

Protecting Marriage Gets the Business

The battle over the future of marriage in Indiana has boiled over from the political and cultural battlefields into the business boardrooms. One fallacy, *Chick-Fil-A's* record setting sales day notwithstanding, is that preserving the importance of having both a husband and wife in marriage is bad for business. It is an opinion that came from a book by Richard Florida called "The Creative Class." When the *Wall Street Journal* reviewed Florida's theory, they dismissed it as "economic snake oil."

Marriage has a great number of business benefits. Married men have stronger employment status than cohabiting men. Men's productivity increases by 27 percent as a result of marrying. Women in intact marriages have a higher income-to-needs ratio than women in any other family structure. Dr. Jennifer Morse of the Ruth Institute notes, "The family is absolutely necessary for the market to function. The substitutes to the family are expensive and ineffective, and taxpayers end up paying the price."

As to the claim that the 31 state marriage protection amendments create bad business environments, there are numerous job studies that debunk this lie:

- The US Department of Commerce's Bureau of Economic Analysis ranked states for per capita personal income growth from 1999-2009. Eight of the top ten states for best personal income growth have passed Marriage Protection Amendments. None have same-sex marriage or civil unions.
- *CEO Magazine* surveyed 543 Chief Executive Officers asking them to rank the best and worst states for business and job growth. All of the top five have marriage protection amendments. The worst five business environment states were California, New York, Michigan, New Jersey and Massachusetts, the first state to allow the unraveling of marriage.
- In February, *Kiplinger Financial Magazine* named the top ten states for predicted job growth in 2012. Every one of the top five states have marriage protection amendments.
- This fall, CNBC profiled "America's Top States for Doing Business" using input from the National Association of Manufacturers and the Council on Competitiveness. Nine of the top ten business-friendly states have marriage protection amendments. None has same-sex marriage. Those states with same sex marriage landed toward the bottom of their business performance data.

In spite of this easily obtainable data, the myth that respecting marriage is bad for business continues to be repeated. If the Indiana legislature allows Hoosiers to vote on the importance of marriage including husbands and wives, mothers and fathers, I will bet you a *Chick Fil-A* sandwich that this lie will still be a scare-tactic used against it.

Micah Clark is the Executive Director of the American Family Association of Indiana

Footnotes: There are ten different examples of state economic ratings found in the National Organization for Marriage Research Briefing Paper: “Is Gay Marriage Good for the Economy?” Two of them are cited in the above editorial. Eight others are not mentioned in this simply due to space, but all ten make the point that by various measures from various entities and sources, states with marriage protection amendments are not being harmed in these rankings. Moreover, the majority of high performing states have amendments. States with same-sex marriage rank low by comparison. (http://www.nationformarriage.org/atf/cf/{39d8b5c1-f9fe-48c0-abe6-1029ba77854c}/NOM_RESEARCH-BRIEF_ECONOMY.PDF)

Chick Fil-A’s record setting sales day: <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/08/02/huckabee-chick-fil-appreciation-day-beyond-anything-could-have-imagined/>

http://articles.philly.com/2012-08-03/news/33020623_1_world-record-today-sales-turnout

Married men have higher incomes: “The median income of married men living with their spouses is 64 percent greater than that of married men whose spouses are absent, 109 percent greater than never-married men, and 33 percent greater than divorced men.” Heritage Foundation, <http://www.familyfacts.org/charts/360/married-men-have-higher-incomes-than-single-men>

“Men in cohabiting households tend to have lower earnings than married men with families. Based on the 1990 census, the average income of males in married-couple families (\$34,533) was twice that of males in co-habiting couple families (\$17,889).” Heritage Foundation <http://www.familyfacts.org/briefs/9/cohabitation-vs-marriage-how-loves-choices-shape-life-outcomes>

Married women fare better economically than other women in other living structures: “Married women are less likely to experience poverty. Compared to never-married peers, women who had ever been married were substantially less likely to be poor—regardless of race, family background, non-marital births, or education. Ever-married women have a poverty rate that was roughly one-third lower than the poverty rate of never-married women. Currently married women had an even lower probability of living in poverty—about two-thirds lower than other women.” Heritage Foundation <http://www.familyfacts.org/briefs/8/marriage-and-poverty>

Married Women, Highest Income to Needs Ratio: “When the babies were six months old, married mothers reported, on average, the highest income-to-needs ratio (4.26), followed by cohabiting mothers (2.3) and then single mothers (1.17). Income-to-needs ratio (total family income divided by poverty threshold) is an indicator of financial resources per person in each household; higher ratios suggest greater financial resources.” Heritage Foundation: <http://www.familyfacts.org/briefs/9/cohabitation-vs-marriage-how-loves-choices-shape-life-outcomes>

“On average, married mothers have much higher per-capita family incomes than peers who are divorced, single, or cohabiting. On average, never-married and divorced mothers had much lower per-capita family incomes compared to married mothers regardless of their living arrangements. Cohabiting single mothers did the best among non-married mothers but still had lower per-capita incomes than married mothers.” Heritage Foundation, <http://www.familyfacts.org/briefs/31/family-structure-and-economic-well-being>

Dr Jennifer Robak Morse, Ruth Institute “The family is absolutely necessary for the market to function . . . the substitutes are expensive and taxpayers end up paying the price.” **The New York Times reports Marriage Leads to Economic Prosperity**, Ben Johnson, July 20, 2012

<http://www.lifesitenews.com/news/the-new-york-times-reports-marriage-leads-to-economic-prosperity/>

Bullet Point 1 - Personal Income Growth States:

http://www.bea.gov/scb/pdf/2011/07%20July/D%20pages/0711dpg_k.pdf

Chamber of Commerce, Enterprising States 2011

<http://ncf.uschamber.com/library/2011/06/enterprising-states-2011>

Bullet Point 2 - <http://chiefexecutive.net/best-worst-states-for-business>

Bullet Point 3 - <http://www.kiplinger.com/slideshow/top-10-states-for-employment-growth-2012/1.html>

Bullet Point 4 - <http://www.cNBC.com/id/100016697>