.5 | 8.1 |
| Lake Havasu City-Kingman, AZ. | 12.7 | 11.3 |

[^11]Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011 American Community Survey.
differs statistically from each other, and they also do not differ from estimates for some other metropolitan areas. But all of the areas listed above are significantly higher than the U.S. average value of 35.7 percent.

Among the metropolitan areas with percentages of unmarried women with a birth in the last year that are at least 10 percentage points below the national average are Provo-Orem, Utah (8.2 percent), Kennewick-Pasco-Richland, Washington (12.2 percent), Bremerton-Silverdale, Washington (12.5 percent), and Lake Havasu City-Kingman, Arizona (12.7
percent). None of these estimates differs statistically from each other, and they also do not differ from some estimates for other metropolitan areas. ${ }^{19}$ A complete list of percentages of women with a birth in the last year who were unmarried, for metropolitan areas is available in Table A available on the Internet at <www.census.gov/hhes/fertility /data/acs/>.

As demonstrated above at the state level, a statistical model can quantify the amount of association

[^12]
among several factors. The same model that was used for states was estimated for metropolitan areas and shows the same pattern of positive association between the proportion of women with less than a high school degree and the proportion of recent births to unmarried women. We also see the same negative association with income, such that metropolitan areas with higher median income have lower proportions of recent births to unmarried women, in general. With the larger number of metropolitan areas compared with states, there was an increase in the variance of the proportion of recent births to unmarried women. The model explains roughly 27 percent of the variance, less than was explained in the state-level model mentioned above. So, while the model shows women's educational levels and
household income to be related to the proportion of recent births to unmarried women over and above the area's proportion of unmarried women, it also demonstrates again that there are other factors related to the proportion of recent births to unmarried women.

## SOURCE AND ACCURACY

The data presented in this report are based on the ACS sample interviewed in 2011. The estimates based on this sample approximate the actual values and represent the entire household and group quarters population. Sampling error is the difference between an estimate based in a sample and the corresponding value that would be obtained if the estimate were based on the entire population (as from a census). Measures of the sampling errors are provided in the form of
margins of error for all estimates included in this report. All comparative statements in this report have undergone statistical testing, and comparisons are significant at the 90 percent level unless otherwise noted. In addition to sampling error, nonsampling error may be introduced during any of the operations used to collect and process survey data such as editing, reviewing, or keying data from questionnaires. For more information on sampling and estimation methods, confidentiality protection, and sampling and nonsampling errors, please see the 2011 ACS Accuracy of the Data document located at <www.census.gov/acs /www/Downloads/data _documentation/Accuracy/ACS _Accuracy_of_Data_2011.pdf>.
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